

## Developments

### **Review Essay – Fuyuki Kurasawa’s, *The Work of Global Justice: Human Rights as Practices* (2007)**

By Adam De Luca\*

[FUYUKI KURASAWA, *THE WORK OF GLOBAL JUSTICE – HUMAN RIGHTS AS PRACTICES* (Cambridge University Press, 2007); ISBN: 9780521673914; 256 pp.; \$31.99 Paperback]

#### **Abstract:**

This is a book review of FUYUKI KURASAWA’S, *The Work of Global Justice: Human Rights as Practices*. Fuyuki Kurasawa is an associate professor of sociology, political science and social and political thought at York University in Toronto. Professor Kurasawa has a particular interest in human rights and global justice through the exploration of the theoretical underpinnings of global justice projects. Kurasawa proposes a theoretical model that strikes a balance between normative universalism and empiricism. This leads to a vision of an alternative globalization marked by radical redistribution of economic and political power. The work of global justice is largely the emancipation of those who are systemically barred from justice, through five modes of ethico-political practice: bearing witness, forgiveness, foresight, aid and solidarity. This book review is a critical look at this theoretical model and his vision of an alternative globalization.

## **A. Introduction**

Fuyuki Kurasawa is an associate professor of sociology, political science and social and political thought at York University in Toronto. His particular interest in human rights and global justice is in the exploration of theoretical underpinnings of global justice projects; “the theoretical analysis of the socio-political labour that underpins projects of global justice and the modes of practice under which human rights struggles can be regrouped, in order to pose an alternative to the principal tendencies within the human rights literature today (formalism and normativism,

---

\* Adam De Luca is currently a J.D. student at Osgoode Hall Law School in Toronto, Canada, and senior student editor of the German Law Journal. Email: adamdeluca@osgoode.yorku.ca. [Many thanks to Professor Peer Zumbansen for his guidance and helpful comments in the writing of this review, and also for additional materials and resources for further study.]

on one hand, and empiricism on the other)."<sup>1</sup> Kurasawa proposes an alternative vision of globalization, marked by a sensitivity to the struggles of people for justice in their unique historical and cultural settings.

The project of Kurasawa's *THE WORK OF GLOBAL JUSTICE: HUMAN RIGHTS AS PRACTICES*, is to dethrone a formalistic traditional view that justice is advanced by and through norm-setting juridical institutions. On the traditional model (simply stated, without nuance), justice is the product of setting appropriate abstract norms to govern the state, and installing the correct institutions to further those norms. Kurasawa labels this the "top-down" approach.<sup>2</sup> Kurasawa's project is perhaps most clearly stated in the abstract from the book's jacket:

Human rights have been generally understood as juridical products, organizational outcomes or abstract principles that are realized through formal means such as passing laws, creating institutions or formulating ideals. Kurasawa argues that we must reverse the 'top-down' focus by examining how groups and persons struggling against global injustices construct and enact human rights through transnational forms of ethno-political practice.<sup>3</sup>

In unfolding this idea, Kurasawa's project is not merely a descriptive empirical analysis of the groups struggling against global injustice, but rather it is an attempt to use the descriptive analysis as the starting point of reforming institutions to reinforce their projects. Kurasawa frames what he sees as a middle position between formalistic institution-driven pursuit of justice, and mere empirical description of socio-political struggles for justice. He calls this middle position, 'critical substantivism'. Kurasawa envisions human rights institutions as extensions of the people who are struggling on the ground: "aside from examining the actually existing patterns of socio-political action produced by progressive civil society participants [in historically specific socio-cultural contexts], critical substantivism advocates an extension and intensification of the emancipatory tasks that contribute to alternative globalization."<sup>4</sup> That is, Kurasawa applies socio-political analysis to the struggles of people on the ground, thereby working 'from below' to create institutions that emancipate those who are bound (economically and politically)

---

<sup>1</sup> Fuyuki Kurasawa, *Fragments Around Critical Cosmopolitanism*, available at: <http://www.yorku.ca/kurasawa/Fuyuki%20research%20socio-political%201.htm>, last accessed 29 March 2010.

<sup>2</sup> FUYUKI KURASAWA, *THE WORK OF GLOBAL JUSTICE: HUMAN RIGHTS AS PRACTICES* (2007).

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*, abstract found on book jacket.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.*, 10.

giving a voice to those who do not have one. The work of global justice, analyzed through the lens of critical substantivism, is therefore dependant on the needs and demands of the people in their specific cultural and social settings.

The majority of the book is, therefore, dedicated to exploring the struggles of people on the ground; further positing that institutions ought to be structured to reinforce and aid people in those struggles. The book also scrutinizes the relation between the developed and the developing world through a vision of an interdependent and globalized civilization. It challenges those of us in developed nations to find communion with those who suffer through what Kurasawa depicts as five forms of 'practice': bearing witness, forgiveness, foresight, aid and solidarity. These practices are the work of global justice, through which an alternative globalization may be constructed.

## **B. Critical Substantivism, the Five Modes of Ethico-Political Practice and Critical Cosmopolitanism**

### *I. Critical Substantivism*

The theoretical foundation laid by Kurasawa for the five modes of practice is what he terms 'critical substantivism'. As discussed above, this model is a blend of formalism and empiricism. Critical substantivism is a balance of the abstract principles of justice articulated by international institutions, and the observable reality of struggles of people on the ground.<sup>5</sup> Kurasawa urges that international institutions need to remain sensitive to the empirical evidence and the real-life struggles that are taking place. The focus needs to shift away from abstract principles to a new dynamic understanding of justice founded in the struggles of others. Through the five modes of ethico-political practice, global justice is best promoted. Kurasawa employs several diagrams that map how critical substantivism lies between normative universalism and empiricism, and how the five modes of ethico-political labour are intended to constitute the work of global justice.<sup>6</sup> They are all interdependent forms of practice, and all exist between pure empirical observation and abstract institutional norms.

---

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*, 9.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*, 9, 12, 16, 17.

## II. Chapters 1-5: Bearing Witness, Forgiveness, Foresight, Aid and Solidarity

Having an understanding of critical substantivism is a prerequisite for understanding the five modes of ethico-political practice (bearing witness, forgiveness, foresight, aid and solidarity). One of the virtues of Kurasawa's work is the clear presentation of his arguments related to the various concepts. Further, as Kurasawa notes, "[the] sequential treatment of the five modes of practice is a heuristic device rather than a suggestion about their discrete or self-contained status. In fact, they are characterized by a considerable degree of overlap and interdependence, to the point of being mutually constitutive; engagement in one mode of practice is facilitated a great deal by performance of the labour that defines the others..."<sup>7</sup> As a consequence, the 'conclusions' derived from each practice appear to be, in fact, variations (Kurasawa may prefer to refer to them as fragments<sup>8</sup>) of the same idea driving each ethico-political practice. Namely, each practice is driven by and informs one single idea: critical substantivism; therefore, each practice is essentially the self-aware process of moving from actual experiences of people on the ground to (context-specific) ideals and norms.

For Kurasawa, *bearing witness* involves that practice whereby humans observe and report the struggles of others. It is an important practice because it encourages people to participate in helping others who are the victims of global injustices. One of the greatest enemies of global justice is indifference.<sup>9</sup> Kurasawa explains the value of bearing witness: "By way of a publicly framed dialogical process that often crosses socio-cultural and territorial borders, the two parties engaged in testimonial labour are enacting a pattern of social action composed of the tasks of speaking out and listening, representing and interpreting, creating empathy, remembering and preventing."<sup>10</sup> But it does not come without a warning: it is important not to become de-sensitized to the plight of others simply because we find ourselves in the face of overwhelming evidence of widespread injustice.

---

<sup>7</sup> *Id.*, 22.

<sup>8</sup> Fuyuki Kurasawa, *Fragments Around Critical Cosmopolitanism*, available at: <http://www.yorku.ca/kurasawa/Fuyuki%20home.htm>, last accessed 5 April 2010: "The title of the website, 'Fragments' "express[es] a productive tension between the fact that its different components are woven together relatively loosely and the existence of a common thread running through most of them."

<sup>9</sup> Kurasawa (note 2), 42.

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*, 53.

*Forgiveness* is depicted as that distinctly human capacity to break the cycles of revenge.<sup>11</sup> Forgiveness does not entail forgetting the injustices of the past, but is to be understood as an active part of the sociological practices of truth telling and record-keeping.<sup>12</sup> This practice comes with a caveat. Kurasawa notes that “certain commentators have declared that ‘[f]orgiveness died in the death camps’...of Nazi Germany or, one could add, in the killing fields of Cambodia, the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda. Perhaps this is so. Indeed perhaps this ought to be so when wrongdoers repudiate reciprocal participation in the labour of forgiveness designed to a situation of moral asymmetry. At the same time, we should keep in mind that, however difficult and limited it may be, forgiveness is not doomed to failure since it persists as a source of hope and justice in the face of disastrous legacies and seemingly intractable troubles around the world.”<sup>13</sup> *Asking* for forgiveness is, for Kurasawa, as important as *giving* forgiveness. It allows for a *dialogue* to be opened, whereby the opportunities for peace and justice can flourish. Forgiveness, as an active practice is structured as a two-way street, requiring something on the part of the one seeking forgiveness as well as the ones being asked to forgive.

*Foresight* is the ability to employ bearing witness and forgiveness into the future. It is the need to learn from the past to understand what is in the future, and how to prevent human rights violations from occurring. It is, like all human rights practices, an active process constantly in need of re-evaluation. The practice of foresight is the practice of being aware of the existing power structures, and determining how best to deal with them to provide greater emancipatory opportunities to the oppressed. Foresight is not leaving the task to future generations. Foresight, working now, “is most likely to sustain an emancipatory politics”<sup>14</sup> through the awareness of current power struggles. “It must be made, starting with us, in the here and now.”<sup>15</sup>

*Aid* is defined as the *capacity to give*, and as the *duty* placed upon those who have to give to those who have not. Despite the worry that it is endless, it is incumbent upon developed nations to help under-developed nations. The problem with aid as it is traditionally understood, is that, “neither development nor international relief work constitutes an effective mechanism of global reallocation of resources. Both rely excessively on the self-conceived benevolence of individual Euro-American

---

<sup>11</sup> *Id.*, 56.

<sup>12</sup> *Id.*, 92.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*, 93.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*, 19.

<sup>15</sup> *Id.*, 125.

donors and countries that can freely choose (or, most often, refuse) to extend a helping hand, simultaneously leaving intact the transnational system that lies at the root of the global South's perpetual impoverishment and subordination."<sup>16</sup> Kurasawa re-imagines aid as, "a form of normative and political labour that implicates both those helping and those being helped in substantiating the latter's socio-economic rights, while simultaneously struggling against the conditions which cause and sustain vulnerability for vast sections of humankind."<sup>17</sup> It would be accurate to categorize Kurasawa's conception of aid (combined with the other forms of practice) as a development theory of emancipation, whereby the primary duty of international organizations is not to assist in economic restructuring, or even in 'top-down' human rights efforts, but rather to "conceptualize aid as a form of social action, a mode of ethico-political practice that helps vulnerable human beings extract themselves from their immediate life-threatening predicaments, while at the same time aiming to remove the structural injustices that produce conditions of severe poverty, discrimination and transmission of epidemics in many of the world's societies."<sup>18</sup> The concept of aid is to emancipate the oppressed and give a voice to those who do not have one. Institutions, therefore, ought to strive to remove barriers to free speech, public participation, and socio-economic and cultural equality, not be the barriers themselves.

*Solidarity*, intertwined with all of the above concepts, is perhaps the most important to Kurasawa. Solidarity is the culmination of having respect for others, and standing with them in their struggles. Bearing witness, having the willingness to forgive, having foresight and giving aid all results in finding solidarity with the plight of others. It is recognizing the pluralism of our world, moving past our different beliefs to find commonalities and mutual and reciprocal respect. Kurasawa claims that solidarity requires a cosmopolitanism from the "bottom-up"<sup>19</sup> and readily admits the difficulties, and potential for conflict of such a vision.<sup>20</sup> He insists, however, that one must engage in that labour nonetheless.

---

<sup>16</sup> *Id.*, 130.

<sup>17</sup> *Id.*, 131.

<sup>18</sup> *Id.*, 155.

<sup>19</sup> *Id.*, 163.

<sup>20</sup> *Id.*, 192.

### *III. Critical Cosmopolitanism*

The culmination of Kurasawa’s vision of the work of global justice, through the five modes of ethico-political practice, is what he calls critical cosmopolitanism. It is a new goal that globalized societies ought to strive towards, through which justice is promoted. Kurasawa holds that, “strongly stated, human rights only matter to the extent that agents put them into practice via forms of socio-political and ethical action that challenge relations of domination and contribute to systemic change, thereby protecting persons and groups from mass, severe and structural injustices or, more affirmatively, contributing to meeting human needs and making human capacities flourish.”<sup>21</sup> The primary duty is to be aware of others, to feel compassion, and to not ignore them. Critical cosmopolitanism is an alternative view of globalization that is founded on the recognition of the struggles of individuals and groups for justice worldwide, with a duty imposed on developed nations to facilitate and create the necessary conditions through structural transformation that make it possible for the realization of their goals:

Critical cosmopolitanism is dedicated to the advancement of global justice in all its dimensions: North-South and domestic socio-economic redistribution, egalitarian reciprocity, the creation of substantively participative and polycentric democratic institutions, the prevention of political and structural violence, as well as the pluralistic recognition of marginalized subjectivities.

However, unlike most cosmopolitan theories that are oriented toward the normative or institutional aspects of global justice (i.e., what are its ethical foundations and what formal political structures can bring it about, respectively), critical cosmopolitanism is envisaged here as lens with which to comprehend the socio-political labour involved in constructing an alternative world order... [T]ransnational, public and dialogical repertoires of social action and sets of social relations (such as bearing witness and solidarity) create and undergird cosmopolitanism.<sup>22</sup>

In light of the foregoing, it is accurate to claim that we see, in Kurasawa’s work, the emergence of a political and economic ethic of emancipation. Encouragement of public participation in local and state governance becomes an essential feature of the new cosmopolitan society. Politically, democratic principles and ideals are

---

<sup>21</sup> *Id.*, 195, 196.

<sup>22</sup> Fuyuki Kurasawa, *Fragments Around Critical Cosmopolitanism*, available at: <http://www.yorku.ca/kurasawa/Fuyuki%20research%20socio-political%201.htm>, last accessed 29 March 2010.

associated with this vision insofar as democracy provides the conditions under which individuals and groups can have their voices heard; economically, Kurasawa envisions a globalization with a redistribution of resources from the 'Global North' to the 'Global South':

"a substantive theory of global justice strategically deploys and redefines the notion of human rights to contribute to the dense labour of radically restructuring socio-political relations at local, national and global scales via **participatory political and economic democracy**, the **North-South and domestic redistribution of resources** and of capacities for existence, the establishment of new institutions of global governance, as well as intercultural dialogue" [emphasis added].<sup>23</sup>

It seems fair to characterize Kurasawa's ideal theoretical conception of an alternative globalization as a level playing field, both locally and internationally. Actors struggling for human rights engage in meaningful *dialogue* with others in order to determine their own realization of substantive human rights. Kurasawa envisions this through participation in local, national and international political processes, and significant redistribution of wealth and power on a global scale.

### C. A Critical Lens

THE WORK OF GLOBAL JUSTICE is a well-organized text. Kurasawa has organized each concept so as to be accessible to the reader, with each chapter following a fairly easily navigable pattern of analysis. The understanding of his ideas is facilitated through the use of various diagrams provided in the introductory chapter. As a pedagogical tool, these enable the reader to grasp the conclusions that Kurasawa intends to draw. The diagrams illustrate where Kurasawa places each mode of ethico-political practice: that is in the middle position between normative universalism and empiricism, showing how they are the labours of global justice. As an unfortunate consequence, however, since the theoretical model is so well explicated, the book feels largely repetitive throughout each chapter.

Despite its highly structured organization, THE WORK OF GLOBAL JUSTICE suffers at times from the use of florid prose.<sup>24</sup> Although the overall structure is clear from the outset, individual thoughts are confusing to pick out from the whole on account of

---

<sup>23</sup> Kurasawa (note 2), 205.

<sup>24</sup> This has also been noted of Kurasawa's writing style in a review of another of one of his books, *The Ethnological Imagination: A Cross-Cultural Critique of Modernity*: Neil Gross, *Book Review: The Ethnological Imagination: A Cross-Cultural Critique of Modernity* 111 AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY 940 (2005).



this. Kurasawa cites over 310 different authors in the span of just over 200 pages. Oftentimes the quotes are no more than allusions to an entire body of thought that Kurasawa leaves hanging for the reader to interpret.<sup>25</sup> This technique runs the risk of barring a reader who is not familiar with these works from understanding many of the details and subtle points that Kurasawa is making. Sometimes it is also unclear *what* Kurasawa is referencing as he paraphrases a thought into one or two sentences followed by a citation to a whole work.<sup>26</sup>

It has been noted in a review of this book by Elaine Coburn in the *Journal of the Society for Socialist Studies* that while laudable in its efforts to tackle global justice from a critical and practical perspective, the book is remarkably lacking in an analysis of political economy.<sup>27</sup> That is to say, Coburn believes that Kurasawa has a great sensitivity to cultural aspects, but makes little headway into an analysis of how, for example, democratic processes are to be installed and how radical economic redistribution can be legitimized given the world as it is. Coburn illustrates this point:

The reader is reminded generically of ‘asymmetries of power within national and global arenas, which enframe the socio-political production and reception’ (31) of global justice practices. Near the conclusions, Kurasawa suggests that some of these power asymmetries are associated with specific, concrete historical relationships, including ‘neoliberal capitalism’ and ‘neo-imperialist unilateralism’ – but these are never defined and certainly not explored in any detail. Likewise, there are passing, underdeveloped references to ‘structural violence’. At one point, Kurasawa suggests that ‘democratic control of production’ (207) is necessary against such ‘global threats’ as neoliberal capitalism. But, these structures are gestured to, rather than explored and explained as specific, material arrangements that contribute to global injustice.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> As a paradigmatic example, see Kurasawa (note 2), 47: “‘assassins of memory’ (Vidal-Naquet 1992).” This reference is left unexplained.

<sup>26</sup> As a paradigmatic example, see *id.*, 73: “On the contrary, interpretive pluralism and reasonable disagreement are signs of democratic robustness, for citizens ought to retain and exercise their right to dissent as well as contest official versions of history that risk congealing into new and supposedly self-evident dogmas (Gutman and Thompson 2000).” What is unclear to the reader is whether this sentence is intended to be an encapsulation of the entire work.

<sup>27</sup> Elaine Coburn, *Book Review: The Work of Global Justice Human Rights as Practices* 5 *JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY FOR SOCIALIST STUDIES* 154, 156 (2009).

<sup>28</sup> *Id.*, 156.

While Coburn believes that this criticism could simply be the result of, “unfairly high expectations,”<sup>29</sup> the present reviewer is inclined to share this skepticism regarding the lack of deeper exploration of the political economy of the observed human rights issues. In light of the complexity of the subject, one is left asking for more analysis, more direction for further research, and, arguably, which direction human rights activism could go. Kurasawa’s project can be seen as trying to find a middle-point between normative universalism and empiricism: but what follows from this? While it is laudable to proclaim that humans ought to *participate* in the five forms of ethico-political practice, does this do more than to ask individuals, groups and nations to respect others and to treat others as ends? The lack of analysis of political (or legal) implementation leads one to draw only vague conclusions about attitude adjustment, and little in the way of how to substantively proceed forward. And while Kurasawa makes reference to “participatory political and economic democracy, [and] the North-South and domestic redistribution of resources,”<sup>30</sup> this aspect is not concretised much further. This could, for example, be done fruitfully in the context of the present debate around ‘global administrative law.’ This debate has involved public and international law scholars, political philosophers and political scientists from the North and the South for a number of years now in an exchange over the structural deficiencies of international organizations, rule-making and (participatory) governance.<sup>31</sup>

Kurasawa’s posited ideals turn out to be problematic as long as the conditions of their implementation are not scrutinized in more detail. As an example, if ‘democracy’ is to be understood as the tool of political and economic equality, it ought to be asked to what degree an unpacked conception of democracy might already raise issues of imperialism: inevitably the installation of institutions that lead to the political and economic emancipation involves importing Western democracy (and notions of pluralism).<sup>32</sup> Further to this, who chooses the elements

---

<sup>29</sup> *Id.*, 156.

<sup>30</sup> Kurasawa (note 2), 205.

<sup>31</sup> For more on this ongoing debate, see Nico Krisch, Benedict Kingsbury and Richard B. Stewart, *The Emergence of Global Administrative Law*, 68 *LAW AND CONTEMPORARY PROBLEMS* 15 (2005); Carol Harlow, *Global Administrative Law: The Quest for Principles and Values*, 17 *EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW* 187 (2006); B.S. Chimni, *Cooptation and Resistance: Two Faces of Global Administrative Law*, *INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL LAW AND JUSTICE: INTERNATIONAL LAW AND JUSTICE WORKING PAPERS* 2005/16 (2005); Nico Krisch, *Global Administrative Law and the Constitutional Ambition*, *LAW, SOCIETY AND ECONOMY WORKING PAPERS* 10/2009 (2009), available at <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1344788>, last accessed 9 April 2010; Alec Stone Sweet, *Constitutionalism, Legal Pluralism, and International Regimes*, 16 *INDIANA JOURNAL OF GLOBAL LEGAL STUDIES* 621 (2009).

<sup>32</sup> See SUSAN MARKS, *THE RIDDLE OF ALL CONSTITUTIONS: INTERNATIONAL LAW, DEMOCRACY, AND THE CRITIQUE OF IDEOLOGY* (2000), and ANTONY ANGHIE, *IMPERIALISM, SOVEREIGNTY AND THE MAKING OF INTERNATIONAL LAW* (2005).

of democracy to be adopted in any given situation? Who chooses which downtrodden group has their voice validated through political processes? What are the boundaries of an ethic of emancipation through democratic principles? That is, when one group asserts its rights, what are the duties imposed on others? Is that burden always justifiable? There is room for fruitful engagement with concurring research in law and legal pluralism.<sup>33</sup> With regard to another issue, particularly the case for radical international economic redistribution, it remains unclear how, within a world-spanning capitalist order, Kurasawa proposes to achieve a radical redistribution of wealth from developed nations to underdeveloped nations. Who controls this redistribution of wealth in an international market of goods, services and capital? More research is needed in this direction.<sup>34</sup> Yet again, his call for a ‘reform’ of the political landscape remains unsatisfying (and controversial) without further unpacking of the claim that, “politically, the principal threats to global justice today consist of a belligerent, neo-imperialist US unilateralism (exercised in the name of the ‘war on terror’) and the prevalence of crimes against humanity in several settings...”<sup>35</sup> In light of the intense exploration of these issues, Kurasawa’s observations in this regard cannot be more than signposts in that direction.

## D. Conclusion

THE WORK OF GLOBAL JUSTICE is a call for attitude adjustment in those seeking to promote global justice. The work of global justice, rather than implementing “top-down” abstract principles of justice, is to labour in five modes of ethico-political practice: bearing witness, forgiveness, foresight, aid and solidarity. These five modes of labour exist between the institutions and the struggles of people on the ground, and flow from the conditions and needs of others.<sup>36</sup>

Although Kurasawa’s ‘middle position’ invites skepticism on the basis that in order to provide concrete guidance it would need to be further developed and

---

<sup>33</sup> See Robert M. Cover, *Violence and the Word*, 95 *YALE LAW JOURNAL* 1601 (1986), Sally Engle Merry, *New Legal Realism and the Ethnography of Transnational Law*, 31 *LAW AND SOCIAL INQUIRY* 975 (2006), and *THE PRACTICE OF HUMAN RIGHTS. TRACKING LAW BETWEEN THE LOCAL AND THE GLOBAL* (Mark Goodale & Sally Engle Merry eds., 2007).

<sup>34</sup> See, for example, DAMBISA MOYO, *DEAD AID: WHY AID IS NOT WORKING AND HOW THERE IS ANOTHER WAY FOR AFRICA* (2009), ROBERTO MANGABEIRA UNGER, *FREE TRADE REIMAGINED: THE WORLD DIVISION OF LABOR AND THE METHOD OF ECONOMICS* (2007), and DANI RODRIK, *ONE ECONOMICS, MANY RECIPES* (2007).

<sup>35</sup> Kurasawa (note 2), 208.

<sup>36</sup> This is illustrated in a diagram found on *id.*, 197.

concretized, it must be noted that finding the middle ground is often the most difficult task. It is comparatively easy to be an extreme optimist who holds that abstract principles are sufficient to constitute the work of justice. It is likewise easy to be an extreme skeptic who holds that there is no meaningful contribution that international institutions can make to the struggle of those suffering because of the particularity of their conditions. Kurasawa illustrates that the structures of institutions must reflect the needs of the individual or group within the appropriate social and cultural setting. The work of justice can never be abstracted from the particular circumstances in which the struggle for justice is found. As Kurasawa notes, the work of global justice is never finished: "the work of global justice is always in the making, incomplete and partial, for it dwells in escapable aporias as well as formidable institutional obstacles and social pathologies; actors must continuously engage in the demanding tasks of which the five modes of practice are composed, to confront sources of situational and structural violence around the planet."<sup>37</sup>

Kurasawa's alternate vision of globalization, a pluralistic cosmopolitanism 'from below,' casts a striking difference to the future of globalization on its present path. It calls for a radical redistribution of political and economic power on a global scale. In the ideal vision of critical cosmopolitanism, the perfect balance of power leads to the perfect balance of interests: this is the emancipation of those struggling to attain justice. Because imbalances inevitably persist, Kurasawa's vision of the constant labour of global justice is to continuously work to build institutions that encourage emancipation rather than bar it. The attitude adjustments required in order to frame this new globalization stem from the constant duties to bear witness, forgive, have foresight, give aid, and find solidarity with others.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> *Id.*, 210.

<sup>38</sup> In this context, see an important work: HAUKE BRUNKHORST, *SOLIDARITY: FROM CIVIC FRIENDSHIP TO A GLOBAL LEGAL COMMUNITY* (Jeffrey Flynn transl.) (2005). Also see, THOMAS POGGE, *WORLD POVERTY AND HUMAN RIGHTS*, 2ND ED. (2008).