

Recrafting International Relations by Worlding Multiply

David L. BLANEY

Prof. Dr., Macalester College, Department of Political Science

Tamara A. TROWSELL

Assoc. Prof. Dr., Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Department of International Relations

To cite this article: David L. Blaney And Tamara A. Trowsell, “Recrafting International Relations by Worlding Multiply”, *Uluslararası İlişkiler*, Vol. 18, No. 70, 2021, pp. 45-62, DOI: [10.33458/uidergisi.985929](https://doi.org/10.33458/uidergisi.985929)

To link to this article: <https://dx.doi.org/10.33458/uidergisi.985929>

Submitted: 21 August 2020
Last Revision: 15 March 2021
Published Online: 13 August 2021
Printed Version: 13 August 2021

Uluslararası İlişkiler Konseyi Derneği | International Relations Council of Turkey
Uluslararası İlişkiler – Journal of International Relations

E-mail : bilgi@uidergisi.com.tr

All rights of this paper are reserved by the *International Relations Council of Turkey*. With the exception of academic quotations, no part of this publication may be reproduced, redistributed, sold or transmitted in any form and by any means for public usage without a prior permission from the copyright holder. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the author(s)'s and do not reflect those of *the Council*, editors of the journal, and other authors.

Recrafting International Relations by Worlding Multiply

David L. BLANEY

Prof. Dr., Macalester College, Department of Political Science, USA

E-mail: blaney@macalester.edu

Orcid: 0000-0002-4248-9815

Tamara A. TROWNSELL

Assoc. Prof. Dr., Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Department of International Relations, Ecuador

E-mail: ttrowsell@gmail.com

Orcid: 0000-0003-3008-4199

ABSTRACT

The contemporary IR craft homogenizes a pluriverse of time-spacescapes as if it were a “one-world world.” We propose a strategy of recrafting to engender a nimble discipline for actively encountering ‘the world multiply’ and a generation of scholars capable of engaging various forms of knowing/being/sensing/doing. Worlding multiply requires: (1) taking seriously the plurality of worlds that emerge through distinct existential assumptions and (2) learning how to translate/read across time-spacescapes built through incommensurate ways of doing/being without reducing one to the other. We suggest conscientiously developing tools—new skills, concepts, ways of being—for encountering complexity in both pedagogy and scholarship.

Keywords: Recrafting, Worlding, Ontology, Multiplicity

Dünyalaştırın Çoğaltma ile Uluslararası İlişkileri Yeniden İmal Etmek

ÖZET

Çağdaş uluslararası ilişkiler zanaatı, zaman-uzam manzaralarından bir çoğul evreni “tek-dünyalı bir dünya”ymışçasına homojenleştirir. Biz, “dünya çoğaltmayı” ve muhtelif bilme/varolma/hissetme/yapma biçimleriyle iştigal edebilen bir araştırmacılar kuşağı ve etkin bir karşılaşmaya yönelik hazırcı cevap bir disiplini vücuda getirebilecek bir yeniden imal stratejisi öneriyoruz. Dünyalaştırın çoğaltma şunları içerir: 1) birbirinden ayrı varoluşsal varsayımlar aracılığıyla kendini gösteren dünyaların çoğulluğunu ciddiye almak ve 2) birini diğerine indirgemedi, ölçülemez düzeydeki yapma/olma biçimleri aracılığıyla inşa edilen zaman-uzam manzaraları üstünden nasıl tercüme/okuma yapılacağını öğrenmek. Özenli biçimde hem pedagojide hem de bilimsel alanda karmaşıklıkla yüz yüze gelmeye yarayan araçlar –yeni beceriler, kavramlar, oluş biçimleri– geliştirmeyi öneriyoruz.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yeniden İmal, Dünyalaştırma, Ontoloji, Çoğulluk

* The authors would like to thank the editors of this special issue, the reviewers for their helpful comments, and María Fe Vallejo Sigüenza for her unrelenting support.

Introduction

Over the last two decades, IR has been roiled by calls to globalize IR¹ or, for more critical sensibilities, to pluralize, de-center, or decolonize the discipline.² We see these critiques of IR as an extension of the post-positivist rupture that opened the space for the call to make the disciplines polycentric, as Shohat and Stam explore, and the re-imagining of knowledge production as an “ecology of knowledges”, as de Sousa Santos urges.³ A strong reading of polycentrism would suggest that knowledges are not simply different beliefs or interpretations of a singular world reality, but are transgressive of modernity’s production of “a one-world world” that is sealed against other alternatives, better expressed through multiplicity or the idea of the pluriverse.⁴ We therefore resist efforts to tame the processes unleashed by calls for globalizing or decolonizing IR as just another in the line of great debates and wonder whether IR as a claim to universal knowledge will (or should) survive this roiling.⁵ We respond to the calls for globalizing or pluralizing IR by advocating ontological commitments that allow a recrafting of our very being and doing as scholars and teachers to support more diverse processes of worlding.

We follow Nicholas Onuf and Richard Sennett in deploying the notion of craft and, by implication, re-crafting. Onuf speaks directly of IR as a “craft” in order to focus our attention on the rules, tools and models that we must master and the senses we must hone as part of practicing IR.⁶ This mastery must be acquired, and, in the case of IR, we all know that this training is both enabling and narrowing. Despite the power-infused nature of knowledge production, disciplines as crafts are neither uniform nor fixed, as Onuf suggests. We develop Onuf’s and Sennett’s ideas in the second major section of this paper to set the stage for thinking about recrafting IR.

-
- 1 Amitav Acharya and Barry Buzan (eds.), *Non-Western International Relations Theory*, London, Routledge, 2010; Amitav Acharya, “Global International Relations (IR) and Regional Worlds”, *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 58, No 4, 2014, p. 647-659, gave these calls official status. See also Yong-Soo Eun, *What Is at Stake in Building “Non-Western” IR Theory?*, London, Routledge, 2018; Ersel Aydınli and Gonca Bıltekin (eds.), *Widening the World of International Relations: Homegrown Theorizing*, London, Routledge, 2018; and Pınar Bilgin, “‘Contrapuntal Reading’ as a Method, an Ethos, and a Metaphor for Global IR”, *International Studies Review*, Vol. 18, No 1, 2016, p. 134–146.
 - 2 Many scholars call for including traditions beyond those that have been central to IR thus far. See Navnita Chadha Behera, *Political Science: Volume 4: India Engages the World*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2013; Giorgio Shani, “Toward a Post-Western IR: The ‘Umma,’ ‘Khalsa Panth,’ and Critical International Relations Theory”, *International Studies Review*, Vol. 10, No 4, 2008, p. 722-734; Phillip Darby, *From International Relations to Relations International*, New York, Routledge, 2015; Stephan Chan, Peter Mandaville, and Roland Bleiker (eds.) *The Zen of International Relations: IR Theory from East to West*, London, Palgrave, 2011. Some draw on feminist, postcolonial or decolonial perspectives to suggest de-centering IR. See Zeynep Gulsah Capan, “Decolonising International Relations?” *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 38, No 1, 2016, p. 1-15; Robbie Shilliam (ed.), *International Relations and Non-Western Thought*, Routledge, 2011; Anna M. Agathangelou and L.H.M. Ling, “Postcolonial Dissidence within Dissident IR: Transforming Master Narratives of Sovereignty”, *Studies in Political Economy*, Vol. 54, No 1, 1997, p. 7-38; Arlene B. Tickner and David L. Blaney (eds.), *Claiming the International*, London, Routledge, 2013; Kosuke Shimizu (ed.), *Critical International Relations in East Asia: Relationality, Subjectivity, and Pragmatism*, London, Routledge, 2019; L.H.M. Ling, *The Dao of World Politics: Towards a Post-Westphalian, Worldist International Relations*, New York, Routledge, 2014.
 - 3 Ella Shohat and Robert Stam, *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media*, London, Routledge, 1994, p. 46-49; Boaventura de Sousa Santos, *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against Epistemicide*, London, Routledge, 2014, p. 188-193.
 - 4 David L. Blaney and Arlene B. Tickner, “Worlding, Ontological Politics and the Possibility of a Decolonial IR”, *Millennium*, Vol. 43, No 3, 2017, p. 293-311. They follow John Law, “What’s Wrong with a One-World World”, *Heterogeneities*, 25 September 2011, p. 1-13, in seeing that the multiplicity of knowledges produces more than a “one-world world.”
 - 5 Arlene B. Tickner, “By Way of Conclusion: Forget IR?”, Arlene B. Tickner and David L. Blaney (eds.) *Claiming the International*, London, Routledge, 2013, p. 214-232.
 - 6 Nicholas Onuf, “What We Do: International Relations as Craft”, Andreas Gofas, Inanna Hamati-Ataya and Nicholas Onuf (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of History, Philosophy and Sociology of International Relations*, New York, Sage, 2018, p. 513-526

That section on craft builds on notions of ‘worlding’ or ‘world making’ developed in the first, where we show that the increasing interest in the language of worlding/worldism among IR scholars opens attention to the presence of worlds in the plural. We note that Onuf follows Wittgenstein and other linguistic philosophers in explaining how social worlds are built through language games, out of intersubjective rules of usage that allow us to go on in social life. Wittgenstein and Onuf limit intersubjectivity to the human, however. Others deepen our understanding of relationality and extend the notion of worlding beyond the anthropocentric, placing us firmly in a pluriverse of multiple, distinct, but interconnected worlds that transcend the human. Our discussion of worlding highlights how we are active participants in the co-creation of a co-constituted and multiple time-spacescape, which reinforces the growing feeling that scholars who claim to know *the* world need to learn how to engage across the multiplicity of the ontological registers of the pluriverse.⁷

Our focus on recrafting begins by acknowledging the existing plurality in the discipline and field. In the third section, we highlight the way post-positivist, feminist, and queer theory respond to conventional IR with different models, concepts and methods. More recently and more central for our thinking, posthuman IR, studies of Science, Technology and Society (STS), indigenous IR, studies rooted in the black diaspora, and decolonial approaches show us how recrafting involves developing not only new models and toolkits of concepts and methods, but also distinct forms of relations, including those with wider non-human worlds. For us, re-crafting involves the realization that we are all constantly worlding through how we direct our vital life force and that our fundamental existential commitments shape the kinds of worlds that we co-create. Here, we point to the possibility of a shift in ontological commitments to non-anthropocentric relational orientations as a way to encounter and participate in multiplicity. We then offer a preliminary sketch of what an ontological shift at the level of fundamental existential assumptions means for teaching and scholarship.

Worlding and Worlds

The notion of ‘worldism/worlding’ has been recurrently introduced into IR as part of critiques of dominant modes of knowledge production and being. Following Onuf’s groundbreaking assertion that we live in worlds of our making,⁸ Agathangelou and Ling use the term “worldism” to signal that “we live in multiple worlds and these, in turn, live in and through us”: these worlds “stock our visions, guide our actions, underpin our institutions, and account for our interactions with Others.”⁹ While ‘worlding’ brings attention to the “situatedness of knowledge and experience in relation to the dominant reading of world globalization,”¹⁰ Bilgin stresses the way this language attunes us not only to the power-laden situatedness of representations of global realities, but also to practices of knowing and doing as constitutive of a world of interconnected worlds.¹¹ Blaney and Tickner encapsulate

7 Tamara Trowsell, “Recrafting Ontology: A Strategy for a More Inclusive Discipline”, *Review of International Studies*, forthcoming.

8 Nicholas G. Onuf, *World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations*, Columbia, University of South Carolina Press, 1989.

9 Anna M. Agathangelou and L.H.M. Ling, “The House of IR: From Family Power Politics to the Poisies of Worldism”, *International Studies Review*, Vol. 6, No 4, 2004, p. 34, 22.

10 Ole Wæver and Arlene B. Tickner, “Introduction: Geocultural Epistemologies”, Arlene B. Tickner and Ole Wæver (eds.) *International Relations Scholarship Around the World*, London, Routledge, 2009, p. 9-10.

11 Pinar Bilgin, “Do IR Scholars Engage with the Same World?”, Ken Booth and Toni Erskine (eds.), *International Relations Theory Today*, Cambridge, Polity, 2016, p. 97-108.

these varying senses of worlding by suggesting that scholars using the language of “worlding’ and ‘worldism’ highlight the co-existence of multiple and intersecting economic, political, social, historical and knowledge practices that are geoculturally situated and that ‘make’ many worlds that might be placed into conversation as equals”, instead of some worlds being subordinated to others.¹²

A central concern here is how worlds come to be and how they are sustained. Onuf suggests that worlds are made through rules.¹³ In the linguistic philosophy informing this view, Wittgenstein observes that the rules of a language-game give mostly unnoticed but critical shape to social interaction. As example, he observes that mathematicians can disagree fervently about a mathematical proposition but not come to blows over the language game they commonly employ to have their altercation.¹⁴ No one questions or is even aware of the shared, almost seamless linguistic rules they follow. Consistency in meaning and practice comes through convention of use. Onuf refers to this emergent and fruitful process as “worldmaking”, capturing how human beings come to be and to interact in particular time-spacescapes. Wittgenstein likens these worlds to “ancient cities”: meaningful landscapes within which our activities unfold but whose foundations and dimensions may be barely registered, so deeply are they buried below the surface.¹⁵

For Wittgenstein and Onuf, the intersubjective realm extends only as far as human collectives. As representative of the literature hinging together Andean and Amazonian ethnography and science and technology studies (STS), Mario Blaser suggests a non-anthropocentric definition of worlding. He opens up our understanding of “the processes through which a world is being brought into existence”, whereby anything encountered in the cosmos -- stars, extraterrestrial beings, elements, mountains, oceans, plants and animals -- can be understood to be actively worlding.¹⁶ For us, then, the verb “to world” denotes not simply a constructivist social theory, but an ontology that recognizes the active participation of all beings in bringing a world of worlds into existence--a process of cosmopraxis¹⁷ or co-creation.¹⁸ Recognizing that co-creation involves a sociality or relationality prior to and beyond human language-games requires a shift in the existential assumptions informing our sensing, knowing and being in relation to a world of varied beings.

The existential assumptions we make even *prior to language* guide more fundamentally how we are entangled in, perceive, and energetically engage the world. Making worlds in a particular way, including meaning-making and practice through language, depends on privileging certain existential assumptions over others, whether we are conscious of them or not. Just as the linguistic turn clamored to make people aware of language as a central aspect of the diverse co-constitutive process that

12 Blaney and Tickner, “Worlding”, p. 294.

13 Onuf, *World of Our Making*.

14 Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*, 3rd ed, New York, Macmillan, 1958, p. 240.

15 Ibid, p. 18.

16 Mario Blaser, “Is Another Cosmopolitics Possible?”, *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 31, No 4, 2016, p. 552.

17 Amaya Querejazu, “Why Relational Encounters?”, *International Studies Perspectives*, Vol. 22, No 1, 2021, p. 31-34; Arlene B. Tickner and Amaya Querejazu, “Weaving Worlds: Cosmopraxis as Relational Sensibility”, *International Studies Review*, 2021, p. 4 (doi:10.1093/isr/viaa100); Amaya Querejazu, “Cosmopraxis: Relational Methods for a Pluriversal IR”, *Review of International Studies*, forthcoming.

18 Tamara Trowsell et al., “Differing about Difference: Relational IR from around the World”, *International Studies Perspectives*, Vol. 22, No 1, 2021, p. 26-64. The process of becoming, in contrast to a more substantive understanding of being, is critical here. See Alfred N. Whitehead, *Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology*, New York, Free Press, 1979 [1929]; William Connolly, *A World of Becoming*, Durham, NC, Duke University, 2011.

“reproduces” the human collectives and practices we know and live within, we emphasize *in addition* the shaping role played by the varying existential/ontological assumptions that peoples embrace as part of participating in making the multiple time-spacescapes that scholars have come to call the fractiverse/pluriverse.¹⁹ If scholarly ‘worlding’ involves not only the discursive capacity to decipher language-games and social practices, we also need to learn how to engage across the multiple time-spacescapes of the pluriverse. Recrafting IR, we will argue below, requires not only a greater awareness of the relationship between given existential/ontological assumptions and the imaginable range of possible lifeways and modes of knowing that they afford (and exclude), but also a capacity to inhabit and move through these time-spacescapes. We begin with the idea that IR is usefully seen as craft.

Crafting

Crafting can be understood as a form of worlding that includes an element of intentionality with regards to what is being created, though also always drawing from tacit collective knowing. Craft invokes artisanal notions of creative making yet can be distinguished from art. Richard Sennett suggests that “art seems to draw attention to work that is unique or at least distinctive, whereas craft names a more anonymous, collective, and continued practice.”²⁰ Two axes contribute to this distinction. First, art is often associated with individual self-expression (though we doubt it can ever be exclusively so), whereas craft is an intentionally (and necessarily) social practice. As a specific form of practice, a craft is embedded in both particular collective networks of knowledge and culturally shaped desires for particular kinds of objects.²¹ The second axis is that while the market for art emphasizes the uniqueness or originality in creative expression, crafts are valued for their consistent excellence and culturally meaningful qualities.

Craft is a knowledgeable, skilled practice that is learned only over time. Sennett estimates that mastering craft skills requires 10,000 hours or seven years.²² Through these hours of practice, the person moves from a conscious practice of “ingraining habit” to arrive at “embodiment”, whereby “the habits that we learn along [the] slow time of craftwork become tacit understanding, that is, unconscious.” Speaking to an IR audience, Onuf also focuses our attention on the rules, tools, and models that we must master as part of practicing IR. Never innate, this mastery must be acquired, so we must attend to the “central relation between craft and training.” As we all know, it is university degree programs and standards for hiring, publication, and promotion that are the key sites of “training and certification.” To succeed, we must display the requisite “skill in making, building, using, maintaining, adjusting,

19 This language of “pluriverse” or “fractiverse” is proliferating. Pluriverse is widely used among Latin America scholars who draw on Andean cosmovision. See Arturo Escobar, *Designs for the Pluriverse: Radical Interdependence, Autonomy, and the Making of Worlds*, Durham, NC, Duke University Press, 2018; Marisol de la Cadena and Mario Blaser (eds.), *A World of Many Worlds*, Durham, NC, Duke University Press, 2108. For uses in IR, see Amaya Querejazu, “Encountering the Pluriverse: Looking for Alternatives in Other Worlds”, *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, Vol. 59, No 2, 2016, p. 1-16; Cristina Rojas, “Contesting the Colonial Logics of the International: Toward a Relational Politics for the Pluriverse”, *International Political Sociology*, Vol. 10, No 4, 2016, p. 369–382; Kimberly Hutchings, “Decolonizing Global Ethics: Thinking with the Pluriverse”, *Ethics & International Affairs*, Vol. 33, No 2, 2019, p. 115-125; Tamara Trowsell, Navnita Behera and Giorgio Shani (eds.) “Pluriversal Relationality: Between Theory and Practice”, *Review of International Studies*, forthcoming. John Law, “What’s Wrong with a One-World World”, favors the term “fractiverse.”

20 Richard Sennett, *The Craftsman*, New Haven, Yale University Press, 2008, p. 66.

21 “Richard Sennett on Art and Craft”, *Getty Museum*, 3 December 2009, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LH1aX_6-xkY (Accessed 14 January 2020).

22 Ibid.

taking apart.” All these terms, Onuf stresses again, point to craft as “work, purpose, standards, tools.” The craft of IR is much more than “research methods” as is usually taught. It is about a form (a ‘world’) of “human relations”²³ and, as we would add, of relations among humans *and* non-humans.

Building on our discussion of worlding above, we stress that a key shared, though often implicit, dimension of the craft of IR is the existential assumptions that we internalize as part of learning and honing the craft and that make our status as craftsperson possible. An existential assumption is a basic and fundamental supposition about the primordial conditions of existence, assumptions that shape what we can see, hear, and feel as well as the range of potential imaginable strategies towards the world (including the international domain and the wider cosmos) that we can generate in response. In this sense, the craft itself and the criteria used to collectively demand it (and subsequently judge its quality) all reflect and tend to reinforce these (often tacit) assumptions about reality and how we engage it. Given the growing awareness that conventional IR does not and cannot comprehend how other equally important beings (humans and otherwise) world differently as part of a world politics, we translate calls for globalizing IR as a process of recrafting that fosters more nimble, versatile skills capable of engaging with the world’s multiplicity. IR scholars might recognize that the “so-called era of globalization is not about a single global reality (or world) being experienced and responded to in different ways”, and come instead to cultivate a higher order repertoire responding to and drawing on “different visions of the world, projects, and conceptions.”²⁴ For IR to understand and ethically engage these worlds made differently but in relation to one another,²⁵ scholars must re-craft the discipline and the world.

Recrafting

The Limits and Possibilities of Recrafting

Craft involves creation, but creating something ‘radically’ new normally falls outside the confines of a craft. As we saw, these habits and criteria, just like the social demands to which the craft responds, are socio-material constructions that make crafting a largely self-reinforcing process. The potential degree of change in the craft is also limited by the particular skillset of each craftsperson. By dedicating one’s life to becoming a violinist, for instance, one does not perfect skills on the Andean *zampoña* (panpipes) or on the Indian *sitar*. The craft’s applied technology also limits the horizon of potential change. Instruments played in an orchestra can only emit a particular range of sounds. A photograph too only captures the visual dimension, leaving aside many other senses. In short, a certain skill and mind set decidedly shapes what is capable of being perceived and understood, and therefore circumscribes innovation. Like photography, IR’s traditional tools privilege certain perceptive angles and senses to such a degree that the virtuoso performance of our craft often blinds us to what we are missing and limits our ability to understand other forms of worlding. As example, immersion and success in the world of applying static quantitative models may make one relatively insensitive to dynamic models or

23 Onuf, “Craft”, p. 513-515.

24 Nathalie Karagiannis and Peter Wagner, “Introduction: Globalization or World-Making?”, Nathalie Karagiannis and Peter Wagner (eds.), *Varieties of World-Making: Beyond Globalization*, Liverpool, Liverpool University Press, 2007, p. 1-13.

25 For a useful discussion of pluriversal ethics, see Kimberly Hutchings, “Decolonizing Global Ethics: Thinking with the Pluriverse”, *Ethics and International Affairs*, Vol. 33, No 2, 2019, p. 115-125.

new possibilities in complexity or network theory and completely dismissive of ethnographic studies or narrative modes of writing.

Sennett and Onuf see any craft as unfolding within the taken-for-granted foundations of an ancient city but also open a space of hope. Sennett stresses that we are not completely hostage to the protocols of our learned craft because there is a conscious element to crafting. “In the higher stages of skill”, he explains, “there is a constant interplay between tacit knowledge and self-conscious awareness, the tacit knowledge serving as anchor, the explicit awareness serving as critique and corrective”,²⁶ so that “a repertoire of multiple solutions” lurks within a craft practice.²⁷ Onuf similarly notes that while “a craft . . . conforms to stringent standards and (therefore) a narrowly bounded body of knowledge”, it is not fixed: crafts evolve and mutate, often into new disciplines.²⁸ We would add that other worlding practices are not simply excluded others, but exist within a craft as doubt or critical self-reflection, or lurk as a constitutive outside that offers an alternative view.²⁹ Here, we find the presence of some agility, even within the ancient city, that gives us some hope that those deeply schooled in the IR craft might be open to recrafting both scholarly and pedagogical practice.³⁰

Recrafting points us beyond the re-production of patterns to the generation of new models and new pathways of sensing, doing, and engaging, that is, new modes of being.³¹ These new modes of being and doing may result from new tools that allow the production of new forms and qualities. These modes of being often rely on radically new concepts since they are grounded in different, largely implicit, ontological commitments, alternative models of the international and the cosmos and more encompassing human and trans-human relations. Thus, recrafting turns on a mixture of a strong intentional component and tacit elements, but the effect is to alter the pathways and patterns of crafting worlds.

Recrafting as Recurrent Practice in IR

The call for recrafting is not unique to our project. As Onuf suggests, recrafting is a periodic moment in the unfolding of a craft and a periodic feature of IR. For example, the post-positivist turns of the third (or fourth in some counts) great debate in IR disrupted the ease with which we could take for granted the existential assumption of fixed categories including those of nation-state, anarchy and international system. This existential shift opened conceptual and methodological spaces that encouraged innovations across a variety of literatures. And, given its origins in rethinking the philosophy of (social) science, post-positivism facilitated movements toward conceptual and methodological pluralism.³²

26 Sennett, *Craftsman*, p. 50.

27 “Richard Sennett on Art and Craft.”

28 Onuf, “Craft”, p. 514-516.

29 Naeem Inayatullah and David L. Blaney, *International Relations and the Problem of Difference*, London and New York, Routledge, 2004, p. 9-16.

30 For an initial statement, see Tamara Trowsell, “Ontological Agility as Pedagogical Imperative”, Jan Lüder (ed.), *Signature Pedagogies in International Relations*, Bristol, E-International Relations, 2021, p. 55-69.

31 Tickner and Querejazu, “Weaving Worlds”; their term: “being-feeling-knowing-doing”, p. 4. See also John Law, *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*, London, Routledge, 2004, p. 42-43, on craft skills and modes of being as key parts of any “method assemblage.”

32 See Yosef Lapid, “The Third Debate: On the Prospects of International Theory in a Post-Positivist Era”, *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No 3, 1989, p. 235-254; Steve Smith, “Epistemology, Postmodernism and International Relations Theory:

Feminists in IR quickly took advantage of the opportunities provided by various post-positivist moves to recraft IR concepts through a gender lens. Spike Peterson's classic edited work *Gendered States*³³ problematizes the state and the state practice of subordinating women's identities to its own purposes. The point is to "(re) vision" the discipline, opening it to new concepts and additional methods, and to support alternative political configurations more attuned to the concerns of women.³⁴ Here, scholarship and making the world is intimately connected; many feminists reject the positivist vision of the objective scholar setting himself at a distance from the world. Feminist scholars imagine themselves as entangled in the worlds they study and research as involving diverse modes of inquiry in which those studied appear also as participants or collaborators in knowing and doing.³⁵

Some gender theorists developed a broad agenda to recraft IR by 'queering' our relation to standard IR models. As Peterson suggests: "queer theory aims to 'make strange'—disrupt, destabilize, deconstruct, effectively to *queer*—what is considered normal, commonplace, taken-for-granted or the 'natural order of things.'" For example, the interconnection identified above between the intimate and the international might be read only as a homology, but is, in fact, constitutive. Just as we make our gendered being, we make the world of IR. Queering our gendered being challenges the state/the international constituted as heteronormative models of thinking and being.³⁶ More specifically, Jasbir Puar's recrafting of nationalism as "homonationalism" exposes the "convivial linkages" between forms of normalized sexuality and the "tactics, strategies, and logistics of our contemporary war machines."³⁷ We can see how queering notions of sovereignty and nationalism destabilize certain forms of worlding and open possibilities for other ways of knowing and making worlds.

Similarly, post-positivism opened an unforeseen space for the critique of anthropocentrism in both the natural and social sciences. For example, a post-human turn in IR has emerged as scholars have worked through the implications of assuming the vitality of the world beyond the human.³⁸ Sharing the view that IR fails to engage the world's multiplicity, Cudworth, Hobden and Kavalski

A Reply to Østerud", *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 33, No 3, 1997, p. 330-336. For an example of methodological recrafting, see Patrick T. Jackson, *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations: Philosophy of Science and its Implications for the Study of World Politics*, London, Routledge, 2011.

33 V. Spike Peterson (ed.) *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)visions of International Relations Theory*, Boulder, Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1992.

34 As exemplary of that legacy, Ann J. Tickner, *Gender in International Relations*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1992, and *Gendering World Politics*, New York, Columbia University Press, 2001, shows how realist models of the international system support conventional national security practices that produce a world in which women's lives and livelihoods and the environments they inhabit are radically insecure. Centering on the insecurities faced by women quickly diversifies our understanding of security and insecurity beyond national security to encompass the globe, economic justice and ecological health. Her point is that rethinking security involves reimagining and making a different world.

35 See Sandra Harding, *Objectivity and Diversity: Another Logic of Scientific Research*, Chicago, IL, University of Chicago, 2015.

36 Spike V. Peterson, "Family Matters: How Queering the Intimate Queers the International", *International Studies Review*, Vol. 16, No 4, 2014, p. 604-608. Quotation from 604.

37 Jasbir Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*, Durham, Duke University Press, 2007, p. xiv. See also Cynthia Weber, *Queer International Relations*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2016.

38 On this 'new materialism,' see Jane Bennett, *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*, Durham, NC, Duke University, 2010; and Diana Coole and Samantha Frost (eds.), *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics*, Durham, NC, Duke University, 2010. For illustrative ruminations in IR, see Rafi Youatt, "Interspecies Relations, International Relations: Rethinking Anthropocentric Politics", *Millennium*, Vol. 43, No 1, 2014, p. 207-233; and Carolin Kaltofen, "Between Radical Posthumanism and Weak Anthropocentrism: The Spectrum of Critical Humanism(s)", Clara Eroukhanoff and Matt Harker (eds.), *Reflections on the Posthuman in International Relations: The Anthropocene, Security and Ecology*, Bristol, E-International Relations, 2017, p. 19-28.

argue that IR's standard model ignores that "the social world is embedded in and intersected by the non-human" and, thereby, renders us incapable of realizing that our own human-centered notions of health, security and livelihood will fail ultimately to sustain our health, our security, and our livelihood. Our "inability as well as the professed unwillingness of existing epistemic and ontological perspectives to account for the diversity of non-human forms of being and action" can be dislodged, in their view, only "by encouraging interest in and recognition of the embeddedness of world affairs in broader networks of relations."³⁹

We applaud this move, though we believe that Cudworth, Hobden and Kavalski's reference to 'encouraging interest' does not quite capture the shift required. Indeed, Stefanie Fishel suggests nothing less than recrafting our most basic metaphors. It is only by shifting from models informed by the nearly sacred image of a unitary and isolated unit (the state as a "body politic") to those built on images of the world as constituted by 'broader networks of relations' or a pluriverse that we can produce the transformative "metaphorogenesis" required of IR. As Fishel makes clear, this is not simply about describing the world differently. It is about organizing our craft and its models according to new metaphors rooted in existential assumptions of deep connectedness or relations.⁴⁰ Since craft practices are always also a set of 'human relations' (as Onuf suggests) or also trans-human relations (as we claim), our very being in the cosmos is implicated. We largely reproduce ourselves and our worlds as we perform our craft.

Nevertheless, Law and Lin sense something provincial about the new work in STS around which much of the posthuman turn in IR is organized. While its methods have been pathbreaking in constructing case studies of "alternative modes of knowing", "STS is dominated conceptually, linguistically, bodily, metaphysically and institutionally by provincial EuroAmerican and especially English-language practices."⁴¹ Addressing this problem in a recent work, Mark Jackson notes that "discourses addressing coloniality" are now tasked with "renewing themselves to meet the theoretical and empirical demands of a more-than-human world." The "[h]uman-centred orthodoxies" of "identity, cultural hybridity, and political heterogeneity", must now be stretched "to account for how human beings are entangled ontological aspects of wider relational and ecological processes."⁴² But, instead of recrafting IR with the "Euro-American" tools of the new materialisms alone, Jackson argues that "[w]e need to recognize that other people, other philosophies, other worlds, and other ideas have been making similar claims on wider ecological relations for hundreds, sometimes tens of thousands, of years, and crucially, in critical ways." Much is at stake: "The European and modern experiments are not working as promised." Jackson writes that, "if thinking carefully and rigorously

39 Erika Cudworth, Stephen Hobden, and Emilian Kavalski, "Introduction—Framing the Posthuman Dialogues in International Relations", Erika Cudworth, Stephen Hobden and Emilian Kavalski (eds.), *Posthuman Dialogues in International Relations*, London, Routledge, 2018, p. 4. See also Delf Rothe, "Global Security in a Posthuman Age? IR and the Anthropocene Challenge", Clara Eroukhmanoff and Matt Harker (eds.), *Reflections on the Posthuman in International Relations: The Anthropocene, Security and Ecology*, Bristol, E-International Relations, 2017, p. 87-101; Audra Mitchell "'Posthuman Security': Reflections from an Open-Ended Conversation", Clara Eroukhmanoff and Matt Harker (eds.) *Reflections on the Posthuman*; David Chandler, *Ontopolitics in the Anthropocene*, London, Routledge, 2018; and Jarius Grove, *Savage Ecology: War and Geopolitics at the End of the World*, Durham, NC, Duke University Press, 2019.

40 Stefanie R. Fishel, *The Microbial State: Global Thriving and the Body Politic*, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota, 2017, p. 51.

41 John Law and Wen-yuan Lin, "Provincializing STS: Postcoloniality, Symmetry and Method", *East Asian Science, Technology and Society*, Vol. 11, No 2, 2017, p. 211, 221. See also Itty Abraham, "The Contradictory Spaces of Postcolonial Techno-Science", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 41, No 3, 2006, p. 210-217, who they reference.

42 Mark Jackson (ed.), *Coloniality, Ontology, and the Question of the Posthuman*, London, Routledge, 2018, p. xi.

is, most importantly, about creating new possibilities, then the more tools, possibilities, practices, and voices, the better.”⁴³ But, as Jackson indicates, the goal of multiplying and diversifying our concepts and toolsets manifests itself against the stark backdrop of colonial conquest, particularly the historical and contemporary tendency for Europeans to dominate and annihilate these others through forms of modern logic and knowledge practice.⁴⁴

Recrafting through Deep Relational Commitments

With this colonial backdrop, calls for a global or decolonized IR that motivate this special issue demand going beyond expanding the geocultural scope of IR. Recrafting IR as global requires opening us to traditions of thinking and being which begin with deeply relational existential assumptions at variance with those that motivate the modern science of IR.⁴⁵ In the most atomistic versions of IR that assume a set of separate objects or actors as ontologically given, interactions among actors might create outcomes that can be modelled as causally or functionally related to the actors’ behaviors or interests. These outcomes though are given little ontological weight since atomistic models treat them as expressions of the traits of the atoms of the system.⁴⁶ In other IR conceptual models, relations may be formed amongst these actors who might also construct institutions or practices, which become new objects for IR. But the relations remain secondary with the major features of the antecedent actors already given, even though a feedback loop might be added to the model to show that deeper actor traits (preferences, interests, even elements of identity) may be reshaped.

In relational worlds, entities are “not given in advance.” A deep conception of ontological relationality “begins by assuming interconnection as *prior* to the existence of entities.” Entities don’t exist but by entanglements with others. Deeply relational worlds do not sustain the kinds of categorical distinctions or borders between self and other, “human and natural, life and death, present, past and future.” Lines of categorical difference are blurred, existing only “in a constant exchange and complementarity.”⁴⁷ Through this lens or model, differences are always dynamic and subject to change. Our experiences, including consciousness of self, come to be only in such reciprocal and dynamic relationality.

Beginning with an existential assumption of deep relationality prompts interconnected conceptual *and* methodological recrafting, with implications for both scholarship and teaching. It is not simply that we begin with models built around concepts reflecting the deep relationality of worlds, but that we acknowledge and necessarily deploy our relational entanglements with the world as part of our being, knowing and doing. If we learn to be attentive, we also find ourselves entangled with and needing to engage the ‘other philosophies, other worlds, and other ideas’ that Jackson stresses. The existential commitment to a deep relationality brings attentiveness to multiplicity.

43 Ibid, p. xii.

44 See also Anibal Quijano, “Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality”, *Cultural Studies*, Vol. 21, No 2-3, 2007, p. 171-172; and Blaney and Tickner, “Worlding”.

45 See Tamara Trowsell, et al., “Recrafting International Relations through Relationality”, *E-IR*, 8 January 2019, <https://www.e-ir.info/2019/01/08/recrafting-international-relations-through-relationality/> (9 January 2019), for an earlier version of this and the next paragraph. See also Robbie Shilliam, *The Black Pacific: Anti-Colonial Struggles and Oceanic Connections*, London, Bloomsbury, 2015, p. 13.

46 Naem Inayatullah and David L. Blaney, “A Problem with Levels: How to Engage a Diverse IPE”, *Contexto Internacional*, Vol. 17, No 3, 2015, p. 889-911.

47 Trowsell et al., “Recrafting International Relations.”

As noted, craft skills emerge through a process of training. In IR, this occurs largely in university coursework. We might say that the criticisms of IR as a discipline all begin with the standard pedagogies employed: almost universally, IR syllabi privilege realism and liberal rationalism/constructivism with their taken-for-granted categories and objects of analysis.⁴⁸ When adding poststructuralist, feminist, and postcolonial perspectives, the discussion tends to revolve around the categories we add and the political issues that alternative perspectives allow us to engage. We still leave students blind to the question of our most basic ontological assumptions and unprepared to world multiply.

The capacity to world multiply requires teaching a pluralized understanding of ontology. Not cultivating the ability to navigate ontological pluralism at the level of fundamental existential commitments among students means that we will continue to (re)enforce colonial epistemic violence wrought by collectively holding onto a singular, monopolized ontological register. The process of simulating a situation of discomfort or failure so as to prod students to a breakthrough implies much more than just the cognitive development that our courses usually hone. It involves actively denaturalizing the very bases of existence that students take for granted at the level of fundamental ontological suppositions.

First, we teach against the grain of the conventional one-world world IR syllabus, prodding students to become conversant with the intersubjectively co-constituted time-spacescapes that make a pluriverse. They learn how distinct primordial existential assumptions lead to very different logics that translate into disparate lifeways that are neither commensurate with nor easily grasped through the ontological filter with which they have been raised. By validating that there are distinct ways of doing things and that none is the single answer to all, we also cultivate empathy whose significance, according to Anahita Arian, “has been largely neglected in the field of IR ... in a teaching or classroom setting.” Defined as “an affective and cognitive ability by which an individual or group seeks to understand another person’s or group’s different (cultural) perspectives, feelings, or experiences”, Arian observes, “empathy enables us to comprehend, negotiate and understand differences in a positive way.”⁴⁹

Second, cultivating empathy requires that students learn to become comfortable with being existentially uncomfortable. Existential ontological resilience and versatility involve not just familiarity with plural frameworks or paradigms and how to apply them, as in most syllabi’s learning objectives, but actual existential agility in being/knowing/doing multiplicity. This agility comes with risks and anxieties however, since it both challenges our being as professionals and prods us to attune to our deeper relations as a person-in-the-cosmos. Nevertheless, professors (through their own training in ontological agility) can learn to guide students through their emotional and existential anxieties in a way that enables them to learn how to sit in the tension of encounters between incommensurate lifeways.

IR scholarship would similarly involve learning to think/sense/live multidimensionally in our engagement with the pluriverse. A few examples of scholarship may suffice. Many scholars attuned to indigenous and Afrodescendent groups expose the models and craft skills of most development

48 James Hagmann and Thomas Biersteker, “Counter Mapping the Discipline: The Archipelago of Western International Relations Teaching”, Andreas Gofas, Inanna Hamati-Ataya, and Nicholas Onuf (eds.) *The Sage Handbook of History, Philosophy and Sociology of International Relations*, New York, Sage, 2018, p 428-445; Felix Berenskoetter, “E Pluribus Unum”: How Textbooks Cover Theories”, Gofas, Hamati-Ataya, and Onuf (eds.) *The Sage Handbook of History, Philosophy and Sociology of International Relations*, New York, Sage, 2018, p. 446-468.

49 Anahita Arian, “An Ethics of Understanding”, *International Studies Perspectives*, Vol. 22, No 1, 2021, p. 23.

practitioners as notoriously insensitive to their particular time-spacescapes. Standardized notions of agricultural development hit both a linguistic and existential wall when the Andean *chacra* is understood not as a smallholder “crop field” open to the improving interventions of international agencies or NGOs, but as a sacred site for nurturing life in all of its diversity⁵⁰ -- as a site of worlding that enacts deeply relational existential assumptions. What is revealed in this example is not simply an alternative notion of development. Rather, Arturo Escobar suggests that indigenous and Afro-descendent communities struggle to sustain “alternative ‘Life Projects’” that embrace “inclusion, participation, collaboration, understanding, respect, sacredness, and the always-recurrent cyclic renovation of life.” We are called, Escobar suggests, to recognize “a politics of another civilization that respects, and builds on, the interconnectedness of all life, based on a spirituality of the Earth.” In addition, Escobar envisions scholars participating in “a culture of healing, the revitalization of tradition and the creation of new ones” in response to the spread of modern industrial civilization that generated what Escobar, very much like Jackson above, calls an “ontological occupation.”⁵¹

Relational worldings also disrupt our conceptions of the ‘body politic.’ Building on the scholarship discussed above, Manuela Picq shows how Kichwa women advocate as representatives of local communities tied relationally to particular places. Their appeal to international standards to reform community customs and laws bypass and ignore state boundaries they consider to be the artifacts of colonialism. As non-state actors pluralize sovereignty, IR’s very spatial models and conceptions of belonging and political organization must be recrafted.⁵²

The confrontation between the Innu people and efforts to restrict *atiku* hunting by the colonial settler community of government officials, biologists and conservationists in the Canadian provinces of Newfoundland and Labrador suggest a similar conceptual recrafting. Blaser notes that what is lost by a simple translation of *atiku* as *caribou* is a deeper web of relationships that transgress our modern and human-centered notions. Since *atiku* and the Innu only thrive together in a cosmopraxis enacted on particular lands, the Canadian state’s actions violate not only the Innu’s claims to territorial sovereignty in a conventional sense, but also do violence to the entire cosmopolitical world in which both *atiku* and the Innu are citizens. Blaser suggests that the world of the Innu/*atiku* requires imagination to engage a “diffractive and divergent” world in which citizenship is extended beyond the human.⁵³ Comments by Amaya Querejazu at a recent roundtable point perhaps to a deeper message. Recrafting requires *more* than the ethnographer’s honed capacity to describe the imaginative universe of studied subjects from a distance. It requires entangling ourselves empathically in a re-enchanted world.⁵⁴

50 Julio Valladolid Rivera, “Andean Peasant Culture: Nurturing a Diversity of Life in the *Chacra*”, Frédérique Apffel-Marglin and PRATEC (eds.), *Spirit of Regeneration: Andean Culture Confronting Western Notions of Development*, London, Zed Books, 1998, p. 51-88.

51 Escobar, *Designs*, p. x, 12-14, 20, 69, 81, 248 n1.

52 Manuela L. Picq, “Indigenous Wording: Kichwa Women Pluralizing Sovereignty”, Arlene B. Tickner and David L. Blaney (eds.), *Claiming the International*, London, Routledge, 2013, p. 121-140.

53 See Mario Blaser, “Doing and Undoing Caribou/Atiku: Diffractive and Divergent Multiplicities and their Cosmopolitical Orientations”, *Tapuya: Latin American Science, Technology and Society*, Vol. 1, No 1, 2018, p. 47-64. We follow Marc Woons, “Decolonizing Canadian Citizenship: Shared Belonging, Not Shared Identity”, *Settler Colonial Studies*, Vol. 4, No 2, 2014, p. 192-208, and *Restoring Indigenous Self-Determination: Theoretical and Practical Approaches*, Bristol, E-International Relations Publishing, 2014, in speaking about ‘caribou’ citizenship.

54 Roundtable on “Wrestling with Foundations and Actions”, International Studies Association-Northeast, 7 November 2020. See also Querejazu, “Cosmopraxis.” The language of re-enchancement can be traced back to Morris Berman, *The Reenchantment of the World*, Ithaca, NY, Cornell University, 1981, if not Max Weber.

Robbie Shilliam's *The Black Pacific* connects this line of thinking to a distinctly decolonial project. As a deeply relational scholar/being, he does more than reconstruct the beliefs or imaginative universe of Maori youth who have engaged "sideways" with Caribbean cosmologies. Shilliam instead encourages scholars to "walk with" the "living knowledge traditions of colonized peoples." These traditions exist in "*tapu*"—in "deep relation" with the "spiritual, philosophical, and political standpoints" that they deploy to "rebind" themselves to their ancestors and "to heal the wounds suffered at the hands of Cook and Columbus."⁵⁵ He describes these wounds as the result of "a cutting logic that seeks to – but on the whole never quite manages to – segregate peoples from their lands, their pasts, their ancestors and spirits." These "living practices" of binding or healing, this engagement of deep relations by walking with, recover a moral "compass and energy store" that is lost when modernity and colonial science, as Jackson noted above, sever our access to the connection between the "manifest and spiritual domains."⁵⁶ A decolonial science, Shilliam explains, '*cultivates* knowledge,' rather than producing it. Cultivation implies "habitation", a living in and with a particular time-spacescape. He stresses that "knowledge is creatively released as the practitioner enfolds her/himself in the communal matter of her/his inquiry."⁵⁷ Thus, walking with peoples and places in deep relation involves "a participatory criterion" that defies the categorical separation of researcher and researched and subject and object. Following Shilliam, we see that our engagement is a conscious tending of "the relations that constitute the cosmos."⁵⁸

Though Shilliam speaks about "relations that constitute the cosmos", he grounds this "sideways" engagement in "a deep global infrastructure of anti-colonial connectivity" – to the sociology of the interconnectedness of the modern era.⁵⁹ Querejazu extends this critique of modern cosmology to our most basic existential commitments. As she puts it, "relational relating" is the state of all being.⁶⁰ Thus, we need to be clear what we mean when we say that modern science "constitutes our realities" as atomistic and mechanical. The modern colonial imaginary works to "enhance the existence of the universe" as a singular way of being/doing, but it always co-exists with a pluriverse whose mode of worlding it renders "latent" or inaccessible to many.⁶¹ In Querejazu's view, then, the mechanical universe enhanced by an atomistic ontology that underlies colonial domination exists "in interaction and intertwined with other worlds." Accessing this multiplicity requires the capacity to traverse multiple worlds in the 'manifest' and 'spiritual' domains. It is a practice of "multidimensional diplomacy" which involves navigating nimbly the worlds made through interaction within and among multiple human and non-human communities. This is a possibility in principle open to all, though not all communities and practices equally cultivate these capacities as a way of being and doing in the world.⁶²

55 Shilliam, *The Black Pacific*, p. 5-12, 16-17, 20. For an example of an ethnographic approach that mirrors this more reflexive and even intimate style (in the sense of intimately entwined relationally), see Michael D. Hill and Georgina Maldonado, *Para aprender a viajar así: movilidad en la vida de una mujer quechua*, Quito/Lima, USFQ Press and Editorial del Instituto de Estudios Peruanos, p. 20-22.

56 Shilliam, *The Black Pacific*, p. 13, 29.

57 *Ibid*, p. 24-25.

58 *Ibid*, p. 13-27.

59 *Ibid*, p. 3.

60 Querejazu, "Cosmopraxis", p. 10.

61 See also Law, *After Method*, p. 4-5, 9, 14, which highlights the multiple methods already on offer and the multiple "realities" they construct.

62 *Ibid*, p. 16-18.

How to do IR as part of that collaboration or co-participation that Querejazu calls cosmopraxis? Switching ontological assumptions and embracing a more robustly relational stance permit doing IR differently through distinct and multiple forms of being, thinking and doing. Here the generative dimension of our engagement would not be limited to human language games, because interconnected interaction takes place well beyond the human realm. Developing a more diverse and nimble repertoire of craft skills for engaging the multiplicity of the cosmos would include engaging everything from our instincts, actions, emotions, thoughts and basic existential assumptions in making and doing existence -- along with and alongside all non-human others.⁶³ Being, doing and thinking become about how we use the vital life force that accompanies all being. We can speak this way because we begin with existential assumptions quite distinct from most scholars in IR, including most critical scholars.

We recognize that the discipline of IR has historically been crafted while assuming an ontological separation of objects as pre-existing our knowing, of objects as distinct from observer, and enacting a distinction of the human from non-human and that this promulgated and reproduced reductionist ontological lens renders us blind to other forms of cosmopraxis and ineffective in engaging across distinctly constituted time-spacescapes. We resist such erasures and don't envision any single method, model of international relations, or mode of worlding. As we have argued, the IR craft is like an ancient city whose foundations are laid by assuming pre-given objects, whether conceived as separable atoms or as anthropocentrically co-constituted relational entities. Beginning with an assumption of an interconnection prior to entities or categories gives us access to radically distinct ontological logics, begetting distinct conceptual fruit and enacting a multiplicity erased by other ontological logics. The call to cultivate knowledge differently requires not only doing the academic enterprise differently, but also alters our conscientious worlding. Instead we advocate developing the capacity to switch the assumptions we make about the primordial condition of existence, a honing of ontological agility.⁶⁴ The onus is on scholars in IR to recognize our co-creative participation in an always emergent pluriverse and the ethical demands this imposes.

Standard Euro-American ontological commitments produce truth as singularity or as universal. If we assume deeply relational ontological commitment, we become attuned to the multiple/fractured realities we enact. Truth doesn't disappear as a good of knowledge production, but it is changed in our attunement to multiplicity. And truth must share the stage with other possible goods: aesthetic, political or spiritual.⁶⁵ The re-crafting we recommend -- with its expanded repertoire of models, craft skills, and ways of being, including the relations it establishes with others -- might be judged by its capacity not only to enact and sustain realities attuned to the multiplicity of truth, but also a politics of respect for difference: a practice that allows us to participate in beauty, to engage with an enchanted world, and to cultivate the human and more-than-human relations that sustain and are sustained in the cosmos.

63 Ibid, p. 25-26. See also Jarrad Reddekop and Tamara Trowsell, "Disrupting Anthropocentrism through Relationality", David Chandler, Franziska Müller and Delf Rothe (eds.) *International Relations in the Anthropocene*, Hampshire, Palgrave Macmillan, 2021.

64 See Trowsell, "Ontological Agility".

65 Law, *After Method*, p. 16, 67.

Conclusion

We have described conventional IR as reproducing ontological parochialism, which creates a world by exclusion, domination, and erasure. Calls for a global IR have opened us to alternative possibilities. Here, we emphasize that options are available for recrafting IR along deeply relational lines and extend the invitation to co-participate in generating time-spacescapes that actively foster a more globalized IR. Already woven into this relationally recrafted 'logical' and experiential fabric is the interconnected dimension of the cosmos and the complexity of the pluriverse. By the latter term, we do not mean to encourage retreat into separate and fixed worlds. We see this as an ineffective option since these worlds are always already emergent, multidimensional, multiplicitous and interconnected. We turn our focus instead onto the potentialities of engaging in relation. This new craft of a globalized IR will require the skills and tools to engage fully other ways of worlding. This global IR would mutually nurture a craft that worlds based on a cosmopraxis that cultivates not just knowledge but knowing how to sense, be, engage and even harmonize multidimensionally. Through these encounters with difference, actors hone an agility for sensitive inquiry and to participate with other ways of knowing with respect. And, we would stress once again that more is at stake than IR as a field of inquiry. In a pluriversal time-spacescape, being able to navigate existential/ontological pluralism is absolutely critical to *our* survival, where 'our' includes more-than-human realms.

Bibliography

- "Richard Sennett on Art and Craft", *Getty Museum*, 3 December 2009, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LH1aX_6-xkY (Accessed 14 January 2020).
- Abraham, Itty (2006). "The Contradictory Spaces of Postcolonial Techno-Science", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 41, No. 3, p. 210-217.
- Acharya, Amitav (2014). "Global International Relations (IR) and Regional Worlds", *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 58, No. 4, p. 647-659.
- Acharya, Amitav and Barry Buzan (eds.) (2010). *Non-Western International Relations Theory*. London, Routledge.
- Agathangelou, Anna M. and L.H.M. Ling (1997). "Postcolonial Dissidence within Dissident IR: Transforming Master Narratives of Sovereignty", *Studies in Political Economy*, Vol. 54, No. 1, p. 7-38.
- Agathangelou, Anna M. and L.H.M. Ling (2004). "The House of IR: From Family Power Politics to the Poisies of Worldism", *International Studies Review*, Vol. 6, No. 4, p. 34-22.
- Arian, Anahita (2021). "An Ethics of Understanding", *International Studies Perspectives*, Vol. 22, No. 1, p. 23.
- Aydınlı, Ersel and Gonca Bıltekin (eds.) (2018). *Widening the World of International Relations: Homegrown Theorizing*. London, Routledge.
- Behera, Navnita Chadha (2013). *Political Science: Volume 4: India Engages the World*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Bennett, Jane (2010). *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham, Duke University.
- Berenskoetter, Felix (2018). "'E Pluribus Unum?' How Textbooks Cover Theories", Andreas Gofas, Inanna Hamati-Ataya, and Nicholas Onuf (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of History, Philosophy and Sociology of International Relations*. New York, Sage, p. 446-468.
- Berman, Morris (1981). *The Reenchantment of the World*. Ithaca, Cornell University.
- Bilgin, Pinar (2016). "'Contrapuntal Reading' as a Method, an Ethos, and a Metaphor for Global IR", *International Studies Review*, Vol. 18, No. 1, p. 134-146.
- Bilgin, Pinar (2016). "Do IR Scholars Engage with the Same World?", Ken Booth and Toni Erskine (eds.), *International Relations Theory Today*. Cambridge, Polity, p. 97-108.
- Blaney, David L. and Arlene B. Tickner (2017). "Worlding, Ontological Politics and the Possibility of a Decolonial IR", *Millennium*, Vol. 43, No. 3, p. 293-311.
- Blaser, Mario (2016). "Is Another Cosmopolitics Possible?", *Cultural Anthropology*, Vol. 31, No. 4, p. 545-570.

- Blaser, Mario (2018). "Doing and Undoing Caribou/Atiku: Diffractive and Divergent Multiplicities and their Cosmopolitical Orientations", *Tapuya: Latin American Science, Technology and Society*, Vol. 1, No. 1, p. 47-64.
- Capan, Zeynep Gulsah (2016). "Decolonising International Relations?", *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 38, No. 1, p. 1-15.
- Chan, Stephan and Peter Mandaville (eds.) (2011). *The Zen of International Relations: IR Theory from East to West*. London, Palgrave.
- Chandler, David (2018). *Ontopolitics in the Anthropocene*. London, Routledge.
- Connolly, William (2011). *A World of Becoming*. Durham, Duke University.
- Coole, Diana and Samantha Frost (eds.) (2010). *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics*. Durham, Duke University.
- Cudworth, Erika et al. (2018). "Introduction—Framing the Posthuman Dialogues in International Relations", Erika Cudworth, Stephen Hobden and Emilian Kavalski (eds.), *Posthuman Dialogues in International Relations*. London, Routledge.
- Darby, Phillip (2015). *From International Relations to Relations International*. New York, Routledge.
- De la Cadena, Marisol and Mario Blaser (eds.) (2018). *A World of Many Worlds*. Durham, Duke University Press.
- De Sousa Santos, Boaventura (2014). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against Epistemicide*. London, Routledge.
- Escobar, Arturo (2018). *Designs for the Pluriverse: Radical Interdependence, Autonomy, and the Making of Worlds*. Durham, Duke University Press.
- Eun, Yong-Soo (2018). *What Is at Stake in Building "Non-Western" IR Theory?*. London, Routledge.
- Fishel, Stefanie R. (2017). *The Microbial State: Global Thriving and the Body Politic*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota.
- Grove, Jarius (2019). *Savage Ecology: War and Geopolitics at the End of the World*. Durham, Duke University Press.
- Hagmann, James and Thomas Biersteker (2018). "Counter Mapping the Discipline: The Archipelago of Western International Relations Teaching", Andreas Gofas, Inanna Hamati-Ataya, and Nicholas Onuf (eds.), *History, Philosophy and Sociology of International Relations*. New York, Sage, p. 428-445.
- Harding, Sandra (2015). *Objectivity and Diversity: Another Logic of Scientific Research*. Chicago, University of Chicago.
- Hill, Michael D. and Georgina Maldonado (2020). *Para aprender a viajar así: movilidad en la vida de una mujer quechua*. Quito/Lima, USFQ Press and Editorial del Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- Hutchings, Kimberly (2019). "Decolonizing Global Ethics: Thinking with the Pluriverse", *Ethics & International Affairs*, Vol. 33, No. 2, p. 115-125.
- Inayatullah, Naeem and David L. Blaney (2004). *International Relations and the Problem of Difference*. London, Routledge.
- Inayatullah, Naeem and David L. Blaney (2015). "A Problem with Levels: How to Engage a Diverse IPE", *Contexto Internacional*, Vol. 17, No. 3, p. 889-911.
- Jackson, Mark (ed.) (2018). *Coloniality, Ontology, and the Question of the Posthuman*. London, Routledge.
- Jackson, Patrick T. (2011). *The Conduct of Inquiry in International Relations: Philosophy of Science and its Implications for the Study of World Politics*. London, Routledge.
- Kaltofen, Carolin (2017). "Between Radical Posthumanism and Weak Anthropocentrism: The Spectrum of Critical Humanism(s)", Clara Eroukhmanoff and Matt Harker (eds.), *Reflections on the Posthuman in International Relations: The Anthropocene, Security and Ecology*. Bristol, E-International Relations, p. 19-28.
- Karagiannis, Nathalie and Peter Wagner (2007). "Introduction: Globalization or World-Making?", Nathalie Karagiannis and Peter Wagner (eds.), *Varieties of World-Making: Beyond Globalization*. Liverpool, Liverpool University Press, p. 1-13.
- Lapid, Yosef (1989). "The Third Debate: On the Prospects of International Theory in a Post-Positivist Era", *International Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 33, No. 3, p. 235-254.
- Law, John (2004). *After Method: Mess in Social Science Research*. London, Routledge.
- Law, John (2011). "What's Wrong with a One-World World", *Heterogeneities*, p. 1-13.
- Law, John and Wen-yuan Lin (2017). "Provincializing STS: Postcoloniality, Symmetry and Method", *East Asian Science, Technology and Society*, Vol. 11, No. 2, p. 211-221.
- Ling, L.H.M. (2014). *The Dao of World Politics: Towards a Post-Westphalian, Worldist International Relations*. New York, Routledge.
- Mitchell, Audra (2017). "'Posthuman Security': Reflections from an Open-Ended Conversation", Clara Eroukhmanoff and Matt Harker (eds.), *Reflections on the Posthuman in International Relations: The Anthropocene, Security and Ecology*. Bristol, E-International Relations, p. 10-18.
- Onuf, Nicholas (1989). *World of Our Making: Rules and Rule in Social Theory and International Relations*. Columbia, University of South Carolina Press.

- Onuf, Nicholas (2018). "What We Do: International Relations as Craft", Andreas Gofas, Inanna Hamati-Ataya and Nicholas Onuf (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of History, Philosophy and Sociology of International Relations*. New York, Sage, p. 513-526.
- Peterson, Spike V. (2014). "Family Matters: How Queering the Intimate Queers the International", *International Studies Review*, Vol. 16, No. 4, p. 604-608.
- Peterson, Spike V. (ed.) (1992). *Gendered States: Feminist (Re)visions of International Relations Theory*. Boulder, Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Picq, Manuela L. (2013). "Indigenous Wording: Kichwa Women Pluralizing Sovereignty", Arlene B. Tickner and David Blaney (eds.), *Claiming the International*. London, Routledge, p. 121-140.
- Puar, Jasbir (2007). *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times*. Durham, Duke University Press.
- Querejazu, Amaya (2016). "Encountering the Pluriverse: Looking for Alternatives in Other Worlds", *Revista Brasileira de Política Internacional*, Vol. 59, No. 2, p. 1-16.
- Querejazu, Amaya (2021). "Why Relational Encounters?", *International Studies Perspectives*, Vol. 22, No. 1, p. 31-34
- Querejazu, Amaya (forthcoming). "Cosmopraxis: Relational Methods for a Pluriversal IR". *Review of International Studies*.
- Quijano, Anibal (2007). "Coloniality and Modernity/Rationality", *Cultural Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 2-3, p. 168-178.
- Reddekop, Jarrad and Tamara Trowsell (2021). "Disrupting Anthropocentrism through Relationality", David Chandler et al, Franziska Müller and Delf Rothe (eds.), *International Relations in the Anthropocene*. Hampshire, Palgrave Macmillan, p. 441-458.
- Rojas, Cristina (2016). "Contesting the Colonial Logics of the International: Toward a Relational Politics for the Pluriverse", *International Political Sociology*, Vol. 10, No. 4, p. 369-382.
- Rothe, Delf (2017). "Global Security in a Posthuman Age? IR and the Anthropocene Challenge", Clara Eroukhmanoff and Matt Harker (eds.), *Reflections on the Posthuman in International Relations: The Anthropocene, Security and Ecology*. Bristol, E-International Relations, p. 87-101.
- Sennett, Richard (2008). *The Craftsman*. New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Shani, Giorgio (2008). "Toward a Post-Western IR: The 'Umma,' 'Khalsa Panth,' and Critical International Relations Theory", *International Studies Review*, Vol. 10, No. 4, p. 722-734.
- Shilliam, Robbie (ed.) (2011). *International Relations and Non-Western Thought*. London, Routledge.
- Shilliam, Robbie (2015). *The Black Pacific: Anti-Colonial Struggles and Oceanic Connections*. London, Bloomsbury.
- Shimizu, Kosuke (ed.) (2019). *Critical International Relations in East Asia: Relationality, Subjectivity, and Pragmatism*. London, Routledge.
- Shohat, Ella and Robert Stam (1994). *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the Media*. London, Routledge.
- Smith, Steve (1997). "Epistemology, Postmodernism and International Relations Theory: A Reply to Østerud", *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 33, No. 3, p. 330-336.
- Tickner, Ann J. (1992). *Gender in International Relations*. New York, Columbia University Press.
- Tickner, Ann J. (2001). *Gendering World Politics*. New York, Columbia University Press.
- Tickner, Arlene B. (2013). "By Way of Conclusion: Forget IR?", Arlene B. Tickner and David Blaney (eds.), *Claiming the International*. London, Routledge, p. 214-232.
- Tickner, Arlene B. and Amaya Querejazu (2021). "Weaving Worlds: Cosmopraxis as Relational Sensibility", *International Studies Review* p. 1-18.
- Tickner, Arlene B. and David L. Blaney (eds.) (2013). *Claiming the International*. London, Routledge.
- Trowsell, Tamara et al. (8 January 2019). "Recrafting International Relations through Relationality", <https://www.e-ir.info/2019/01/08/recrafting-international-relations-through-relationality/> (Accessed 9 January 2019).
- Trowsell, Tamara et al. (2021). "Differing about Difference: Relational IR from around the World", *International Studies Perspectives*, Vol. 22, No. 1, p. 26-64
- Trowsell, Tamara et al. (eds.) (forthcoming). "Pluriversal Relationality: Between Theory and Practice". *Review of International Studies*.
- Trowsell, Tamara (2021). "Ontological Agility as Pedagogical Imperative", Jan Lüdert (ed.), *Signature Pedagogies in IR*. Bristol: E-International Relations, p. 55-69.
- Trowsell, Tamara (forthcoming). "Recrafting Ontology: A Strategy for a More Inclusive Discipline". *Review of International Studies*.
- Valladolid Rivera, Julio (1998). "Andean Peasant Culture: Nurturing a Diversity of Life in the *Chacra*", Frédérique Apffel-Marglin and PRATEC (eds.), *Spirit of Regeneration: Andean Culture Confronting Western Notions of Development*. London, Zed Books, p. 51-88.

- Wæver, Ole and Arlene B. Tickner (2009). "Introduction: Geocultural Epistemologies", Arlene B. Tickner and Ole Wæver (eds.), *International Relations Scholarship Around the World*. London, Routledge, p. 9-10.
- Weber, Cynthia (2016). *Queer International Relations*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Whitehead, Alfred N. (1979 [1929]). *Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology*. New York, Free Press.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig (1958). *Philosophical Investigations*. New York, Macmillan.
- Woons, Marc (2014). "Decolonizing Canadian Citizenship: Shared Belonging, Not Shared Identity", *Settler Colonial Studies*, Vol. 4, No. 2, p. 192-208.
- Woons, Marc (2014). *Restoring Indigenous Self-Determination: Theoretical and Practical Approaches*. Bristol, E- International Relations Publishing.
- Youatt, Rafi (2014). "Interspecies Relations, International Relations: Rethinking Anthropocentric Politics", *Millennium*, Vol. 43, No. 1, p. 207-233.