



H-Environment

H-Environment Roundtable Reviews

Volume 9, No. 6 (2019)
<https://networks.h-net.org/h-environment>

Publication date: June 21, 2019
Roundtable Review Editor:
Kara Murphy Schlichting

Karen Routledge, *Do You See Ice? Inuit and Americans at Home and Away* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 2018) ISBN 978-0-226-58013-5 (cloth), ISBN 978-0-226-58027-2 (e-book)

Contents

Introduction by Kara Murphy Schlichting, Queens College CUNY	2
Comments by Amelia Fay, Manitoba Museum	4
Comments by Karen Oslund, Towson University	7
Comments by Daniella McCahey, University of Idaho	9
Comments by David Neufeld, Parks Canada	16
Response by Karen Routledge, Parks Canada	20
About the Contributors	26

Copyright © 2019 H-Net: Humanities and Social Sciences Online

H-Net permits the redistribution and reprinting of this work for nonprofit, educational purposes, with full and accurate attribution to the author, web location, date of publication, H-Environment, and H-Net: Humanities & Social Sciences Online.

Introduction by Kara Murphy Schlichting, Queens College CUNY

Reading *Do You See Ice? Inuit and Americans at Home and Away* by Karen Routledge is a reminder that history can be profoundly intimate. The book's subtitle sets the culturally-loaded idea of "home" as the touchstone for its investigation of colonialism and cultural identity, environmental knowledge, and ideas of place. In her beautifully written and artistically structured book, Routledge uses the ideas of belonging and homesickness to consider the experiences of both American whalers and Inuit on Cumberland Sound from 1850-1920. **Amelia Fay** opens this roundtable with a reflection on Routledge's use of "home" as evoking more than just a physical structure or household, but as a concept rooted in both culture and material nature. Fay considers the differences inherent to the vocabulary of "home" versus "homeland" and how these terms have been applied across settler and Indigenous peoples' histories in the Arctic. This, Fay tells us, is a window into the history of colonialism and both Inuit and Qallunaat (non-Inuit) experiences of home on Cumberland Sound, in the High Arctic, and in New England. Because the meaning of "being at home" animates the central questions of *Do You See Ice?*, **Karen Oslund** also focuses her comments on the idea. Oslund commends Routledge for taking stock of the emotions of Inuits and Qallunaats alike. Oslund pays particular attention how Routledge mines Qallunaat archival materials to treat Inuit and Qallunaat as equal partners in this history. To achieve this goal, Routledge weaves contemporary oral histories and fieldwork into her scholarship. Oslund reflects on both the admirable results of this work while also offering questions about whether such an approach might flatten Inuit history by inhibiting the evolution of ideas across time.

Daniella McCahey, a scholar of the Antarctic, broadens this roundtable with a comparison of themes frequent to polar history in both the Arctic and the Antarctic. Pointing out the fundamental difference of human habitation (the Antarctic has no indigenous populations), McCahey nevertheless finds similarities between histories of the two poles. First she identifies the ways in which colonizers and explorers constructed ideas of whiteness and race. Second, she considers gender relationships in polar regions and gendered understandings of these environments as places to which only men could "belong." Third, she draws parallels in the gothic frameworks explorers and whalers used to describe polar environments.

David Neufeld offers the roundtable's final set of comments. Neufeld highlights how ideas of home and family were essential to the imperialistic beliefs that Americans brought to their interactions with the Inuit. Routledge, he says, reveals the complexity of what it means to be at home through personal experiences like those of the Inuit couple Hannah and Ipiirvik who for a time lived in the United States. Surveying the archival collections at the foundation of this history, Neufeld reflects on the "intent and purposes of knowledge holders," considering how and in what ways intimate Inuit and Qallunaat experiences are preserved in the historic record but also across space and time. In her response, **Karen Routledge** reiterates that

the making and unmaking of homes was a central project of imperialism/colonialism and a motivating factor for her research. She explains the ways in which her work connects to literature that looks beyond “home” as confined to domestic life and family. Routledge encourages environmental historians to see material nature as intrinsic to cultural constructs of home. She takes the opportunity to expand on why the physicality of being in an Arctic or High Arctic environment, environments that are often extreme in terms of daylight and temperature, shapes understandings of that place. She also offers insight into how environmental change affected homes in Cumberland Sound. In so doing, she reiterates a central idea of *Do You See Ice?*: the way in which people’s sense of belonging in a home is inherently based on individual experiences, and the ways that imperialism’s challenge to this concept happened simultaneously as international struggles and personal suffering. Routledge also reflects carefully, and with grace, on the limits she sees in her role as a historian telling this history. At the center of her project, Routledge reminds us, is respect for how deeply personal experiences ground sweeping historical narratives. And, she writes, there is only so far a historian can go in recovering such experiences or in crafting general conclusions from them. As she does throughout *Do You See Ice?*, Routledge pushes the reader to be aware of the role of the historian as an interpreter of intimate histories.

Before turning to the first set of comments, I would like to pause here and thank all the roundtable participants for taking part. In addition, I would like to remind readers that as an open-access forum, *H-Environment Roundtable Reviews* is available to scholars and non-scholars alike, around the world, free of charge. Please circulate.

Comments by Amelia Fay, Manitoba Museum

Weaving together perceptions of home and away from both American and Inuit perspectives, Routledge masterfully presents an engaging story about people's relationships with the environment. Based on a decade of research, and written in an incredibly accessible academic style, the reader is transported back in time through the compelling narratives. Yet Routledge also manages to ground the reader in the present, by articulating how the repercussions of the encounters, experiences, and perspectives have shaped Arctic perceptions today.

The prologue provides the theoretical basis for Routledge's exploration and situates her work within the broader environmental history literature. By doing this, Routledge is able to maintain the focus of each chapter on specific narratives and events, and allows the reader to contemplate the larger ideas discussed in the prologue as they go along. The remainder of the book is organized into four chapters, and each chapter framed by a method of marking time unique to the environmental focus of the chapter. Thus, chapters 1 and 4, which focus on Americans and Inuit in Cumberland Sound (respectively) use the six Inuit seasons for organization; chapter 2 centres on Inuit in the United States and uses a series of Sundays, as a week became the method of marking time during the nineteenth century; and chapter 3, which looks at the combined experiences of Americans and Inuit, uses the appearance and disappearance of the sun in the High Arctic.

Unique to this work is the central focus on the concept of home and its relationship to the environment from both Inuit and Qallunaat (non-Inuit) perspectives. For Routledge, home is understood to be more than just a household and family, but also the landscape, animals, seasons, and even methods of marking time that together help frame one's perception of home. I appreciated this discussion on home, and particularly her criticism of the commonly framed dichotomy of "homes" for settlers and "homelands" for Indigenous peoples. This is fairly common in my own discipline of archaeology as well, where Indigenous houses are often explored in a wider environmental context, but settler dwellings are at times focussed solely on the household and its goods. Here Routledge argues that home is where nature and culture meet, and could thus serve as an important topic for environmental historians, and I would extend this to other disciplines in the social sciences and humanities (xxv). This broader conception of home is particularly important today, as climate change is forcing people to take a closer look at their relationship with their environment and contemplate how 'home' for many is changing at an alarming rate.

The other large and underlying theme throughout the book is colonialism, and how the nineteenth-century Qallunaat perceptions of the Arctic and Inuit presented continue to shape the region and Inuit-Qallunaat relations today. Of course a book that investigates any aspect of Inuit-Qallunaat contact would be remiss without a

discussion of the colonial implications, and Routledge deftly identifies this right from the prologue and carries the thread throughout. This awareness is also evident in her methodological approach, which she outlines in an appendix, regarding how she came to know and understand the Inuit perceptions presented in the book. Throughout Routledge makes it clear that she is sharing knowledge that she has acquired from working with Inuit Elders, translators, and communities. Many sections regarding nineteenth-century Inuit experiences are prefaced with appropriate disclaimers that her understanding may be partial due to the limitations of the archival source. It is through these sections that I appreciated her use of the first person the most (although I am a big fan of this in general), as her interpretations were clearly distinguished.

The stories presented in each chapter highlight how people negotiate and perceive an unfamiliar place. And while some of the stories of Americans in the Arctic will be familiar to readers with a background in Arctic exploration, Routledge avoids romanticising the expeditions in her framing and analysis. For me, the strongest chapter is chapter 3 where she explores how both Americans and Inuit handled the unfamiliar in the High Arctic. Many southerners still perceive the Arctic, and Inuit communities, as monolithic entities, but the story of the Lady Franklin Bay Expedition highlights how even the Greenlandic Inuit members of the crew felt like Ellesmere Island was a strange and unfamiliar place, despite it being part of Inuit territory.

Furthermore, reading how the Americans perceived this land, and the expectations they placed on their Inuit crew members, sheds light on later events in Canadian history. For example, how and why the Canadian Government thought it was reasonable to relocate Inuit from Inukjuaq (Northern Quebec) to Ellesmere Island in the 1950s. It was part of an Arctic sovereignty strategy but masked as an attempt to assist the Inuit in a perceived overpopulated community. A government apology for this atrocious instance was not issued until 2010. How many other policies and decisions made by southern lawmakers were informed by these nineteenth-century ideas of the north and its people? What more can we learn from reading books like this and how can we use this information, and particularly the Inuit oral history, to move forward? With the Arctic at the forefront of climate change, understanding people's relationship to the environment, and learning from past mistakes, is crucial.

Chapter 2, Inuit in the United States, presents some of the most interesting archival information as letters and drawings by Hannah (Tookoolito) are interspersed with American newspapers, and records from explorer Charles Francis Hall and other Americans. This chapter helps shift the gaze around as it looks at how and why Inuit would find American society unfamiliar and challenging, a narrative that is rarely explored. I am only aware of a few examples of nineteenth-century Inuit writing regarding their experiences in new and strange environments, and the excerpts from Hannah were very illuminating.

This is a well-written and organized book that would not only be right at home on any academic's shelf, but also anyone's with a keen interest in Arctic history. Routledge's accessible style of prose makes this a suitable read for the general public as well as scholars from a variety of disciplines. Her careful approach to presenting Inuit knowledge reflects the respect and admiration she has for the community members she has worked with over the years, and I think her approach is an excellent model for other scholars wishing to engage with Indigenous communities for their work.

Comments by Karen Oslund, Towson University

Karen Routledge's *Do You See Ice?: Inuit and Americans at Home and Away* is elegantly divided into four chapters: Americans in Cumberland Sound; Inuit in the United States; Americans and Inuit in the High Arctic; and the Inuit in Cumberland Sound. The structure of the book reflects its argument—Routledge seeks to explore “ideas of home: how Inuit and Americans often experienced each other’s countries as dangerous and inhospitable, how they tried to feel at home in unfamiliar places, and why this continues to matter” (xiv). She opens by narrating how American (Qallunaat) whalers and explorers dealt with being away from home, continues on to relate how Inuit lived away from the Arctic in New England, then journeys to the High Arctic, a place foreign to both the Americans and the Inuit (West Greenlanders) whom they employed, and finishes by explaining how the Inuit found themselves at home in Cumberland Sound. The conclusion focuses on how Cumberland Sound changed under Canadian management in the 1960s and 1970s and what these changes have meant for the Inuit living there today, after the end of the bowhead whaling which brought these two cultures into contact in the first place.

Routledge demonstrates that both Americans and Inuit had notions of home and of being away, and, at the high period of both American Arctic exploration and of bowhead whaling, also dealt with feelings of homesickness and psychological distress when spending extended periods of time in the home of the other. In the book, American explorers and whalers and Inuit hunters and craftspeople are treated as emotional equals. Each has a homeland, even while these homelands have little physically and environmentally in common with each other, and each has an experience of navigating a foreign land and learning how to survive there. The strength and beauty of the book lie in Routledge’s admirable dedication to the principle of treating Inuit and Qallunaat as equal partners, even when the history of Arctic exploration and whaling did not do so.

To achieve this rather remarkable tour-de-force, Routledge uses a large variety of sources: logbooks of ships’ captains, letters written by Inuit—especially by Hannah (Tookoolito), an Inuit woman who lived in the United States under the tutelage of the explorer Charles Francis Hall—, and Routledge’s own fieldwork in the present-day Cumberland Sound. As she convincingly argues, the notion of home is a colonial one in American history, which means that Routledge often has found her story by “reading against her sources.” The ship captains routinely interpreted Inuit behavior in patronizing and colonial manners, but Routledge, having worked extensively in the Arctic, is able to re-interpret their actions or words as recorded in the logbooks to explain how the Inuit acted or spoke in a way consistent with their notions of home. For example, chapter three—Americans and Inuit in the High Arctic—explains the concept of going qivittoq (a suicide attempt which is not only physical but also spiritual) by West Greenlanders in the High Arctic as a response to being taken to a place which the American explorers believed was an Inuit home, but was

not in fact home for them. In this chapter, the colonial violence of the notion of home and of displacement from home is most apparent, although this theme is pursued throughout the book. In Lady Franklin's Bay, two West Greenlanders were expected to hunt seals for the entire party and both of them perished, while six of the Americans, including the commander, Adolphus Greely, returned home to honors and promotions. The families of the Inuit hunters, who had been especially selected for their sealing skills, were sent pensions worth half of what the families of the American survivors received.

Poignant stories of this nature appear in every chapter, and Routledge does not neglect to address the homesickness of the American whalers as well. Polar histories are always filled with wonderful stories, but at times I would have wished for a more analytical approach to the material, rather than such a narrative-driven one. The book explores and narrates notions of home, but tends to shy away from drawing general conclusions about home and its role in colonialism. Routledge poses suggestive questions, first and foremost her call for environmental historians to include the study of home in our field. She points out early in the book that "everyone's home includ[es] shelter but extend[s] far beyond it" (xxv). This is an important and pathbreaking idea, but the theoretical potential of the book is explored rather briefly in the prologue, and not really picked up again at the end of the story, where the epilogue of only a few pages brings the story up to the present day in Cumberland Sound. I can only hope that other environmental historians will answer this call and include an analysis of "home" in their work, although I would have liked to see Routledge press on with the colonial implications of the idea of home in this volume.

As I mentioned, the source material for the book is diverse and this diversity brings overall admirable results. However, there are some niggling issues which accompany this. Although there may be no easy or good solution to this problem, the use of present day fieldwork to explain the past, while valuable, and, given the paucity of written sources from Inuit, maybe the only possible solution has—in this book as well as others—the unfortunate effect of making Inuit seem like a "people without history," whose culture and emotional responses did not change over time, as those of the Qallunaat did. Routledge attends in chapter two to shifts in the way middle-class Americans began to express grief more openly, but we are not able to investigate if there were any similar patterns in the way that Inuit culture changed in the expression of their emotions over time. Since Inuit accounts of their own culture do not portray it as unchanging in other regards, I would find it difficult to imagine that the expression of emotions was not an area in which the Inuit also underwent changes in the last century. While it may be next to impossible to solve this problem, and Routledge is certainly sensitive to the implications of discrepancies in the types of sources on each side of the cultural exchange, it is a point worth highlighting for future research of this type. That said, *Do You See Ice?* is a beautifully written piece of work and a fine model for future cross-cultural environmental histories, whether in the Arctic or elsewhere on the globe.

Comments by Daniella McCahey, University of Idaho

During my first read of this book, I was initially reminded how frequently people conflate the polar regions. While both regions have ice, whaling, and science in common, the Arctic and Antarctic are actually extremely different, in terms of geopolitics, flora and fauna, natural resources, and geographical features, just to name a few. And arguably, the primary difference between the two regions is the lack of indigenous peoples in the Antarctic. As the interaction between Inuit and Qallunaat is the primary focus of Karen Routledge's 2018 *Do You See Ice?*, my first impression of this text was that I was not particularly qualified to comment in any sort of informed capacity on the themes that dominated this book. Ideas of gender, class, and imperialism definitely permeate the history of Antarctica, but given the lack of indigenous population, most of these issues are expressed in profoundly different ways. The concept of "home," a theme that runs through Routledge's text, is different in the Antarctic—no traveler is ever home, and no person has successfully lived for long in the Antarctic (or even sub-Antarctic) without an immense logistical support system to provide resources such as food and shelter.

Routledge's text is divided into four chapters, addressing in turn the experience of American whalers in the Cumberland Sound, an Inuit couple in New England, American and Inuit explorers in the High Arctic, and Inuit experiences with whaling in the Cumberland Sound. Despite initially only seeing the dissimilarities between my own interests and *Do You See Ice?*, during a second read, I found more in common than I had originally seen. With this in mind, I am going to draw out a few themes that reoccur through Routledge's text; specifically race, gender, and horror. These are themes that can also be applied to Antarctic exploration and perhaps serve as bridge connecting the cultural histories of both poles.

Race in Polar Regions

Antarctica, probably more than any other region in the world, was historically constructed as a place for white men. In fact, it was the ideal settler colony, a part of the world actually empty of the Indigenous populations that made settler colonialism tricky in other parts of the world.¹ While Saami men took part in the *Southern Cross* Expedition in 1898, this expedition was generally disparaged by the British establishment as unscientific, and its British-Norwegian leader Carsten Borchgrevink as an unreliable publicity hound.² Maori applied to join the New Zealand Trans-Antarctic Expedition during the International Geophysical Year, but they were not selected, though the organizers acknowledged the traditional Polynesian account of the seventh century Polynesian navigator Ui-te-Rangiora who

¹ Adrian Howkins, "Appropriating Space: Antarctic Imperialism and the Mentality of Settler Colonialism," *Making Settler Colonial Space*, eds. T.B. Mar, P. Edmonds (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

² T. H. Baughman, *Before the Heroes Came: Antarctica in the 1890s* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994).

sailed south until reaching a sea of pack ice and the Aurora Australis.³ While the Norwegian Roald Amundsen, who brought his experience in the Arctic to the race for the South Pole, used techniques and technologies such as animal-skin clothing and dogsleds that he had learned from Indigenous Arctic peoples, the more famous Robert Falcon Scott used pony-drawn sleds, man-hauling, and woolens, inappropriate for the strenuous trip, despite the years of British experience in the Arctic, interacting with the Inuit.

Contrast this to the expeditions described by Routledge, where Inuit expertise was sought by American leaders, perhaps even against their will (89). In her third chapter, “Americans and Inuit in the High Arctic,” it seemed that Jens Edvard Angutisiak and Thorleif Frederik Christiansen lacked enthusiasm for joining the Lady Franklin Bay expedition. Additionally, for overwintering whaling expeditions, Indigenous expertise was highly prized, particularly regarding warm-weather clothing, much prized by American and European whalers, as highlighted in the first chapter, “Americans in Cumberland Sound.” While whalers could rarely develop a permanent sense of home in the Arctic, many developed relationships with local communities in the Cumberland Sound, ranging from simply trade for food and clothing, to forming families with Inuit women. Yet despite this respect for Inuit expertise, it seems that Qallunaat never truly regarded Inuit as equal to themselves. This can be seen in the poor treatment received by Christiansen and Angutisiak, to the point where Angutisiak thought his life to be in danger.

When, as described in Routledge’s second chapter, “Inuit in the United States,” the Inuit couple Hannah and Ipiirvik relocate to the United States, they are at one point denigrated to side-show attractions in P.T. Barnum’s American Museum. While on display either in the Museum or more commonly, in Charles Francis Hall’s lecture tours, Hannah and Ipiirvik’s racial identity was “othered” as much as possible, particularly through their traditional clothing which drew attention to their Arctic origins. This racializing was necessary since Hannah had an excellent command of English and “were it not for his ‘North Pole uniform,’ Ipiirvik could have been mistaken for an Italian immigrant” (42). As a result, “Americans were constantly judging the couple as different and inferior, as unintelligible and strange and antimodern” (41). As one of the recurring themes of this text is that Qallunaat really appreciated and coveted traditional Inuit clothing, this is interesting. If Ipiirvik and Hannah could only be positively identified as Inuit by their clothing, what does it say that so many Americans “were photographed wearing Inuit clothing they had acquired in Cumberland Sound” (33)? Was this a bending of racial ideals? Cultural appropriation? Something different?

Gender in Polar Regions

Lisbeth Lewander has argued that “No person, whatever their educational or professional background, visits Antarctica without being impressed by the climate

³ Arthur Stanley Helm and Joseph Holmes Miller, *Antarctica; the Story of the New Zealand Party of the Trans-Antarctic Expedition* (Owen, 1964). 13

and geography. This particularity seems to provoke visitors into encoding the place with expressions of humanity, including gender relations.”⁴ Women were explicitly excluded from Antarctica for many years, justified for reasons ranging from their lack of physical or emotional ability, to the lack of facilities for women, to the most common fear that women would ruin the camaraderie and social dynamics of Antarctic science or exploration. British women were not given equal access to Antarctic facilities until 1996. In contrast, Antarctica and the activities associated with it have been explicitly gendered as male. Many authors have addressed the history of gender in various ways in Antarctica; in a land that historically prohibited the presence of women and touted the masculinity required for occupation, there are rich opportunities for gender analysis.⁵

Like the Antarctic, there is a rich literature on gendered ideas regarding the Arctic. Lisa Bloom’s 1993 text *Gender on Ice*, cited by Routledge, and which also addressed race in polar exploration, unpacks the racial, gender, and national ideologies imbedded in the American exploration of the Arctic. Michael Robinson’s 2006 *The Coldest Crucible* has a chapter on the Lady Franklin Bay Expedition, which is the subject of Routledge’s third chapter, that he even titles “Dying Like Men.”⁶ Robinson further unpacked the masculinity embedded in Arctic exploration in the 2015 *Osiris* issue, aptly called *Scientific Masculinities*.⁷ This is not to mention books on gender in Inuit, Saami, Yupik, and other Indigenous cultures and societies throughout the Arctic.

Throughout *Do You See Ice?*, ideas of gender permeate every chapter. While in the Antarctic there was a marked absence of women, in Routledge’s first chapter, “Americans in Cumberland Sound,” we see that “countless Qallunaat whalers partnered with Inuit women,” and “women were frequent visitors” to whaling ships, where they would “mend, sew, interpret, and prepare skins for Qallunaat” (16). The American crews “were grateful for the companionship, help, and diversion the women provided” (15). There were varying degrees of consent in these

⁴ Lisbeth Lewander, “Women and Civilisation on Ice,” in *Cold Matters: Cultural Perceptions of Snow, Ice and Cold*, ed. Heidi Hansson and Cathrine Norberg (Umeå: Umeå University and the Royal Skyttean Society, 2009). 89

⁵ For example: Lisa Bloom, *Gender on Ice: American Ideologies of Polar Expeditions* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993); Elizabeth Chipman, *Women on the Ice: A History of Women in the Far South* (Carlton, Victoria: Melbourne University Press, 1987); Christy Collis, “The Australian Antarctic Territory: A Man’s World?,” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 34, no. 3 (March 1, 2009): 514–19; Marianne Cronin, “Richard Byrd, Technological Explorer: Polar Exploration, the Machine, and Heroic Masculinity in Interwar America,” *Technology and Culture* 57, no. 2 (April 2016): 322–52; E. Glasberg, *Antarctica as Cultural Critique: The Gendered Politics of Scientific Exploration and Climate Change*, 2012 edition (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012); Peder Roberts, “Fighting the ‘Microbe of Sporting Mania’: Australian Science and Antarctic Exploration in the Early 20th Century,” *Endeavour* 28, no. 3 (September 2004): 109–13; Morgan Seag, “Women Need Not Apply: Gendered Institutional Change in Antarctica and Outer Space,” *The Polar Journal* 7, no. 2 (July 3, 2017): 319–35.

⁶ Michael F. Robinson, *The Coldest Crucible: Arctic Exploration and American Culture*, Reprint edition (Chicago London: University of Chicago Press, 2014).

⁷ Michael Robinson, “Manliness and Exploration: The Discovery of the North Pole,” *Osiris* 30, no. 1 (2015): 89–109.

relationships, but some relationships transcended the distances that separated American and European whalers from their Inuit families, a theme explored in “Inuit in Cumberland Sound.” While some Qallunaat “drew a sharp distinction between Inuit women and what they called ‘civilized’ women,” there was not a question of whether or not women “belonged” in the environment (15).

In “Inuit in the United States,” Hannah and Ipiirvik’s fulfillment of specific gender roles colored the experiences that they had in the United States. First, “their father-mother-child unit likely served to support an emerging middle-class assertion that nuclear families were universal and natural” (46). Hannah’s skills and “expertise as a cook, mother, and seamstress,” as well her mastery of the nineteenth-century Inuit value of conflict avoidance, better corresponded with American gender norms than the skills of her husband (67). As an English-speaking Christian who eventually owned private property and built familial relationships with American women, she had acquired many of the trappings of American ‘civilization.’ In contrast, for Ipiirvik, adherence to the same value of avoiding conflict infantilized him in the eyes of American men, who felt that he lacked the ability to command authority. Likewise, in the Arctic, Ipiirvik supported his family through hunting, but in Connecticut he had limited ability to work in the agricultural and industrial economies. Therefore, he “suffered intensely from the devaluation of his skills” (67). Ipiirvik worked for some time as a mechanic and did farm labor as well, but according to Routledge, it is unlikely that he saw the same value in this work as he did in his hunting and fishing in Cumberland Sound.

There are a few points to be made here. First, Ipiirvik’s feelings of de-masculinization and inadequacy from the devaluation of his skills in the United States still reveal masculine ideals within Inuit culture, ones that even correlate with American ideals. What does the masculine ideal look like for the Inuit as opposed to the Qallunaat? Second, if Hannah’s skills in sewing and cooking fit her within a feminine ideal, what does this say about either Antarctic explorers or explorers in the High Arctic, men who did their own cooking and sewing? Is your gender role dependent on the physical space in which you live? I also found myself reflecting inward for my own future studies: How was the exclusion of women in Antarctica justified when laid alongside the presence of women in the Arctic?

Polar Regions as Horrorscapes

The tradition of seeing polar landscapes as either horrific or romantic, is an old one. *Frankenstein*, one of the most famous gothic novels, heavily influenced by the Romantic Movement, ends with a high-stakes chase through the Arctic. You can also see this motif in some of the earliest descriptions of the Antarctic Circle. James Cook, who came within one hundred miles of Antarctica in 1773, himself explained that the ice islands “could not fail filling us with horror when we reflected on the danger...[our] situation was truly terrific and alarming, in an immense ocean, surrounded with ice, utterly destitute..., and far from any habitable shore.”⁸ One of

⁸ James Cook. *Voyages Round the World.*, 181-182

his crewmen, John Marra, agreed, writing that the surrounding ice “presented a most romantic prospect of ruined castles, churches, arches, steeples, wrecks of ships, and a thousand wild and grotesque forms of monsters, dragons, and all the hideous shapes that the most fertile imagination can possibly conceive. About these islands, the penguins are heard continually screaming, and add to the horror of the scene, which cannot be beheld by the most intrepid without some emotions of fear.”⁹

Cook’s horrific vision of the Antarctic is one that is repeated in Samuel Taylor Coleridge’s *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*, published in 1798. Southward, he says, “there came both mist and snow,/and it grew wondrous cold:/and ice, mast-high, came floating by...The ice was here, the ice was there,/ The ice was all around:/ It cracked and growled, and roared and howled...The ice did split with a thunder-fit.”¹⁰ It is a depiction that the Far South was to be considered the edge of the world, completely inhospitable and utterly dangerous for people, the stuff of gothic literature, a theme continued in Edgar Allan Poe’s 1838 novel *The Narrative of Arthur Gordon Pym of Nantucket*, a story which includes mutiny, shipwreck, and cannibalism. The deaths of the entire South Pole party of the *Terra Nova* expedition in 1912 and the sinking of the *Endurance* in 1915 were highly romanticized, and cemented Antarctica’s status in popular culture as an alien place, unfit for human habitation. This motif has continued through the twentieth century, with the H.P. Lovecraft novella *At the Mountains of Madness*, an Antarctic research station being the setting of the horror film *The Thing*, an abandoned sub-Antarctic whaling station the setting of *Alien vs Predator*, and the ongoing conspiracy of a secret Nazi UFO base under the Antarctic ice. For more on gothic or horrific literary depictions of the Antarctic, the work of Elizabeth Leane, Eric Wilson, and Francis Spufford would be good starts.¹¹ The latter two both also address the Arctic and are cited in *Do You See Ice?*.

The depiction of polar regions as hellish, terrifying landscapes is definitely highlighted in this text. Throughout *Can You See Ice?* Routledge describes ways that the Arctic, even the well-populated Cumberland Sound, was conceived as a horrorscape by American and European whalers. Her first chapter deals with American whalers in the Cumberland Sound. Many of the Qallunaat whalers who overwintered in the Cumberland Sound suffered from scurvy and lived with the persistent threat of starvation throughout the winter. During the spring, whaling was an extremely dangerous, unpleasant, and laborious job. Considering these experiences, it is no wonder that many whalers disliked their experiences in this area. Routledge provides the somewhat Romantic image of men who would cry

⁹ Quoted in Brian W. Richardson, *Longitude and Empire: How Captain Cook’s Voyages Changed the World* (UBC Press, 2010). 52

¹⁰ Samuel Taylor Coleridge. *The Rime of the Ancient Mariner*

¹¹ Elizabeth Leane, *Antarctica in Fiction: Imaginative Narratives of the Far South* (Cambridge University Press, 2012); Eric Wilson, *The Spiritual History of Ice: Romanticism, Science and the Imagination*, (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003); Francis Spufford, *I May Be Some Time: Ice and the English Imagination* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1997).

while killing a hare, yet would go out of their way to hurt the whales that were the source of their misery (30). Yet some whalers, particularly those who developed close trade or even personal relationships with local Inuit, passed their time relatively pleasantly, living “more comfortably than on many whaling ships” (4). Yet even those who felt positive attachments to the Arctic still longed for home, and almost universally retired to the United States. Transplanted to a new environment, most Qallunaat whalers could not consider this strange and alien landscape to be their homes.

The horror felt for the region is portrayed in more explicit terms in her third chapter “Americans and Inuit in the High Arctic,” on the International Polar Expedition, or the Lady Franklin Bay Expedition (1881-84). The tragic story of mutiny, starvation, and cannibalism for twenty-five men isolated in “places that were remote even to Inuit,” is a familiar fixture in stories of polar exploration. After all, it is the disastrous expeditions that “dominate Qallunaat conception of the Arctic...” (78). You can even see this today with AMC’s 2018 TV series, *The Terror*, a fictionalized account of Franklin’s lost expedition, or the popular *In the Kingdom of Ice*, on the tribulations of the *USS Jeanette*.¹² For more on the ghostly, gothic aspects of Arctic research, you can see Shane McCorristine’s excellent 2018 *The Spectral Arctic*.¹³ In this chapter, Routledge contrasts the experiences of two low-ranking members of the party, both of whom died on the expedition: an Inuit man, Jens Edvard Angutisiak, who drowned while hunting, and the Qallunaat Hampden Sidney Gardiner, who likely starved to death. Neither of these men felt at home in Lady Franklin Bay, as evidenced by Gardiner’s diary of complaints and Angutisiak’s running away. Gardiner’s account (and those of most of the Qallunaat) take a gothic tone, focusing on the unending winter darkness, the lack of food, and the foreboding landscapes.

Her account of Angutisiak’s experience is the more interesting, presenting both an idea of Inuit horror different from that of the Qallunaat, and stark reminder that the Arctic is not one monolithic geography. Angutisiak’s comfort in Greenland did not equate to feeling at home in Lady Franklin Bay. Sometime before his death, Angutisiak ran away from the relative safety and shelter of the stranded expedition cabin, and was found walking twenty miles away. His behavior was considered mad to the Americans, but fit within Inuit stories of “dangerous beings,” dwelling in inland regions. One of these beings was the *qivittoq*, “a terrifying figure of ‘loneliness personified’” who emerged from people who had fled society due to mistreatment (91). This was essentially an act of suicide, only for the desperate, and stories of going *qivittoq* served as warnings against mistreating others. While some of the Qallunaat at Lady Franklin Bay saw the romantic nature of abandoning society to live on one’s own, “for Inuit, *qivittut* stories are horror stories about losing one’s

¹² Hampton Sides, *In the Kingdom of Ice: The Grand and Terrible Polar Voyage of the USS Jeannette* (Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group, 2014).

¹³ Shane McCorristine, *The Spectral Arctic: A History of Ghosts and Dreams in Polar Exploration* (London: UCL Press, 2018).

home forever. They are usually full of suffering and violence and grieving for everyone involved” (92). Routledge attributes Angutisiak’s desperate act to his mistreatment at the hand of the Qallunaat on board, a claim for which she provides ample evidence, but I wonder how much the environmental stresses of living so perilously in a land so different from his home made living with them all the more unbearable and too drove some of the worse behavior of the Qallunaat themselves. She mentions “how much human relationships and power dynamic affect our experience of place,” but I wonder how much the reverse is true as well; how does place affect human relationships and power dynamics (79)? To quote Mark Twain, “A long sea-voyage not only brings out all the mean traits one has, and exaggerates them, but raises up others which he never suspected he possessed, and even creates new ones.”¹⁴

In this essay, I identified three themes in Routledge’s text for which there are easy comparisons to Antarctic exploration: race, gender, and horror. There are certainly more: science, whaling, home, and food and clothing to name a few. But I would like to end by pointing out my favorite part of *Do You See Ice?* (besides the amazing title). We often think of the polar regions as remote and separate from human history (in the case of the Antarctic) or at least from the rest of the world (for the Arctic). Through this book, by focusing primarily on the Cumberland Sound, Routledge shows how one place can simultaneously have a history that is extremely local and extremely global. Through examining a place, that for many people, is very distant and unimaginable, and situating it within the rest of world history, she highlights both the similarities and differences of humans from different backgrounds as they navigate familiar and strange environments. Experiences within a given space and place are not universal, but rather, as she states in her conclusion, shaped by a number of historical contingencies. Or, in Routledge’s words: “...the definition of a harsh environment is relative and contingent on many human factors” (154).

¹⁴ Mark Twain, *The Innocents Abroad* (London: Collins, 1964), 341.

Comments by David Neufeld, Yukon and western Arctic Historian, Parks Canada (retired)

Karen Routledge launches her book with a stunning story of survival. Explorers abandon their ship as it is crushed by ice. Oppressed by the darkness and cold, the men huddle fearfully on an ice floe surrounded by salvaged goods – seemingly doomed. Only then does Routledge introduce the Inuit members of the crew who transform the apparent disaster into an extended camping trip. The story features the skills and knowledge of the Inuit but also highlights the value of engaging with people who are at home. Her richly detailed account of the nineteenth-century contact and exchanges between Eastern Arctic Inuit and New England whalers – Qallunaat (non-Indigenous outsiders) – centres on different conceptions of home. The whalers’ described the eastern Arctic as the “middle of nowhere,” a place so void of familiar necessities and comforts it must exist only for the exploitation of its resources (xv). Routledge’s research with contemporary Cumberland Sound Inuit offers fascinating insights into the “middle of somewhere” –a place and how to live there—and opens new possibilities of thinking about the past and place.

The experiences of both Inuit and Qallunaat, at home, in the other’s homes and in no one’s home, are enlivened by Routledge’s careful and thoughtful interpretation of her sources. The lively writing – in many respects this is a storybook as much as it is a history book – and the numerous well-chosen photos, maps, art works and sketches generously distributed through the book make it a pleasure to read. The core of her book is the investigation of the complicated relationships and knowledge exchanges developed over the eighty years of commercial whaling activity in Cumberland Sound, Baffin Island, which ended in the 1920s.

Do You See Ice? centres on culturally diverse ideas of home. The contrasting notions of home and not home are highlighted by her extensive research with both the New England whaling community – artfully presented through ship’s logs (New Bedford Whaling Museum, New Bedford, MA), expedition records (Explorers’ Club Archives and Manuscript Collections, New York, NY), collections of letters (G.W. Blunt Library, Mystic Seaport Museum, Mystic, CT) and period newspapers carefully collected and preserved by their descendants in archives and museums – and the eastern Arctic Inuit of Cumberland Sound where her careful and sensitive research with fifteen community Elders – ten in person and five others through the recordings they made before passing (Angmarlik Visitor Centre, Pangnirtung, NU) – and the insightful Inuit cultural guide and translator, Andrew Dialla. In Routledge’s hands the tales each community tells about their homes’ past are skillfully moulded into stories describing their values and hopes for the future.

The different character of the preserved sources shaping the content of the book raise interesting issues about the intent and purposes of the knowledge holders. The archived materials of the whaling history are collected and maintained by a

community that prospered and flourished on the harvests of whales in the eastern Arctic. Inuit local knowledge of marine life and skills in harvesting made them valued commercial partners of the whalers. Even so, opportunities to take advantage of Inuit unfamiliarity with the value of western wares or to confine them to whaling stations as labourers appear to have occurred regularly. Perhaps this is most keenly observed in Routledge's description of the tragic Adolphus Greely Lady Franklin Bay expedition (Chapter 3). Organized by the US Army in 1881 as the American contribution to the First International Polar Year, the expedition included two Kalaallit men of Greenland, pressed into service as guides and hunters. While acknowledging the services of the two men, Greely's and other men's diaries note a not-so-subtle racism within the camp. In the depths of the first winter, one of the two Kalaallit, Jens Edvard Angutisiak, left the camp cabin without food, equipment or mittens, a sign of going *qivittoq*, abandoning home due to mistreatment (88-90). While Melanie Gagnon's research with Inuit in Iqaluit on the effects of the mid-twentieth century military presence reveals a generally positive relationship between American soldiers and Inuit, Linda Green's *Fear as a Way of Life* suggests that in isolation from a home community, as in the case of the two Kalaallit men, a persistent low-level hostility can create a state of chronic fear. This "fear undermines one's confidence in interpreting the world, it penetrates social memory, destabilizes social relations, and divides communities."¹⁵

Routledge describes the whaling activity as an example of the disruption of American ideas about home. The American soldiers of the Lady Franklin Bay expedition, like their whaling cousins, were in the Arctic to enhance their economic opportunities and/or their power and authority at home. To progress, one had to move and explore new possibilities. The result was that "[p]eople began placing more importance on their houses and immediate family over the larger land and community" (xxii-xxiii). This re-shaping of American ideas of home, and who might actually have a home, was also celebrated in the Barnum exhibition of Inuit visitors (Chapter 2) and subsequently in colourful hagiographical books such as Francis Trevelyan Miller's 1930, *Byrd's Great Adventure, with the complete story of all polar explorations for one thousand years*.¹⁶

Both Routledge's description of the experiences of the Inuit family—Hannah, Ipiirvik and their infant son, Tarralikitaq—as Charles Francis Hall's fund raising trophies during an extended stay in New England (40-46), and Miller's book demonstrate the transformation of local personal experiences of place into a powerful cultural narrative of American prowess and superiority and its consequences in interactions with other peoples.

¹⁵ Melanie Gagnon, *Inuit Recollections on the Military Presence in Iqaluit*, vol.2 (Iqaluit Arctic College, 2002); Linda Green, "Fear as a Way of Life," *Cultural Anthropology* 9, no. 2 (1994), 227-256, as discussed in Stacey A. Fritz, "DEW Line Passage: Tracing the Legacies of Arctic Militarization," (PhD. Thesis, University of Alaska Fairbanks, December 2010) 66-72, quote is Fritz's words, 70.

¹⁶ Francis Trevelyan Miller, *Byrd's Great Adventure, with the complete story of all polar explorations for one thousand years* (Philadelphia: The John C. Winston Company, 1930).

The contact with Qallunaat also challenged traditional Inuit practices and lifeways. The book's description of the sharing of the Inuit knowledge of Arctic waters, winter survival and the skills needed to effectively take whales comes largely from the accounts of whalers and missionaries. In contrast to the archival nature of the whaler's records, Inuit sources rest in the living memories of Elders and the ongoing passage of their knowledge to their community. Routledge's attention to the Elders who generously shared their stories with a visitor was guided by her language and cultural interpreter Andrew Dialla. Her application of this learning is respectful and effective. However, she readily and regularly signals her limited ability to absorb and transfer the full significance of what she hears. The meaningful "translation" of Indigenous ways of being in the world confounds ready understanding. Routledge's multiple extended stays in Pangnirtung, Nunavut, working with Elders for *Do You See Ice?*, and her continuing work as the Parks Canada historian in the Arctic, suggest northern communities can expect increasingly sophisticated and nuanced understanding from her.

On this point I've found Tim Ingold's work an important source for understanding Canadian Inuvialuit and Athapaskan First Nations interests in the western Arctic. His *Lines: A Brief History*, describes two approaches to being in place, "wayfaring and navigation."¹⁷ Robert Macfarlane, applying Ingold's text to Lewis Islanders, artfully describes the distinction, "the navigator plots a course 'before even setting out', such that the journey is, 'no more than an explication of the plot', but the wayfarer 'follows a path that one has previously travelled in the company of others, or in their footsteps, reconstructing the itinerary as one goes along.'¹⁸ Ingold suggests the erosion of wayfaring is a condition of modernity, perhaps not dissimilar to the experience of the nineteenth-century New England whaling communities. The fragmentation of the active walk on the land "has taken place in the related fields of *travel*, where wayfaring is replaced by destination-oriented transport, *mapping*, where the drawn sketch is replaced by the route-plan, and *textuality*, where storytelling is replaced by the pre-composed plot. It has also transformed our understanding of *place*: once a knot tied from multiple and interlaced strands of movement and growth, it now figures as a node in a static network of connectors."¹⁹ The biographies of the Elder Inuit artists featured in the book indicate they are well aware of this transformation. Elisapee Ishulutaq (1925-2018) used her art to inform Inuit youth of their home lands and living in them while other Inuit artists' work has been called "memory art."²⁰ These Elders' concerns centre on Inuit youth, their sense of being in their home lands, and environmentalism.

¹⁷ Tim Ingold, *Lines: A Brief History* (London: Routledge, 2007), 15-17.

¹⁸ Robert Macfarlane, *The Old Ways: A Journey on Foot* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 2012), 379n31.

¹⁹ Tim Ingold, *Lines: A Brief History* (London: Routledge, 2007), 75.

²⁰ https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Elisapee_Ishulutaq, accessed 2019 04 04; Marybelle Mitchell, ed., "Speaking for Themselves: Eight Inuit Artists Compare Notes During a Seminar Organized by the Inuit Art Foundation," *Inuit Art Quarterly* 5, no. 2 (1990), 16. <http://iaq.inuitartfoundation.org/product/5-2-spring-1990/> accessed 2019 04 04.

The sources for the stories of Qallunaat whalers and Arctic Inuit in *Do You See Ice?* reveal a temporal mismatch. Whalers and their effects on the Arctic are presented in their times but disappear in the present. Inuit content, from both whaler and Inuit sources, continues to the present and, through contemporary oral histories and art works, addresses current community issues. With these diverse sources I would be interested in Routledge's thoughts on how one might extend her arguments of home in the present. What new possibilities might become apparent by approaching the contemporary representation of Inuit in the New England museums and archives? What does the state's commemoration of the whaling period in Cumberland Sound at Kekerten National Historic Site offer local Inuit and visitors? Finally, how are contemporary Inuit communities drawing from their past as Elders pass on? Each of these voices, story sets and collections continue to shape contemporary communities. Routledge's thoughts on the significance of these contemporary contributions and their continuing effects on the future of both Eastern Arctic Inuit and New Englanders would be appreciated. How does the character of historic and cultural sources and their intent – remembrance and the use of the past – determine what people value now and seek in their future?

With thanks to the staff of the Akaroa Public Library (Christchurch, New Zealand) for their hospitality and assistance in the preparation of this review.

Response by Karen Routledge, Parks Canada

I would like to begin by thanking Kara Schlichting for proposing and coordinating this roundtable, and Amelia Fay, Karen Oslund, Daniella McCahey, and David Neufeld for their insightful and generous reviews. I am very grateful for the rare opportunity to engage with these thoughtful scholars about my work. I can't respond to all of their comments here, so I have chosen to focus on their questions and observations around the theme of home, which is central to my book.²¹

In the introduction to *Do You See Ice?*, I lay out what I have learned about American and Inuit ideas of home in the nineteenth century. I conclude that while the specifics of home varied widely, "a good home was a place, or a network of places, where people felt secure; where their ways of thinking, being, and living made sense; and where they believed they and their loved ones had a future" (xxiii). This is what settler colonists like my ancestors built for themselves in new places, and what whalers and other resource extraction workers hoped to make for themselves when they returned home with their profits. It is what has been—and continues to be—taken away from and rebuilt by many Indigenous peoples. In other words, I argue, the unmaking and remaking of homes is central to colonialism. Karen had hoped that I would say more about this connection. I welcome this chance to expand more on my conclusions, and to explain why I did not go further.

There is a significant and growing literature on colonialism and home. Scholars have examined, among other things, marriages between settler men and Indigenous women, the lives of their children, and the ways in which imperialist ideas both shaped and were shaped in newcomers' homes and in their letters to far-flung family members.²² For the most part, these studies focus on domestic life and family.

²¹ I couldn't work these answers into the body of my response, but I wanted to respond briefly to two of Daniella's other comments. I really appreciated her bringing my book into conversation with a very different part of the world. I was interested in her comments and citations about Antarctica being one of the few regions on earth that is not an Indigenous homeland, and that no traveler is ever home there. I have always thought this too, and it's why I didn't engage much with scholarship on Antarctica in my book. But now I am wondering: my husband did one six-month contract in Antarctica, and he said many of the staff there returned summer after summer. Some of them went "home" on their time off, but others travelled. I wonder whether there are people today who would consider an Antarctic research station their primary home. After all, a lot of people around the world, including myself, rely heavily on imported food, fuel, and household goods. Secondly, Daniella raised the issue of gender roles and place, with men forced to do their own cooking and sewing on many expeditions. This is also a topic that interests me – when I was studying mountaineering history, I argued that women climbers, while they challenged male climbers' ideas about womanhood, also enabled "men to be men" on expeditions when they took on these female-coded tasks. See Karen Routledge, "'Being a Girl Without Being a Girl': Gender and Mountaineering on Mount Waddington, 1926-36," *BC Studies* 141 (Spring 2004): 31-58 (esp. 45).

²² See, e.g., the review article by Esme Cleall, Laura Ishiguro, and Emily J. Manktelow, "Imperial Relations: Histories of family in the British Empire," *Journalism of Colonialism and Colonial History* 14:1 (2013). For more recent publications, see, e.g. Adele Perry, *Colonial Relations: The Douglas-Connolly Family and the Nineteenth-Century Imperial World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015); Jane McCabe, *Race, Tea, and Colonial Resettlement: Imperial Families, Interrupted* (London:

I speculate that much academic scholarship on “home” reflects a shift in thought that occurred in the nineteenth century, wherein Europeans and their descendants gradually placed more value on the household and family, at the expense of the community or larger landscape (18-19). Yet people’s sense of home—and their impacts on others’ homes—was never contained among family members or within four walls. I question why environmental historians, who study how people have changed their surroundings and been changed by them, have devoted relatively little attention to the subject of home and how ideas of home have changed over time.²³ I echo Sarah de Leeuw’s call for more attention to how colonial struggles over land and resources play out in what she terms the “tender, intimately scaled, lived violence” in daily lives.²⁴ I think environmental historians are uniquely positioned to add to this conversation. Events that seem to happen outside the home—like resource exploitation, “natural disasters,” or as Amelia points out, climate change—are part of our identities, our thoughts, and our most intimate spaces.

I will give one example of how environmental change affected homes. In Cumberland Sound in the nineteenth century, thousands of whales were killed, processed, and shipped out. Very few bowhead whales remained in the region by around 1920. This upended the relationships that Inuit and other living creatures had with these whales. But it also changed how Inuit lived in, thought about, and moved through their home territory. When whaling ended, Inuit fanned out from the commercial whaling stations to live in smaller *nunaliit*, or communities. They travelled more, partly because they were no longer tied to work at the whaling stations. Whales had been an important and copious source of food for both humans and dogs, and well-fed dog teams were critical for survival. Before the end of commercial whaling, these dogs had pulled meat home on sleds with runners made of whale jawbones. Whale oil had provided most cooking fuel, heat, and light inside

Bloomsbury, 2017); Laura Ishiguro, *Nothing to Write Home About: British Family Correspondence and the Settler Colonial Everyday in British Columbia* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2019).

²³ There are histories of people acclimating to new or changed surroundings. Much of this work discusses people affected by high-modern mega projects, and settlers reintroducing species from their old homes. I list more examples in my book (164n44), but see, e.g. Joy Parr, *Sensing Changes: Technologies, Environments, and the Everyday, 1953–2003* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010); Conevery Bolton Valenčius, *The Health of the Country: How American Settlers Understood Themselves and Their Land* (New York: Basic Books, 2004); Harriet Ritvo, “Going Forth and Multiplying: Animal Acclimatization and Invasion, President’s Lecture.” *Environmental History* (17:2 (2012): 404–14. For some recent environmental history on how colonial resource exploitation impacted Indigenous homes, see, e.g. Paige Raibmon, “Obvious but Invisible: Ways of Knowing Health, Environment, and Colonialism in a West Coast Indigenous Community,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 2018:60(2): 241-273; Heather Green, “The Tr’ondëk Hwëch’in and the Great Upheaval: Mining, Colonialism, and Environmental Change in the Klondike, 1890-1940” (University of Alberta, PhD Diss., 2018). I’m sure there is more key work on these topics – it is spread across many time periods and parts of the world and isn’t easy to search for. I would very much welcome anyone sending me citations!

²⁴ Sarah de Leeuw, “Tender Grounds: Intimate Visceral Violence and British Columbia’s Colonial Geographies,” *Political Geography* 52 (May 2016): 17.

Inuit homes. Whales had even been integrated into the structure of Inuit homes: *qammat* dwellings were traditionally framed with huge bowhead rib bones.²⁵

The death of the whales certainly did not destroy Inuit society or their sense of home. When the bowhead whales were gone, Inuit developed or returned to other resources and technologies. But the loss of the whales changed homes and the tastes and smells inside them. Inuit continued to watch for whales and think about them. Elders remembered their parents longing to taste bowhead whale *mattak* again. When Inuit in Cumberland Sound reopened a subsistence whale hunt in the 1990s, it was not just about food. This example of environmental change affecting home is not unusual, especially in colonial history. Indigenous people have long fought to keep their homelands recognizable and to rebuild a future in which their children can have more control over changes.

When I read Daniella's questions about place impacting human relationships and behaviour, I feared I may not have been clear enough in my book about the ways that people are shaped by place. I have long been fascinated by this topic. It is why I was drawn to the work of environmental historians and later to working for Parks Canada, where we often interpret history in situ. It is why I chose to study human experiences in what I once would have called "extreme" environments—first high mountains (for my MA) and later the Arctic (for my PhD). The land itself has power, and both Inuit and Americans in my book felt it. People who did not or could not adapt to a new place generally did not fare well. But after spending time with Inuit in some of the places Americans wrote about, I became equally interested in how we shape our experience of place. I understood that what the Americans saw there was not what everyone would have seen. A whaler in wool clothing on a drafty frozen-in ship did not feel cold in the same way as an Inuk sleeping under caribou skins next to her family in a *qammaq*. If many visitors experienced the Arctic as an inhospitable place compared to their own temperate homeland, it was also a rich home centred on different resources and ways of living.

Some of the suffering under colonialism comes from imposing outside ideas of home. The Canadian government resettled most Inuit into permanent communities in the 1960s with a goal of providing southern markers of a good home: access to schools, health care, wage labour, and permanent wooden houses. While there have been some benefits, Inuit still fall well short of parity with southern Canadians on these markers, and most have had to compromise their own foundations of a good home, including a deep relationship with the land that was built every day over a lifetime and passed onto children. As the Qikiqtani Truth Commission concluded, "Settlement life often imposed a new form of poverty, and hindered access to the

²⁵ Whale products were also once ubiquitous in American homes (see 28-29)—although in most cases there was a much greater emotional and physical distance between production and consumption, one that became increasingly common in the nineteenth century.

land and country food that nourished [Inuit].”²⁶ After being resettled into the permanent community of Pangnirtung, Inuit families continued to return to the places they had lived before in Cumberland Sound, often for months. According to the translator Andrew Dialla, they referred to this as going to their land or their home. Although some Pangnirtung residents return to these home-places today, and others long to, these trips require money for gas and snowmobiles or boats, which are more difficult to afford since the market for seal pelts collapsed due to seal hunt protests in the 1970s.²⁷

When it comes to understanding colonialism and home, cultural specifics matter greatly. Every society has ways of being and feeling at home that can be hard for outsiders to fully understand. Claudio Aporta has written of “the trail as home” for Inuit he worked with.²⁸ For Inuit, I think frequent intentional travel or “wayfaring” was integral to being at home. Living year-round in one dwelling was not.²⁹ In a different example, Paige Raibmon writes about an Indigenous community in British Columbia living next to a pulp mill, where many suffered from cedar poisoning. In a society where cedar “is a medicinal, spiritual substance associated with healing and cleansing”—cedar poisoning was about more than just serious lung problems. It also indicated that “something had gone very wrong, [that] the relationship between human and other-than-human life was *wikiš ča?miiḥta*, seriously out of balance.”³⁰ I don’t think historians can hope to understand all specifics of home in the past places we study—or even in our own communities today. But it is important to believe they exist, and to think about what we might not know, in addition to what we do know.

This brings me back to Karen’s critique: that she wishes I had drawn more general conclusions about home and colonialism. There are reasons that I did not. First, I didn’t plan to write a book about home. My research unexpectedly sparked thoughts on home that I wanted to share, but I can only know so much about the inner lives of nineteenth-century Inuit and American whalers. Most people I study left relatively few records and stories that survive today. Archives and museum collections are

²⁶ Qikiqtani Inuit Association, “QTC Final Report: Achieving Saimaqatigiingniq” (Iqaluit: Inhabit Media, 2013), 17. For more on these relocations and their consequences, see the full series of histories produced by the Qikiqtani Truth Commission, all available for download at qtcommission.ca (Accessed 9 June 2019). For a broader look at state actors who worked to relocate “poor” communities across Canada, see Tina Loo’s just-released book, *Moved by the State: Forced Relocation and Making a Good Life in Postwar Canada* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2019).

²⁷ For more on the impacts of the seal hunt protests, see Alethea Arnaquq-Baril’s excellent documentary, *Angry Inuk* (Angry Inuk Inc. and the National Film Board of Canada, 2016).

²⁸ Claudio Aporta, “The Trail as Home: Inuit and Their Pan-Arctic Network of Routes,” *Human Ecology* 37(April 2009): 131-146.

²⁹ David Neufeld brought up the concept of wayfaring in his review, but Amelia also considers the importance of mobility in her dissertation, Amelia Fay, “Understanding Inuit-European Contact along the Labrador Coast: A Case for Continuity,” (Memorial University of Newfoundland, PhD diss., 2016).

³⁰ Paige Raibmon, “Obvious but Invisible: Ways of Knowing Health, Environment, and Colonialism in a West Coast Indigenous Community,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 2018:60(2): 241-273. Discussion of cedar on pp. 254-5.

representative of the individuals or entities that create and sustain them, with all their prejudices and blind spots.³¹ As for Inuit oral histories, much of what I write about took place too long ago for people to know or feel comfortable speaking about it to me. I agree with Karen that there are limitations to this type of comparative book, especially one set beyond living memory. In addition, I think I've always been uncomfortable drawing broad conclusions, but I became even more reticent after listening to Inuit Elders who were careful not to speak beyond the limits of their knowledge or to portray their truths as absolute. I recognize the value of academic scholarship, but I think its conclusions should be more often made with humility and an acknowledgement that they remain relative and incomplete.³² I also learned in the course of this project just how much Inuit have been misrepresented by outsiders, and I remain fearful of doing the same. In the end, I went as far as I was comfortable with, and it is my hope that others will develop and critique the ideas in my book.

In conclusion, I want to speak a bit about the future. I appreciated David and Amelia connecting the past to the future in their reviews. My job as a historian for Parks Canada (a role that David Neufeld expertly “wayfared” and broke trail on) has made me think more about the future: especially how history can be taken away, and how recovering it is as much about the future as the past. In Canada, so many Indigenous people have had pieces of their past taken from them, for example through relocation or residential schools. I think it's fair to say they are forced to think about their future and fight for it in ways that I haven't needed to.

I recently took a course offered by the Tr'ondëk Hwëch'in, a self-governing First Nation in Yukon, about their history. The class aims to help their own citizens and others understand “why we are the way we are.” The course material intertwines past, present, and future—as well as Indigenous and non-Indigenous history, and the personal and the political—in ways that academic historians could learn from. Many other times at work, Indigenous people have showed me how to make a history project more relevant to the present. They have discussed and considered how research can fit with goals for the future. Moving forward is not easy: people are still working to recover culture and language, and still fighting for basic security and social equity with other Canadians. It will take time, money, resources, and dedication. But I think the work that Indigenous communities are doing is critical, and that Canadians should do what they can to learn about and support it. For

³¹ See for example Adele Perry's introduction in *Colonial Relations*. Colonial archives and museum collections can, of course, be useful in unanticipated ways. For a moving example, I recommend the documentary, *Inuit Piqutingit: What Belongs to Inuit* (Isuma TV, 2006), which shows Inuit poring over and discussing collections of Inuit clothing and artefacts in major museums. <http://www.isuma.tv/isuma-productions/inuit-piqutingit>. (Accessed 9 June 2019).

³² For more on uncertainty and not knowing (as well as many other ideas about research that are good to think with), see Emilie Cameron, *Far Off Metal River: Inuit Lands, Settler Stories, and the Making of the Contemporary Arctic* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2015) and Emilie's response to reviews of her book in “Book Review Forum,” *The AAG Review of Books* (4:2): 100-110.

nearly everyone, knowing where we came from and believing we have a future are central to feeling at home.

About the Contributors

Amelia Fay is the Curator of the Hudson's Bay Company Museum Collection at the Manitoba Museum. Her research interests center on the interactions between Europeans and Indigenous peoples as they negotiated space, material culture, and their daily activities. Her PhD dissertation focused specifically on Inuit-European contact along the Labrador coast from the sixteenth-nineteenth centuries.

Daniella McCahey is a lecturer at the University of Idaho where she teaches courses on British history and the history of science. She is currently completing a book manuscript on British and New Zealand science in Antarctica during the International Geophysical Year and is one of the guest-co-curators for the upcoming Mystic Seaport exhibit "Discovering Antarctica: 1820-2020." She has also begun a second project on the environmental history of South Georgia and the Shetland Islands.

David Neufeld is an environmental historian in the Yukon Territory, Canada. He studies the intersection of knowledge and practice in both Western settler approaches to Canada's North and Yukon First Nations' ways of life in their subarctic boreal homelands. His reflexive research approach is grounded in forty years as a community-based cultural researcher drawing upon archives, museums and work with Elders. His complementary travel with both "hunters" and "miners" has made him sensitive to the character of the contact between Indigenous and Newcomer through the twentieth century and their changing expectations of each other.

Karen Oslund is a professor of world history at Towson University. She published *Iceland Imagined: Nature, Culture, and Storytelling in the North Atlantic* with the University of Washington in 2011 and is currently working on a project about Arctic whaling in the long nineteenth century, entitled *The Hunt in the Global Arctic: Whales, Seals, and the Struggle for Sovereignty in the Danish, Canadian, Russian and American Arctics*.

Karen Routledge is a historian for Parks Canada (the Canadian National Park Service). She works mainly on collaborative exhibits and other projects related to national parks and historic sites in northern Canada, especially Yukon and Nunavut. She has a PhD in History from Rutgers University.

Kara Murphy Schlichting is an Assistant Professor of History at Queens College, City University of New York. Her work in late-19th and 20th-century American History sits at the intersection of urban, environmental, and political history. Her book *New York Recentered: Building the Metropolis from the Shore* (University of Chicago Press, 2019) is part of the press's History of Urban America series.

Copyright © 2019 H-Net: Humanities and Social Sciences Online

H-Net permits the redistribution and reprinting of this work for nonprofit, educational purposes, with full and accurate attribution to the author, web location, date of publication, H-Environment, and H-Net: Humanities & Social Sciences Online.