



## Editors' Outro

# Reckoning, Repairing, and Reworlding as Praxis

JESSE ARSENEAULT  
Concordia University, Canada

TAYAH CLARKE  
McMaster University, Canada

LINZEY CORRIDON  
McMaster University, Canada

FEISAL KIRUMIRA  
University of Alberta, Canada

SUSIE O'BRIEN  
McMaster University, Canada

JANE SEWALI-KIRUMIRA  
University of Alberta, Canada

SUSAN SPEAREY  
Brock University, Canada

HELENE STRAUSS  
University of the Free State, South Africa

NANDINI THIYAGARAJAN  
Acadia University, Canada

ANDREA VELA-ALARCÓN  
McMaster University, Canada

How do our enquiries into reckoning, repairing, and reworlding relate to our experiments with collaborative editing of this Special Issue? As we outlined in the Introduction, our collective began to meet during the Covid-19 pandemic

*Correspondence Address:* Susie O'Brien, Department of English & Cultural Studies, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, L8S 4L8; email: [obriensu@mcmaster.ca](mailto:obriensu@mcmaster.ca)

ISSN: 1911-4788



lockdown. The texts we were reading, along with the circumstances we were living, raised questions about the intersections of multiple crises, and required us, as our work proceeded, to navigate further and compounding emergencies. It was impossible to disaggregate our academic selves and concomitant commitments from the roles that each of us plays in other spheres, and the obligations that entailed therein. Together we sought ways to prioritize where our respective energies and points of focus would be best directed, and to support one another, as well as the larger project and all the people involved in its realization (our contributors, our peer reviewers, the Editorial Board of *Studies in Social Justice*) as we moved forward. We were not always successful in achieving or sustaining the balance we aspired to strike, but we all see the value of learning by trial-and-error.

Our process drew sustenance from the series of workshops we facilitated during annual Canadian Association of Postcolonial Studies (CAPS) conferences: “Re-placing Literature: Mobilizing Emergent Strategy to Decolonize our Institutional Practices” (2022); “Alter-modes of Scholarly and Creative Practice” (2023); and “Beyond the Toxic University: Towards Connection, Kinship, and Care” (2024). In 2024, the CAPS gathering was held away from the McGill University campus in Montreal, following the Association’s decision to withdraw from the Congress gathering in support of striking Law Faculty at McGill, and in protest against McGill’s complicity with the police, who used tear gas on student protesters in the Gaza solidarity encampments. Our workshop addressed that context of institutional violence along with the softer brutalities of humanities work that this issue set out to explore. In addition to generating inspiring insights from all the participants, all three workshops nurtured our connections with one another as collective members, confirming our sense of the importance of embodied knowledge and conviviality.

These workshops aside, we have never met in person as an entire collective because our members are situated across seven different time zones. This “Outro,” then, began as a Zoom conversation, the mode of all of our meetings. The discussion was based on a few prompts that we had circulated in advance to generate a shared reflection on the work we have done, and included the following questions:

1. How has your thinking about our three guiding terms – reckoning, repairing, reworlding – evolved over the course of our collaboration?
2. To what extent and in what ways, on a micro-scale, were we able to work towards enacting these practices as we worked with one another, and also with our contributors, our peer reviewers, and the journal’s editorial board? What obstacles kept us from doing so, or made the effort more challenging?
3. What were the benefits and drawbacks of working collaboratively, and what made us lose certain people along the way?

4. Considering where we started and where we are now, what reparative work has been done within our collective along the lines of our 3 Rs and in relation to the major themes that we established for our Special Issue? [See Appendix 1: Tables of Contents at the end of the Introduction]
5. What lessons do we need to take forward?
6. What kind of human beings do we become when we come together to start curative work?

We'd initially planned to reproduce a lightly edited version of that wrap-up meeting to give a true representation of our collaborative process, but we quickly realised that our spoken conversation needed some serious revision to become legible on the page. Our desire to make visible our collectivity banged up against the need to say something coherent, provide context where our contributions assumed a great degree of shared knowledge, and figure out how to distribute the work of editing in a way that respected the principle of collectivity and the reality of inequitable workloads. This challenge, of trying to balance our commitment to the ebb and flow of conversation and the jangle of differently situated and embodied voices with institutional (and pragmatic) demands for clarity and economy of expression, illustrates a tension that has shaped our editorial process from the start. We ended up settling on a more conventional Introduction that would perform the crucial task of highlighting the work of our contributors, and saving for this Outro the rawer, more meandering back-and-forth that foregrounds our individual voices. The energy of our final Zoom conversation is the spark that got this started, and hopefully its glow is still tangible in places. Though it was ultimately assembled over a protracted period of time and largely over email, this Outro retains the bumps of real-life conversation, including dropped threads, unevenness of tone and mood, longer and shorter contributions, and in this sense embodies the life of our editorial process and the tumultuous circumstances of its production.

**Jane Sewali-Kirumira:** First, I personally would like to send a special thank you to those who have kept the pace going even when some of us were not there. With respect to the benefits of our editorial process, one important element was the group's diversity, which included senior faculty, junior faculty, young members, seasoned members, different walks of life, different experiences, and different backgrounds. I also felt that throughout the collaboration we were all on equal footing, and it made working together much easier. I did not feel that any one person on the RRR collective was more important than the next. So that made the work much smoother in its running. I've reached out in the past to people in academia and asked for collaboration, and many times they say, "Oh, we would love to." But then as you all know, in this publish-or-perish game, people usually stop at "I would love to," and then, when you push again, you don't hear from anybody. So, I felt that our collaboration was really rich and there was the freedom to speak freely

regardless of where our conversations took us in all the thousands of directions. We adjusted a lot along the way, back and forth, and I personally appreciate many of you for not giving up and then also highlighting some of the special things that I think kept us on the ball. For example, trying not to lose focus on the social justice theme is something that I think we emphasized, using our different specializations, including education, literature and language studies, and cultural studies.

And then some drawbacks. Role distribution or role ambiguity. Part of it is dividing the work more equitably. I also like more structured work. Knowing: this is my part. This is what I have to do by this time. Additionally, I think we could have pushed more on trying to get away from the traditional way of doing things. But then, again, we have to have more grace for ourselves, remembering that we are all within these academic structures that we have grown up in, and we all still function in. We still have room for improvement but must remember that change takes time.

**Feisal Kirumira:** For me, this format of speaking the Outro and then writing the Outro, creating the connection through conversation, captures the essence of working within this group. There's a sense of resonance in conversation that is difficult to capture even with a Google doc. There is that emergent component. There is a sense of something being indeterminate, but you can build upon it. One of the reasons why the resonance is so important is that it connects to that question we posed in the 2022 CAPS workshop: How can we teach with broken hearts? I asked that question, because really, that's where I was. I also ask: How can we become whole if we don't reach out to others, if we don't collaborate? Being unwell, you can do it on your own, but getting well requires the collaboration of others, requires an opening up, having that emergent component of it. And so then, moving within that space and understanding that when we do equality work, justice work, we have to always contend with that brokenness of things and not just in terms of us as human beings, but our scholarly processes, including academic journal editing, including the peer review process – the system is broken. We are broken, but as our work together opened up the ruptures and the spots that we needed to find our way through, I started looking at it as something potentially empowering, because we didn't carry it alone.

One challenge in this process was that of trying not to bring what we were going through in our personal lives into the work so much. Because when we write about anti-Black racism, for example, it's not just something we write about. It is something we are going through. But even grappling with that piece, working within this collective has been a healing process, because then I could see what else can *be* as opposed to what *is*. We can ask the question: what kind of human beings do we become when we come together to do curative work? I think we become good ancestors in a way, because we begin to see the work transcend our own physical lives. We look at reworlding as not something that is just figurative, far away in the future: we are already reworlding our lives

within the collective, but also reworlding our lives as we live them. So that was to me, one thing that resonated a lot throughout. And then how our work has responded to the challenges of working within corporate structures. The concepts of reckoning, repairing and reworlding have impacted a lot of the things I do, including my role as the public safety lead for anti-racism work. And those are some of the – I wouldn't say unintended, but not so obvious – impacts. And something I've learned is that restorative reparative work is high maintenance. It requires a collaborative approach, but then it pays off dividends, not maybe in the short term, not right there and then, but it does.

**Tayah Clarke:** Continuing this reflection on the ethics behind our editing process, and bringing an unconventional approach to our methods, I think the format of a discussion, where we were all able to speak and provide our own experiences of what the editing process felt like from our perspectives, is that type of de-hierarchized collaborative work and space that we're trying to create within the Special Issue itself. So our methodology in this Outro remains very reflective of that underlying praxis or the ethos that we're striving for. Even though we were often working individually or in small pairs throughout the process, at the critical moments when we were trying to define who we are as a collective – including the drafting of our CFP; our curations of the CAPS workshops; and our questions of how we were going to lay out and organize the Special Issue – we came together as a collective, and those decisions were made with as many people as possible in the room. We tried to prioritise that co-constructive praxis as much as we could within the constraints that we were working with.

To enable this practice of collaboration, we had to foreground flexibility as a critical part of our praxis. We had to recognize that there are so many demands on our time, and not everyone was going to be able to attend every meeting. Our flexibility was our attempt to meet everybody's needs as much as possible. For example, with our Intro and Outro, members were able to participate both via the live group discussion on Zoom and through written contributions to the transcript, which not only made space for those who could not attend the meeting, but also ensured that people were able to participate in the way that worked best for them – whether that was through the written word or active dialogue with others. Ultimately, this allowed us to create the type of polyvocal Outro to our work that best reflected the values of our collective.

Grounding our methodologies in this principle of collaboration also opened doors for a more generative and constructive praxis throughout the curation process. One of the things that was really critical for our group was Andrea Vela-Alarcón's ability to do translation work throughout the process. That opened pivotal avenues in terms of who would be able to contribute to the journal because Andrea was able to access a language that would have been excluded otherwise. In addition to strengthening the Special Issue itself, working collaboratively also allowed us to grow individually and collectively as writers, speakers, collaborators, and leaders, because there were so many

different knowledges in this space that we were able to tap into and learn from. There was an opportunity to take on different roles that we were unfamiliar with – whether in the writing, editing, or speaking – and try on different roles in different spaces. However, the fluidity of roles also presented its own difficulties, such as an inequitable distribution of labour, with Sue Spearey in particular taking on the heaviest share of the work.

We also made mistakes as a collective. We lost some of our members because of the time zone differences and the centering of an Eastern Standard time zone, which highlights the difficulty of trying not to fall back into those colonial structures that marginalise certain voices. We can speak broadly of our aims to decolonize the process, but if we don't explicitly identify those specific structures upholding that coloniality, then we can't deconstruct them. And perhaps because we didn't necessarily identify time zones as one of those pillars of marginalising non-American or non-Canadian voices, then we weren't able to deconstruct that pillar. So we did end up replicating that element of coloniality unintentionally, and also to the detriment of our collective, because those would have been critical voices to have throughout the entire process. It speaks towards one of the ways that coloniality can function insidiously, and why it can be so difficult to deconstruct: because we fall back into practices that seem the most convenient – in this case, these times that most people can come together – but those seemingly convenient practices are the barriers that are restricting people from accessing the spaces. And this example demonstrates the subtle temptations of colonialism in the way that it structures our tasks and our labour.

We have also needed to enact repair throughout the process. In one instance, a contributor had to withdraw their work because one of the peer reviewers we had secured did not communicate with us or respond to reminder notifications after agreeing to review, and after multiple attempts to find a replacement, we found ourselves still unable to find a second peer reviewer. This may not be something that we intentionally caused, but it is still a rupture within the process that we have to think about. And we are still wondering, what does repair look like in these scenarios?

This ongoing question of how to centre the authors and their own processes of writing was critical for our work. One of our goals was to increase the accessibility of the Special Issue, and to work with people and texts in ways that are not always possible in conventional colonial spaces. And we are still reflecting on this question. Looking back on our submissions, were authors able to present research that might have been excluded in other venues because of different colonial structures? Were they able to write a bit more freely within our space, without having to shape their work substantively to conform to colonial conventions? And, given the limitations of working within the institution of academia, were there any ways that we fell short of this goal? That is something we continue to reflect on.

**Linzey Corridon:** To reckon with the world we have inherited means to be *in* and *of* this world first. We should not be expected to perform a kind of mathematics of change without first making space for the individual to simply be present and in the moment, a moment that may possibly lead that individual down a path to affecting change, whether it be on a micro or macro level.

Our work of reckoning, reworlding, and repairing has not been easy or simple. This work was taken up by individuals across various institutions, countries, continents, time zones, and research disciplines. I contributed to this project while being physically located both in Canada and the Caribbean. Because of the very nature and location of the work carried out via the Reckoning, Repairing and Reworlding collective and its members, I witnessed the emergence of a model for transnational and transdisciplinary solidarity work that exceeds the physical location of the university. Earth is massive and because the planet and its inhabitants are seemingly infinite it can sometimes feel like there isn't much hope in coming together to try and collectively work through a particular social problem. That said, I am at the end of the experience of working on this Special Issue after having spent a few years alongside scholars from Africa, North and South America, and the Caribbean. I have witnessed the repeated efforts, sometimes failures and sometimes successes, to collaborate across times and spaces that are often meant to keep us apart. I have witnessed a group of concerned people working through the mess of yearning for a better world at a time when yearning must remain our *modus operandi*. And I am hopeful that this solidarity is a possible model that we can individually enact elsewhere in our lives long after the Special Issue has been published.

**Nandini Thiyagarajan:** Next to reckoning and reworlding, repair – as a crucial element of our collective – can be easily overlooked. The work of repair has been careful and often subtle. Working within this collective, on the Special Issue and beyond, began to repair my relationship to academic work, which can be so alienating. As the collective started, grief took over my life and I missed meetings, conversations, and conferences. I kept expecting to be kicked out, to have this feeling of inadequacy reflected back at me, but every time I managed to pull myself to a meeting or contribute to this Special Issue I was met with warmth and gratitude. This made me reflect on how I have come to understand so much of academic work to be unforgiving, how it has been hard to hold life and work alongside each other. More than this, I learned how powerful even a small collective can be.

**Andrea Vela-Alarcón:** At the beginning of this process, I had trouble grasping the meaning of reckoning. No matter how many times I'd see or hear the definition, my mind wouldn't catch up with it. But throughout the almost three-year process of co-making this special issue, my body eventually caught up with the practice of reckoning, as one that lets the weight be felt. That weight wasn't the knowing or awareness that neoliberal academia exists, but the

embodied sensation of rushing to the academic product without making the space for, as Feisal compassionately writes above, our broken hearts.

In this collective, reckoning wasn't merely a discussion, but a non-linear embodied practice of going slow to make space for our hearts to be exhausted, anxious, frustrated and, often, broken. Through this reckoning, the collective interrupted the fast-paced rhythm of neoliberal academia, attending to scholarship's normalized, self-exploiting habits through the labour of love that is our research and academic work. As a result, I was able to deeply focus on writing, translating, and reviewing pieces at an unrushed pace, encouraged and supported by the collective members who helped me balance the weight of global anxiety and personal imposter syndrome. I don't mean to romanticize this process; reckoning meant feeling the weight of academia's double-bind. While some of us needed to go slow to deal with our academic responsibilities, community needs, and personal grief, others in the collective would pick up the organizing of the issue, leading to an inequitable distribution of tasks. Similarly, our slow pace of the reckoning practice sometimes meant we couldn't attend to everyone's needs and paces, leading to one of our contributors pulling out their piece because we had yet to find a second reviewer in just over two years.

Often, when we were enacting a reckoning practice, we were also engaging in repairing and reworlding an academic process, and I would also say, a community process. The weight that needed to be felt was shared amongst us, allowing small constellations of collaboration within the collective. Mentorship groups were formed organically, where the hierarchy of academic seniority was interrupted by the active community practices of many of our collective members who are in the early stages of the academic path. Through these constellations I was able to feel the practices of repairing and reworlding, as something that can't happen in isolation but through companionship. Both required us to think and feel how we want and need to accompany each other and our contributors. For example, how would we, as writers, want to receive feedback? This not only required crafting caring emails, which Sue Spearey did excellently, but also opening spaces of synchronous virtual connection with contributors to clarify feedback, to tackle any distressing feeling that reviews often give us, or to think through a particular section together.

As this particular product has come to fruition (you are reading the published version), its process does not feel like it has come to an end. Reckoning, repairing and reworlding are non-linear processes, and the thinking-feeling-doing of this journal special issue is allowing for those already-here and yet-to-come possibilities to continue unravelling as we let the weights be felt as shared.

**Susie O'Brien:** It struck me as we were going along that our approach was analogous to the pedagogical practice of flipping the classroom, which – upending the traditional emphasis on content – uses class time to centre the learning process, emphasizing collaboration and problem-solving. Though we

were committed to enlisting awesome contributors and publishing exciting work (I think we succeeded!), our emphasis was less on showcasing brilliance than on recognizing and transforming the behind-the-scenes process of generating good scholarship – i.e., reckoning/repairing/reworlding on the tiny scale of academic publishing. As noted in the Intro, the dynamics of mentoring, collaboration, and attending to what was happening in our lives/the world around our scholarship weren't incidental to the process but central to it. That made it slower than any of us would have wanted, but maybe changing our expectations is part of cultivating what Zahra Tootonsab (2021, p. 109) calls an “ethical (s)pace” for working together.

“Flipping” the process of creating the Special Issue also highlighted in a way I hadn't anticipated the kind of work that normally goes unrecognized, including:

*Peer-review:* Peer review is one of the many forms of care work on which the whole edifice of evidence-based research is founded that is rendered barely visible in research metrics. That invisibility perhaps explains why the process of securing reviewers was disheartening at times. Many scholars whom we contacted as potential reviewers simply didn't respond to our enquiries, even though the Online Journal System used by *Studies in Social Justice* conveniently offers them the option to easily decline with the click of a hyperlink in the invitation. Others agreed to review and then never responded to follow-up reminders or enquiries as to whether there were extenuating circumstances preventing them from submitting their reports. Additionally, some reviewers assumed that their principal role was to *find fault* with the work they were assigned, rather than to help *strengthen* it or amplify its contributions. This situation may be a function of the neoliberal insistence on efficiency and on treating time as a scarce commodity: care work can be time-intensive, and it is often quicker to flag problems and recommend rejecting a submission than to engage in a sustained way with its potential offerings. On the other hand, by far the majority of the peer reviews we received impressed us with both their thoughtful engagement with the pieces and care for the way they would be received by authors. Some reviews became constant points of reference for us as co-editors because they offered such cogent and helpful ways of framing processes of revision, and we regretted that this careful, meticulous work – because anonymous – could not be acknowledged explicitly. One of our contributors, Ela Przybylo, edits the journal *Feral Feminisms*, and suggested the practice of circular review, whereby all contributors to a specific issue blind review one another's work, ensuring a shared commitment to generous, constructive feedback, and to making the publication the best it can possibly be. Our experience also revealed that the protocols of blind peer review can have unanticipated negative effects. Having researchers who are strongly conversant with a particular field weigh in on new scholarship emerging within that field may be beneficial, and it is important to pre-empt discrimination against, or favouritism towards, particular scholars who are producing that new work by keeping reviewers at arm's length from

authors. However, any researcher with a commitment to situated knowledges values the specific circumstances and conditions in which knowledges emerge, the particularities of context that shape what can be articulated and known. Many of the authors, while anonymizing their submissions for blind peer review, had to eliminate much of the rich detail that made their investigations so pertinent to the questions raised in our CFP and so compelling to think with. It often took several drafts to reintroduce this contextual detail, to recentre the authors' voices, subject positions, practices of knowledge generation, and critical perspectives in order to do full justice to their arguments or artistic interventions. *SSJ*'s inclusion of sections such as "Dispatches," "Creative Interventions" and "Book Reviews" that require close work with the journal's editors, but that are not required to undergo the blind peer review process therefore proved advantageous by allowing scope for greater experimentation than is possible within the blind peer review paradigm of scholarly publication.

*Communication with contributors:* Attention to what kind of feedback would support contributors towards the best possible expression of their ideas also spurred our efforts as editors to generate careful, collaboratively written notes that balanced encouragement with scrupulous attention to the journal's standards (see below). Our communications were far from perfect (and focusing on communication was a good reminder that, unlike solitary scholarship where there is a temptation to strive for virtuosity, engaging in dialogue means committing to uncertainty, openness and adaptation as well as the inevitability of occasional confusion and embarrassment); however, the warmth and mutual appreciation that infused so much of our email correspondence confirmed our sense of the central importance of this part of the process.

*Copyediting:* Like reviewing, the final stages of getting a manuscript out, particularly the work of copyediting, get short shrift in metrics of academic publishing. This is despite the fundamental importance of such contributions to maintaining the calibre of work that brings journals like *Studies in Social Justice* into the vital interdisciplinary conversations that are happening in academia and beyond. As we sought to give broad licence to our contributors to challenge constrictive academic conventions, we came increasingly to appreciate the need simultaneously to recognize the infrastructure and the labour required to put our thoughts out into the world, in a shape that invites engagement by others. Some open-source journals require authors to pay fees to publish; the fact that *Studies in Social Justice* does not means that most of the extensive behind-the-scenes labour is voluntary. I am appreciative of all the fine-tuning collective editors and contributors did to prepare submissions, as well as immensely grateful to David Butz, the Editor-in-Chief of *Studies in Social Justice*, Caleb Johnston, the Creative Interventions editor, and Vanessa Farr, Dispatches editor, whose careful reading, prompt, generous responses, and patience with our sometimes unwieldy process, got us to this point. Thanks also to Samuel Ikueze who painstakingly edited the wrap-up Zoom meeting that provided the seeds for this Outro.

**Sue Spearey:** Susie’s “flipped classroom” analogy evocatively captures how we learned by focusing on process and problem-solving as our work unfolded. At the outset, I’m not sure we had a precise sense of what reckoning, repairing and reworlding would entail in the micro-context of academic publishing. As we proceeded, though, we were repeatedly reminded that we work within a system that relies on, and simultaneously eviscerates, care work. Nancy Fraser’s (2022) stark assessment that relations of care are *cannibalized* in late capitalism is abundantly clear in the neoliberal university, where this foundational labour is continually offloaded, outsourced, undervalued, and rendered invisible. Like all neoliberal institutions, universities take no responsibility for maintaining, replenishing, or invigorating the infrastructures necessary to regenerate the care work on which their operation nevertheless depends. This labour becomes evermore prolific and onerous in direct proportion to its increasing invisibility. Universities privatize the profits and socialize the costs in their privileging of the dominant model of academic life: the competitive publish-or-perish star scholar system where funding and prestige accrue to a select few atop institutional hierarchies, while taking for granted the evermore burdensome labour of those who sustain it through contributions to institutional governance, service, teaching, and student support that receive scant recognition. The frequency with which our reflections in this Outro invoke “brokenness” – of spirits, hearts, and systems – along with experiences of alienation from ourselves, our bodies, our feelings, and our lived conditions, is a strong indicator of the affective costs that amass when scholarly work and institutional processes conform to and reproduce neoliberal and extractive logics, targets, and metrics. Overwhelm, alienation, depletion, and distraction by extrinsic factors lie behind the high level of burnout amongst academics, and the hurtfulness of the system shows up most when careful thinkers, whose waking hours are almost entirely dedicated to work, feel like failures, because of the tenacity of the embodied and individualistic survival habits that we adopt in order to stay afloat in this context. In survival mode, we can only be reactive to our immediate circumstances; we can’t be proactive, expansive, curious, creative, playful, or experimental, which are presumably the conditions that animate good research and passionate, engaged researchers. Shaking off these deeply conditioned survival habits is difficult, and of course none of us could disentangle ourselves from systems and individuals operating according to neoliberal logics as we did this work. So certain unhelpful patterns of behaviour arose at different points in this collaborative process where one or more of us defaulted to survival mode – reactive adaptations, as Feizal, Nandini, Andrea, Helene and Jesse’s reflections suggest, to the overwhelming and depleting world in which we work.

How does a reparative collective proceed in such conditions? We committed ourselves to practising a different set of values and relations that centred care work and brought it into greater visibility, while prioritizing the wellbeing of collective members, so that processes of collaborative knowledge generation

(distinct from knowledge *production*) might emerge. My sense is that we are still learning how to open and step into the new spaces we aspired to establish. We have been consciously shifting the affective experience of doing scholarly work, expanding the significance, complexity and nuance of the learning that unfolds when we write reparatively in a collective. And we have been deepening the calibre and impact of the work that was emerging, and anticipating what it might go on to do, on publication.

I frequently experienced this affective shift when I was working with others. So many aspects of this collaborative work felt *joyful*, *energising*, and *enlivening*. I often emerged from one-on-one or larger-group meetings and work sessions, or from reading an updated version of one of our contributors' projects, buzzing with excitement, overspilling with anticipation of the abundant possibilities for thinking further with an idea or applying a praxis, or eventually bringing this work into the classroom. It has been inspiring to work with a group of people with shared and intersectional commitments to social and planetary justice, who are open to – and actively facilitating – exciting reimaginings of our disciplinary and cross-disciplinary practices and the role of scholarship more broadly. They are, or have become, friends and allies, a robust support network, and important touchstones as I carry out other aspects of my work beyond the collective. It has been exhilarating to work with the scholars, scholar/activists, and scholar/artists represented in this volume, and with reviewers and *SSJ*'s editorial team. We represent so many different career stages (undergraduate and graduate students; sessional, early-career, and tenure-track scholars), geopolitical and cultural locations (Canada, South Africa, the UK, Peru, Chile, and the US) and positions within institutions, and are cultivating so many ways to be in relationships of mentorship and mutual care.

If those who are situated closest to centres of power in any system are the most protected from – and often the most oblivious to – the failings of that system and the harms it enacts, having this range of voices and vantage points in this Special Issue – always in need of further expansion – has repeatedly illuminated for me what goes missing when scholarly communities and processes are narrowly constituted, conceived, and focused, and how enriching it is to imagine beyond these limits. What emerged as our work proceeded is a dynamic I think of as multi-directional mentoring, a practice modelled and further extended in several of the Special Issue contributions that explore the mentorship and teachings of more-than-human teachers and knowledge carriers. To cite one example of many, as I worked closely with Peruvian scholar, community-based artist, and PhD candidate Andrea Vela-Alarcón on co-editing several articles, and as Susie and I worked with her to capture the nuances of her translated discussion with Eliana Otta and to fine-tune her artist's statement for her own creative intervention, Andrea was mentoring me at least as much as I was mentoring her. I learned an enormous amount as she guided me into a body of decolonial literature from Latin America with which I was not previously conversant, and immersed me in the field of research-

creation. With Andrea and Susie, I experienced the power and struggle behind meticulous translation work. I also benefited enormously from witnessing, draft by draft, the evolution of contributors' writing and creative interventions. And I learned much from treating the CAPS workshops we co-facilitated for three consecutive years as occasions to think through, amongst ourselves and in dialogue with conference attendees each year, many of the questions and problems that were arising at that particular juncture in the course of our collaborative work.

The point of centring care work is not merely to foreground the ways it has been neglected, eroded, and made invisible – to name the problem – but also, ideally, to build and strengthen infrastructure that supports and enhances individual and collective wellbeing. Whether we are late-career scholars or first-time TAs, we are all aware of the increasing prevalence of illness – both physical and mental – in our students and peers. As a collective, we sought to align our explorations of the possibilities afforded by the terms “reckoning,” “repairing,” and “reworlding” with the goals of supporting the health and wellbeing of our collective members, each of whom, as the reflections in this Outro powerfully illustrate, has been navigating pressures and often toxic institutional cultures and practices that individually, or in combination, compromise health. Cara Page and Erica Woodland, in *Healing Justice Lineages: Dreaming at the Crossroads of Liberation, Collective Care, and Safety* (2023) – a body of work into which Tayah Clarke delves in her essay – propose that working towards health, flourishing, and justice should be mutually constitutive projects: that the advancement of any one of these aims should, if carefully focused and executed, contribute to the advancement of the others. I continue to ponder, “are there ways to do academic work collaboratively that support us to grow and flourish, deepen our learning and sense of interconnection, hone our skills, enhance our wellbeing, and connect our work to broader processes such as community engagement and the advancement of transformative justice? Can early-career scholars move beyond entrenched pathways rendered seemingly inevitable by the neoliberal university? Can later-career scholars find porousness within the institutions in which we work to open or widen those pathways, and create conditions for other such pathways to emerge in future?”

Finding or widening such pathways arguably must foreground that we are situated in networks of relations. Transforming neoliberal institutions is about more than individuals taking oppositional stances to systems understood as monolithic. If we adapt our practices within these systems, we need to stay aware of how those changes impact others. As each of us works to prioritize our own health and wellbeing, there has to be an openness to negotiation or give-and-take, an understanding of health and wellbeing as both individual *and* collective priorities. My sense is that if we had addressed these issues more explicitly from the outset, and used them as points of reference in our ongoing conversations, we might have been able to articulate more clearly for ourselves a set of best practices that better supported our shared work, and that provided

early-warning signals when we found ourselves falling back into reactive survival patterns. These lessons, along with the many profound satisfactions afforded by this shared work, will serve me well in future collaborative projects.

**Helene Strauss:** Our collective's reparative approach to the editorial process has been inspired in large part by a desire to undo some of the damage done by a cognition-centred university that tends to erase the materiality of our bodies from the learning process and from our relationships with one another. Working on this Special Issue has compelled us anew to honour the vitality of the body as the foundation from which to build accountability and to draw the fortitude needed for reparative work. One of the key lessons to have come from this collaboration is that healing our relationships with our own bodies in a broken university and a broken world is far from a retreat into individual silos. As many of our contributors also make plain, to reconnect with the body is expansive. To return to the intuitive wisdom of our bodies, in other words, is to revitalise our relational interdependence with each other as well as with the more-than-human material and ancestral realms.

We explored ways of rebuilding these forms of connection, for instance, as part of the 2024 CAPS workshop mentioned earlier, where we aimed to dismantle the nexus of the toxic university and some of the many forms of toxicity that saturate material relations under racial capitalism. I was reminded of this nexus again recently while teaching Y-Dang Troeung's fiercely brilliant *Landbridge: A Life in Fragments* (2023) as part of an undergraduate course on "Embodying Power." Y-Dang was a dear friend to me and several of the members of our collective, and her passing in the Fall of 2022 came as a huge shock. Both Sue and I have taught *Landbridge* in the past year, and we were both struck by how powerfully each of our three terms comes to life in its pages. Y-Dang's own struggles with the toxic university while living the debilitating embodied aftermath of genocidal violence as a Cambodian refugee reveal the deep interdependence of our academic lives and the larger work of reckoning with histories of colonial separation that so many of our contributors address in their papers. Amongst the many ways in which Y-Dang directs the work of reckoning towards repair and reworlding, her reframing of the concept of *baksbat* is particularly instructive:

The Khmer concept of *baksbat* translates as *broken courage* or *broken form*. I prefer the latter, *broken form*, because it invokes a sense of fragmented surface and impermanence. Breaking of the body is not necessarily the same as broken strength or broken spirit. Also, just because a form breaks does not mean it is broken, nor that it has become something shameful, incomprehensible, a thing to be silenced and forgotten.

I find these words in Khmer can express the brokenness of our selves in ways that give us repair and much-needed spiritual guidance. (Troeung, 2023, p. 62; emphasis in original)

While Y-Dang draws on the concept of *baksbat* here to relieve the intergenerational transmission of brokenness for herself and her own family after Pol Pot time, her own ancestral voice has also become a powerful spiritual guide for us as a collective trying to eliminate the viciousness that so often attends the peer review process. Recounting some of her own painful experiences in this regard, Y-Dang explains, for instance, how her scholarly book on Cambodian history and creative cultural production after the Khmer Rouge era was rejected by the editorial board of an unnamed press even after it had already been approved by academic peer reviewers (the book, titled *Refugee Lifeworlds: The Afterlife of the Cold War in Cambodia*, was subsequently published by Temple University Press and has since garnered several prestigious awards). Reasons given for its initial rejection included the claim that it was not “academic enough, that its subjects – Cambodia’s civil war, the US bombings, the Khmer Rouge takeover, work camps, genocide and its aftermaths – were too minor for a scholarly book, unless these issues were ‘ported’ to speak to histories and places closer to the West” (Troeng, 2023, p. 24). Her unflinching account of the devastating impact that these glib editorial dismissals had on her own mental health serves as a powerful lesson for those of us working in academia to attend to the parochialisms of our scholarly lenses and to remain sensitive to the embodied effects of academic gatekeeping and anonymous peer-review. This is a lesson that we have taken to heart in our efforts – outlined already by several voices in this Outro – to bring greater kindness to our scholarly praxis.

Y-Dang’s spiritual guidance has extended also into my own classroom praxis, as I’ve tried to implement forms of embodied pedagogy attentive to the work of repair. Listening to my students’ lively podcast assignments on *Landbridge* this past week, I kept hearing Y-Dang’s voice echo through my headphones and marvelling at the brilliance she’s bringing out in my students. I know she would have found great joy and comfort in witnessing my students’ enthusiastic embrace of her words, and in seeing how her text is helping them move beyond some of their own struggles with the embodied hardship of colonialism’s afterlives in South Africa.

**Jesse Arsenault:** I’m glad you bring us to the question of embodied feeling and desire, Helene. So much of the work that’s occurred here has been around questions of feeling, desire, and sensation. As I write this, my students are out in the streets, in a “cops off campus” rally to protest the increasing police presence in university life and in Montreal streets, committed to our shared feeling that the world is broken. Amid all of this, in the interest of making all the university’s members “feel welcome” when many “feel buffeted” by the suffering in our world (Brown, 2024), my university Provost has banned political statements on department websites – a sweeping response to statements in solidarity with Gazans that has now also seen commitments to Black Lives Matter taken off of department units’ pages. As we’ve grappled in this Special Issue with the question of what it means to repair, I’m reminded

of Mohammad Shabangu's insistence that "any question of liberation has to be approached by way of desire" because, he explains, "neoliberalism has totally economised the capacity of individual and collective desire" as desire has "been subsumed into the imperative to satisfy capitalist 'need'" (2020, p. 138). The administrative rhetoric that wants to make everyone feel okay when genocide is unfolding teaches us to distrust our abiding sense that something is broken. It teaches us to distrust our feelings, even when it violently polices (as in deploys actual police to quell) the collective responses these feelings generate. If we think about feeling at the level of the body – at the level of sensation – Mignolo and Vasquez note the modern/colonial project's tendency toward "control over the senses and perception" (2013). As Nandini points out, academic work can be so alienating, and part of the reason is that its institutional imperatives alienate our bodies from their feelings.

Repair has been getting a bad rap lately, mostly because of it having been co-opted by neoliberal rhetorics that substitute political action with good feelings (e.g., Stuelke, 2021). The example above might confirm this distrust, but I think when we combine repair with reckoning and reworlding (which don't allow us to feel good about the troubled present, but insist on an ongoing desire-based project) it involves learning to think about repair differently. Feisal asks above, "How can we teach with broken hearts?," recognizing in the process the widespread brokenness of the world around us. Repair, at least as we've been practicing it, seems less about good feeling than about how this brokenness involves a visceral, aching sense in the deepest part of our bodies of the brokenness around us. Sue notes above the failings in our systems, and Tayah emphasizes the failings of our own editorial process, even at the level of working across colonially-structured time zones that powerfully organize global time. (It strikes me, Tayah, that the notion of time zones offers a beautiful way to think about the timespace we are in. Time zones make some of us too early and some of us belated, but being temporary and localized rather than universal they indicate that other timespaces than the mired here-and-now exist.) Amid these failings – the cracks that we have let ourselves and others fall through – I wonder how to think about repair differently with embodied desire in mind. Julietta Singh tells us that failure allows us to "become vulnerable to other possibilities for living, for being together in common" (2018, p. 21). This, I suspect, is what many of us were becoming through collaboration, not seeking wholeness or unity but inhabiting brokenness together in ways similar to what, for Y-Dang, the concept of *baksbat* brings into view: as a guide towards repair and spiritual sustenance.

## References

- Brown, N. (2024, September 17). The Palestine exception's creeping threat to academic freedom: Policies at Concordia University exemplify the new campus repression. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/the-palestine-exceptions-creeping-threat-to-academic-freedom>

- Fraser, N. (2022). *Cannibal capitalism: How our system is devouring democracy, care, and the planet – and what we can do about it*. Verso.
- Mignolo, W., & Vasquez, R. (2013, July 15). Decolonial aestheSis: Colonial wounds/decolonial healings. *Social Text Online*. [https://socialtextjournal.org/periscope\\_article/decolonial-aesthesis-colonial-woundsdecolonial-healings/](https://socialtextjournal.org/periscope_article/decolonial-aesthesis-colonial-woundsdecolonial-healings/)
- Page, C., & Woodland, E. (2023). *Healing justice lineages: Dreaming at the crossroads of liberation, collective care, and safety*. North Atlantic Books.
- Shabangu, M. (2020). Education as the practice of freedom: Towards a decolonization of desire. *Social Dynamics: A Journal of African Studies*, 46, 132-149. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02533952.2020.1747738>
- Singh, J. (2018). *Unthinking mastery: Dehumanism and decolonial entanglements*. Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822372363>
- Stuelke, P. (2021). *The ruse of repair: US neoliberal empire and the turn from critique*. Duke University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9781478021575>
- Tootonsab, Z. (2021). An ethical (s)pace/water is life project: restoring the Athabasca River ecosystem through Indigenous self-determination. *English Studies in Canada*, 47(4), 109-118. <https://doi.org/10.1353/esc.2021.a932534>
- Troeng, Y. (2022). *Refugee lifeworlds: The afterlife of the Cold War in Cambodia*. Temple University Press.
- Troeng, Y. (2023). *Landbridge: A life in fragments*. Alchemy, Penguin Random House Canada.