

# Creating Knowledge by Editing a Handbook

## A Self-Critical Reflection

*Berit Bliesemann de Guevara, Katarzyna Kaczmarek, Xymena Kurowska, Birgit Poopuu, and Andrea Warnecke*

We set out on the journey of editing this Handbook with the aim of cultivating a pluralist archive of the many, partly incompatible, perspectives on knowledge and expertise in international politics and substantiating them as a transdisciplinary paradigm at the heart of International Relations (IR). Focusing on a variety of questions and puzzles, and loosely grouped by their different starting points or foci, the chapters assembled in this volume showcase the boundary work involved in drawing and enacting world-images and making knowledge claims. They highlight knowledge's fluidity, incomplete sedimentation, continuous contestation, and its situatedness in colonial modernity.

As such, the process of editing a handbook is an epistemic act in its own right. To '[stay] with the trouble' (Haraway 2016) of the process of its own making, we—the editors—want to finish this Handbook not with a classic conclusion, as such a task would be futile given the spirit of openings (as opposed to closures) that has guided our work, but with a self-critical reflection on the cultivation of knowledge through the editing of a handbook. The following sections reflect on our editing process through the lenses of practices, actors, structures, contexts, and relations, respectively. They lay open the rationales, decisions, and challenges that we encountered, confront the intersectional imbrication in power relations that no project can fully transcend, and acknowledge failures, while also embracing the joys of collective knowledge production. We hope to thereby contribute to more self-critical knowledge-making practices within the discipline of IR and beyond.

Creating Knowledge by Editing a Handbook is available open access online and distributed under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives 4.0 International licence (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), a copy of which is available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Berit Bliesemann de Guevara et al., *Creating Knowledge by Editing a Handbook*. In: *Knowledge and Expertise in International Politics*. Edited by: Berit Bliesemann de Guevara et al., Oxford University Press. © Oxford University Press (2025). DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780192871145.003.0067

## Handbook editing as epistemic practice

There has been a proliferation in recent years of ‘handbooks’—edited compilations of scholarly texts around different topics, some of them central to discussions in their respective disciplines, others more obscure—to the extent that it has provoked memes on social media, with colleagues claiming cheek-in-tongue to have published a ‘Handbook of Handbooks’ of this or the other publishing house. Far from being just a form of academic humour, such memes can be read as critique of a practice that is clearly driven by neoliberal politics of academic positioning on the part of editors and new revenue streams on the part of publishers. We ourselves have laughed at the ever-higher granularity of handbook themes, and yet, here we are, editing a handbook. Reflecting on our own motivations to embark on this five-year journey helps shed light on a central question about editing handbooks as an epistemic practice: What does editing a handbook do in epistemic terms?

One of the main reasons why we decided to edit a handbook on knowledge and expertise in international politics was to contribute to taking extant scholarship in this transdisciplinary field—including our own—out of many colleagues’ perception as a ‘niche’ and consolidate it as a recognized, transdisciplinary field within the discipline of IR. Editing a substantial handbook published by a renowned publisher is by far not the only way of making something ‘a thing’, a subject worthy to be taught in higher education and receive research funding. Rather, it contributes to the many other initiatives of the scholarly community concerned with knowledge politics, which include the publication of special journal issues and edited volumes and the organization of knowledge-themed conference panels and roundtables, including the establishment of a multi-year standing section on ‘Knowledge in International Relations: Epistemic Struggles in a Complex World’<sup>1</sup> at the European International Studies Association’s (EISA) annual conferences. In our own epistemic endeavour of field consolidation, the handbook was preceded by the founding of the Centre for the International Politics of Knowledge at Aberystwyth University by Berit Bliese-mann de Guevara and Inanna Hamati-Ataya in 2016<sup>2</sup> and their co-convening of the second-largest section at the EISA’s 2018 conference in Prague on the topic of ‘Global Epistemes: Structures, Practices, and Pathways of Knowledge Formation and Diffusion.’

Like any other epistemic practice, editing a handbook necessarily represents both coercive and productive workings of epistemic hierarchies. Performing a practice is made possible by mobilizing already existing epistemic resources (dominant and/or marginalized), while the performance itself affects the meaning of those resources and how they can and should be put to use. To edit a handbook consequently enacts an epistemic privilege that both recentres and can implode epistemic conventions; it enables certain things, while precluding or limiting others. It contributes to institutionalizing and canonizing knowledge by legitimating and operationalizing distinct categories and means of ordering that render alternatives less visible and authoritative. Such epistemic fixing, enabled by and in the exercise of academic freedom, makes systematic discernments based on explicit criteria and thus a judgement as to

which interpretations are superior. It produces scholarly consolidation that, as an orientating tool, facilitates access for students and others new to discussions and can thus level the stratified epistemic field. That the categorization and ordering of knowledge has sedimented can be seen, for instance, when students and scholars start locating their work within the proposed categories: ‘In my essay, I take a context-centred approach to ...’, or ‘This article contributes to the growing field of practice-focused studies of expertise in ...’. Such statements express an alignment with some epistemic authority—with different degrees of reflexivity about doing so; yet their newly established legitimacy also shows that epistemic reconfigurations, and the grounding of epistemic alternatives, are within our reach. Consolidation still produces epistemic foreclosures that limit creativity and freedom when they pre-empt an accepted way of how to think and talk about knowledge and expertise in IR. The categories and orderings established by this Handbook (as well as any other handbook) are based on decisions about inclusions and exclusions: as editors, we make judgements as to what does or does not count as knowledge and expertise in international politics. We are not, however, omnipotent in performing these practices. Not least, the neatly organized, published result obscures the degree of arbitrariness, chance, pragmatism, and compromise that underpins the act of creating and ordering categories, substantiating overarching themes, and establishing which chapters speak to which matters and thus warrant their placement in particular sections.

Our Introduction already mentions initial deliberations over the organization of this Handbook and how it could have been organized otherwise. Indeed, it took a couple of large A1 flipchart posters, a collection of detailed mind-maps drawn onto them, and several days of fierce in-person discussions among us editors to settle on the story this Handbook would tell through its ordering. The process went into the second round when we needed to justify this hard-won collective decision against ‘Reviewer 2’s’ inevitable critique. While invested in our line of reasoning, we never strove to make it a new ‘canon’ in the traditional sense, the must-read of knowledge studies in IR. There were countless moments during our regular Zoom meetings throughout the process when we questioned our own acts of fixing knowledge, and we continued to appreciate the contextual and pragmatic character of our categorization. Our objective was, in other words, to create a handbook that acknowledges the historical moment of its creation and its creators as necessarily embedded within the contemporary epistemic landscape, while also engaging in, as Jeffrey Boakye (2023) puts it, ‘curating something new, pruning, rummaging and bringing things together in unexpected ways’. To that end, we put in place several criteria to make the contents and authors in this Handbook as plural, collective, and transdisciplinary as possible, which—as we recount below—was a more challenging task than we had envisaged. The academic form certainly curbed our aspirations. Integrating an open-format ‘Disruptions and Meditations’ section into the Handbook seeks to break through the straightjacket of academic writing conventions at least to a degree. The final volume, we believe, straddles the purpose of the legitimacy-bestowing ‘canon’ and

the ‘curating’ of something new and unexpected. As such, we hope it helps others ground and contextualize their contributions in a transdisciplinary paradigm that makes space for doing so in a creative manner.

## **Handbook editors as epistemic actors: why us, and how does it matter?**

The epistemic practice of editing a handbook bestows expert authority upon its editors, or what in Bourdieusian terms might be called symbolic capital. While editing is one core task many academics perform, handbooks are not just like any other edited book, special issue, or compilation. They claim to be authoritative reference points, or in the words of our publisher, they are ‘authoritative and up-to-date surveys of original research in a particular subject area, which comprise ‘[s]pecially commissioned essays from leading figures in the discipline [that] give critical examinations of the progress and direction of debates, as well as a foundation for future research’ (Oxford University Press n.d.). Handbooks are meant to shape their fields, and their editors and contributors are seen as the avant-garde of this endeavour. Illustratively, the reason why this book is contracted as a stand-alone publication rather than part of the OUP Handbooks series, as we learned in the process of negotiating with the publisher’s commissioning editor, is that a ten-book series on IR had already been entrusted to two eminent general editors. They, in turn, had already decided on topics to be covered and solicited handbooks from other eminent scholars accordingly—yet another indicator of how knowledge in the discipline is ordered and canonized, epistemic authority is established and distributed, and the field (re-)bounded.

Rather than being commissioned, this Handbook came about as a joint project by five scholars who met in different roles at Aberystwyth University in 2019, finalizing or starting externally funded projects, or being a member of staff. There was no strategic planning in bringing together this particular group of scholars into an editorial team. We had the idea for this Handbook together, since we were all involved, as members and/or co-directors, in the activities of the Knowledge Centre. This Centre facilitates research and intellectual exchange across two interrelated strands: ‘knowledge production, expertise, and evidence in international politics’ and the ‘history, philosophy, and sociology of knowledge, science, and technology.’<sup>3</sup> We also concluded that being at the Department of International Politics at Aberystwyth would be a good place to make this intervention into the IR discipline. While still to some extent fetishized as the academic birthplace of the discipline of IR, despite research that has pointed to both the colonial roots and history of the discipline (Leira and de Carvalho 2018) and to its political ambitions (see Thakur, Chapter 2, ‘International Politics by Other Means: The Role of the Scholar in IR’), the Department is nonetheless a community with a reputation for allowing contradictions in IR scholarship to coexist, which created a suitable condition to start this transdisciplinary Handbook and bring together this group of editors.

Reflections on our positionalities did not initially determine the composition of the editorial team which, we acknowledge, is a manifestation of epistemic privilege. They surfaced patently, however, over the editing process and its problematization. While we were all based in the UK when the project started, we soon scattered across Western and Eastern Europe again, ending up in Wales, Scotland, the Netherlands, Hungary and Austria, and Estonia, which all have their own national higher education contexts that impact on individual editors' motivations, possibilities, and constraints. As contemporary academic nomads (only one of us currently works in the country where they were brought up and whose nationality they hold), we did not put our own demographics centre-stage in the epistemic process of handbook editing until a UK-based scholar with origins in the Global South declined our invitation to contribute to the Handbook since in their assessment it represented an exploitation of the labour of people of colour for our white-European benefits. We would also get scoffed on occasion for the team's all-female composition. We were thus confronted with a particularly problematic configuration of an epistemic privilege that derives from the confounded effects of the non-junior, white, European, and female demographic attributes.

This sparked further interrogation of our individual situatedness and the structural conditioning of both intra-European stratifications and epistemic hierarchies across the Global Norths, Souths, and Easts. Throughout the process, such instances would highlight the lack of intersectionality in critiques directed at global academia, where at different moments in time some characteristics acquire more saliency than others, with 'race' and 'whiteness' in addition to 'gender' currently being problematized with more awareness and nuance than, say, 'class' (germane, for instance, to a sense of inadequacy experienced by first-generation academics and the perversity of 'the imposter syndrome') or 'disability' (almost non-existent in dominant debates). In considering this aspect, we do not intend, overtly or by stealth, to engage in the establishment of 'hierarchies of humanity' or 'hierarchies of vulnerability', or to dismiss (our) white European female privilege. There is no way in which diverse experiences of oppression can be equated or played off against each other, or privileges denied. We hope instead to contribute to challenging mechanistic binaries that permeate processes of othering within global stratification and thus bring to bear more prominently the shaping role of contextual nuance.

Beyond class, nationality, and upbringing (on one or the other side of the 'iron curtain' that once divided Europe), the team's internal diversity also surfaced, for instance, in our different stances towards inhabiting (or not) a 'hyphenated' identity as scholar-activist (see also Nilsen and Cox, Chapter 48, 'Social Movements and Insurgent Social Theory: Making Theoretical Knowledge Through Collective Action'), which affects ways in which we know the world and thus the focus of this Handbook and its contributions. We confronted the dilemma of whether each chapter needs to embrace a form of criticality that we associate with, individually or as an editorial team, specifically regarding the contemporary decolonial struggle around knowledge and expertise. Or should we rather be programmatic about containing the urge to profess epistemic authority over what it means to be critical?

The issue returned in our—far from harmonious—discussion over whether to extend a timely invitation to scholars from war-torn Ukraine to co-author a chapter. There is no denying that non-hegemonic knowledges must be cultivated; and yet, we did struggle to settle on whose interests such invitations serve at the end of the day. Ultimately, the Handbook maintains these tensions and embraces unresolved frictions as inherent to this project.

## **(Incomplete) strategies to counter structural inequalities in academic knowledge production**

Reflections on our own positionalities and their embeddedness in historical trajectories and global structures of inequality, coloniality, and capitalism are integrated in how this Handbook attempts to counter patterns of inclusions and exclusions in academic knowledge creation. As editors, we sought to negotiate the concern of exploiting the labour of contributors. Early in the process, we renounced the logic of assembling canonical texts and eminent authors as established in academic conventions of what a handbook is and should do. Instead, we worked with the ethos of diversity and care—however incompletely—as our situated response to the structural inequalities that shape knowledge creation in the global academy. In practice, this meant compiling lists of contributors-to-be-invited that tallied authors and topics, considering gender and sexuality, career stage (i.e., including early career researchers), nationality/origin (especially searching for contributors from the Global Souths and Easts), race and ethnicity, location of their employing institution (again hoping to bring regions other than Europe and North America into the Handbook), and individuals situated along the spectrum from scholar to activist—a task that proved particularly ambitious, as we discuss below. Mindful of the problematic practice of ‘just adding voices’, we endeavoured to situate these intersectional guidelines within the authors’ larger scholarship, their practices of knowledge making, and the drafts they shared with us. However, we also observed the dictum that the introductory section to the Handbook should feature ‘brief answers by prominent scholars to the question of how they approach knowledge in IR’, as we wrote in one of the iterations of the book proposal. The names we thought should feature in the introductory section signalled a preference for academic status and established voices including critical and decolonial ones, presumably (although not necessarily explicitly discussed) to give gravitas and legitimacy to the Handbook. In other words, while constructing the introductory section, we reproduced the embodied conventions of academia of how to contribute to (and make a career in) an established discipline.

A standing criterion in the Handbook concerned ‘bringing in voices and ideas from the Global Souths’. In one of our online editorial meetings, we specifically pondered whether we might be overly bounding and thus possibly implicitly ‘romanticizing’ knowledge in/from the Global Souths; that is, whether we were pre-determining the role of place in the production of knowledge at the expense of other factors,

such as the shaping force of the globalized neoliberal academy (see Jerrems et al., Chapter 39, ‘The Everyday Practices of Making a Global Discipline’). In the editorial process, we experienced just how difficult it is to get outside of the Global Northern context. Many among our contributors, even if from diverse backgrounds, reside and work in the UK and other countries in the Global Norths, which con-founded our commitment and capacity to include voices from the Global Souths. Our preoccupation with places of origin and location of workplace brought to bear the issue of a default equation of certain spaces with authentic ‘decolonial knowledge’ (cf. Osorio Michel and Ackerly 2022) as well as its opposite. Ultimately, we recoiled from defining decoloniality as such, but the Handbook offers numerous illustrations of how ‘colonialism has not only displaced particular communities, but also their knowledges’ (Global Social Theory n.d.; cf. Tamale 2022).

We will not claim, however, that we responded fully to Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s (2019) call for a different understanding of knowledge. Key to establishing epistemic authority of different conceptions of knowledge is, for example, an appropriate valorization of indigenous knowledges where indigenous knowers have the space to theorize as effortlessly as those who inhabit spaces where the right to theorize is not questioned; we speak to this concern in a small degree (see Querejazu, Chapter 60, ‘Pluriversal Knowledge and Shamans: The Aymara Yatiris as Knowers: and Diplomats’). Similarly, we offer only a few, although noteworthy, epistemic instantiations of Donna Haraway’s (2016, 130) idea of cultivating ‘response-ability’ for multi-species communities beyond the human and human knowledge (see Cudworth and Hobden, Chapter 59, ‘Complexity Thinking, Posthumanism, and International Relations Knowledge’; Kurki, Chapter 61, ‘Cosmologies, Sciences, Planetary Politics: Reflections on “Knowledge” in New Registers’). If we were to edit this Handbook again, our points of departure today might indeed be different, perhaps more radical, than the ones we chose five years ago. They would certainly incorporate a more structured, formalized process of reflexivity throughout the editorial journey, akin to what we include in our research projects.

Next to the commitment to multiplicity of people and knowledges assembled in the Handbook, we mobilized the principle of care that required an additional effort of mentoring less experienced scholars in writing a handbook chapter from its conception to its final edits. We soon learned the hard way that academic seniority does not always go along with ‘accessible writing’ and ‘proper referencing’ and spent some of that mentoring energy on working with some not-so-early career scholars instead. We also resolved to supporting colleagues through any personal or professional rough patches rather than dropping their contributions. The review process was thus one of constructive feedback rather than elimination. This did not prevent all withdrawals from the book, but it certainly helped in retaining some pieces which may otherwise have never been finalized. Being a team of five facilitated mustering the capacity and enthusiasm to work with each chapter in such a meticulous manner, yet putting into practice the principle of academic care would sometimes drive us to our personal energy limits.

In the end, and despite all the effort that went into design and execution, the Handbook is a far cry from the grand plans we initially envisaged. It represents way fewer scholars from or based in the Global Souths and Easts than we had planned. Although we went out of our way to integrate some topics (e.g., queer knowing, indigenous knowers), others (e.g., disability, religion) do not feature at all. Some of these omissions are due to our own oversight; a lot, however, follow from how the neoliberal context shapes knowledge production in the global academy.

## **How context shapes knowledge creation through editing a handbook**

The stratified neoliberal context is crucial to understanding the form that the present Handbook ultimately acquired. Labels such as ‘knowledge’ and ‘expertise’ are not common denominations in global IR scholarship, as opposed to other labels that are generalized (e.g., security, governance, global health, international law, etc.). Even if the questions we ask are not far off those posed in different regional and national academies, such concerns are articulated in different vocabularies, which hampered searches for potential contributors across the world. Additionally, the global economy of knowledge production (Tilley 2017) dictates what kind of academic publications are likely to generate greater rewards, and loosely established fields rarely belong to this category. The requirement for academic English proficiency certainly adds to the limits of participating in this economy. Given limited funds, we could not offer translation services to potential authors and hence relied only on voices able to enunciate in English. The alternative strategy of including researchers from non-Northern backgrounds who are based at universities in the Global Norths reignited discussions among us editors about positionality, intersectionality, and perhaps the thorny question of authenticity and representation: Are we circumscribing, romanticizing, or overseeing scholarship from the Global Souths? How are plural perspectives related to ethnicity, race, or national background? How is privilege distributed? These questions have no standard answers. In many cases, they were decided ‘for us,’ through the invited authors’ contingent or predetermined act of accepting or declining our invitation to contribute, on the one hand, and their ideas on what shape their contribution should take, on the other (with some accepting at first but withdrawing or ‘disappearing’ later in the process).

The contextual limits posed by contemporary academia do not stop with the author recruitment process. A number of colleagues sadly had to withdraw due to work overloads, work-related health issues, burnouts, and sick leaves, revealing the particularly draining aspects of neoliberal academia that makes it ever harder to read, think, and write. Others pushed on regardless, perhaps because they are early career researchers in precarious circumstances hoping for a permanent job, because they feel that withdrawal amounts to personal failure, or simply because we are all socialized into the idea that ‘being an academic’ means having an unsustainable

'killer work ethics'. The critical question is: How can we produce knowledge ethically while being part of this system (for some initial answers, see Choi et al. 2024; Narayanaswamy et al. 2023)? In some cases, we were able to accommodate colleagues by granting generous extensions and tailoring the process somewhat to their needs, often taking on much more hands-on and constructive roles in revising first drafts than a normal review and editing process would entail. Nonetheless, it felt wrong to keep nagging about deadlines, referencing styles, and word limits for what, in the grand scheme of life, is a very unimportant task. This sense of imposition was exacerbated by the realization that in some contexts neither handbook chapters nor indeed the editing of handbooks count for much in research monitoring exercises and/or as part of career progression.

Beyond specific contexts of research assessment, colleagues across the world suffer from the pressures of juggling teaching, administration, and research tasks under conditions of fierce competition and little support. In some places, it is not just this material context, but also factors like the lack of academic freedom and similar constraining or threatening dynamics that add to the pressure. Other authors struggled with the discursive context of what can be said within the discipline and how, without risking one's career, for example when early career researchers feel they should self-censor their critique in order to 'fit in' and not 'rock the boat' (see also Tripathi, Chapter 11, 'Coloniality of Knowledge (Re)Production: Individual Entanglements and Collective Solidarities in Epistemic North-South Relationships'). As Jerrems, Cuadro, and Fonseca (Chapter 39, 'The Everyday Practices of Making a Global Discipline') have noted, the global university's 'everyday practices are marked by, and contribute to, the homogenizing practices of evaluation and validation of knowledge embedded in differentiated social, political, and economic conditions'. The effects of these homogenizing pressures are beyond what can be rectified by the editors of one handbook, no matter how determined they are. While we tried to advise on how to juggle that which should be said with that which can be said safely—for example, where authors were in two minds about their chapter's argument—there were just no satisfying solutions.

The issue of open access is another illustration of how the wider political economy of knowledge production intervenes in the process of editing and publishing a handbook. While a few authors have been able to use grant funding or university resources to make their chapters open access, the Handbook as such is not openly available and too pricey for anyone but (university) libraries in the Global Norths to acquire. This determines who can benefit from the knowledge assembled—both in terms of authors making their chapters more widely available and hence more likely to be cited and readers among scholars, students, and practitioners having access to these latest scholarly debates.

In contestation of the 'established' rules of the game, some of our contributors tried to stand up against the practices of this Handbook's publisher. They drew our attention to the fact that the publishing contract, which the editors and each chapter author were obliged to sign, had been constructed in such a way that the publisher has 'rights' whereas the authors—who provide their work for free—have 'obligations'.

They described the contract as uneven, offering one-sided protection of the interests of the publisher, who profits financially from academic work for which it does not pay. In correspondence with the publisher, they suggested that it should be more in line with the Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC), a not-for-profit advocacy organization that promotes knowledge as a public good. The contract, however, was non-negotiable. So where does this leave us in terms of our initial aims of promoting diversity, sparking conversations, and employing an ethics of care?

## **Editing a handbook as an opening, a practice of care, a co-creation**

The period of editing this Handbook feels like an era in our professional and, at least equally so, personal lives. The Handbook was taking shape in the professional background, often by unexpectedly promising leaps and banal disappointments, as we shifted locations, changed life circumstances, had our positionalities and outlooks evolve in hardly pre-meditated ways, and welcomed and bid farewell to various people on our separate paths. Dare we say, the time was transformational as the work on the Handbook folded into the texture of other goings: the larger structures of the discipline that we are savvy about yet which we cannot mould (although we still keep some hope for and work on possible transformations), the entanglements and contingencies of the academic industry whose harm we discuss with sophistication yet whose affective and material rewards we succumb to (Kurowska 2020), and the visceral tangibility of daily ‘getting by’ which ultimately takes precedence for every critter.

We might have had some fierce exchanges earlier on in the editing process over epistemic and theoretical questions of great significance, as we also document in this reflection. We berated structural epistemic inequalities, cringed at the arrogance of those who could afford to be flippant about our venture, but also listened and tried to navigate the various hierarchies of privilege and vulnerability that we were confronted with. As the Handbook grew, the firmness abated. We found ourselves in the midst of co-production. We became of a more relational, and dialogical, disposition towards the messiness of the epistemic process and its evolving participants. We certainly declared epistemic openness at the very outset, programmatically with regards to the setup of the Handbook and as a reflection of our own normative convictions. Yet it was in the process of emergence and friction, in the immersive experience of epistemic abundance that resists bending to one’s own ‘will to know’ (Foucault 2013), that a declaration transposed into a plural way of knowing the world.

There is irony in our description of this trajectory. Arguably, the focus on the relational transformation of the editorial process is inward-looking and thus affectively gratifying. This can obscure the potential ambivalence of the myriad epistemic effects that this Handbook is bound to instigate. We do not skip over this potential. In a reflexive tradition of our own discipline which is—by its own admission—concerned

with the study of violence, and with the acquired capacity for epistemic care, we turn that ambivalence into an object of analysis.

We hope that the reader will see this brief glimpse into our journey as an invitation to approach the Handbook as both an outcome of and an opening to such epistemic care. It is amidst collaboration—fraught with discomforts and enlivened by the excitement of insight that can only be stumbled upon collectively, and despite the ever-lingering shades of misunderstanding—that we make knowledge about the world. In this sense, the Handbook ends by gesturing towards relationality, thought companionship, and joint struggles (Hayes and Kaba 2023), as a way of knowing which holds a particular promise for new beginnings (Olufemi 2021). This is, of course, not to diminish other perspectives which we sought to curate with dedication. The primacy of relations is not, however, simply one possible ontological premise that should be translated into analytical frameworks and methodological procedures—as would be a standard expectation of research design for a scientific project. It is an ethos of knowing the world that thrives in and on imaginative co-creation that is worthwhile because it comes about through collective struggle and thus transcends alienation (Kaba 2021, 172). We invite the readers to join this conversation about making knowledge and urge them to approach this Handbook with criticism that accommodates the ethics of care.

## References

- Boakye, Jeffrey. 2023. 'The Big Idea: Do We Need to Dismantle the Literary Canon?'. *The Guardian*, 12 June, <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2023/jun/12/the-big-idea-do-we-need-to-dismantle-the-literary-canon> (accessed 27 February 2024).
- Choi, Shine, Saara Särmä, Cristina Masters, Marysia Zalewski, Michelle Lee Brown, and Swati Parashar. 2024. *Ripping, Cutting, Stitching: Feminist Knowledge Destruction and Creation in Global Politics*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Foucault, Michel. 2013. *Lectures on the Will to Know*. Translated by Graham Burchell. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Global Social Theory. n.d. 'Decoloniality'. <https://globalsocialtheory.org/topics/decoloniality/>.
- Haraway, Donna 2016. *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene*. Durham, NJ: Duke University Press.
- Hayes, Kelly, and Mariame Kaba. 2023. *Let This Radicalize You: Organizing and the Revolution of Reciprocal Care*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.
- Kaba, Mariame. 2021. *We Do This 'Til We Free Us: Abolitionist Organizing and Transforming Justice*. Chicago: Haymarket Books.
- Kurowska, Xymena. 2020. 'The Secondary Gains of Neoliberal Pain: The Limits of Consolation as a Response to Academic Anguish'. *Political Anthropological Research on International Social Sciences (PARISS)* 1 (1): pp. 117–136.
- Leira, Halvard, and Benjamin de Carvalho. 2018. 'The Function of Myths in International Relations: Discipline and Identity'. In *The SAGE Handbook of the History,*

- Philosophy and Sociology of International Relations*, edited by Andreas Gofas, Inanna Hamati-Ataya, and Nicholas Onuf, pp. 222–235. London: Sage.
- Narayanaswamy, Lata, Julia Schöneberg, Montserrat Algarabel, Lina Abou-Habib, Shivani Satija, Mahima Nayar, and Anandita Ghosh. 2023. 'Decolonising (Feminist) Knowledge and Practice'. *Gender and Development* 31 (2–3): pp. 307–321.
- Olufemi, Lola. 2021. *Experiments in Imagining Otherwise*. London: Hajar Press.
- Osorio Michel, Daniela, and Brooke A. Ackerly. 2022. 'Feminism and Decolonizing Decoloniality: Decolonizing the Coloniality of Power in Aymara Cosmology'. *Millennium* 51 (1): pp. 8–32.
- Oxford University Press. n.d. 'Oxford Handbooks'. <https://global.oup.com/academic/content/series/o/oxford-handbooks-ohbk/> (accessed 27 February 2024).
- Tamale, Sylvia. 2022. 'Anton Wilhelm Amo Lectures: Sylvia Tamale, Decolonising Knowledge Production'. 22 November, University of Ghana. <https://www.youtube.com/live/x-A3QSSINx8?feature=share>.
- Tilley, Lisa. 2017. 'Resisting Piratic Method by Doing Research Otherwise'. *Sociology* 51 (1): pp. 27–42.
- Tuhiwai Smith, Linda. 2019. 'Decolonising Methodologies, 20 Years On' [Video]. In *The Sociological Review Annual Lecture*, Goldsmiths, University of London, 16 October. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YSX\\_4FnqXwQ](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YSX_4FnqXwQ).

## Notes

1. Section chairs are Mariam Salehi and Werner Distler.
2. See <https://knowledge-centre.org>.
3. See <https://knowledge-centre.org/about/>.