

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository:<https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/162115/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Choi, Shine, Souza, Natalia Maria Felix da, Lind, Amy, Prugl, Elisabeth, Parashar, Swati and Zalewski, Marysia 2023. Editorial: A global feminist public sphere? *International Feminist Journal of Politics* 25 , pp. 157-159. 10.1080/14616742.2023.2195743

Publishers page: <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616742.2023.2195743>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



EDITORIAL

A global feminist public sphere?

Becoming more inclusive, appreciating and negotiating difference, and counteracting the coloniality of knowledge – these goals have been central for *IFJP* editors from the inception of the journal at the turn of the millennium. Twenty-three years on, the list of the top ten countries from which our submissions originate now includes China, India, Brazil, and Turkey; however, *IFJP* remains an Anglophone journal whose authors and readers continue to come disproportionately from the UK and the US. In 2023, about 60 percent of our submissions are from these two countries, followed by about 10 percent from Australia (on par with China). Conversely, as measured by article downloads, 52 percent of our readers are from Europe, mostly from the UK, followed by North America (22 percent). The next highest category are readers from Asia, accounting for 11 percent. *IFJP* can thus rightly claim to be an international journal – though its weight is in the Western Anglosphere.

Clearly, the geographical pattern of submissions and downloads is just one indicator of many to measure inclusion and diversity, and not a particularly good one with regard to most dimensions of difference. We also believe that we are doing better when looking at the themes covered in the journal's articles, which invariably explore and critique power relations of all kinds. However, it is worth reflecting on why a feminist journal attuned to global dynamics of power and committed to fostering dialogue across borders has difficulty moving beyond the Western Anglosphere.

There are, of course, multiple reasons that we could cite for the geographical hegemony reproduced in our pages, and though we can no doubt try even harder, it is worth recognizing the power structures that preserve inequalities in global knowledge production

and dissemination. These include the colonality of epistemes and the English language as much as material differences related to funding and infrastructures. We are particularly concerned about the way in which new information technologies are threatening to aggravate existing hierarchies and exclusions. On the one hand, the Open Access (OA) movement is tearing down the paywalls that limit who can read our articles. Thus, article downloads for *IFJP* have almost quadrupled since 2015, and the most downloaded articles in the journal tend to be OA. On the other hand, OA is turning publishing into a privilege that can only be enjoyed by authors at well-resourced institutions that pay the publishers' substantial fees for processing articles, thereby amplifying epistemic injustice. Moreover, the publishing business increasingly thrives on metadata on the behavior of authors and readers, which has become a commodity and influences what we read and cite. Many feminist journals in Latin America and Africa have always published OA outside the increasingly monopolistic publishing industry that dominates Anglophone knowledge dissemination. Yet, they fear that being excluded from the commercial platforms of publishers perpetuates their invisibility. The impact of these new infrastructures on attempts to create an inclusive, global, and feminist public sphere is pernicious.

Even as we struggle to make sense of these patterns of epistemic injustice, and reflect on what we could be doing differently, the articles in this issue remind us that different feminisms are offering insights into new forms of resistance, and vocabularies that are both inclusive and limiting. Arpita Chakraborty demonstrates through a re-reading of Bourdieu how the Dalit women's movement in India has paved the way for thinking about intersectional emancipatory politics from the margins. Similar ideas are to be found in Devin K. Joshi's article, which advocates – through an examination of the case of peace campaigner Jeannette Rankin – for engagement between Daoist thought and modern feminism to inform feminist political activism globally.

Revisiting and recovering different feminisms also implies engaging with gendered concepts that inspire feminist research and activism. Jill Williams and Kate Coddington show us how “the family” continues to be invoked in public information campaigns, which then engender affective responses shaping transnational migration policies and governance. Wenyan Tu and Xianjuan Guo study Chinese corruption practices to tell us that the exclusion of women from clientelist networks makes them less tolerant of corruption.

The path to feminist resistance is discussed in Lilli Loveday, Jenny Rivett, and Rosie Walters’ article, which offers insights into young girls’ resistance practices in nine countries in the Global South, underlining that it is not just Greta and Malala who are politically engaged and active. Mona Lilja, Mikael Baaz, and Filip Strandberg Hassellind tell us that resistance to female feticide or sex selection in societies such as India is possible through new theoretical formulations that challenge normative understandings of which bodies represent what, how, and when.

Social media has been a useful space for crafting feminist resistance, but it is not an unequivocally benign tool. Claire Fitzpatrick reminds us that social media hashtag campaigns are not always about solidarity; on the contrary, we can end up being unwittingly complicit in structures of inequality, discrimination, and oppression. Finally, Natalie Jester’s article offers an important exploration of how arms manufacturers use social media to convey their neoliberal “feminism.” Socially progressive messages and images are disseminated via Twitter to hide the degradation and damage that their products inflict.

Times are tough, and solidarities are threatened and inequalities challenged in many different ways. Yet, as reflected in this issue of *IFJP*, feminist research always reminds us that hope lies in not only dismantling conventional patriarchal wisdom, but also – and arguably more importantly – critically and continuously examining feminist language,

vocabularies, and practices. Feminisms demand perpetual reflexivity and critical scrutiny, for that is what makes our research impactful, necessary, and future oriented.

shine choi (she/her/hers)

*School of People, Environment and Planning, Te Kunenga ki Pūrehuroa Massey University,
Aotearoa New Zealand*

[[[INSERT EMAIL LOGO]]] S.Choi1@massey.ac.nz

[[[INSERT ORCID LOGO]]] <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6583-7563>

Natália Maria Félix de Souza (she/her/hers)

*Department of International Relations, Pontifical Catholic University of São Paulo, São
Paulo, Brazil*

[[[INSERT EMAIL LOGO]]] nmfsouza@pucsp.br

[[[INSERT ORCID LOGO]]] <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9914-8985>

Amy Lind (she/her/hers)

Taft Research Center, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, OH, USA

[[[INSERT EMAIL LOGO]]] amy.lind@uc.edu

Swati Parashar (she/her/hers)

School of Global Studies, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden

[[[INSERT EMAIL LOGO]]] swati.parashar@gu.se

[[[INSERT ORCID LOGO]]] <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7162-6367>

Elisabeth Prügl (she/her/hers)

Gender Centre, Geneva Graduate Institute, Switzerland

[[[INSERT EMAIL LOGO]]] elisabeth.pruegl@graduateinstitute.ch

[[[INSERT ORCID LOGO]]] <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-4363-3540>

Marysia Zalewski (they/them/theirs)

School of Law and Politics, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK

[[[INSERT EMAIL LOGO]]] ZalewskiM@cardiff.ac.uk

[[[INSERT ORCID LOGO]]] <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0449-2199>