

# Editors' Note

Issue 3.44 (Summer, 2021) developed out of early conversations with artists and writers doing the work of “focusing to make the invisible visible” (Russna Kaur). Making use of the generative potential of revisioning, many of the contributions collected here ask us to consider the relationships and subjectivities prioritized within well-established narratives alongside possible retellings.

Through reflection of the exhibit *lineages and land bases*, Tarah Hogue and Ashlee Conery, with an introduction by Találsamkin Siyám Chief Bill Williams, bring forward the aesthetic practices and basketry of Sewinchelwet (Sophie Frank) in the discussion of the life and work of Emily Carr. Drawing on the work of Huneault, Moray, Crosby, and others, they demonstrate the difficulty of shifting or “puncturing” institutional thinking around a figure so central to Canadian identity as Carr, highlighting that even when divergent histories are presented, they are often “treated as branches or ‘alternative narratives’ rather than roots.”

When stories continue to go unheard across institutional and individual settings, how do we care for and carry forward our multiple histories? Non-articulations, such as those found within Helen Cho’s work, prompt us to consider how space and silence are just as important as utterances. “Nuanced forms of refusal” (Tanya Lukin Linklater) recognize an inability to translate to all readers. The contributors to this issue reveal to us that care may take shape through intentional slowness, by way of multiple paths or directions for reading, or the foregrounding of relationships—including those of human lives past and present and their surroundings.

Each issue involves its own process of revision, slowly moving backwards and forwards through the material to bring together a finite collection that nevertheless contains possibilities for continued revisiting. So, how do we encourage ourselves and others toward the sensibility of an “open receptor” of the kind that Joni Low locates in her review of Ken Lum’s work. In the words of Klara du Plessis and Elee Kraljii Gardiner: “how can we create the space and context for listeners to leave the clock world and enter the chronology of the text?”

—Emily Dundas Oke and Matea Kulić