

2015

Review of Edges of Global Justice: The World Social Forum and its Others

Manisha Desai

University of Connecticut, manisha.desai@uconn.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/swb>

 Part of the [Human Rights Law Commons](#), and the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Desai, Manisha. 2015. "Review of Edges of Global Justice: The World Social Forum and its Others." *Societies Without Borders* 10 (1). Available at: <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/swb/vol10/iss1/7>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Cross Disciplinary Publications at Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Societies Without Borders by an authorized administrator of Case Western Reserve University School of Law Scholarly Commons.

Conway, Janet. 2013 *Edges of Global Justice: The World Social Forum and its Others*. London and New York: Routledge.

True to its title, Janet Conway's groundbreaking book *Edges of Global Justice* illuminates both the leading and the outer edges of the World Social Forum (WSF) as a global event and process of (pursuing?) global justice. Aware of the methodological and epistemological limits of analyzing such a complex phenomenon, her methodology "walks forward questioning," and her epistemology acknowledges "the limits of my own knowledge, its partial, positional, and situated character, and the therefore open-ended nature of my conclusions" (pg. 5). Informed by this self-delimiting approach, she conceptualizes the WSF as a global political and cultural project and interrogates, in a sympathetic yet critical manner, the theory and praxis of some major currents within the WSF: the new politics of open space, WSF as global civil society, the new politics of autonomist theorizations, and feminisms. Using a post-colonial, anti-racist, feminist and practice-based approach, Conway's main argument is that the WSF is a product of the emancipatory traditions of Western modernity, a site of contention among those traditions as well as the site where subaltern presences demonstrate the limits of those traditions. Yet amidst the current conjunction of Neoliberal capitalist expansion and neo-imperial "anti-terrorism," the WSF – despite its problematic aspects – might represent one of the most hopeful opportunities for transformation of the aforementioned (Eurocentric / Western) traditions as well as the additional movements that constitute the WSF.

Engaging the vast literature that now exists on the WSF – among which this book will now be a must-read – Conway begins by challenging the understanding of many commentators that the non-intelligibility of the project in process is desirable. She argues that this obscures the operations of power within it. Furthermore, in describing the genealogies of the WSF she reminds us to go beyond the anti-globalization protests in the Global North by focusing on the specific struggles in Brazil and Latin America as well as the entire Global South. Conway insists that we not dismiss the contributions of newer social movements to the WSF process. Similarly, she is critical of the WSF and its mostly male and "light-skinned" analysts for not recognizing that some of its defining practices are shaped by the young, white autonomists from the Global North and feminists from the North and South.

Her analysis of WSF as an open space versus deliberative movement shows that, after much internal contestations, the open space conception has won. However, she argues that these debates are those of the Brazilian and Latin American Left. As the WSF moved from Brazil to India and then to Kenya, Dakar and beyond, subaltern groups were able to disrupt this dynamic but did not displace it. Rather, subaltern actors were included as subordinates and given the

(corresponding) material inequalities and their political modalities. She wonders if they can be easily assimilated or engaged as epistemological equals. In a similar vein, Conway highlights the contradictions of the WSF as global civil society. She argues that the WSF's praxis moves beyond Habermasian and Gramscian analysis and is influenced by radical Latin American politics. Therefore it might be better captured by Sen's (2007) conception of incivil -- as opposed to civil or uncivil -- which focuses on the ways in which the insurgents are producing their own associational forms and articulating issues that go beyond those shaped by the state and market dichotomies of Western civil societies. As for the autonomist trend, she argues that it is a particular Euro-American product embodied by young, white men. While others have noted this demographic composition, few have analyzed it as Conway does. She demonstrates how some of the underlying principles of autonomy, such as self-organizing, involve privilege and how that leaves out the subaltern. By reinscribing the coloniality of power and knowledge they are at the outer edges, but to the extent that they emphasize anti-statist, anti-capitalist and prefigurative non-violent politics in everyday life they are at the leading edges of the WSF.

In the chapter on feminisms, Conway convincingly demonstrates how the culture of the WSF reflects practices of hegemonic Latin American masculinities, captured by the concept of the Porto Alegre Men. Through their intersectional analysis of neoliberalism, their focus on embodied issues such as reproductive rights and sexuality, their transversal practices of solidarity and coalition building, and their knowledge as praxis, feminists are at the leading edges of the WSF. Yet, they often operate in silos that privilege gender over other axes of oppression, thus reproducing inequalities and operating within "acceptable bounds of difference," including the avoidance of religion and spirituality issues.

While Conway provides a rich, nuanced, and sophisticated analysis of the WSF as praxis, she reproduces some of the same erasures and limits that she demonstrates in the WSF. For example, in her discussion of feminisms, while she acknowledges multiple feminisms, her analysis primarily engages one Latin American variation, Articulation Feminista Marcosur, and the global World March of Women. Dalit, Asian, Indigenous, Afro-descendant Latin American and Caribbean, and African feminisms are mentioned but not engaged systematically as they "did not leave written traces." While it is commendable that she acknowledges the extent to which coloniality of knowledge and power shapes her book, and recognizes that other methods are needed to study the non-European ways in which the subaltern speak, it is not enough to continue privileging the privileged. The subaltern, uncritically singular, do not speak either at the WSF or in Conway's book.

In noting this, I do not intend to diminish its rich contributions but only to echo her insight that to engage other worlds and epistemologies, we need other languages, and as long as we rely exclusively on the written, academic, and colonial languages we too see the subaltern only in their cultural and spectacular presence even as we critique it. Nonetheless, Conway's work is an admirable accomplishment and falls in the category of what Bevington and Dixon (2005) refer to as movement relevant theorizing. *Edges of Global Justice* is sure to be read by activists as well as scholars, and will hopefully inform their practices.

REFERENCES

Bevington Douglas & Chris Dixon 2005. "Movement-relevant Theory: Rethinking Social Movement Scholarship and Activism," *Social Movement Studies: Journal of Social, Cultural and Political Protest*, 4:3, 185-208

Sen, Jai. 2007. "The Power of Civility," *Development Dialogue*, 49:51-67.