

# Editorial Introduction

**Sarah Olive**

Children and young people from across Ukraine are being killed, physically and psychologically maimed, bereaved, orphaned, evacuated, displaced, forced into existence underground, separated from loved ones—perhaps most commonly their male relatives who must stay to fight under martial law—rendered translators and spokespeople for those who cannot express their experiences or needs in the languages of major news corporations, and made carers for injured or vulnerable relatives, as I write. They are also at risk of being trafficked by those who would exploit the chaos for profit (Eglinton). Suddenly, the items in our last issue on refugee children’s experiences during the First World War seem less distant, less historic, as comparisons are nightly drawn between the impacts on children then and now. For instance, comparisons between the *kindertransport* scheme and those to support children fleeing Ukraine have peppered television news in the UK. From babies *in utero* in Mariupol’s bombed maternity hospital, to kindergartens hit, to school-aged children whose places of learning have closed and reopened as places of shelter, to teenagers whose tertiary studies have been suspended so that they can join the Ukrainian army or—in the case of international students—return to their home countries, young people and “children are not near the front line, they are the front line” (BBC News).

Ukrainian children are also the makers, and recipients, of creative texts. They have produced poems about occupation and the longing for peaceful skies, diaries of their lives since the day the invasion started (Channel 4), drawings of tanks, games, and toys. A mother reports her children “making pistols with their fingers to kill the enemy” on the morning after the invasion began, a father shows the toy ambulance his son gifted him as a memento on

parting from him (BBC News. Ukrainian language picture books have been donated to children in Bulgarian crisis centres (see the Facebook page of FOX book café in Sofia). Anglophone children, meanwhile, are the audience for the recently translated Ukrainian picture book *Maya and Her Friends*, written by Larysa Denysenko and illustrated by Masha Foya. The book's objective is to ensure that children see the diversity of family types to which they belong represented in fiction. Bonnier Books released it in April in the UK as a fundraiser for UNICEF, supporting children affected by the invasion. Children around the world have mobilized to fundraise for their peers in manifold ways from sponsored runs to shaving their heads for charitable donations. But as a counterpart to these children engaged in fruitful creative encounters in and beyond the Ukraine, there are also those who have stopped dancing, stopped speaking, stopped eating and drinking (BBC News).

This issue opens with Lara Saguisag's article "Blood in the Water: Jewell Parker Rhodes's *Bayou Magic* as Children's Petrofiction." Rhodes's book (2015) responds to another real-world crisis of the twenty-first century: the 2010 BP oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico. In reviewing the existing literature on petrofiction, Saguisag reminds us that "the Oil Encounter" is often invisible and unspoken. Yet it underpins daily lives, with the West's oil dependency increasingly, seemingly inexorably, spreading across the globe. It is only at moments of rupture that we "pay attention to oil" (Ghosh; Saguisag p.XX). These may be literal, as in the BP oil spill, or figurative, such as in the soaring price of oil internationally as markets responded to the scope for supply disruptions after Russia's invasion of Ukraine. Saguisag's reading of *Bayou Magic* centres constructions, also seen in coverage from Ukraine, of young people as symbols of hope, displaying phenomenal endurance, and as guardians: of local communities, of various life forms from environmental destruction, as well as of their families, friends, and pets in war zones. Additionally, gelling with questions

raised by (and in) reportage from the conflict, Saguisag attends to the quandary many caregivers and educators face in relation to the appropriateness of explaining deadly world events. They ask: “How does one tackle the subject of oil when addressing young people? How are children enabled to participate in discourses on petroleum?” (p.XX) How does one approach talking about the significant and distressing harm the petroleum industry causes to animals and plants, as well as to the people who rely on these ecosystems, with younger age groups? Young readers may have only a “purported inherent kinship to the natural world” (Saguisag p.XX), but they are certainly socialized from infancy to invest emotionally in flora and fauna, not least through television programmes, picture books, video games, and toys with anthropomorphic characters.

Does anyone else recall their schools banning children from bringing in Tamagotchi, ostensibly due to the anguish pupils were experiencing when their “pets” died? (I suspect, though, the pupils’ distraction while nurturing their pets was also a significant factor in school leaders’ decisions.) Perhaps another factor in the outlawing of these pocket-sized, digital pets was the way in which they thwarted the dominant (Western) demand for children’s literatures and cultural products to exhibit an optimistic ending. The original Japanese Tamagotchi displayed a ghost and headstone to signify a pet’s demise, while English-language versions were adapted to show angels or eggs, Christian and Pagan symbols of after/new lives. Why recall the Tamagotchi in relation to Saguisag’s article, apart from debates surrounding both in relation to causing or, conversely, avoiding potential psychological harm to children by inappropriately introducing certain topics to them? Well, both are useful in highlighting the preference to obfuscate permanent loss, especially where children are concerned. Rhodes has a supernaturally built barrier restrict the spill. Programmers included buttons that allow Tamagotchi players to reboot and start again with a

new pet, presumably in a much shorter time frame than many adults would allow the introduction of a new, actual animal into the home. Saguisag suggests that Rhodes does not provide the perfect solution to old dilemmas of how to relate catastrophes and their long-term impact to young people. Nonetheless, they see its referencing of the African deity Mami Wata as a call for environmental activism to recognize “that the struggle for racial justice and the campaign for decarbonization are intertwined projects” (p.XX). They highlight the need for such projects to be open to the knowledges, lore, and traditions of sustainable land management and care that many Communities of Colour have practised: the same traditions that have been devalued and imperiled by colonization and by the use of slave labour to implement colonial agricultural and industrial ventures (Schuster, Germain, Bennett, Reo, and Arcese).

Petra Fachinger’s article follows Saguisag’s. Along with Jane Newland’s piece on Julie Flett in the resources section, it too speaks strongly to sense-of-place, cultural and linguistic identity, especially for the Cree and Métis peoples. Fachinger focuses on David Alexander Robertson’s *The Barren Grounds*, a young adult Cree retelling of C. S. Lewis’s British war-trauma narrative *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*. Their analytic lenses on *The Barren Grounds* include postcolonial and trauma theory, specifically Cree scholar and educator Suzanne Methot’s notion of complex post-traumatic stress disorder (CPTSD). Fachinger highlights the novel’s calls for education in North America to support Indigenous children and young adults to “find their roots first in their own cultures before being able to benefit from Western schooling and reading the stories of the European canon” and its contributions to realizing this objective (p.XX). These include promoting language revitalization as an essential part of identity and a prerequisite of accessing and mobilizing Indigenous knowledge and culture. As an Anglo-Australian academic working in a university

that is at the forefront of Welsh language and bilingual higher education provision and currently immersed in media coverage of the Russian invasion of Ukraine, I was seized by several “affinities” between the Canadian context of Fachinger’s article and international ones. In using this notion of “affinity,” I do not want to claim equivalence between the experiences of Indigenous peoples in Canada, Australia, Ukraine, and Wales—not least because, in the latter countries especially, notions of Indigeneity are troubled by a long history of “imperial political geography and different conceptions of history held by the peoples of the region[s]” (Minority Rights Group International). The idea of Cymraeg as an “Indigenous language” is complicated, for example, by a long history of its take-up and use by migrants into Wales, the objectives of Welsh Government in its policy *Cymraeg 2050: A Million Welsh Speakers*, and campaigners’ aspirations for its becoming a world language. Rather, I invoke the affinities I observed to suggest ways in which Fachinger’s, Robertson’s, and Methot’s work out of Canada has significance for researchers, educators, and communities in former/present/neo- colonies internationally. Admittedly, such an impulse arises, at first unconsciously and structurally, out of my multiple positions of privilege: as an editor of an international academic journal, a scholar in a system where success is measured by the international reach and impact of research, and a speaker of English with the access to a global audience that entails.

Fachinger’s account of Robertson’s, his father’s, and his characters’ experiences of alienation from their Indigenous languages and identities evoked for me Nugi Garimara’s book *Rabbit-Proof Fence* (often published under their English name Doris Pilkington, or with a combination of their names). It is a true story based on their mother’s experience as part of Australia’s Stolen Generation: those affected by a policy of forced removal of mixed-race children from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander families, from the early twentieth century

onward. In one scene, an older child at the residential school tells the newly arrived girls: “You girls can’t talk blackfulla language here.... You gotta forget it and talk English all the time” (Pilkington Garrimara 72). The protagonist’s stunned and bereft response is: “We can’t talk our old wangka.... That’s awful” (73). This confrontation fuels her determination to escape. Pilkington Garrimara’s book thus not only criticizes linguistic colonialism but also redresses its harms by using, sharing, and teaching the language of the Martu, glossed at the back of the book (“Mardu” in some orthographies, the traditional owners of a large part of central Western Australia). For over a decade, I have taught Pilkington Garrimara’s work to British and international undergraduate students, sometimes paired with its film adaptation (Noyce), hot on the heels of Shakespeare’s play *The Tempest*, with its speech against linguistic colonialism made by Caliban—now predominantly read as an Indigenous character: “You taught me language, and my profit on’t / Is I know how to curse. The red plague rid you, / For learning me your language” (1.2.363). These lines, written around 1610, when Spanish and English colonizations of North America were ongoing, are juxtaposed with Pilkington Garrimara’s portrayal of 1930s Australia, some three hundred years later. Highlighting the longevity of colonial oppression helps students make sense of concepts that can be initially difficult, such as *intergenerational* trauma. I will add Methot’s Complex Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder to my teaching of intergenerational trauma, while continuing to use the wonderful, online school toolkit of the Healing Foundation in Australia (“Stolen”). Many of the tools include stunning animated videos made by Indigenous artists and actors. Robertson’s joy that their daughter is “an avid learner of the Cree language” who will be able to teach it and promote healing in younger generations also reminded me of the leadership of my colleagues Enlli Thomas and Rhian Tomos to implement Welsh language policies across the university; researching bilingual language transmission, acquisition, assessment and use

in the Welsh context; delivering degree programmes in Welsh; and making the Welsh language podcast on childhood *Am Blant* (trans. About Children).

Fachinger's article ends by expanding their focus on Robertson's Indigenization of a European source to proposals in Canada to Indigenize the curricula. They cite the guidance document *Pulling Together*, explaining that "'indigenization can be understood as weaving or braiding together two distinct knowledge systems [Indigenous and non-Indigenous] so that learners can come to understand and appreciate both' (Antoine et al. 6)" (p.XX). The emphasis here is against siloing Indigenization as an "Indigenous issue" that only concerns the teaching of Indigenous young people but that should be undertaken equally by all learners in Canada, or in other colonial contexts such as Australia and Wales. While it is contested whether "Indigenization" is an appropriate term to apply to the Welsh context, this concept of a curriculum needing to weave or braid together knowledges with distinct characteristics—Welsh and English literatures, arts, and languages, for example—potentially offers Welsh researchers and policy makers a useful model with which to evaluate the new Curriculum for Wales.

Fachinger's article, which delves into Robertson's autobiography, complements Jane Newland's interview with Julie Flett, a Swampy Cree and Red River Métis children's author and illustrator, in the resources section of this issue. There is a tangible connection in that Flett illustrated Robertson's *When We Were Alone*. Fachinger quotes Robertson's memoirs and recalls her personal experience of collaborating with them. Newland shares the first-hand account Flett gave during their dialogue of personal experiences and inspirations. Language loss through the generations of Flett's Métis family is akin to the Robertsons' experience with Cree. It is also something that their work aims to redress for the next generations, forming "a resource for children" that can be used to support the reintroduction of Indigenous languages,

stories, and literacies into family homes where these practices have been suppressed, rendering adults unconfident to teach it.

Fachinger hears, and adds their voice to, Robertson's call for Indigenous children to have access to representations of Indigenous characters and culture in their reading. So do Newland and Flett, who "recalls a story of a librarian friend reading *The Moccasins* to a young boy, who was himself a foster child. They remark: "The impact of that book on him was really something—he felt cared for, represented—there it was just a little book, stapled together with so much meaning" (p.XX). Additionally, Newland and Flett discuss a strategy the latter has developed inspired by the filmmaker Agnès Varda's saying about the process of producing their work and its relationship to audiences: "I can't see you, but I see you" (p.XX). Flett explains that numerous young readers, as well as parents and librarians on their behalf, have spoken to them of "how hard it is to find themselves in a book" but Varda's line has fed into the development of an approach Flett uses when rendering faces in their illustrations (p.XX): their partial obscurement and their oblique points of view in drawing them creates enough ambiguity for the faces to be polyvalent to readers since, as they explain, "I can't be the voice for every face" (p.XX). The conversation between Flett and Newland is followed with the latter's critical reflections, including further biographical details for Flett as well as analysis of their texts, informed by their contents and Flett's previously published descriptions of their creative processes. Like Fachinger with Robertson, Newland with Flett reads their illustrations and writing as expressing landscapes and textiles, human relationships with nature and mythological entities, and communities and relationships in ways that are distinctly Indigenous, rooted in Flett's own lived experiences and Métis knowledge. Fachinger cites the image of weaving in relation to "braiding together two distinct knowledge systems" in an ideal, Indigenized education that might redress some

of the losses Robertson expresses in their work and that they and their forefathers experienced; Newland does so in relation to Flett weaving “multiple narrative encounters together” in their work *Birdsong*. Both envisage weaving together Indigenous and non-Indigenous young people to benefit from Indigenized education and culture in Canada. Yet their pieces in this issue can also be read in ways that produce a wider, international resonance.

Since February 2022, these articles—particularly Fachinger’s analysis of the Lewis source text—have gained a fresh, *subsidiary* relevance through the latest Russian invasion of Ukraine. Fachinger is clear that, in the Narnia series, “Although unsettling and frightening for both parents and children, the temporary separation of children from their relatives during the Second World War is not comparable to the forced separation of Indigenous children from their parents, their placement into potentially abusive situations, and their disconnection from their culture” (p.XX). Reinforcing this position, they quote Methot’s explanation that “[a]lthough many other ethnic groups have had adverse experiences, survived traumatic episodes, and been the victims of genocide, the ongoing cycle of trauma in Indigenous communities is perpetuated by the loss of land and the consequent loss of the stories and ceremonies that once connected Indigenous peoples to the land’ (Methot 22–23)” (p.XX). Methot’s highlighting of communities’ experiences of sustained or multiple colonizations, leading to re-traumatization, also apply somewhat to Ukraine. I do not want to suggest that Methot’s concept be applied primarily to European situations, and certainly not *instead of* the experiences of Indigenous people in and beyond North America. However, I found myself using it to make sense of some news coverage from a besieged Ukraine: footage of distraught older Ukrainians who have already survived Russian imperialism at multiple points in their lives; people from Crimea and Donbas repeatedly relocating away from the borderlands; and

families who fled fighting in the Middle East for asylum in Ukraine. These re-traumatized, twice-displaced refugees include Syrians already hit by Russian armed support for President Assad and Afghans who have experienced a lifetime of serial occupations from competing superpowers and fundamentalist rulers, of which Russia is but one.

I also found sections of Fachinger's writing on Lewis's series speaking, indirectly, to the present trauma that children and young people are experiencing in and beyond Ukraine as a result of the Russian invasion. Their description of the Second World War context for Lewis's story chimes with fears that child traffickers will exploit the turmoil in Ukraine: "The children were usually unaccompanied, siblings were separated.... The evacuated children often experienced trauma not only by living in a world at war but also by the separation from their families and by suffering mistreatment from some of their hosts" (p.XX). Fachinger's summary of Lewis's plot of Allied Forces triumphing over Nazism as one in which "the children ultimately fight for social justice and the liberation of Narnia alongside the lion Aslan, who is the rightful king of Narnia, against the White Witch who has violently colonized the land" (p.XX) is redolent of Ukrainian teenage boys shown enthusiastically training to defeat another arch villain. Their argument that "[o]ne of the many lessons they learn in Narnia is how to interpret this world by looking for clues as how to fit the new experiences into their familiar worldview" resonates with how Ukrainian children—and their peers following the news on television, the internet and social media—are attempting to make sense of the conflict. A glimmer of hope might be found in this coverage, since Fachinger's voice chimes with those of other media effects and identities scholars. They similarly argue that representation of communities, nations, and identities by authors who belong to them helps heal trauma and promote self-actualization among survivors of colonial and wartime violence.

Fachinger's and Newland's desire for more numerous and fuller representation of minoritized peoples in children's books, and their research undertaken with those authoring such representations in a First Nations and Canadian colonial context, is potentially served in another First Nations and colonial context by Emily Booth and Rebecca Lim's article "The Picture of Privilege: Examining the Lack of Diverse Characters in 2018 Australian Children's Picture Books." It discusses the findings of the first diversity count of Australian children's picture books. This was conducted in 2019 in collaboration with the advocacy group Voices from the Intersection (VFTI). They found that 83% of Australian picture books did not feature a minoritized protagonist, with the result that readers are offered a narrow demographic of human, animal, and non-human protagonists. Additionally, they draw attention to the way in which activism itself, including campaigns like We Need More Diverse Books, and media attention to them, centres the American publishing industry and audiences. Their work, from the Global South, redresses this marginalization of publishing elsewhere. One particularly interesting aspect of their article is their emphasis not on decrying a "diversity deficit," with its connotations of passivity and lack but on the "excess of representations of a very narrow demographic" (p.XX). This better captures the agency involved in producing and maintaining the *status quo*.

Furthermore, Booth and Lim find that where marginalized creators are involved in making Australian picture books, they seem to be siloed into the role of illustrator, with non-marginalized creators siloed into the role of the writer. The authors' note the further research needed to explore the reasons behind this apparent divide, offering one possible explanation as a starting point: "that marginalized creators could be perceived by publishers as more valuable for their capacity to *decorate* the stories of non-marginalized authors than their potential to speak and write their own narratives" (p.XX). This resonates with the

disproportionate popularity, commodification, and commercialization of Indigenous arts and crafts among non-marginalized people in and visiting the continent compared to other aspects of Indigenous history and culture. This phenomenon is noted by the participants in the University of Sydney's YouTube video "Ask Us Anything: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People." It also further suggests the importance of the texts produced by the Healing Foundation, which combine written, spoken, and visual creativity by Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Perhaps future diversity counts will consider whether texts from other media and genres, particularly those which have lower or fewer barriers to the production and distribution of content by creators than print publishing, are more popular with marginalized creators or an additional way of segregating the texts they produce from the mainstream. For now, Booth and Lim conclude with a handful of clear, practical recommendations to combat hegemony in the industry, leading to positive change.

The methodology and criteria they use to study diversity in Australian picture books are outlined in ways that make their approach available for use with other contexts and populations not well served by existing studies—although I suspect debates about how to “read” non-human characters in diversity counts will continue to pose a challenge for researchers and stakeholders. All four authors problematize and resist the homogenization of children's picture books in a “standardized” world (Booth and Lim—I would add “globalized” and “cosmopolitan”). They all reference the collective and individual harm that can be done when texts for young people establish an “artificial normal” child, predicated on the dominant cultures, “at the expense of children who do not adhere to this uniformity, and therefore become abnormal children within literature” (Booth and Lim p.XX). This exclusion is compounded by the effects of what Ronald Carter describes as socio-cultural constructions of literariness: that a market saturated with texts by authors from the dominant culture leads

to better chances of these texts winning literary prizes, is one example they give. Booth and Lim also spell out the negative effects of this reified, “normal” child, on those marginalized for reasons other than ethnicity and their capacity for self-actualization as this textually constructed normality is likewise unattainable for them. There is clear potential to additionally consider the implications of intersectionality here, the compounded unattainability of the ideal for children with multiple identities figured as outside the norm. Those who can and do approach this ideal are blinkered by these texts to other possibilities, to pluralities, to diverse peers, and left without the tools to question and challenge the stereotypes they receive and perpetuate, argue Booth and Lim.

Like Booth and Lim, Shara L. Crookston is interested, albeit implicitly, in the idea of the idealized “normal” child. Here, however, the normative ideal is the hetero-romantic and heterosexual teenage girl, and its portrayal through the character of Katniss Everdeen. Crookston considers the contentious impact on critics and young women readers of the Hunger Games series’ ending (spoiler alert). This depicts Katniss as married and a mother, at the behest of her husband, in spite of her previous statements favouring a child-free future. Crookston does so using interviews undertaken with readers and fans, thereby rebalancing the relative dominance of critics’ voices on the series. I enjoyed the article’s troubling of false connotations of feminist and anti-natalist, of mother and failed feminist heroine: some of the young women argued that Katniss need not be held to statements of intent made earlier in the series, that through the timespan represented, their character could have a change of mind about their life goals. On the flip side, I readily identified with those fans disappointed by the ending because of their investment in Katniss as a young woman outspokenly eschewing gendered expectations, including by resisting the default pronatalism of many real and fictional societies (that is, the centring, even reifying, of reproduction). Although the majority

of Crookston's participants felt the series' ending to be fitting and saw no incongruity between "a female protagonist be[ing] both a gender role—challenging revolutionary and a married mother of two" (p. XX), it struck me that the series' resolution had missed an opportunity to provide a rare antidote to widespread and persistent under-representation of asexuality and aromantic identities. Posthuman, companionate relationships were hinted at in one participant's assertion: "I think some women might not be interested in any love, but they might want pets as a companion instead of a human" (p. XX). LGBTQ relationships and identities were invoked by another. So, although the series has concluded, against-the-grain, resistant reading remains an option for restoring power and pleasure to readers and viewers who feel they have been let down by the authorial reinstatement, or at least privileging, of gender and sexual norms.

With its privileging of readers' perspectives, I drew connections between this article and that other popular YA series with a love triangle ("what, only one?", you ask, incredulously): Stephenie Meyer's *Twilight* Saga. Firstly, Sarah Artt and Sara Wasson have similarly used a reader-response approach to challenge dominant, critical assumptions that inform their reception of the series—that, for example, a female character desiring to be loved and cared for by a boyfriend is necessarily passive, necessarily anti-feminist. Secondly, Crookston's argument that Katniss choosing Peeta over Gale resists narrow, normative masculinities echoes arguments made in relation to the power of Bella in choosing Edward over Jacob in the *Twilight* Saga. The extent to which that choice is radical and progressive is, however, complicated by the intersections of race and class that compound Jacob's eventual disfavouring by Bella: Jacob's werewolf, Indigenous, lower-class identities versus Edward's vampire, white, upper-middle-class ones.

Intersections of race and class are at the heart of the work of the final author featured in our resources section this issue: José Mauro de Vasconcelos, the Indigenous/Portuguese dual-heritage Brazilian writer best known for his works *My Sweet Orange Tree* (1968)—with its twenty-first-century film adaptation by Marcos Bernstein (2012)—*The Crystal Sailboat* (1973) and *The Japanese Palace* (1969). Vasconcelos's oeuvre is not well represented in English-language versions, but some of it has been translated into other European Languages, including French. Samuel Bidaud's piece articulates an understanding of the distinctive poetics characteristic of Vasconcelos's work, tracing commonalities in the narrative frameworks, allusions to Christian religion, and use of allegory of each title. Bidaud concentrates on protagonists who similarly endure intense suffering, even facing death, with the help and comfort of a friend. They read this through the lens of the Biblical typology, and its legacy in twentieth-century literature and literary criticism (think of the taxonomies of character types evolved by Vladimir Propp and Algirdas Greimas). Bidaud's proposal of the works' Christian allegorical nature and Vasconcelos's dual Indigenous and Portuguese heritage make for an interesting dialogue with Fachinger's exploration of Robertson's Cree retelling of *The Lion, Witch and the Wardrobe* earlier in the issue. I have to admit a vested interest in Vasconcelos's *The Japanese Palace*, since I have taken up the role of Megumi Visiting Professor of Literature at Kobe College, Hyogo Prefecture, Japan for the next academic year (Spring 2022–2023). Inspired by Bidaud's piece, I packed my French translation, and it matters not a jot to me that the titular Japanese Palace and its inhabitant, Prince Tetsuo, are only conjured in the mind and realized in the artwork of the solitary painter, Pedro, working in São Paulo. After all, as political and social theorists such as Benedict Anderson and John Thompson posited from the mid-twentieth century on, my experience of Japan will be mediated through my own subjectivity, previous experiences of

visiting since my first trip in 2014, plus fictional and critical texts, including Studio Ghibli's *anime* films jam-packed with fantastic castles. I can only hope that Vasconcelos's story of someone enjoying renewed professional inspiration through their experience of an imaginary Japan represents the reality of my own concrete visit.

With this volume's strong attention to the work of Black and Indigenous authors and Authors of Colour, as well as the representation—or under-representation—of diversity in children's literature in several of Europe's former colonies, it is fitting to draw attention to the journal's adoption, late last year, of the diversity principles outlined in the Joint Statement made by the Coalition for Diversity and Inclusion in Scholarly Communications. It is one way of formalizing and concretizing something that *Jeunesse* has had at the core of its ethos for many years: valuing—and seeking to promote—accessibility, diversity, as well as equitable and inclusive practices within the scholarly communications ecosystem. In practical terms, one recent innovation is that everyone who submits to the journal is given information about, and opportunity to ask for and comment on, the support that we make available to foster such an environment. We have drawn attention to our implementation of these principles in the recent calls for articles and reviews on our website. We look forward to the ensuing submissions, expressions of interest, and feedback.

Sarah Olive

Dr Sarah Olive is the Megumi Visiting Professor in the English Department of Kobe College, Japan, during the academic year 2022-23. She is on loan from the School of Educational Sciences, Bangor University, UK, where she is a Senior Lecturer and Director of Research. She is the lead author of *Shakespeare in East Asian Education* (Palgrave, 2021), the author of *Shakespeare Valued* (Intellect, 2015) as well as book chapters and articles on young people's Shakespeare. In the twilight hours, she researches Young Adult gothic fiction.

## Works Cited:

<edb>Artt, Sarah, and Sara Wasson, "The Twilight Saga and the Pleasures of Spectatorship: The Broken Body and the Shining Body." *Open Graves, Open Minds: Representations of Vampires and the Undead from the Enlightenment to the Present Day*, edited by Sam George and Bill Hughes, Manchester UP, pp. 181–191.</edb>

<eref>"Ask Us Anything: Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People." *YouTube*, uploaded by University of Sydney, 27 May 2018, [youtube.com/watch?v=SHVbVBLlhCM](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SHVbVBLlhCM).</eref>

BBC News. BBC News at Six, 2 Mar. 2022. Learning on Screen, [learningonscreen.ac.uk/ondemand/index.php/prog/3BF07FDF?bcast=136337070](https://learningonscreen.ac.uk/ondemand/index.php/prog/3BF07FDF?bcast=136337070). Accessed 31 Mar. 2022.</eref>

BBC News. BBC News at Six, 7 Mar. 2022. Learning on Screen, [learningonscreen.ac.uk/ondemand/index.php/prog/3BF07FDF?bcast=136337070](https://learningonscreen.ac.uk/ondemand/index.php/prog/3BF07FDF?bcast=136337070). Accessed 31 Mar. 2022.</eref>

<eref>BBC News. BBC News at Six, 9 Mar. 2022. Learning on Screen, [learningonscreen.ac.uk/ondemand/index.php/prog/3BF07FDF?bcast=136337070](https://learningonscreen.ac.uk/ondemand/index.php/prog/3BF07FDF?bcast=136337070). Accessed 31 Mar. 2022.</eref>

<eref>Channel 4. Channel 4 News, 18 Mar. 2022. Learning on Screen, [learningonscreen.ac.uk/ondemand/index.php/prog/17096416?bcast=136392558](https://learningonscreen.ac.uk/ondemand/index.php/prog/17096416?bcast=136392558). Accessed 31 Mar. 2022.</eref>

Denysenko, Larysa. *Maya and Her Friends*. Illustrated by Masha Foya, Bonnier, 2022.

<eref>Eglinton, Kristen Ali. "Preventing human trafficking webinar. Footage Foundation is hosting a free webinar for NGOs and volunteers working with displaced people in

#Ukraine.” *Facebook*, 14 Mar. 2022,

facebook.com/kristen.eglinton/posts/10166243347505581.</eref>

<eref>FOX book café. “Home.” *Facebook*, n.d., facebook.com/foxbookcafe. Accessed 31 Mar.

2022.</eref>

<other>Ghosh, Amitav. “Petrofiction: The Oil Encounter and the Novel.” *The New Republic*, 2 Mar.

1992, pp. 29–34.</other>

<eref>“Joint Statement of Principles.” *Coalition for Diversity and Inclusion in Scholarly*

*Communications*, updated October 2021, c4disc.org/principles/</eref>

<eref>Minority Rights Group International. “World Directory of Minorities and Indigenous

Peoples—Ukraine.” 2007. *Refworld*, refworld.org/docid/4954ce5123.html. Accessed 3

May 2022.</eref>

Noyce, Phillip, director. *Rabbit-Proof Fence*. Rumbalara Films, 2002.

<bok>Pilkington Garimara, Doris. *Rabbit-Proof Fence*. Hyperion, 2002. </bok>

<jrn>Schuster, Richard, Ryan R. Germain, Joseph R. Bennett, Nicholas J. Reo, and Peter Arcese.

“Vertebrate Biodiversity on Indigenous-Managed Lands in Australia, Brazil, and  
Canada Equals that in Protected Areas.” *Environmental Science and Policy*, vol. 101,

2019, pp. 1–6.</jrn>

<bok>Shakespeare, William, and Anne Barton. *The Tempest*. Penguin, 1981.</bok>

<eref>“Stolen Generations Resource Kit for Teachers and Students.” *Healing Foundation*, n.d.,

healingfoundation.org.au/schools/. Accessed 3 May 2022.</eref>

<eref>Tomos, Rhian. *Am Blant*. Apple Podcasts, 2021–2022, [podcasts.apple.com/us/podcast/am-blant/id1594175372?uo=4](https://podcasts.apple.com/us/podcast/am-blant/id1594175372?uo=4).</eref>