

Review Essay

POSTSTRUCTURALIST APPROACHES TO DEVELOPMENT: SOME CRITICAL REFLECTIONS

by Anur Agrawal

Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World, by Arturo Escobar. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.

The Anti-Politics Machine: "Development," Depoliticization, and Bureaucratic Power in Lesotho, by James Ferguson. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.

The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power, edited by Wolfgang Sachs. London: Zed Books, 1992.

In recent years, poststructuralist approaches have made inroads into most arenas of social inquiry. They now occupy center stage in specific subdisciplines of anthropology, history, geography, and political science, and they have begun to influence discussions about environmental issues and economic development. Rather than displacing earlier approaches, poststructuralist strategies have attempted to uncover and expose reigning assumptions, seeking thereby to demonstrate the politics inherent in established discursive formations. This is particularly true in developmental studies.¹

AUTHOR'S NOTE: Discussions with Catherine Boone, Sabine Engel, Julie Greenberg, Jesse Ribot, K. Sivaramakrishnan, and an ad hoc of the political economy seminar at the University of Texas at Austin have aided immensely in the writing of this review essay. I gratefully acknowledge all the help I have received.

PEACE & CHANGE, Vol. 21 No. 4, October 1996 464-477
© 1996 Peace History Society and
Consentium on Peace Research, Education and Development

Two characteristics seem to distinguish the approach of poststructuralist scholars from others. Writings from within such fields as Marxist studies, cultural analysis, dependency theory, and political economy attempt most often to examine empirically the developmental processes that affect people. Poststructuralist writings, in contrast, devote far greater attention to rhetorical and discursive strategies (the interplay of ideas, images, myths, and language in defining worldviews) that are critical to creating the concept of development. Second, while earlier analyses accepted the desirability of development on the whole, poststructuralist studies focus more critically on the processes of knowledge-production that are essential in casting development as a universal aspiration. Owing a large debt to theorists who have written about the organization of discourses and narratives, especially to Michel Foucault and his insistence on the integral relation between power and knowledge, scholars such as James Ferguson, Arturo Escobar, and Wolfgang Sachs have examined the politics that is central to the production of the development discourse.

This review discusses three recent poststructuralist works that have thus "problematized" development: Escobar's *Encountering Development*, Ferguson's *Anti-Politics Machine*, which was earlier published in hardcover by Cambridge University Press, and *The Development Dictionary*, edited by Sachs. After briefly describing the three texts, I want to offer a wider, three-part critique of poststructuralist methodology. Initially, I will outline some of the foundational elements of the development "project," especially as it has unfolded in the post-Second World War era. The treatment here is necessarily sketchy and aimed mainly at viewing some of the central assumptions of development as seen by poststructuralist theorists.

The second section briefly examines the theoretical insights from poststructuralism that have been used to challenge ("interrogate") the concept of "development." Analyses by such scholars as Escobar, Ferguson, and the contributors to Sachs's edited volume force our attention toward the operation of power in development processes and the unquestioned cultural assumptions that undergird the development debate. At the same time, these works exemplify the difficulty poststructuralist critics face in moving beyond critique and pointing out productive avenues of change. In order not to contradict their critique and epistemological stance, the second section suggests, poststructuralist theorists are forced to repeat as conclusions the assumptions of their critique (what I later refer to as "overdetermination").

The third section suggests that this contradiction is imposed by their acceptance of some of the foundational elements of the development discourse. The conclusion implicitly uses Gayatri C. Spivak's notion of "catachresis" to cast "development" as a concept that we must persistently critique but cannot not (wish to) have.² Calls to go beyond development (Escobar), or to pose alternatives to development (Ferguson), I suggest, misapprehend the absorptive powers of the discourse and labor under the illusion that a pristine postdevelopment era is even imaginable.

Despite the critical comments that follow, all three of the texts reviewed in this essay deserve wide circulation, discussion, and debate. The viewpoints expressed form a welcome and different corrective to the widespread belief that current strategies of development, with their focus on administrative/technical solutions and market-oriented strategies, are going to alter the life prospects of the world's marginalized inhabitants. In calling for ethnographies of those institutions that produce development rhetorics, poststructuralist approaches also force us to recognize how visions of progress that we take as natural are in fact constructed, but, nonetheless, produce "real" effects.

* * * * *

James Ferguson's *Anti-Politics Machine* is a thought-provoking study of internationally aided and centrally motivated development in Lesotho, Africa. (Using textual analysis of a World Bank development report and a case study of the Thaba-Tseku livestock and range management project, Ferguson delivers a Foucauldian critique that (1) examines how, even when they "fail," development projects strengthen the capacity of central governments to intervene in a society, and (2) suggests that the logic of failure and reform, intervention and depoliticization, may be an integral part of the "development apparatus." Ferguson, interested as he is mainly in the effects of the development discourse, refuses to provide any general response to the question, "If not development, what?") His book aims to critique rather than to prescribe.

Aurore Escobar's *Encountering Development* is more ambitious in scope. He seeks to generalize the arguments Ferguson produced for Lesotho, examining how "development" has come to organize social reality in the greater part of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Writing powerfully and paying close attention to the discourses produced by development economists and international aid institutions, Escobar points to the underlying political aspects of "development" and the ways

in which political issues are transformed into technical ones. Refusing to be co-opted by the new emphases in national/international programs directed toward peasants and small farmers, women, and sustainable development, Escobar calls for dismantling the development paradigm and its institutional infrastructure. In their stead, he offers the reader seductively vague visions of hybridity, locality, and difference, consistent with the romance of poststructuralism.

The Development Dictionary, edited by Wolfgang Sachs, contains 20 short essays by 17 scholars (not all of whom may consider themselves poststructuralists) on such development-related issues as equality, participation, planning, poverty, progress, science, socialism, and the state. Provocative and often polemical in its assessments of these staid orthodoxies, the *Dictionary* forms an invaluable resource for anyone who is interested in rethinking basic formulations about development. Part of the explanatory burden taken on by the contributors to the *Dictionary* is to convince the reader that most of the concepts that today we take for granted, and consider as natural, have a rather recent history. As reifications of a social reality, operationalized through a positivist science, such concepts serve the interests of a centralizing state and its ruling elite, further mechanisms of exploitation that are exercised in the name of development, and require a thorough overhaul.

Narratives about development and related issues, then, have become an object of intense critical attention for poststructuralists. Most of them do not deny the existence of the problems to which "development" emerged as the solution: misery, poverty, and exploitation (Escobar, p. 53; Ferguson, pp. 63, 279; Sachs, p. 1). Yet, the acceptance of such problems as genuine, demanding concrete solutions, creates some puzzles for poststructuralist writers. The chief suggestion of this reviewer is that conclusions from recent poststructuralist writings about development processes and discourses are either "overdetermined" (excessively and tautologically driven by theory) or self-contradictory. The assumptions to which poststructuralism commits scholars such as Ferguson, Escobar, and Sachs lend a discursive dynamic to their arguments that leads to one of two dead-ends. This choice between overdetermined inference and self-contradiction is forced upon poststructuralist authors by the uneasy relationship between the substance of their subject (development) and the methodology of their approach (deconstruction). As Spivak suggests, deconstruction cannot generate a political program of any kind even if it is a politically necessary stance.³ Ferguson and Escobar exemplify the two different problems to which poststructuralist

writings fall prey, while in Sachs's edited volume the problems are mixed together.

The Development Project

In the post-Second World War period, "development" has emerged as a central preoccupation of governments, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), activists, and scholars working on the political economy of the so-called Third World. As Gustavo Esteva suggests in the *Dictionary*, "development occupies the center of an incredibly powerful semantic constellation. There is nothing in modern mentality comparable to it as a force guiding thought and behavior" (p. 8). Between the mid-1940s and the mid-1950s, according to Escobar, the regime of development emerged with the objectives of improving the well being and living conditions of those people in "underdeveloped" regions. In effect, it provided an institutional regime that operated at the local, regional, national, and international levels, and encouraged a discursive formation that designated specific peoples and nations as undeveloped. Thus, in the view of Escobar, Ferguson, and other poststructuralist scholars, Western discourses about development have successfully created an object of development (Third World countries and their poor), imposed a Western vision of desirable social change on this object, and created institutions through which this change should be accomplished (international donors and aid agencies). Sachs claims, "The idea of development stands like a ruin in the intellectual landscape. Delusion and disappointment, failures and crimes have been the steady companions of development and they tell a common story: it did not work" (p. 1). Escobar similarly argues, "Instead of the kingdom of abundance . . . the discourse and strategy of development produced its opposite: massive unemployment and impoverishment, untold exploitation and oppression. The debt crisis, the Sahelian famine, increasing poverty, malnutrition, and violence are only the most pathetic signs of the failure of forty years of development" (p. 4).

A more historical approach to the phenomenon of development reveals deficiencies in some of these assertions. It is an open question whether the emergence of the "development discourse" and its professionalization and institutionalization took place only from the 1940s onward. Perhaps development in various forms historically has been an objective of many states that sought legitimacy and authority.⁴ Second, in asserting that "development" is an imposition of the West, poststructuralist scholars seem to falter on theoretical as well as empirical grounds. They

misappropriate Foucault, for whom power always possessed multiple facets. Power is never simply domination, and resistance is never in a position of exteriority to power or domination.⁵ Similarly, power is never simply negative or exercised just through institutions.⁶ To see "development" as an imposition, or especially, as an imposition by institutions, is to reproduce the hegemonic positions of those who seek to "develop" others without considering the active resistance by those subjected to development. It is to adopt, ironically, a particularly impoverished optic on power by seeing it as synonymous with domination and imposition. Finally, it is also debatable whether development is seen as necessary only for those who live in the Third World, nor is it clear that only outsiders view as desirable the changes that "development" introduces.

The lure of "development" is founded, ultimately, on a conceit, one captured well in the quotation from Harry Truman with which Escobar begins his book (and which is used by a number of poststructuralist critics). Truman remarked: "More than half the people of the world are living in conditions approaching misery. . . . Their poverty is a handicap and a threat both to them and to more prosperous areas. For the first time in history humanity possesses the knowledge and the skill to relieve the suffering of these people. . . . We should make available to peaceloving peoples the benefit of our store of technical knowledge. . . . [G]reater production is the key to prosperity and peace. And the key to greater production is a wider and more vigorous application of modern scientific and technical knowledge" (p. 3). In the poststructuralist vision, then, the "development discourse" is crucially premised on the existence of misery and poverty and the ways in which better scientific and technical knowledge can help relieve those conditions. The source of this knowledge is modernity and its bearers: Western countries and institutions. The rational organization of production, the correct application of scientific knowledge, and the resulting material benefits, "development discourse" claims, is likely to deliver the fruits of a better life to those who are deprived. In this rendering, "development" is only the familiar tale of modernity, progress, and enlightenment that poststructuralist theorists such as Jacques Derrida, Gilles Deleuze, Michel Foucault, Jean-François Lyotard, and Friedrich Nietzsche have so successfully interrogated and problematized.

Poststructuralist Approaches to Development

In a preliminary, by now well-known, statement, Lyotard characterizes postmodernity as "incredulity toward metanarratives."⁷ If the postmod-

ent condition is associated with a loss of faith in such metanarratives as modernity, progress, truth, and enlightenment-style rationality, post-structuralists are the most important speakers for the condition of postmodernity. Attempting to move beyond the reduction of the world to a set of representable objects whose underlying relationships can be scientifically studied and elucidated (structuralism/positivism, loosely speaking), as well as its conceptualization in terms of a meaning-giving transcendental self (hermeneutics/interpretivism, again loosely speaking), poststructuralists are committed to examining how power functions through language, discourses, and institutions. Of the different poststructuralist theorists, Foucault has most influenced scholars of development.

In the context of development, this distrust of metanarratives (also referred to as "master" or "totalizing" narratives) and the search for the ways in which power manifests itself as the coming of reason, has translated into an examination of the ways in which the development discourse came into being in the mid-1940s and of the effects it produces. Specific strategies of development were criticized, of course, long before the turn to poststructuralism. Thus, even within the development establishment, as Ferguson points out, there have been challenges. An enormous restlessness and dissatisfaction with the lack of success can be seen in the rapidity with which various shibboleths have yielded to new ones—from economic growth, to growth with equity, to minimum needs, to appropriate technology, to human capital, to participatory development, to sustainable development, and most recently, to indigenous knowledge.

Poststructuralist critiques, however, have aimed deeper, striking at the very notion of development as a desirable objective. It has been a two-pronged strategy. The first is the familiar one, already often used: questioning the stories of the achievements of development. Poststructuralist critiques point to the ways in which the project of development has failed to bring about the changes it sought in the lives of marginalized and poor people. It has failed to improve poor people's lives, failed to change power relationships, failed to even ameliorate exploitation. Failed to reverse the ecological impacts of industrialization. And currently, we are witnessing a process of economic globalization that is likely to marginalize the powerless even further. But while earlier scholars used such failures to draw the lesson that new strategies were necessary, poststructuralist critics jettison the very notion of development as the second part of their strategy. They ask whether these failures may not be built into the very logic of "development." Further, they suggest,

even in its "failures" the project of development succeeds in bringing about particular effects with remarkable regularity, and those effects might constitute its actual objective.

The real impact of "development" is the extension of state capacities, the legitimization of the state and the asymmetrical relations of power it defends, and the delegitimation of transformative challenges to the status quo at the local, national, and international levels. Every failure of development fires a new strategy, and every new phase leads to greater professionalization and institutionalization of the very apparatuses that should have been called into question by the failures. The notion of "development," according to poststructuralist critics, has become so deeply rooted that it has successfully divided the world into those who are developed and those who are not. It has made the transition to the developed state, misleadingly measured in quantitative terms, the overriding priority of social policy (Escobar, p. 213). And it has cast the Western world as possessing the basic material and scientific means, and technical and human expertise, needed to achieve the developed state.

Instead of pursuing development, poststructuralist critics suggest, the apparatuses, institutions, and mechanisms that create the discourse of development must be discredited and dismantled. Pursuit of development in Lesotho, as Ferguson documents, only led to the creation of a larger bureaucracy and the intrusion and entrenchment of state presence in the Thaba-Tseka district. The story repeats itself in countless locations throughout the world.

This poststructuralist critique, I want to emphasize, is productive. It points, at the very least, to what might be interpreted as the unintended consequences of development projects, especially as they have been implemented in different parts of the world. The critique also goes further. It highlights the importance of greater attention to politics. It questions the necessity of the involvement of a range of bureaucratic institutions in the promotion of development. It shows the integral relationship between the production of particular types of discourses and the selection of specific countries and peoples as needing a particular trajectory of change. Poststructuralist approaches, then, have uncovered previously neglected facets of "development" that require more insistent and systematic analysis.

Beyond this point, however, problems quickly arise. If poststructuralist scholars stop with critique here, they have offered no program of constructive engagement. There are two implications to advancing only

a critique: what I call the problems of (a) the "empty critique," and (b) "overdetermination." Yet, if poststructuralists attempt to move beyond simply attacking established notions, they are liable to contradict the epistemological imperative of their stance.

Empty Critique The arguments are rather well rehearsed. Opponents of the poststructuralists can ask, "While many of your criticisms are valid, what are your alternatives?" Poststructuralist theorists can answer, "We only aim to critique." The questioning has a special force, however, because as long as one accepts the real-world existence of the problems to which "development" is posed as a solution, academic critiques become insufficient. You cannot replace something with nothing.

Constructive engagements with the development project are necessary because the trenchant critiques of development from poststructuralist scholars arrive at a time when the apparatus of development is simultaneously in disarray and has gained greater strength. For instance, theorists have pointed to the need to consider more sympathetically the needs and contributions of indigenous populations, to pay greater attention to local communities' strategies for managing dwindling resources and contesting state power, to involve and empower marginalized groups, to focus on issues of resistance and domination, or to question bureaucratic control. One can find these statements even in reports from the World Bank and national planning documents from developing countries—and certainly in the writings of scholars who see themselves as part of the "development discourse." The babbling up of such issues has helped disrupt the logic of standard strategies of development. But we also see emergent themes of a different kind at precisely the same time. The collapse of the socialist economies and the triumph of the philosophy of the market has lent weight to the hegemonic belief in "getting the prices right" and in the privatization of resources. There is now greater rhetorical valence in assertions that push markets and property as the basic prerequisites of development. Development discourse thus demonstrates a remarkable flexibility by incorporating the need to consider the interests of indigenous and marginalized communities as well as issues related to resistance, empowerment, and ecological stress.

Considering the absorptive capacities of the development discourse, Ferguson's theoretically reflective refusal to develop any alternatives to development becomes problematic. His analysis avoids the problem of internal contradiction but falls prey to becoming an "empty critique." Calling for a disengagement from "development," he suggests that

those who are constituted as underdeveloped, can, and do, fight their own battles (p. 281). But his call to disengage is troubling. If Ferguson means disengaging from the discourse of development, his advocacy rests upon a belief in the productive logic of critique and counter-critique. That is to say, if one stops engaging development discourses, they would wither away, various subject populations would find their own ways to contest development and marginalization, and development through state intrusion would lose its legitimacy. But such a vision is ultimately founded upon the confusion of a purist. It is far more than patterns of criticism that sustain development processes and the discourse of development. However, if Ferguson is advocating working with counter-hegemonic forces alone, and agrees that hegemony is defined locally (p. 287), there is no compelling reason to disengage from the state or international development agencies. Given the enormous power and resources they wield, and the possibilities of discontinuities within them, giving up on them as lost causes would be to yield too much—just as focusing only on reforming them through critique would be to hope for too much.

Overdetermination The second, more fundamental implication of relying merely on a critique is what I call the problem of overdetermination or tautological restatement. As already suggested, poststructuralism begins with the assumption that universalist notions of progress, truth, and rationality are not persuasive. The crisis of representation that is the hallmark of postmodernity is a function precisely of the denial of reality and its replacement by text and discourse. All universalist themes thus become problematic and contested, their validity depending simply on their location in specific discursive formations. The poststructuralist critique of "development," when it seeks to disengage, stops precisely at this point—reiterating its initial assumptions. "Development" becomes simply a flawed vision of progress. There is nothing in terms of evidence that might lead poststructuralist scholars to a different conclusion. But if this is the point at which one wished to stop, there was little need to have gone through the arguments questioning development: one could simply have asserted the complicity of development with power, as an article of faith. One could, then, simply have stopped at the beginning.

Recognition of the twin problems of "empty critique" and "overdetermination" compels poststructuralist scholars of development to pose solutions. But the proffered solutions raise the problem of internal contradiction.

Internal Contradiction

Giving in to the seduction experienced by Karl Marx when he asserted that scholars have only interpreted the world when the point was to change it, writers such as Escobar shy away from an empty critique. They prefer, instead, to advance their own vision of what might replace "development." Citing Homi Bhabha and Chandra Mohanty, Escobar asserts that there are limits to the Western project of deconstruction and self-critique. "[T]he process of deconstructing and dismantling has to be accompanied by that of constructing new ways of seeing and acting. . . . This aspect is crucial in discussions about development because people's survival is at stake." Deconstruction and other critiques "cannot, of themselves, unreconstructed, represent otherness" (p. 17). Even Ferguson, who questions the need to advance an alternative, feels compelled, ultimately, to use his epilogue to present some cursory, possible alternatives.

Poststructuralist writers offer several options as possibilities beyond development. Escobar turns to grass-roots movements, local knowledge, indigenous peoples, and the power of popular protests in his search for a postdevelopment era. He would like to move away from "Western modes of knowing" to make room for other types of knowledge and experience. He approvingly quotes D. L. Sheth to talk about the actions of NGOs as symbolizing "alternative political practice." He focuses on hybridity as the metaphor to denote the kinds of political responses that are necessary to replace development. He talks, finally, about cultural difference, popular culture, and cybertecture as the sources from which alternatives to development might well.

Ferguson, who also uses Foucault as the wellspring of his theoretical approach, is far more circumspect than Escobar. Yet, in the end, he also voices a limited optimism: "The more interesting possibility is to seek out the typically non-state forces and organizations that challenge the existing dominant order and see if links can be found between our expertise and their practical needs as they determine them. Such counter-hegemonic alternative points of engagement might be found in labor unions, opposition political parties and movements, cooperatives, peasants' unions, churches and religious organizations and so on" (p. 287).

Of the contributors to the *Dictionary*, Majid Rahnema points to the importance of "very sensitive 'animators' . . . in grass-roots social movements, 'traditional and vernacular ways of interaction and leadership,' and the freedom from 'any fear or predefined conclusion' as character-

izing a move beyond the rhetoric of participation (p. 127). Esteve, talking about development, suggests that there is a "new commons" where the laws of economics and scarcity do not operate and that "common men on the margins" are likely to lead the way out of "development" (pp. 20-22). Claude Alvares, writing against science, finds the answer to lie in the fact that "people, groups and villages have openly rejected modernizing development and stubbornly insisted on maintaining their ways of life, their ambient interactions with nature, and the arts of subsistence" (p. 231).

The solutions from poststructuralist scholars are founded on the recognition that the problems of development are "real." Their solutions are intended to alter the conditions that existing development regimes have failed to change. But whether such strategies will be more effective in transforming the lives of those who have borne the brunt of the adverse impacts of social change is open to argument. Apart from the dubious status of the distinctions to which one must resort in attempting to draw the lines that favor indigenous knowledges and communities, local peoples, nonparty politics, or NGOs, it is not even very clear that these social formations and concepts possess the kind of transformative capacities that poststructuralist writers suspect. But let me focus on a different problem that is integral to the poststructuralist attempt to discredit development.

Ultimately, as Frederic Jameson points out in his thoughtful foreword to Lyotard's *The Postmodern Condition*, and in the opening pages of his *Postmodernism: The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, one can question metanarratives only by resorting to other metanarratives.⁸ In the subconscious of every attempt to interrogate a grand theme lurk the foundations of another grand theme. As one might expect, the texts of the poststructuralist scholars are rife with appeals to localism, to hybridity, to better life prospects, to cultural difference, to the indigenous, to cybertecture—take your pick(s)—which are supposed to provide the tools for fostering alternatives to "development." But these appeals are themselves subject to precisely the same critiques that scholars like Escobar and Ferguson level against "development."

Part of the tension, of course, stems from the treatment of multiple discourses around development as unitary and undifferentiated. Poststructuralist critics, especially Escobar, wield a broad brush that leaves tainted all aspects of whatever is connected with development. Little room remains for constructive engagement. This is quite ironic since much of what Ferguson, Escobar, and the contributors to Sachs suggest

as possibilities for moving beyond "development" has been explored by those who believe in development and by precisely those actors in whom Escobar locates the possibility of an alternative strategy: indigenous peoples' collectives, grass-roots organizations, popular movements, and so forth. In this sense, the calls to move beyond "development" or repudiate it may themselves be a submission to an illusion: that there is something beyond development.

Conclusion

The stance of this reviewer may be summarized as "I will engage, I must critique"—in contrast to the poststructuralist position of "I will critique, I will reject." Throughout this essay, I have tried to highlight the two dilemmas inherent in adopting a poststructuralist stance. One is led either to a position that repeats one's initial assumptions, or one is forced into contradictions that result from questioning metanarratives. In response, I suggest two small strategic shifts for poststructuralist scholars, the first of which can already be witnessed in the work of Stacy Leigh Figg.⁹ Instead of avowing an explicit commitment to poststructuralism and calling for a repudiation of "development," it might be far more fruitful to examine the ways in which attempts by the state to foster development are often used as instruments of legitimization and extension of political control, yet also often engender resistance and protest. It was Foucault, after all, who pointed to the positive as well as the negative aspects of power.¹⁰

A second productive move might be to accept the impossibility of questioning all metanarratives and instead to rethink how development can be profitably contested from within as well as from outside. Persistent criticisms of "development" are indispensable: calls to go beyond it make sense primarily as signifiers of romantic utopian thinking. In posing the dualisms of local and global, indigenous and Western, traditional and scientific, society and state—and locating the possibility of change only in one of these opposed pairs—one is forced to draw lines that are potentially ridiculous, and ultimately indefensible.¹¹ Development, like progress, rationality, or modernity, may be impossible to give up. Harbor-ing the seeds of its own transformation, it may be far more suited to co-optation than disavowal. Rather than fearing the co-optation by "development" of each new strategy of change, it may be time to think about how to co-opt "development." "[R]eversing, displacing, and

seizing the apparatus of value-coding"¹² is not just the task of the postcolonial position; it is the impossible task of all critical positions.

NOTES

1. See, for instance, Kimberly Pfeifer, "Modernization and Indigenous Knowledge: Options for Development or Strategies for Imperialism?" *Year & Change* 21, no. 1 (January 1996): 41-67.
2. Gayatri C. Spivak, *Outside in the Teaching Machine* (New York: Routledge, 1993), 284.
3. Gayatri C. Spivak, "Poststructuralism, Marginality, Postcoloniality and Value," in *Literary Theory Today*, ed. P. Collier and H. Rynn (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 104; see also idem, *The Post-Colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues* (New York: Routledge, 1999).
4. See, for example, David Ludden, "India's Development Regime," in *Colonialism and Culture*, ed. Nicholas B. Dirks (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992), 247-88.
5. See Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality*, 3 vols. (New York: Random House, 1978), 1: 95-96.
6. Michel Foucault, "Truth and Power" (1971), in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-77* by Michel Foucault, ed. Colin Gordon (New York: Random House, 1980), 122.
7. Jean-François Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), xxiv.
8. Frederic Jameson, *Postmodernism: Or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1991).
9. Stacy Leigh Figg, "Constructing Social Category Through Place: Social Representations and Development in Nepal," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 34, no. 3 (1992): 491-513.
10. Foucault, "Truth and Power," 121.
11. For a questioning of the distinction between indigenous/traditional and Western/scientific, see Anna Agrawal, "Dismantling the Divide Between Indigenous and Scientific Knowledge," *Development and Change* 26, no. 3 (1995): 413-39.
12. Spivak, *The Post-Colonial Critic*, 228.