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Abstract

In the 1920s Canadian colonialism became domesticated; a political and economic change was publically presented and mystified through the creation of a professedly nationalist landscape mythology. In the words of A.Y. Jackson, Canada needed “a new, modern landscape art tradition, for a new modern nation.” According to Jonathan Bordo, such colonial myths of origins have served to supplant aboriginal peoples by establishing a precolonial belief of “terra nullius,” which was later enforced by the removal of visual and cultural references to aboriginal cultures and peoples, rendering their historic and contemporary presence invisible to colonizers. In Canada, however, a second modern art tradition interceded. Even as the Group of Seven’s interpretation of the Canadian landscape became definitive, Robert Flaherty’s *Nanook of the North* rose to acclaim as well. Flaherty’s devotion to the idea (also borne of Europe) that morally uncorrupted pre-modern landscape essentialist communities existed in protective isolation would re-implant certain aboriginal peoples back into the Canadian landscape imaginary, but on particularly disadvantageous terms.

Farley Mowat’s mid-Century reconfiguration of these two landscape art traditions as rhetoric continues to define Canadian understandings of the political relations between aboriginal and non-aboriginal peoples, as well as the Canadian understanding of political claims and relations between mainstream Canadians and their government(s) and internally colonized peoples.

Since the closure of the two historic economic engines along the Northwest Passage, sealing and the cod fishery, in the mid 1980’s and early 1990s respectively, the turn to cultural and eco-tourism based economies has resulted in the wide
promotion of images founded in Mowat’s reimagined history of Inuit and Newfoundlander. Cultural and eco-tourism have, in turn, led to a drive to conformity with Mowat’s visions in Northwest Passage communities, which have resulted in both processes of cultural selection, and instances of resistance.

As the Canadian administrative state positions itself with regard to melting Northwest Passage, it behooves those wishing to understand the politics pertaining to the Northwest Passage to analyze the rhetoric of the images underlying and promulgated during these international negotiations.
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Prologue: Journeying to the Northwest Passage

As the Northwest Passage (NWP) opens for navigation, and Canadians endure a sea of rhetoric steering their opinions so as to bolster Canadian sovereignty claims to resources and control of the storied trade route’s Eastern Gate, it is important to note that Canadian opinions concerning the people of the NWP are also being guided by visual images anchored in landscape ideas. Most often these images present a romanticized landscape populated by landscape essentialist people, of traditional pre-modern cultures who live in harmony with, and are the guardians of, the Canadian Wilderness. “Wilderness” as land unmarked by human presence is a foundational image of Canadian culture that gained currency in North America in the mid-19th Century, and rose to the fore in Canada in the early 20th Century along with folklore studies. Thus, while I have been primarily concerned to understand the visual imagery of the politics of Canadian colonial expansions into the Northwest Passage since 1950, my research led me back repeatedly to Toronto, in the period just after WWI. That is when the Canadian elite, by then largely domesticated, embarked upon a materially motivated quest of nation building both west and north, and while enumerating and advertising the commercial viability of their newly annexed territory, founded Canada’s landscape art aesthetic. Their landscape aesthetics as rhetoric continue to found myths of origin that rationalize the displacement of internally colonized peoples on moral grounds, and make way for the colonial administration and exploitation of their territories.

Colonial policies along the NWP have always been resource motivated and implemented on a standard business model. The first colonial governing agencies in the NWP were the Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC) in the Arctic, and British fishing
admirals/ship’s captains in outport Newfoundland. Motivated by an austere vision of efficiency and a coarse disregard for workers, these commercial entities disinterestedly extracted the most resources at the least cost. In the Eastern Arctic this meant the HBC built exploitative relationships with Inuit, while lobbying successive colonial governments to curb any potential international competition and/or provision of social services. In Newfoundland, for centuries, European settlement beyond the Avalon Peninsula was with rare exception prohibited by international treaty agreements. Under (alternating) British and French colonial rule Newfoundland’s coastal forests were denuded for shipbuilding timber, and the Beothuk, the Island’s coastal Indigenous peoples were first driven inland, and then became extinct. The small European descendent outport populations straddling the coastline were first comprised of escaped indentured fishers (the polite term for legal debt-bondage, commonly known as “white slavery”). These outporters went to extraordinary lengths to avoid detection and starvation, and the Inuit shared their local knowledge of subsistence hunting and fishing with them, ensuring their survival. The descendants of these groups were people of Canada’s new territories after World War II, and were dealt with by the new colonial government expeditiously, so as to limit barriers to resource exploitation. Continuing a long established European rhetorical method toward national identity giving rise to territorial claims, the landscape is illustrated and advertised as national territory, to establish an alibi for expansion, occupation, exploitation, and, if deemed necessary, evictions.

The Group of Seven, Canadian artists, first illustrated the Canadian wilderness, and were central to establishing the necessary national political memory for the political-economic elite of their day, by “producing a visual rhetoric of terra nullius affecting “the
erasure of Aboriginal peoples from the colonial landscape,"¹ and thus prospective settlers’ expectations. The Group’s contemporary, Robert Flaherty, shared their modern landscape sensibilities, and the landscape essentialist anti-modernist escapist sensibilities of Europeans and Eastern Seaboard Americans, which became Folklore Studies in the North American academy.(Ian MacKay’s Folk). When Flaherty debuted his documentary Nanook of the North in 1920, he debuted the Canadian Inuit: friendly, contented, pre-modern landscape essentialist northern “Folk,” living in an awe-inspiringly beautiful, if harsh, landscape. This thesis studies what Homi Bhabha would term the effectivity of these intertwined discourses, their co-development, durability, fixities, malleability that permitted them to become normalized as stereotypes; first premises, in Canadian colonial discourse, and how they are motivated by economic interests.

I argue that in Canada, landscape art invoked as rhetoric mystifies culturally accepted logical syllogisms as political first premises in colonial campaigns. In Canada the politics of landscape images mystify ugly colonial realities to mainstream Canadians. This thesis will discuss how landscape art as rhetoric has been used to shape the political destinies of the Eastern Inuit and Newfoundlander communities that were affected by federal Resettlement policies in the post WWII era.

The Canadianization of the North West Passage

Canada’s interest and claims along the Northwest Passage are more recent, more purely exploitative, and more culturally transformative to colonized communities than many southern or urban Canadians likely understand. Viewed through the prism of landscape art as rhetoric, the resettlement era of the 1940’s and 1950’s in the Eastern
Arctic and Newfoundland constitute a single, large, administrative expansion of the Canadian state into the Northwest Passage as a response to the Cold War American security concerns and new polar transcontinental flight and mining research technology.2

The “Resettlement Era,” as it is referred to in Newfoundland and Labrador, was a decades-long federal campaign to alienate entire Inuit and Newfoundlander communities from their territories. I will argue that Canada’s current NWP imaginary, complete with landscape essentialist pre-modern Inuit and quaint Celtic backwater rural Newfoundlanders are remnants of the Resettlement era.

Eastern Inuit communities, like Newfoundlanders, have short, traumatic Canadian histories, dating to post World War II, even though for the most part these communities have been integrated into a Euro-centred “global” economy since the 17th Century. Often while Southern Canadians debate the future of the NWP and its peoples, they are encouraged to forget the history of hardships endured by these involuntary Canadians at the hands of an acquisitive, expanding Canadian state, and how they, as colonizers, have and will continue to benefit from the political status quo with regard to the NWP. If we are to understand the ongoing politics of the NWP, we must understand the how the present Canadian landscape aesthetic invoked as rhetoric continues to place internally colonized peoples in disadvantaged negotiating positions vis-à-vis the Canadian Federal Government.

During the 1950s to 1980s, Farley Mowat, Canadian author, WWII veteran and naturalist, publicly redefined the relationships between mainstream Canadians and the newly colonized NWP communities, accomplishing two things. Firstly, Mowat publicly displaced the Canadian government as the authority on matters concerning the peoples
and landscape of the North. Thereafter authoritative reports concerning colonized peoples were disseminated through trusted public institutions such as museums, galleries and the National Film Board. During these same years, the National Gallery of Canada actively promoted Group of Seven landscape art as the defining landscape vision of Canada, fulfilling its nationalist mandate by circulating printed copies of the Group’s paintings with pre-packaged lessons to elementary and secondary schools.³

Having destabilized the public trust in the authority of the federal government with regard to the Inuit, Newfoundlanders and the North, the second accomplishment of Mowat (and other mainstream cultural producers) was to incorporate Canada’s accepted foundational landscape myths into a North American pre-modern history and landscape myth of origin for urban non-Indigenous Canadians in the newly annexed territory of Newfoundland, and a static, pre-modern, landscape essentialist present for Canada’s indigenous peoples. This is the content of what I call Mowat’s Canadian Colonial Social Contract, which incorporated a rhetorical encyclopedia of colonial assumptions; defining “Who’s Who” in the Canadian wilderness, the content of Canadian wilderness, how they are related to each other, and to “Canadians.” I will argue that understanding how and why these relations continue to be reproduced and represented, normalized and reasserted is key to understanding how Canada’s landscape essentialist rhetoric prevents the political unity between NWP communities necessary for meaningful negotiations toward the improvement of their conditions with the federal government of Canada. Indeed, even when colonial referents are often obviously counter-factual and anachronistic, many Canadians continue to rely on them. Thus understanding how and why the intermittent floods of Canadian wilderness images
are connected to the ongoing popular myths concerning Canada’s colonized peoples is important.

In the last decade a series of compensation agreements, public acknowledgements and apologies for the harm wrought by the Inuit Resettlements of the 1950s have been forthcoming in the form of what Pauline Wakeham has dubbed “affirmative repair,” a form of official/state restitution or apology that acknowledges that while Resettlement Era

relocations [of Inuit] were spurred by the Cold War scramble for Arctic control, the 2010 apology, though precipitated by astute Inuit lobbying, was transformed by the government into an opportunity to reassert Canada’s Arctic claims in an era of global warming that is rendering the region a renewed site of international interest. (Wakeham, 87)

Extending Wakeham’s insight to the present discourses concerning the people of the NWP produces valuable understandings of the politicized, publicized and newly proclaimed respect and acceptance for selected, racially defined, “traditional,” mores and knowledge of some NWP denizens, by mainstream Canadians, their governments and environmental lobbyists.

It matters how, not just whether, colonized peoples are included in nationalist imaginaries; whether Central Canadians see Inuit as the descendants of Flaherty’s landscape essentialist Nanook, or descendants of Flaherty’s politically active Inuit grand-daughter, Martha, who lobbied long and hard for restitution after her family’s 1953 resettlement to the High Arctic. Inuit cultural producers and economic representatives have used occasions when national and international audiences’ attentions turn North to lobby for redress, object to stereotypes, and publicly define their own interests, culture, history and intentions for the future. Their struggle is against
centuries of colonial mapping and stereotypes founded in exploitative relations. Representations from would have mainstream Canadians (and others) understand the NWP as an oil rich Canadian marine mammal protection zone, dotted with pre-modern communities of “natural” people, and as “Ice Berg Alley,” an ephemerally beautiful, timeless, tourist destination. Melting polar ice extensions are not usually portrayed as the traditional territories and passageways of Northern peoples, but rather they are considered Canada’s claimed protectorates in the international contest for northern resources and transportation routes.

Rey Chow, in his “Where have all the natives gone?” investigates the rhetorical invocation of colonial stereotypes by post-colonial (or anti-imperialist) academics and political activists. He argues that “anthropological-cultural stereotypes -- as a correlate of racism, entail the expectations that members of a group will exemplify the stereotype, or be somehow inauthentic.” To post-colonial academics he poses the questions:

Why are we so fascinated with ‘history’ and with the ‘native’ in ‘modern’ times? What do we gain from our labour in these ‘endangered authenticies’ which are presumed to be from a different time and a different place? What can be said about the juxtaposition of ‘us’ (our discourse) and ‘them’? What kind of surplus value is derived from this juxtaposition? (Chow,133)

He argues post-colonial academics often invoke stereotypes for their own rhetorical purposes, using the same exploitative methods as “the colonizers.”

Urging more self-criticism amongst his peers, Chow asserts: ”‘Natives’ are represented as defiled images, that is the fact of our history. But must we represent them a second time by turning history upside down, this time giving them the sanctified status of the ‘non-duped’?” adding that “defilement and sanctification belong to the same symbolic order.”
Chow asserts that for post-colonial scholars/activists invoking and embellishing “positive” stereotypes does double duty, by “avoiding the genuine problem of the native’s status as object by providing something that is more manageable and comforting -- namely, a phantom history in which natives appear as our equals and our images, in our shapes and our form,” and by permitting the invention of “a dimension beyond the deadlock between native and colonizer” providing post-colonial academics with a foundation for knowledge claims beyond modernism. This “intervene dimension,” much like Mowat’s, is created in an “attempt to salvage the other …as the non-duped -- the site of authenticity and true knowledge. Critics who do this can also imply that, having absorbed the primal wisdoms, they too are the non-duped themselves.” As with Mowat’s claims, these have the effect of elevating academics to a place of authority, underpinning claims that they both can and must act by “performing or feigning” the pre-imperialist gaze on behalf of the oppressed.

Thus the political strategies of liberal pluralism, demanding and enforcing uncritical respect and tolerance for cultural differences arises in postcolonial anti-modernism, defending and honouring the “other” by reasserting stereotypes. Chow makes a forceful argument that exalting some terms of colonial racializing discourses over others can neither challenge nor overcome the systematic colonial thought or practice that generates them.

The visual arts discourses discussed herein are by definition public, meant to shape public opinion by influencing, explaining or resisting political decisions, and are explicitly addressed to, and purposefully made accessible to, an imaginary public. The art reviewed herein is deliberately rhetorical, affective and effective, produced by
politically interested artists, whether painters, film-makers, photographers, writers, singer-songwriters or carvers. These cultural producers draw their authority from within their own communities and purposefully address broader audiences. How, why and when cultural producers of colonial and colonized communities have resisted and reinforced the ideas borne of colonial rhetoric is also instructive, demonstrating that they are often entrusted with the responsibility of responding to colonial discourses both consciously and in kind on behalf of their communities.

Colonial mapping of the NWP preceded the creation of the Canadian state. European colonial mapping practices, which include normalizing nationalist identities and characteristics and then rhetorically connecting these to landscape myths of origin continued in Canada. Landscape artists (as soldiers, ships’ artists, explorers) documenting coastal resources of northern North America were the first political cartographers of the NWP and the first political cartographers for the Canadian colonial state. The traditional connection between nationalism and landscape art in Europe was extended under the Canadian state, and so colonial relations have been mapped by landscape artists as well.

Colonial differentiation processes dubbed “Orientalism” by Edward Said, typically enlist parties holding cultural authority within the colonizing society to organize knowledge on behalf of the colonizing administration in a fashion that categorizes colonized peoples, in some essential way “other” (and thus, lesser).14 While Said and a number of post-colonial academics have analyzed this process, it is Bhabha’s focus on the creation and deployment of stereotypes as the first readily available public information concerning prospective “others” that is particularly useful.
Bhabha’s work speaks to the sort of public rhetorical campaigns waged in advance of, and during, territorial expansions of the Canadian state. In his 1983 *Screen*, Bhabha focuses on the promotion, popularization, and acceptance of stereotypes as colonial representations that become naturalized assumptions. Specifically he argues that there is an ambivalence at the centre of the hard working colonial stereotype. This ambivalence consists of the conceptual fixity of the colonized “other,” which includes both romanticized and derogatory terms; the romanticized being ethereal, the derogatory knowable, both of which are connected and sufficiently elastic to be invoked opportunistically at different political junctures by colonizing governing agencies/interests. Bhabha noted that colonial stereotypes must be prepared, and that this preparation is opaque and appended to cultural knowledge forms that already exist. In other words, stereotypes remain current alibis for colonialism because they are a rhetorical reconfiguration of cultural truths within the colonizing society. They are the intellectual shortcuts to naturalized/normalized common-knowledge that abet the process of creating logical syllogisms.

Bhabha extrapolated upon an under-developed, or perhaps merely languishing portion of Said’s work, which speculated on the nature and importance of stereotypes within colonial rhetoric:

> Altogether an internally structured archive is built up from the literature that belongs to these experiences. Out of this comes a restricted number of typical encapsulations: the journey, the history, the fable, the stereotype, the polemical confrontation. These are the lenses through which the Orient is experienced, and they shape the language, perception, and form of the encounter between East and West. (44)

Bhabha referred to his conceptualization of colonial stereotypes as “suture,” stitching elements of the colonial imaginary to the pre-existent whole, and importantly
concluded that because colonial stereotypes are “Caught in the Imaginary as they are, these shifting positionalities will never seriously threaten the dominant power relations, for they exist to exercise them pleasurably and productively.”\(^{18}\)

Bhabha claimed that “Colonial discourse produces the colonized as a fixed reality which is at once an ‘other’ and yet entirely knowable.”\(^{19}\) The stereotype is then maintained through repetition, becoming the “primary point of subjectification in colonial discourse,”\(^{20}\) “impeding the circulation and articulation of the signifier of “race,”\(^{21}\) denying its createdness, naturalizing it as anything other than its fixity, as racism.”\(^{22}\) Thus, in a colonial society race can only be a means of implementing and administering hierarchical differentiation between people, a production of an alibi for elite rule.\(^{23}\) “To remain effective stereotypes must be a part of a systemic totality -- that permits them to function simultaneously, but always in relation to each other.”\(^{24}\)

Bhabha attributes to Abbot the claim that what ‘authorizes’ discrimination is the occlusion of the preconstruction or working-up of difference: “this repression of production entails that the recognition, as spontaneous and visible, that is attributed to the stereotype. The difference of the object of discrimination is at once visible and natural.”\(^{25}\)

Bhabha shifts from the assessment of the “negative” verses “positive” representations of colonized peoples to the processes of subjectification made possible by these “representations of otherness… contained within the fantasy of origin and identity.”\(^{26}\) Bhabha attributed to Fanon a description of the detrimental effects of this process for colonized cultures:

A continued agony rather than a total disappearance of the pre-existing culture. The culture once living and open to the future, becomes closed, fixed in the
Fanon’s description seems prescient for Canada’s “post”-colonial communities assessing the potential and ongoing stresses brought by cultural selection processes necessary to the pursuit of cultural tourism.

In Canada, colonial thought appears to conform to Bhabha’s diagnostics. Inuit are deemed to be (and self-advertise, when necessary) traditional or natural people and Newfoundlanders are mainland Canada’s quaint, unsophisticated Celtic cousins. Systemic colonial racism means that seemingly neutral (even if objectionable) policies effect targeted groups differently when implemented, which occurred in the case of the post-World War II Resettlement Era in the Eastern Arctic and Newfoundland. While the motivation for the extension of the Canadian administrative state in each case was the creation of a terra nullius open for Canadian controlled resource exploitation, the difference in the extremity of the hardship encountered by Inuit and Newfoundlanders is attributable to racist assumptions guiding policy implementation strategies. The Eastern Arctic Relocations, fit into historical context, appeared to be an attempt by the Canadian federal government to deal with the remnant populations of an ongoing genocide, in a politically convenient, cost effective manner. The Newfoundland Relocations created a *terra nullius by* alienating entire fishing/sealing communities from their traditional (subsistence) resources and territories. These people were moved to designated “growth centres” to create an unpropertied working class to toil in newly built fish processing plants (improving Newfoundlander work-ethic).

Mowat was prominent amongst the cultural producers who re-organized and advertised the post WWII Canadian colonial landscape aesthetic. Flaherty’s happy
landscape essentialist Eskimos moved into the schools through the NFB, and their “endangered authenticity” became internationalized in a 1956 Life Magazine story after Mowat contacted New York colleagues to help him publicize Canadian mistreatment of the Caribou Inuit. Mowat defined Newfoundlanders as similarly endangered authentic landscape essentialist peoples, beginning a process that racialized Newfoundlanders as colonized peoples within Canada. Along with a barrage of images of Newfoundlanders as pre-modern coastal Celts, an entire genre of racist/classist mainland Canadian jokes arose, known as “Newfie jokes,” that spread the stereotype across the country in anticipation of a Resettlement spawned diaspora. “Newfie jokes” had punch-lines that asserted the intellectual inferiority of Newfoundlanders, which were seemingly proven after the controversial use of inappropriate tests to assess the intelligence of Newfoundland school children. Test results were cited to prove that the intellectual shortcomings of Newfoundlanders were attributable to their cultural inferiority to mainland Canadians. In turn, this argument was used to argue for the expedited closure of outport schools and communities, to improve the prospects and performance of Newfoundlanders as Canadians.

The Canadian administrative state continues to administer the NWP separately from its people, and its people separately from each other (on racist grounds) as a means of maintaining access to resources. With the NWP becoming commercially navigable in the foreseeable future, exerted efforts on the part of the Canadian state to establish “interest” in the local people (beyond larceny, negligence and abuse) have escalated. Nationalist images placing these people in a colonial landscape aesthetic have once again become the backdrop of Canadian political discourses.
Images of the Imaginary

These are contemporary images, but they are re-viewings of the Canadian colonial imaginary.

Above are two recent, broadly circulated images patterned after traditional European/Canadian visions of the NWP. They are examples of political cartography. The NWP is portrayed as uncontrovertibly Canadian, resources are emphasized, and the landscape is either depopulated or remote, cold, and populated by welcoming, isolated, Canadian Inuit. In the aftermath of the diversion of Canada’s climactic research toward funding in the Arctic for the sake of sovereignty and commerce boosting quests, the highly publicized location of one of the lost Franklin ships (the Erabus) in 2015 saw Inuit knowledge honoured for its valuable contribution to the nationalist quest in another act of “affirmative repair.” Predictably, Inuit traditions and knowledge were visibly, publicly honoured and valued because they helped expedite Canadian nationalist goals. The meaning of melting ice for NWP dwellers remains, however, under-represented, as it undoubtedly it differs from the Federal line
delineating opportunities afforded through better access for Canadians to the NWP, for
commerce, transportation and tourism/tourism development and opportunities.

Hopkin’s 2011 map, above, illustrated a Globe and Mail article nominally raising
alarms about a pending labour shortage in Newfoundland and Labrador and constitutes
a forceful example of how cartographic imagery accomplishes ideological
representation by both commission and omission. Globe and Mail readers are
presented with an onshore/offshore resource development map as a map of
Newfoundland and Labrador. While “Labour” appeared in the article’s byline, it does not
appear on the map; note the limited, nominal (place name only) references establishing
coastal communities as landmarks, while describing development projects within the
illustrated, Canadian 200 nautical mile “territorial waters” surrounding the Newfoundland
and Labrador coastline, in great detail. Note that the map neither makes reference to
the demographics of Newfoundland and Labrador, Northern Quebec and/or Nunavik,
nor to any established or proposed post-secondary skills training facilities (in any
location) that might be able to respond to the looming skilled labour shortage.

The “NWP Adventure Canada” tourism advertisement is also a representation of
the Canadian NWP. Like landscape representations produced by the Group of Seven
as CPR advertisements almost a century ago, such ads establish continuity for a
particular set of ideas about Canadian/European presence in the Arctic. Produced in
the aftermath of the Canadian state’s expansion into the represented region, they
illustrate an aspect of the profitability of the landscape. Through advertisements such as
these and renewed public interest in the Arctic’s changing climate and ecology, this
potentially resource rich, and soon commercially navigable trade route, has made a
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comeback of sorts, as a location in the American, Southern Canadian and European imaginary. In aid to the maintenance of the imaginary of Europeans, the Group of Seven collection toured Britain in 2011 after the European ban on Canadian seal exports was upheld on “moral grounds.”

With the NWP back on the economic agenda, particularly because it remains contested international territory, it has become the subject of many public discourses, emphasizing the early and elevated levels of annual ice melt of the polar ice cap. Historically, few people beyond northern Newfoundlanders, Innu and Inuit have ever experienced the NWP, so it owes most of its existence as a political and landscape referent in the Canadian, American and European imaginary to artistic representations. This is not unusual, as visual images have historically founded European national(ist) and international(ist) imaginaries.

The NWP began as a fifteenth century European hypothesis that there could be a northern marine trade route to Asia from the west of Europe. Knowledge of the NWP and the northern landmass that stood between Britain, France, and Asian markets remained elusive to Europeans for hundreds of years. During these centuries the NWP was represented to interested audiences in Europe through drawings, paintings and print as a daunting, foul weathered, ice-filled marine resource reservoir to exploit, map and claim. The Inuit, when they appeared, appeared as guides or enemies. European commercial forays mapping the Arctic were extremely expensive, and state subsidization of expeditions (with the attendant promise to claim “discovered” contiguous territories) was always the norm. To sustain support for this activity, a
tradition of illustrating arctic expeditions as nationalist quests of intrepid adventurers to the “last frontier” of the earth became entrenched. 27

During the earliest explorations, Inuit were regularly kidnapped by Britons to serve as guides, and taken to Europe as proof for patrons that expeditions had actually reached the Arctic. By the middle of the 17th century, however, Basque and Norwegian Arctic whaling, and Newfoundland fishing and sealing were generally joint ventures. As the fur trade expanded in the Arctic under the British HBC charter, many Inuit communities were using abandoned or salvaged wooden whaling boats of American, Basque or Norwegian origin for marine hunting and fishing. While ample visual evidence of intercultural exchange abounded in the Arctic, illustrations meant for European and later American audiences largely expunged this evidence for a myriad of reasons, the primary motivation likely being rhetorical, maintaining the hagiographic public narrative. These processes of resource mapping projected geo-political theories onto landscape representations, producing valuable knowledge for the colonial, exploitative classes. These relations did not change until Britain’s relation to the Arctic changed in the late 19th Century.

The NWP was mapped from the European commercial quest to the European colonial imaginary to Canada’s. The mapping of colonial space is key to establishing the colonial imaginary as foundational knowledge. Harvey claims that the discursive activity of “mapping space” is a fundamental prerequisite to the structuring of any kind of knowledge. 28 Those producing colonial maps; soldiers, painters, traders, explorers -- political cartographers all, knew what sorts of information they had been sent to document (commercial and topographical), and the potential audience(s) their artifacts
would address. European colonial maps thus documented resource extraction and transportation potential with acute attention to topographical accuracy, so that sites could be relocated. Colonized peoples were included, or not, in landscape images in accordance with the knowledge needs of European patrons.

Landscape representation as political cartography is a form of rhetoric. Rhetoric is political speech, or political communication, and for some theorists is the means to understanding the world, for others, the means to creating a humanly understandable world. This thesis draws from Aristotle’s understanding of rhetoric.

In his *The Art of Rhetoric*, Aristotle argued that rhetoric, or public political speech, could arrive at rational policy decisions by weighing arguments comparing probabilities in circumstances of incomplete knowledge. “Rhetoric’s function is in fact with just those things about which we deliberate, but of which we have no arts, and with audiences of limited intellectual scope and limited capacity to follow a chain of reasoning.”\(^{29}\) Rhetoric, then, first establishes proofs for demonstrable truths through processes of public, persuasive speech, delivered by “deliberative oration” (and orators) toward influencing political opinions.\(^{30}\) After which “deliberative” rhetoric is invoked to compare competing policy proposals, assuming established demonstrable proofs and assessing potential consequences, [“advantage or harm”].\(^{31}\) Aristotle’s contemplations about the appropriate function of rhetoric in political decision making were meant to guide his society during a period of political experimentation, expansion and external threat (Athens and Egypt). Compared to Plato’s orderly ship of state, emanating reflected light from the cave, Aristotle’s was a ship of fools in need of an evaluative decision making method in order to control the rudder. Rhetoric was that method.
Marx accepted much of Aristotle’s rhetoric, adding that ruling ideas in any age are those of the class with the means to publicize and enforce their ideas as the self-evident for all of society.32 While Marx’s statement may seem largely uncontroversial, the identities of “rulers,” how rule is established and maintained, and the “carrying agents” of the rulers’ ideas, on the other hand, remain controversial.

According to Marx, ideology is the aestheticized (abstracted and fetishized) advertisement of the political and economic will of the rulers or property owning class (message), and rhetoric is the carrying agent (media). Marx accepted much of Aristotle’s writings on rhetoric, and added an epistemological engine that bound the rhetorical creation of social knowledge to the ongoing yet changing nature of the relationships between the working and ruling classes.

The epistemological base of this project is a particularly technological determinist variety of Marxism. Within Marxism, the working (producing) class has a privileged epistemological position because it produces the entire society as it implements the dictates of scientific management over its own creativity (labour). According to Richard Miller, Marx defined ideologies as systemic apologia for the political uses of technology; social scientific/scientific knowledge, managed to reproduce hierarchical class relations.33 Both Marx and Miller hold that day-to-day gaps between elite theory and working class experience which might give rise to challenges to the social order are temporarily filled with ideology, but eventually the productive class would retake the ability to plan (class consciousness) and govern the society they create(Communism), through revolution.
While this thesis invokes Aristotle’s understanding of rhetoric, and a Marxist analysis, there are credible alternative theories of rhetoric, such as the literary theory of rhetoric of Kenneth Burke. Burke argues that all social terms/human relations are negotiated through symbolic interaction. In Burke’s view all communication is rhetorical and motivated to establishing the grounds for cooperation. Ideology is thus constructed through the use of language, that is, through symbolic interactions humans construct, negotiate and perform a unifying “norm.” Analyses of art works for Burke, would be an “empirical study of symbolic action, “analyzing the “terministic screens” that filter, enable and frame our understandings.” Burke describes the potential for change in the interpretation of foundational symbolic references, without reference to any particular motive or catalyst for such changes. As a result, Burke’s analyses can describe and measure change by way of the qualitative ratios of his dramatology, but cannot attribute motive, cause or identify potential catalysts toward change.

Burke claims that “all political representation is synecdoche, visual representations are no exception”, and that the “Symbolic is the implicit use of tautologies toward shaping our acts.” Further he claims that visual synecdoche and visual tropes are an important component of visual art identification processes, whether aesthetic or critical. Strictly defined, a synecdoche is a simple form of substitution, occasioned when a singular noun stands for an imputed whole: for example, when a sport team from a particular city loses a potential playoff berth in any particular competition, it is said that that city is out of the playoffs. A synecdoche may also be used to imply a relationship between social expectations and the content of a work of art. These understandings drawn from Burke represent valuable contributions toward understanding the colonial
visual art discourses within Canada, as they render the effects of “erasures” and substitutions in visual arts representations easily understood. As well, for Marxists who wish to analyze society as if political relations were spatially productive, Burke’s Dramaturgical ratios offer a valuable method of qualitative adjudication of the relative importance of setting, or venue, in rhetorical discourses\(^{38}\) by weighing the relative importance of scene; act and actor, permitting the consideration of the relative importance of place, whether as venue or setting, to rhetorical acts. \(^{39}\)

Burke’s understanding of art is, however, different from Marx’s theory as professed in the *German Ideology*. Marx wrote that works of art were mystified representations of the actual social-historical human relations. Burke’s understanding of ideology and language is significantly different as well. Ideology, for Marx is the normalization of elite social theory as social mantras; repeated and normalized demonstrable truths. \(^{40}\) For Marx, people learn as they create their world together and material relations between people (base) are the foundations of all social understandings (superstructure).

As stated before, Marx’s engine for change is the working class’s ability to analyze and plan responses to gaps experienced between the ideological promises of their society (elite social theory) and their material experiences as producers. Ian Hacking discusses cultural changes possible upon the study and response to these gaps. He argues that what is arrived at by way of responses to these gaps are not usually new or temporary Truths, but rather “robust fits”\(^{41}\) that shape the nature of future beliefs and research. These “robust fits” -- or tentative social explanations/bridging theories -- may be proposed by either class. Inevitably some “robust fits” will become assumed first premises or social scientific truths, while others will quickly be falsified or eclipsed. I will
argue that Mowat created such a robust fit in the aftermath of World War II, combining his sense that science could no longer be trusted to save humanity, with his naturalism, Group of Seven landscape sensibilities and romantic anti-modern stereotypes concerning isolated rural Northern communities. I call it his Canadian Colonial Social Contract.

Mowat’s Canadian Colonial Social Contract has proven a valuable demonstrable truth for securing political consensus toward colonial policy in Canada. This is especially true in the aftermath of the disintegration of the nominally Marxist Communist Bloc in Eastern Europe (approximately 1989-92). Since that time many objectors to liberal international hegemony have embarked on a search for alternative sources of anti-capitalist agency. For post-modern theorists and activists, Marxism is deemed (another) form of modern metanarrative founding self-fulfilling scientific knowledge processes (that are by their very nature colonizing; expansionist and exploitative), by other anti-capitalist theorists, Marxism is seen as a defeated, passé form of resistance to globalizing capitalism. For most the search for agency toward change; a connection between theory, practice and preferred outcome, continues.

Harvey explains the recent turn to pre-modern places and mores as reserved spaces for potential progressive agency precisely because many deconstructive critiques of modernity have no location of agency that can “disrupt the seemingly automatic reproduction of the repressive social order which they typically depict.”

Renewed international interest in the Arctic due to the accelerated effects of climate change experienced there, and the opportunities these changes could afford, have led many Central Canadians and Europeans to seek agency from a traditional source: the
landscape imaginary and the people perceived to draw their most venerable characteristics from that landscape. Recently, many Non-Indigenous Canadians began to look for spiritual and political leadership from Indigenous peoples on matters concerning ecology, climate change, and the environment. Coincidentally, some Indigenous groups’ descriptions of their traditional mores, including the Inuit, while not biocenoetic, are not in complete contradiction to these European sensibilities. Thus it has been helpful for some Indigenous groups in Canada, such as the James Bay Cree, to play what they refer to as the “Dances with Wolves card” while in international negotiations, presenting themselves as the authentic romantic biocenoetic peoples of the European/Mainstream North American imaginary in order to receive popular political support.

While benefits have accrued to some Aboriginal groups for rhetorically invoking (currently) positive stereotypes, the negative potential for cultural selection processes and the history of harm incurred by those having been stereotyped means such practices remain controversial.

Cultural selection for rhetorical purposes is the continuation of a structural feature of the discourses concerning Indigenous peoples since the late 1940s and 50s. While Canadians were being directed to identify themselves more heavily as a Northern people, Mowat gained international credibility for his belief that Inuit and outport Newfoundlanders embodied the last, precious, pre-modern cultural antidotes to the ravages of modernity.

Harvey notes that “social relations are always spatial and exist in a produced framework of spatiality,” and that while the working class may “perhaps be nationless,
but place contributes to bonding and community building⁴⁵ and occurrences, such as a strike gives a locale a working class history. Marx unfortunately exhibited few political-geographic sensibilities. While critiquing liberal economics and documenting the globalizing tendencies of capitalism, he asserted that a conscious working class would be nationless, and neglected investigating local or culturally affected variations and distortions within the contradictions of capitalist development. Thus I have looked to Harvey, Burke, historian Simon Schama and a spate of post-colonial and cultural studies scholars to understand the processes of classed, colonial political cartography.

Harvey argues that “to write of the power of place as if places (localities, regions, neighbourhoods, states, etc.) possess causal power is to engage in the grossest of fetishisms.”⁴⁶

Harvey rejects William’s Militant Particularism, a prior attempt to theorize Marxist political geography, which rests on the universalization of particular aspects of local working class successes⁴⁷ on the grounds that “the move from tangible solidarities understood as patterns of social life organized in effective and knowable communities to a more abstract set of abstraction -- attached to a place -- to another level of abstraction, capable of reaching across space.”⁴⁸ “Place” is therein defined as “a socially constructed… temporal permanence of relative stability…the locus of the imaginary, institutions, configurations of social relations as material practices, as forms of power, as elements of discourse.”⁴⁹

Ordering levels of abstractions is fraught with contradictions and dangers. In this respect, Williams, Burke (and Terry Eagleton) suffer from a similar disease. Where and how levels of abstraction are differentiated and related within their theories (and why)
lacks clarity, and are sometimes reversible, thus metaphors of theoretical “distance,” so important in post-colonial analyses, break down.

Harvey suggests beginning by acknowledging the connected processes of uneven geographical development within national and international urbanization in combination with systemic and socially practiced racism (hierarchic social organization). Urban and rural Indigenous experiences could then be dealt with as related experiences of colonial displacement. The result of such a move could be the end of privileging some experiences of colonization, those which reinforce romantic stereotypes, over others.

In his *Landscape and Memory*, Schama traces the history of landscape imagery as rhetoric in the early European establishment of political community vested in nationalistic imaginaries. He argues that landscapes are cultural creations, and that the European process of creating landscape myths of origin included leaders imbuing the proposed national territory, and then the preferred inhabitants of that territory, with idealized moral characteristics. These campaigns invariably integrated visual art as rhetoric to establish a national imaginary to prepare a sense of common cause with the leader amongst his (mostly illiterate) prospective followers. In this way landscape art has historically both illustrated and created political geography, asserting that a particular part of the world is best understood or described in a particular way, with reference to a particular patron and audience. As with the European practices of political cartography, defining colonial space as Canadian territory meant producing Canadian places by illustrating interpretations of annexed territories as “naturally” or “morally” Canadian, to explore, claim, and protect.
Whether cartographic or impressionist in nature, representing landscape delimitates a geographic circumference of interest and then interprets who and what falls both within and without of said circumference, morally, politically and aesthetically. Landscape representations are rhetorical.

Bruce Willems-Braun, in his study of the colonial relations exposed in the politics of Clayoquot Sound in the 1990s described the continuity and opacity of colonial rhetoric, analyzing the “ways that the colonial past continues to organize experience,” noting that “colonial power, far from monolithic, seizes upon, enlists, and combines a range of discourses, knowledge and signification practices” producing what he refers to as “vestigial thinking” which “permeates, takes for granted and normalizes the hierarchical power relations generated by colonialism and imperialism.” This produces “buried epistemologies” and “bad epistemological habits” that have been normalized as common sense in everyday relations and in social, economic and political institutions amongst the colonizing population.

Willems-Braun notes that the abstraction of certain concepts away from the local to the national has displaced “local” debates to the level of “national” interests or biospheric/global importance. He then argues that this abstraction displaces discussions of authority from questions of territory, tenure… rights of access (and their constitutive colonial history) and convenes them instead through the normalization of the ‘forest’ and its integration into the administration of the ‘nation state’ and its management and conservation.

Willems-Braun produces a genealogy of “nature as the absence of culture” while unearthing the origins Canada’s colonial bad epistemic habits by focusing on the
activities of George Dawson, a geographer and amateur anthropologist who travelled with the Geological Survey of Canada (GSC) during the 1870s and 1880s.

According to Willems-Braun, Dawson and the GSC brought a certain "mode of intelligibility to bear on the landscape." In Dawson’s texts, First Nations were not omitted from landscape representations, rather they were described in great detail, their presence "ordered and contained in a discourse of primitive culture: a culture that lay outside, and had no place in the unfolding history of the modern nation." Dawson’s later texts promoting the potential for forestry and mining began a tradition of representing these landscapes as national/natural spaces and staging them within the "abstract, void, normalized category known as the economy." The economy is an example of an abstraction, like wilderness that "renders invisible colonial histories in which these spaces have been constituted and naturalized."

Willems-Braun’s roll for fixity in Canadian’s bad epistemological habits is very similar to Bhabha’s sense of fixity derived through the normalization of stereotypes in colonial discourses. Willems-Braun noted, for example, that while the environmentalists lobbying to save Clayoquot Sound from logging were aware of the displacement of the First Nation’s inhabitants and professed support for Aboriginal self-government, the most prominent environmental groups, such as Greenpeace, used images drawn from Dorst’s and Young’s Clayoquot: On the Wild Side in which “all representations of First Nations are of traditional or ecological cultures, the reason to support land claims is as a means to protecting the environment." As well, there are “no signs of ongoing struggles by the Nuu-chah-nulth to forge a cultural existence that is at once continuous and

---

Adrian Dorst and Cameron Young, Clayoquot: On the Wild Side, (Western Canadian Wilderness Press 1990).
He further notes that within the context of Canadian environmental struggles that “within the frame of the wilderness only two actors are authorized to “speak” for nature: ‘traditional’ native peoples and ‘disinterested’ ecologists. In essence because the former is often an identity imposed on FN rather than ascribed by them, wilderness becomes the authorial domain solely of the ecologist” (my emphasis). Willems-Braun concludes that the evident “cultural tension” between First Nations of British Columbia, post-modern activists and the environmental movement in BC “reveals some insidious neocolonial tropes that lie at the heart of environmental representations of ‘nature’ in the region.” He further emphasized that it is not only that FNs are present, but how they are present that matters to ongoing political discourses (my emphasis). Furthermore, “While 19C colonial rhetorics simultaneously marked and contained native presence and voice, this representation gives back a native voice only to ask it to speak the language of traditional culture rather than cultural authenticity. Willems-Braun argues:

for the Nuu-Chah-Nulth to forge a modern future within the staples based economy of the West Coast is to risk ‘losing’ what many non-natives consider authentic native culture and thereby also their right to speak as native people for their lands. …on the other hand to refuse modernization to constitute identity around the traditional –as the environmental movement implicitly asks –is to remain forever outside the the economic circuits of the global economy. (Willems Braun, 24)

I will argue at a later point in this thesis that racist stereotypes and visual landscape discourse festishized “bad epistemic habits” of Canadians and their environmental groups have resulted in an analogous situation at the eastern gate of the Northwest Passage.

Stereotypes connected to landscape aesthetics are forceful barriers to rescaling colonial politics. Urban educated Indigenous peoples can only be discredited with the
labels “inauthentic” or “apple” (assimilated) if certain assumptions concerning Indigenous peoples, and their claims on the land, people and state of Canada remain unchallenged. The acceptance of Indigenous land claims as founded in cultural claims to biocenoetic knowledge are a political straightjacket designed by Mowat, that is both continued and reinforced by cultural producers, Indigenous and Non-Indigenous. Like WJT Mitchell, I want to explore landscape as a place of amnesia and erasure, as a strategic site for burying the past and vieling history with “natural beauty.” In Canada landscape similarly veils colonial relations.67

The contradictions borne of Canadian colonial landscape aesthetics as rhetoric are manifold. Mainstream Canadians and their environmental groups privilege the stereotype, reaching for the experiences of rural Indigenous Elders to lead them away from environmental self-destruction, while the Eastern Inuit are denied a commercial seal hunt, because they cannot be entrusted with the fate of “nature.”

Half of Canada’s Aboriginal peoples live in cities, and theirs is also “authentic,” intergenerational Indigenous experience. (And it is also an experience of cultural genocide). The recent mainstream gloss of reverence for traditional Indigenous cultures has provided a harmful cover of cultural pluralism/tolerance masking urban race relations. For example, post-modern feminists fight to organize prostitution, (as the “sex-trade”), as if race, which dictates whether the sex-trade is arguably a choice of profession, or rape by extortion, did not exist.

Returning to the Adventure NWP advertisement, it is time to reiterate that this visual represents how Canadians-scientists, politicians, tourists, activists, and workers-think about and have promoted the Arctic, and that these ideas are ubiquitous.
Witness Stewart and Johnson’s 2005 plea for research into the cultural and environmental costs of tourism in polar regions. In their article they claim that “polar regions symbolize the world’s last great wilderness,” and that as a result “the amount of polar tourism has increased, but there is little knowledge of its effects.” They also note that “the isolation and challenging climates” once deterrents, are now the factors attracting tourists. They further insist that despite emerging clusters, we really know very little about the phenomenon of tourism in the polar regions. With no baseline info, tourism may become embedded in advance of any precautions and that there is a paucity of funding because many nations have not widely supported research directed at tourism impacts. While they briefly discuss relative levels of support for tourism between different Inuit Communities in Canada, they reiterate many of the terms upon which the discourse is built. They polled Inuit communities and discover that support for tourism is based in unproven economic expectations, and directly related to the expectation of communities achieving control over tourism development, and that that control had never been achieved. The authors are also concerned about the potential spread of disease from tourists to local wildlife, because they tend to visit large numbers of abandoned and historic sites, rather than communities. Stewart’s and Johnson’s piece highlights some of the potential difficulties to cultural outsiders when considering the potential costs and benefits of tourism to formerly isolated regions and peoples. They can assess the conditionalities for support and perhaps economic and environmental concerns associated with polar tourism, but cannot speak to potential cultural changes, and how to assess any such changes in advance of or during the development of tourism based economic development.
For cultural outsiders, such as myself, understanding the new material realities of Inuit and Newfoundlanders without resorting to merely critiquing the voyeuristic demands of the tourism industry requires seeking images and information that have been explicitly produced by these communities to counter Canadian colonial rhetoric. How Inuit and Newfoundlanders feel about the colonial stereotypes that they encounter is likely best assessed by the nature of their responses, which are often mixed. These are people who must attempt to survive under harsh colonial conditions, and if cultural claims framed in particularly conservative terms are the only claims that can succeed, then those are the dictated terms of colonial (asymmetric) negotiation. Often positive stereotypes—whether accurate or not, are invoked to support political claims in public. All of the images used herein are drawn from public sources, and meant to reach out to “mainstream Canadians,” and as I have a limited capacity to speak only one Aboriginal language, and have lived in none of the communities studied in this thesis, I am an intended audience member. I am also a political activist, a family member and a friend to members of these communities. I bristle at the gap between my experience of these communities and the ubiquitous mainstream representations. Their responses in kind to mainstream visual representations are forms of resistance and evidence of responsive cultural change. As this is an ongoing visual rhetorical discourse, motivated by continued and enhanced colonial designs on the resources in the NWP, it is important to understand how the visual rhetoric around us effects our political culture, relations with colonized peoples, and political decisions.
Introduction

In Canada, internally colonized peoples have become cultures of tour guides to mythical pre-modern theme parks, serving up the anti-modern, urban escapist fantasies of Central Canadian and Eastern Seaboard American tourists. Increasingly, the political pre-conditions for access to mass media and public support for Canada’s internally colonized peoples in negotiation with the Canadian federal government are the demonstrable acceptance of Canadian visual landscape aesthetics, which function to conserve the unequal material relations between internally colonized peoples and the Canadian and international economic elite. While discourses surrounding internally colonized people in Canada are regularly couched in terms of “cultural conservation” and “suis generis” collective rights claims (generated from a different place than other constitutional rights) it is the case that most Canadians would define the First Nations, Inuit or Newfoundlander cultures (to be conserved) as pre-modern landscape essentialist cultures, and identify First Nations and Inuit “suis generis” collective rights as traditional cultural rights flowing from cultural understandings of regional ecology, lending them credibility as stewards of Canadian wilderness tracts. This thesis is about how these relationships between mainstream Canadians, their governments, and Inuit and Newfoundlander communities along the Northwest Passage have been constructed and resisted through the invocation of visual art as rhetoric. It will also consider the consequences of continuing to permit Canadian colonial landscape aesthetics to establish the parameters within which political negotiations between internally colonized peoples and the federal government of Canada are first presented, and then negotiated.
Founded by the iconic Group of Seven Painters separately, but simultaneously with, the experimental documentary film maker Robert Flaherty, in Toronto in 1920, the promulgation and reassertion of Canadian colonial visual aesthetics concerning First Nations, Inuit, and Newfoundlanders have historically followed Canadian and international economic interests in Northern North America, first west, then north, and northwest again. Like the parliamentary form of government seated in Ottawa, Canada’s visual landscape aesthetic is the product of a long European history, and is best understood as a continuation of the European political practice of invoking landscape visual art representations as rhetoric toward collective motive, defining and connecting cultural virtues to visual representations of physical geography. The first Chapter of this thesis will discuss some historic examples of European political invocation, aestheticization and naturalization of landscape portrayals as demonstrable political truths underlying nationalist sentiments largely drawn from the work of historian Simon Schama. With the use of Aristotelean rhetorical analyses supplemented by Kenneth Burke’s dramaturgical method, how the tumultuous immediate European and American pre-histories of “nature” (Darwin) and the “environment” (Mobius) informed Canadian colonial landscape art as rhetoric will be elucidated. While Burke’s dramaturgical method is meant for literary analyses, it includes a geographic sensibility that permits the contemplation of the relative importance of venue, whereas Aristotle and Marx provided little such guidance. This will be followed by a narrowing of focus to examine early European visual representations of the Northwest Passage and the Inuit, and the political and economic motivations of the Canadian elite of Toronto in 1920 concerning the former Rupert’s Land, the Arctic, and its people. In Canada, the
“Canadian wilderness” and “landscape essentialist pre-moderns,” (landscape essentialist pre-moderns will hereafter alternately be referred to as the “Folk” after Ian MacKay73), remain the demonstrable truths concerning colonized peoples and their territories. Terry Eagleton argues such demonstrable truths serve the function of “aestheticizing,” or mystifying, elevating, and naturalizing, the motives and ideas of the elite in their society.74 The argument developed herein is based in a Marxist analysis: that the Canadian wilderness and the “Folk” visual landscape art discourses function to aestheticize the material motivation for colonialism, which continues to be elite access to, and consequently control over, the exploitation of natural resources.

Chapters Two and Three will demonstrate the way in which these imported visual rhetorical discourses have developed and structured Canada’s internal colonial politics since the 1920s, supplying public support for the alienation of territory from, and the physical displacement of, internally colonized people. During the last half of the 20th Century, the Canadian administrative state expanded northward for resource and military reasons to encompass first the territory and then the marine and submarine resources of Newfoundland and Labrador and the Eastern Arctic. As the Canadian and international governing and economic classes looked north, the visual interventions of a number of mainstream Canadians, led by internationally heralded naturalist, Farley Mowat and later Paul Watson and Greenpeace, combined the “Folk” and the Canadian wilderness discourses, reconfiguring the visual pre-history of the new Canadian colonial landscape and its people, thereby producing a particularly Canadian sort of colonial “social contract.” This contract required the demonstrated acceptance of “the folk” and Canadian wilderness aesthetics by internally colonized peoples as pre-conditions for...
political support from mainstream Canadians. The segment concerning the Inuit and Newfoundlanders will be introduced with a brief exegesis of Jonathan Bordo’s 1987 article “Jack Pine or Erasure of the Aboriginal Presence?” in which he demonstrated the connection between the art of the iconic Group of Seven Painters and colonial visions of *terra nullius*, which was illustrated and disseminated nationally and internationally as the Canadian state expanded westward from Ontario in the first decades of the 20th Century. For Bordo, and for this thesis, 1920 marks the beginning of the visual landscape aesthetic mystification of the material motives for Canadian, as opposed to European, colonialism. These chapters will establish how the Canadian visual landscape aesthetic structured political discourses and mainstream/popular support for elite goals concerning the Inuit and Newfoundlanders as the Canadian administrative state expanded to include their homelands.

In Chapter 3, the origins and nature of Newfoundland visual arts traditions of political resistance, which arose against the federal community relocation programmes which attended the Canadian government’s changes to the structure of the North Atlantic cod fishery, northern defense, and Arctic resource exploitation in 1950’s, will be discussed. The “Resettlement Era,” as it is referred to in Newfoundland and Labrador, was a decades-long federal campaign to alienate entire Inuit and Newfoundlander communities from their territory. Farley Mowat, who had established a reputation as a naturalist and popular animal-relationships-with-people-writer before World War II, became enthralled with the idea of “the Folk” in the “Canadian wilderness,” believing that these cultures embodied the spiritual antitoxin to modernity after his traumatic service in the war. During the early 1950s, Mowat raised public awareness of the very
serious plight of the Caribou Inuit, and was deeply committed to documenting and saving “the folk” in the Arctic interior. He later joined the fight against Resettlement in Central Southern Newfoundland with the same motive, intensity and effectiveness.

Mowat’s beliefs that “the Folk” could be found in isolated communities beyond the taint of modernity, and his naturalist sensibilities concerning nature, were affected by the visions of Robert Flaherty and the Canadian Group of Seven Painters (and likely the pioneers of Northern North American folk studies, such as Helen Creighton) a generation before. Mowat’s combining of “the Folk” and the Canadian wilderness discourses created a sort of Canadian colonial social contract, which implicitly held that so long as the internally colonized people were seen to be living as “Folk”, they should be considered the rightful landscape essentialist (biocenoetic) stewards of the pristine Canadian wilderness. Mowat very publically lobbied to have these cultures (and their economic traditions) protected against change that might alter their biocenoetic mores.

Beginning in the 1950s, however, Mowat’s “Folk” began behaving as economically motivated communities, particularly making economic and political claims resisting federal regulatory control over natural resource development effecting their common, and very nearly exclusive economic foundations, the pack-ice seal hunt (fisheries) and the North Atlantic cod fishery. As the result of their resistance to the federal government’s alienation of their economic foundations, both the Inuit and Newfoundlanders were very publically renounced by Mowat for having abandoned their pre-modern, landscape essentialist moral understandings of the Canadian wilderness.

In the aftermath of Mowat’s public reversals in the late 1970s and 1980s, his colonial visual rhetorical discourses have nonetheless remained foundational, and
developed in ways that reaffirm mainstream assumptions concerning First Nations, Inuit and Newfoundlanders. Furthermore, it has become increasingly difficult for internally colonized peoples to challenge or oppose these mainstream cultural/moral assumptions without potentially suffering a loss of much needed mainstream public support when negotiating with the Canadian federal government. That the “Folk” and Canadian wilderness visual discourses of Mowat’s configuration have been enduring is witnessed by the travelling exhibits of The Group of Seven accompanied by scenes of a muctuc eating Governor General of Canada circulated internationally in 2013, after international economic interests in resource extraction from the Eastern Arctic and Newfoundland and contiguous waters, were rekindled. Indeed, visual images circulated by mainstream cultural producers continue to define and naturalize Mowat’s vision as a particularly Canadian colonial aesthetic.

This Canadian colonial aesthetic has evoked political responses and continued to develop since the last half of the 20th Century. After having been deemed “ignoble savages” by measure of this aesthetic, Inuit and Newfoundlander communities that drew a significant part of their livelihoods and important aspects of their lifestyles from the annual extension of the polar ice cap (“pack ice”) found themselves alienated from seasonal commercial activities on the ice. Actions against the seal hunt taken by far flung governments in Canada and abroad since the 1980s, witnessed a series of responses from Inuit and Newfoundlanders, and a rhetoric of solidarity arose surrounding the seal hunt and rejecting the Canadian and European discourses that entitled only “traditional” (Inuit cultural, historical) uses of ice-bound natural resources, a discourse that the Inuit and Newfoundlanders publically decried as racist.
By the early 1990s both the Inuit and Newfoundlanders had been mass-relocated and had their marine economies completely alienated by the Canadian administrative state, with mainstream national and international support. Beginning in the 1980s, many Inuit and Newfoundlander communities turned to “eco” (ecological) and cultural tourism, with the encouragement of (largely naturalist and anti-sealing) activists and provincial, territorial, and federal governments. The struggle for Inuit and Newfoundlander dissenters against Canadian colonial visual rhetoric intensified after many communities began invoking images of themselves in league with colonial visions for commercial tourism promotions, to attract much needed tourist dollars to these economically depressed regions. Cultural and ecological tourism have intensified colonial relations by requiring a further level of publically displayed cultural conformity amongst internally colonized peoples for mainstream consumption, and compelling the prioritization and conservation of marketable aspects of culture: the display and celebration of the quaint, or the pretty, omitting the ugly or the gritty. Periods of starvation, epidemics, conflict, and struggle are now either omitted from the public record, or presented as depoliticized traditional family hours in timeless, simple, peaceable kingdoms; mythological venues where landscape essentialist communities lived in harmony with nature and didn’t have a lot but were happy….

This cultural voyeurism is an extension of colonial relations aestheticized for ideological purposes in what is now Canada, produced by colonial explorers for European governments and private interests, such as the Hudson’s Bay Company and the British ships’ Captains who would establish regional rule and trade (annually) in Newfoundland harbours. Later, the Canadian Government would support private Arctic
mineral exploration in exchange for sovereignty asserting patrols (Bernier) and employ the RCMP, fine artists, and anthropologists to produce useful knowledge about colonized peoples and territories. The result was the production of information and policy influenced by European colonial assumptions and practices that enforced cultural conformity amongst the colonized as a precondition for the colonizers’ assistance with the amelioration of deteriorating material conditions after the processes of territorial alienation and resource expropriation had begun. Today, disrupting long-established relationships of cultural servility to colonial voyeurism for the sake of historical accuracy, cultural integrity, or to bring clarity to the rhetorical visions underlying ongoing negotiations between Ottawa and the peoples of the Canadianized Northwest Passage remains an intervention into regional, Canadian colonial and high-politics.

Historically, there have been members of internally colonized communities, led by visual artists and politicians, who have risen in resistance to the promulgation of the “Folk” and “Canadian wilderness” visual discourses concerning their cultures and economies. Concerned that the observable price exacted in exchange for economies dependent upon tourism may be cultural integrity and continuity, dissenting artists’ works and words renounce the static, disabling images and values presented by mainstream Canadian colonial noble savage/landscape essentialist imagery. These artists present dynamic cultures and demand to choose which portions of their traditional cultures to preserve and represent, and how, arguing that Inuit and Newfoundlanders should choose the nature of their relationship with modern technology and mainstream society. These alternative images emanating from the “Canadian wilderness” signal that the cultural changes brought to Inuit and Newfoundlanders
communities by cultural selection processes remain contentious, and that there is an ongoing struggle for the Canadian public’s support for internally colonized communities as they are, not as they have been imagined by countless influential outsiders. Dissenters from these internally colonized communities argue that their communities should be permitted to define and advance their cultural, political and economic positions without having to excuse or hide their 21st Century cultures and economic interests behind choreographed cultural reenactments.

Chapter Four of this thesis will discuss three resistant artistic rhetorical responses to Mowat’s configuration of the “the Folk” and Canadian wilderness discourses. Presented chronologically, the first response examined will be *we don’t live in snow houses now*, a book produced by the Inuit Art Cooperative of Arctic Bay in the 1970s, the second, a political painting exhibit by Lloyd Horwood that toured Northern Newfoundland during the 1990s, and *The Fast Runner*, a film produced in Nunavut in the 2000s. Each of these responses answered to waves of colonial visual rhetoric disseminated after public interest in these regions was roused by Canadian economic elites involved in international negotiations concerning jurisdictional control over the access to, and exploitation of, natural resources and transportation along the Northwest Passage.

During the past 60 years, dissenting visions produced by colonized peoples have been met with the constant reassertion of both the “Canadian wilderness” discourse and the “Folk”, in mass media, as negotiations pertaining to the allocation and exploitation of resources along the Northwest Passage continue. One such reiteration, originating in 1987 and republished in 1997, a pictorial retracing of sorts of Mowat’s
visitations of the Inuit and Newfoundland, will be examined to demonstrate how these reassertions have accounted for the impact of loss of the seal hunt (arguing that the seal hunt was a necessary evil, and is no longer necessary), while reclaiming the pre-modern mantle separately for Inuit and Newfoundlanders. *This Marvelous Terrible Place* will not only be used to illustrate the cultural selection practices and the reassertion of Mowat’s colonial contract. The photos and attendant narratives demonstrate the adjudication processes by which historic practices, events, and beliefs are interpreted, preserved and presented, in accordance with their perceived political or economic utility with reference to the colonizing culture. The authors’ confounding of notions of race and cultural essentialism continues to divide Inuit and European descendant Northwest Passage dwellers.

While the Inuit (through their development corporation) have officially rejected the racist terms upon which they have been granted privileged access to Central Canadian audiences, and a limited, traditional seal hunt, they have used that access in attempts to argue for support for a return to a commercial seal hunt, and to publicly redefine their culture and history away from the Canadian colonial visions. This even as Newfoundland’s northern sealing communities have been strategically carved away from the politics of the Northwest Passage by a flood of images supporting commercial tourism. Rebranded through visual campaigns promoting Newfoundland’s “Iceberg Alley,” the Great Northern Peninsula of the historic seal hunt now features the mythical remnants of the lost Norse culture in L’Anse-Aux-Meadows. Canadian naturalists, tourism promoters, and other cultural producers began portraying coastal Newfoundland as a quaint Celtic pre-modern “Folk” culture when the Irish membership
in the European Economic Community brought international investment and interest to all things Irish. Since the 2000s, tourism campaigns custom-designed for Central Canadian and North Eastern Seaboard American audiences have urged prospective vacationers to call Shamus or Sheila, so that they can escape into Canada’s remote and quaint Celtic backwater, filled with pre-modern people with ancient accents and red hair, surrounded by fjords, whales and icebergs. Mummering in Newfoundland, and hunting and consuming raw whale in Inuit communities, both practices once banned, became marketable. The shared economic history of Inuit and Newfoundlanders began to be expunged from the mainstream Canadian public imagination as the international contest over the resources beneath the Northwest Passage continued.²

Chapter 5 will discuss how “the Folk” and the “Canadian wilderness” visual imagery continues to affect ongoing political negotiations between the Canadian federal government and the peoples along the Northwest Passage. Internally colonized people seeking to rouse public support are increasingly making anti-colonial claims in cultural terms because Mowat’s terms of the Canadian colonial “contract” have been so fetishized that unadorned political economic claims made by colonized peoples are attacked as culturally impure (inauthentic or assimilated) or culturally contradictory (self-loathing or politically self-defeating). Thus the recent CBC Radio sponsorship and promotion of a northern wilderness writer retreat housed in a “base camp” established by the noble locals (Inuit) who live in landscape essentialist harmony with their geography, reinforces a number of tenets of Canadian colonial thought: that landscape essentialist re-connectivity and inspiration can be achieved via the conduits of pre-

²L’Anse Aux Meadows, usually featured along with the distant table-top mountains and fjords of Gros Morne National Park, is less than one half hour away from the much maligned, and rarely portrayed, sealing centre and seal interpretation museum of St. Anthony, and even closer to the shores of Labrador’s sealing communities.
modern guided cultural immersion, and that pre-modern noble cultures arise from unmediated understandings of awe-inspiringly beautiful, yet challenging physical geography.

Yet because Central Canadians, Europeans, and Americans are paying attention to the Canadian north as the international contest for resources under the Northwest Passage and Arctic Ocean continues, Inuit and Newfoundlanders are once again able to attract some interest and attention as they rail against mainstream ideas concerning their cultures and economies. Whether it is Miss Newfoundland 2010 declaring that she awaits her sealing license, or the 2014 Polaris Prize winner and Inuk, Tanya Tagaq stating in interviews that Canadians should support a commercial (rather than a traditional) seal hunt, not because it is an Inuit cultural practice, but rather because sealing is the harvest of a sustainable, renewable natural resource (as opposed to oil, implied), and that there is “no reason” why “everyone else can profit from the commercial exploitation of natural resources in Canada” yet Inuit cannot, and that while there is “a MacDonald’s on every corner” in southern Canada, seal hunters continue to be maligned while enduring economic hardship.75

Of course there is a reason, or rather, there are collections of reasons, why the Inuit and Newfoundlanders are locked into these colonial relations, and politically interested mainstream Canadians should understand how their continued uncritical adherence to the welded “Folk” and “Canadian wilderness” visual rhetorical discourses maintain and reinforce internal colonial economic relationships, that continue to structurally disadvantage Inuit and Newfoundlanders in negotiations concerning natural resource exploitation and transport in the Northwest Passage.
Chapter 1
Transplanting European Landscape Ideas to North America

During the 1980s and 90s images and ideas of noble savages in the Canadian wilderness, promulgated by urban artists, cultural producers and assorted professionals and political activists fostered public support for the deliberate alienation of colonized peoples’ economic foundations by the federal government of Canada. Images that portrayed First Nations, Inuit, and Newfoundlanders as living in remote timeless locations where they lived happy, “simple” lives of romanticized pre-modern poverty in sufficient isolation to preserve traditional mores became ubiquitous. Members of these communities often bristled against the uncomfortable implications of mainstream “noble savage” stereotypes, which held that they were somehow less capable of functioning in the “real”, modern world than other Canadians, who had nonetheless connected territorial and natural resource management and development claims made by colonized peoples to the maintenance of stereotypes generated through landscape art invoked as rhetoric.

The use of landscape imagery as the foundation for political claims is an ancient European practice. Historically, changing portrayals of European landscapes, and peoples with reference to them, have coincided with the mores, preferences, curiosities and political aspirations of the art consuming elite. The successful and continuous reassertion of the Folk and Canadian Wilderness aesthetics in concert with the expansion of the Canadian administrative state is the continuation of European visual art rhetorical traditions. Indeed, before there was a Canadian wilderness inhabited by
noble savages, there were similarly noble, isolated, impoverished and romanticized populations in rural France, Germany, and the United Kingdom.

As in Europe, North American landscape myths of origin were invented, disseminated, promoted, and protected to frame political-geographic senses of common identity and cause, during politically constitutive times. Such myths were promoted to visually anchor political rhetoric and create first premises for social theory. These visions continue to be successfully invoked as demonstrable truths during political deliberations. Understanding the results of the intertwining of landscape essentialism and noble savage myths in Canada first requires some appreciation of European landscape discourses, and how they arose in answer to the search for political myths of origins (usually nationalist). These myths changed as regional elites turned toward aesthetic justifications with attendant visual rhetoric to promote regional solidarity toward their goals. What follows is a brief discussion of the prehistory of North American’s landscape visual art as rhetoric as it developed in Europe.

There were three prominent European discourses during the period of transition from British colonial rule to early Canadian Confederation. The first, historically, was the longstanding pastoral tradition drawn from Arcadian and Christian myths, which became intricately associated with the 18th Century, preoccupation with the “sublime”, defined as a secular experience of transcendence, producing a landscape discourse referred to herein as “wilderness sublime.” The 19th Century had also seen the rise of an elite yearning to create or enclose therapeutic wilderness escapes away from grimy industrial cities which were understood to be venues of industrial and moral decay and disease. Early psychologists claimed that urban parks and rural settings would be
solace for upper class bosses and stressed out secretaries-workers would rather have “sandlots and playgrounds.” Finally, the publication of the arguably (functionally) “Godless” scientific works of Charles Darwin and Karl Mobius defined the new relationships between humanity, science and “nature” after the mid-19th Century, redefining both North American and European thought and artistic depictions concerning humanity’s appropriate relationship with “natural landscapes” and the “environment.”

In Europe, Arcadian and Christian mythology about forests has for millennia formed the foundational assumptions concerning the relationships between humanity and “nature.” Simon Schama claims in his *Landscape and Memory*, “[N]ot all cultures embrace nature and landscape myths with equal ardor, and those that do, go through periods of greater and lesser enthusiasm,” he nonetheless notes that landscape metaphors…”have surprising endurance through the centuries and their power to shape institutions that we still live with.” Schama effectively establishes the relative importance and connection between European historical and early North American landscape thought. The evidence I have found in Canada conforms to Schama’s analysis, and I believe speaks to the strength of the nature and landscape related preoccupations of Europeans and Canadians during the colonial periods studied in this thesis.

Schama sources a number of North American landscape traditions, particularly those which have elevated forests to nationalist importance for (historic) Germanic culture. Germanic tribes before the Roman Empire had claimed (according to the Herzfeld Codex of 4th Century) to have sprung from the soil of Germania. During the
Roman Empire, however, Tacitus wrote of these enemies of Rome as “bloody minded barbarians”\(^\text{80}\) and portrayed the battles waged by Ceasar’s armies as “wood against marble, iron against gold; fur against silk, brutal seriousness against irony; bloody minded tribalism against legalistic universalism.”\(^\text{81}\) The German tribes’ myths of origin were interpreted through Tacitus’ writings for centuries, thus the Germanic peoples became known as uncivilized, culturally bereft, unbathed (a popular Roman slur), masculinized barbarians.

In what Schama refers to as the process of “cultural reafforestation,”\(^\text{82}\) he discusses the influence of Celtis, who in the first decades of the 16\(^\text{th}\) Century “reimagined Neuremburga” to include “the virtues of the German woods, especially the Hercynian forest.” Yet because much of the pre-Roman Germanic history had been destroyed, Celtis’ project of cultural redefinition became a matter of “artistic memory.”\(^\text{83}\) In Celtis’ Germanic forest, there were “no hairy German wildmen;” rather, this version of the historic Germanic tribes was “tame, with more ‘civilized’ versions of noble nakedness, not unlike depictions of early Christians,”\(^\text{84}\) roaming the sacred forests of Germania. An artistic depiction of this is German Arcadia, Altdorf’s 1510 *Saint George and the Dragon*, which graces the cover of Schama’s book, the Hercynian, Germanic, forest appears, as Schama proclaims, “a vegetable world of holy heroism.”\(^\text{85}\) By the 17\(^\text{th}\) Century, Celtis’ noble German savages were portrayed as anti-Roman heroes, and Roman ruins were depicted as disintegrating in the depths of lush Hercynian forests.\(^\text{86}\) Schama states that Celtis’ reafforestation became history, then art history, and then the foundation of German nationalism, because there was no other means of political expression to affirm the status of the German collective toward political action.\(^\text{87}\)
After establishing how a particular landscape, the German Arcadia, became a necessary national political memory (a nationalist myth of origin) in Germany, Schama moves across the ocean to the United States of America.

In the opening decades of the 19th Century, “beauty laid in the comprehensive clearing of trees and “red men” west of the coastal cities in the United States of America.”88 The American ideal of the national park was drawn from the Scottish capitalist enlightenment ideals, which initially held that clearing wilderness was character building, but later that “returning” the land to nature was an act of noble stewardship, accomplished by kicking out agricultural tenants, in favour of the reversion of the land to “wild” deer parks for the enjoyment of gentry.89 By mid-century, American tourists drawn from the urban (largely New York) elite would travel west in search of therapeutic sylvan experience as their nation wound toward civil war. These urbanites found their sacred sylvan tract in Yosemite’s stands of giant sequoias, which they lobbied their federal government to save intact.90 After successfully appealing to the press, photographer Charles Weed accompanied his photos of Yosemite sequoias with newspaper and magazine articles that documented the probable age of the trees, establishing them as contemporaries to Christ. Newspapers picked up on the discourse, and throughout the Civil War, Yosemite’s sequoias “became a symbol of a landscape that was beyond the reach of sectorial conflict, a primordial place of such transcendent beauty that it proclaimed the gift of the Creator to his new Chosen people.”91

On July 1, 1864, in the midst of his country’s Civil War, Abraham Lincoln created the world’s first wilderness park with a Bill “denying areas of natural beauty to the fate of private enterprise.”92 These sequoias were later joined by California red woods and
became national and nationalist emblems, and giant tree stands became the natural cathedrals of Manifest Destiny. The woods had become the “true free constitution of America; masculine, free, battle-scarred, lasting, towering, and harboring the chosen.”

Later, in the early twentieth century, American Naturalists found sympathy with Walt Disney and the Rockefeller family whilst lobbying for the preservation of what they saw as the few and dwindling unspoilt natural (biological) communities and regions in the United States. Theirs were largely visual arts based campaigns, and partly as a result of these campaigns, humanity was progressively perceived as the expropriating, polluting, primary threat to the beauty in diversity of a threatened, fragile and beautiful American “nature.” Yet, as Wiener notes, “one person’s “virgin nature” was another’s inhabited landscape, class interests intruded into the process of defining “virgin nature” and assisted in directing the “appropriation of desirable, inhabited tracts of land for the recreational desires of elites.” American National Parks Service Superintendent just after the turn of the century, Stephen Mather, saw the national parks as “national museums of our American wilderness,” and “primeval galleries of American scenery” … “conveniently forgetting centuries of Native North American presence.” Later, in Yellowstone, First Nations, (“Indians”) were deemed such a threat to tourists’ tranquility that the army kicked them out.

By the end of the 19th Century, English landscaped gardens had been transformed from historic and refined cultural landscapes to “wilderness” parks. In Britain, Naturalists also found common cause with those who decried the elimination of much of Britain’s natural forests, and rallied to evict “cottagers” (poor semi urban squatters) off of commons in order to preserve “natural” areas.
Schama and Wiener establish the wilderness park traditions in the United States of America as analogous to the landscape myth of origin created for Germanic peoples under Celtis. The difference between the European and North American traditions is that on the North American landscape racialized Aboriginal peoples, as opposed to tenant farmers or the rural poor, were subject to removal from the land as the professed needs and tastes of the urban elites changed.

Changes wrought to European societies during the 18th and 19th Centuries went far beyond mere changes in taste amongst the elite. Scientific thought during the 19th Century shook the European understanding of “nature”, and God, no less than the Lisbon Earthquake of 1755.

Largely credited to the 1859 publication of Darwin’s *Evolution of Species* and the 1877 publication of Karl Mobius’ PhD thesis; the study of oyster farms in which he first elaborated the theory of Biocenoesis, European thinkers would generate a number of theories to resituate humanity’s relationship with “nature,” “God,” and “wilderness.” At the time, most of Europe was religiously Christian (although divided amongst denominations), and according to the tenets of Judeo-Christianity, humanity had been created in God’s image, and was meant to righteously rule over the earth.

Darwin’s theories of evolution and sexual (natural) selection of 1859 changed the nature of the human agent and disrupted the religiously sanctioned natural hierarchy in Christian Europe, (as well as North America), by placing “man” as the direct descendant of apes. Darwin’s theories also undermined hierarchies within society, between races, classes, and sexes. Darwin’s natural competition and selection was teleological in nature; that is, Darwin assumed not only ongoing natural change, but natural change
that would necessarily result in *improvement*, that is, “progress.” Darwin’s theory hailed the broad acceptance of scientific achievement as the trusted measure of human achievement, and scientific/empirical evidence, the observable truth, as the Truth. At the turn of the 20 Century, “progress” was a common Western European underlying assumption concerning human potential. Hegel, Marx, Mill, Darwin, and even Nietzsche are thinkers indebted to an assumed correspondence between change and progress, usually explained with a teleological explanation drawn from an essential claim concerning “human nature.”

Darwin’s repositioning of humanity also brought to the fore a number of questions that had not previously been posed; such as, how much like us are other primates? Other mammals? Could they have souls? (How) do animals feel pain? And most importantly, (how) are we to understand our relation to “nature” beyond claims to human exceptionality based in an assumed relationship with God?  

Contending scientific responses to Darwin’s challenge to contemporary religious ideas about human history and the human relationship to nature arose, entailing new scientific methods.

The first notable scientific response to Darwin flowed from zoology and botany, and was later dubbed “environmental sciences”, and as a political entity, “environmentalism.” These scientists categorized animals by their internal anatomy and external visual appearance; their illustrations rendered “precisely to represent nature itself.” Reflecting their strong empiricist assumptions, the scientific illustrations by and for environmental scientists were rendered in great detail, so as to illuminate differences between similar species, their studies were often of only a few
individuals of any particular species, and examples were usually visually isolated from potentially confusing or camouflaging contexts, with such information appended in text.\textsuperscript{104} Today, field guides are often arranged in this fashion, with scientific information gleaned for human use, holding the object of study at an observable distance. Objectivity for these scientists meant detaching human interests from the study of plants and/or animals, and studying each so as to discern and describe its characteristics and interests, that is, “for its own sake.”\textsuperscript{105}

By contrast, Naturalists studied “the whole animal world with detached curiosity” whilst “delighting in the world’s diversity.”\textsuperscript{106} Their standards of scientific objectivity made these scientists reluctant to judge the natural world by human standards.\textsuperscript{107} A predator, for example, could not be considered to have motives, or interests, rather than instincts. The field illustrations of Naturalists were (are) of animals \textit{in situ}, and naturalist descriptions of group dynamics amongst animals often borrowed descriptive social organizational language from anthropology.

In 1877, Karl Mobius, a Berlin zoologist, introduced his theory of biocenoesis and it quickly became the scientific rival to Darwin’s natural selection. Biocenoesis rejected the progressive assumptions of Darwin’s theories, but did not dispute Darwin’s theory of evolution. Mobius’ theory of biocenoesis holds that there are natural communities of associated species which create and maintain an interspecies balance within variously designated geographical-biological zones.\textsuperscript{3} Quests for the restoration or achievement of balance in or with nature originate with Mobius’s theory.

\textsuperscript{3}Science practiced assuming the machinations of biocenoesis later gave rise to the integrated scientific model which included post Linnaeus botanists (as students of plant communities) and naturalists (as students of animal communities) under the umbrella of “Ecology.”
While the nascent kernels of new sciences contributed to the expression of America’s budding nationalist yearning for a myth of origin in Americans Yosemite, Canadians were reaching for their own national myths of origin, in part in response to the strong expansionist sentiments of the Americans to the south.

Canada’s historical landscape myths of origin were created as the Canadian Pacific Railroad wound west at the turn of the 20th Century. While perhaps slightly less aesthetically motivated than the natural parks lobbying in the United States of America, Canada’s first National Parks were designed to deliver elite tourists to Banff and Jasper, the new and exclusive Canadian Pacific Railroad tourist destinations, as part of a negotiated deal that saw the private railroad company build Canada’s promised rail link to Victoria, British Columbia108 (the Railway held exclusive access to the mountain parks and through the mountains to Victoria until 1920 and 1923 respectively). The Group of Seven was intimately involved with the territorial expansion of the Canadian administrative state westward, and the inclusion of the west into Canada’s national consciousness as a part of the “new modern landscape art tradition for a new and modern nation.”109 These painters, I will argue, were central to establishing the necessary national political memory vested in a particular landscape history for the Canadian elite. A century later these landscape paintings remain the aesthetic landscape vision of Canada.

Members of The Group of Seven Painters shared in the defining nationalist and international sentiments and struggles of the Western world in their times. Most of the Group’s members volunteered in World War I, and saw battle before being reassigned to war artistry. During the 1920’s, they became internationally acclaimed, as Canada’s
leading modern landscape painters. The acceptance of their nationalist modern landscape vision, along with Flaherty’s romantic landscape essentialism and the invention and growth of Eastern Seaboard folklore studies, would combine to heavily influence Farley Mowat, who grew up in the direct aftermath of World War I.

Naturalist, Farley Mowat as a young man had established himself as a writer of man-in-nature and man-and-animal stories for mass circulation magazines such as Reader’s Digest before WWII. Mowat returned to Canada from military service in WWII a damaged man. For the next three decades, Mowat attempted to rekindle his own hope in humanity by attempting to find isolated Canadian pre-modern communities, and twice, once in the Arctic and once in Borgeo, Newfoundland, he believed he had found them.

Mowat was both prolific and publically and politically influential, reshaping Canadian ideas concerning the Arctic and Newfoundland throughout his career. He documented and published his research and political positions in collaborations with photographers, fine artists, on film, in book form, and through high profile political campaigns. Most germane for this thesis are his 1950’s books concerning the Caribou Inuit, his 1960s to 1980s volumes concerning outport Newfoundland, and his 1984 Sea of Slaughter and 1990 Rescue the Earth: Interviews with Green Crusaders. In these works, Mowat documented a season of travelling and living with the now extinct Caribou Inuit, and later defended of his personal credibility concerning those Inuit, and of life in outport Newfoundland.

Until 1968, Mowat was enthralled with the notion that isolated pre-modern communities still existed in North America, and these noble communities could be
trusted to live in harmony with nature, thus preserving the Canadian “wilderness.” After 1968, Mowat believed that wilderness had to be depopulated to be pristine. Upon abandoning his search for the “Folk”, Mowat began publically supporting Greenpeace and later the Sea Shepherd Society as they began their anti-nuclear testing and marine mammal animal rights campaigns. In his 1984 *Sea of Slaughter*, Mowat wrote an angry documentary (of sorts) of the centuries-long decline of North Atlantic marine life. The book was quantitatively well researched and documented a number of tragic species reductions and extinctions in the western North Atlantic Ocean. At a rhetorical level, Mowat openly referred to species of marine mammals as “nations” and railed against modern humanity as inevitably destructive and morally undeserving of any benefits from “nature.” From the mid-1970s onward, Mowat, Greenpeace, and later the Sea Shepherd Society combined anti-nuclear activism, ecology, and mass produced visual arts campaigns anthropomorphizing large marine mammals (especially seals and whales) to gain popular support for their lobbying of the Canadian Federal Government to end the hunting of marine mammals in Canadian waters. Later in his life, Mowat’s naturalism became a radical ecological vision that excluded humanity from the Canadian wilderness altogether, producing a version of wilderness protection available only to the wealthy. Through his Nova Scotia Land Trust created in 2007 with the announced motives of protecting his “pristine” Cape Breton coastline tract from future human interference by donating it to the province, Mowat supported the establishment of many such Land Trusts (with charitable status) that would support elite designated and donated wilderness conservation areas in perpetuity. As a Member of Parliament, Justin Trudeau, now the leader of the Liberal Party of Canada, endorsed Mowat’s Land
Trust, the creation of which reestablished the Canadian practice of giving the middle and upper classes exclusive decision making powers as to which landscapes should be exalted, preserved, and why, protecting elite landscape aesthetics, definitions, and decisions from any sort of scientific or democratic review. As has been the case historically in Canada, when defining and designating “wilderness,” Land Trusts envision neither acknowledgement nor discussion of the history or fates of the First Nations or, in this case, the Acadians, who had land-use histories in the region.

At the turn of the 20th Century the largest Canadian cities (especially Toronto, St. John, Montreal and Halifax) had slums. A rash of poverty related diseases generated number of municipal and charitable responses to industrial poverty, smog and disease, such as the Social Gospel movement and the Home Economics movement. Early 20th Century Europeans, Canadians and American Eastern Seaboard dwellers with sufficient means began seeking escapes from 20th Century urban modernity; commercial, epistemological, and political methods to reconnect with “Mother Nature,” for respite. This continued in various forms for decades, and the rise of political environmentalism in the last half of the Century reinforced the public yearning to better understand what was perceived to be a diminishing and imperiled “wilderness.” A few of these re-connective methods have welded themselves to Canadian ideas that reinforce the complex colonial wilderness aesthetic.

One such method was developed by Arne Naess, the founder of the Deep Ecology movement in 1973. His claim was that “through self-discipline we render our vision of nature less blurry and hope by virtue of the ‘correspondence rules’ we internalize to arrive at an understanding of the external world by erecting a monadic self
into the measure of all things."\textsuperscript{111} Naess, a Norwegian philosopher and mountaineer, described the sublime wilderness experience as both rapturous epiphany and episteme. Following Naess, Wilson’s \textit{Biophilia} would elaborate a psychology for Deep Ecology, asserting that “eons of interaction had given rise to a deep, genetically based emotional need to affiliate with rest of living world” amongst human beings.\textsuperscript{112} Each granted a privileged epistemological status to “indigenous or pre-capitalist/pre-modern judgments” which they perceived to be “better and more harmonious practices and beliefs” for humanity within nature.\textsuperscript{113} This ecological adaptation of landscape essentialism toward a rhetorical proof concerning the necessity of radical ecology contains a certain type of “enforced localism,”\textsuperscript{114} that answers questions such as “What is the scale of an eco-zone, a Bioregion, a Place, a Human Community?”\textsuperscript{115} and “How do we establish who or what must be guarded against (which “others” must be guarded against?)”\textsuperscript{116} with reference to pre-modern landscape essentialist cultural or spiritual mediation, knowledge, or guidance. It is this mediational role granted to “Folk” wisdom that set the stage for a popularization of eco-cultural tourism amongst North Americans trying to re-connect with “nature.”

In Canada, in the last half of the 20 Century, escapes into “nature” became more popular as environmental movements grew and urbanization processes continued. Simultaneously, the turn to eco-tourism in the Eastern Arctic and Newfoundland was encouraged by federal, territorial and provincial development policies and international tourism advertisement that was co-funded by the federal government of Canada until 2013. Such policies motivated many Inuit and Newfoundland communities after the economic drubbing encountered as the result of Canadian and international policies
concerning resources extracted from Canadian territorial waters. Yet while many local artists defended their communities’ economic foundations as “cultural” or as struggling “ways of life,” and proclaimed solidarity with other newly annexed groups suffering the same fate, others artists and cultural producers pursued the potential for ecological and cultural tourism hoping to establish new economic engines for their communities. Internal divisions within communities continued as the transition to tourism-based economies necessitated what Ian MacKay calls “cultural selection” processes.

For Eastern Arctic and Newfoundland communities, the tourists that they could hope to attract are Central Canadian and Eastern American Seaboard urbanites, and what they want to see are what MacKay refers to as “Folk” culture. The “Folk” are the pre-modern, landscape essentialist noble creatures that spring from the North American adaptation of modern European urban-escape fantasies. In his *The Quest of the Folk: Antimodernism and Cultural Selection in Twentieth Century Nova Scotia*, MacKay traces how Helen Creighton, a young professional journalist of a wealthy commercial Halifax family, became a research engine for New York academics and magazines during the 1920s and 1930s, creating a vision of South Shore and Cape Breton Island Nova Scotians that conformed to the New York elite yearning to discover a rustic, pre-modern setting peopled by naïve, morally uncorrupted, landscape essentialist “Folk.” In his words, “Creighton and countless other cultural figures develop[ed] “the Folk”… “They, as cultural producers, pursuing their own interests and expressing their own view of things, constructed the Folk of the countryside as the romantic antithesis of everything they disliked about urban and industrial life.” Creighton’s research was framed by established European and American thought concerning remote rural
communities, “that there was within the population a subset of persons set apart, the Folk, characterized by their own distinctive culture and isolated from the modern society around them.” Creighton’s folklore collection and interpretation created landscape essentialist histories that became the cultural core of the mythological history of rural Nova Scotians, which was transformed, after World War II, to the commercialized image of Nova Scotia presented to tourists by the provincial government. MacKay noted the “extraordinary extent to which a tourism-oriented politics entailed the willful eradication of a challenging past,” which in the end seemed to produce a history which “was perceived, by insiders as well as outsiders, as a cozy conservatism,” which was at odds with the regional reality during the 1970s and 80’s which was, in MacKay’s words, “alive with the struggles-against the war machine, environmental devastation, racism and exploitation.” In response to the social contradictions that he observed, MacKay investigated the affectations of the “Tourist Gaze” on popular culture in answer to the question:

Why would so many people, in what was plainly a modern, class divided society engaged with all the burning questions of the day, buy into a patronizing and reactionary vision of their own past-in essence, take up positions within a vast state-sponsored historical fiction, one that awkwardly erased oppositional people and unpleasantly conflictual moments? To the extent that art history is acknowledged art history, kitsch, folk art, and crafts, produced by MacKay’s “Folk”, rural, uneducated, primary production or remote workers, remain largely ignored or apocryphal to most aesthetic accountings of art and history. These cases of omission typically remain unchallenged until the elite’s (owners of capital and capital equipment; the means of production, and governing agencies
that administer society so as to defend, by various means, private property rights. Interest in the regional underclass is roused, as the result of the elite’s changing material priorities, and the underclasses must then produce a version of themselves that can survive under these newly dictated conditions. Every permutation achieved to appease changed elite priorities results in changes within the underclasses’ cultures. According to Marx, “each generation changes the sensuous world around them, as well as the sense of history, from and beyond the last, and changes the social system according to changed needs.”

The elite and the underclasses are perpetually in internal and relational flux. The more thorough the changes demanded of the underclass in order to respond to new elite needs, the more likely it is that current dominant ideology, (social theoretical narratives which explain and conserve the status quo), may be insufficient to rationalize the gaps between elite theory and underclass experience without challenge. The fourth chapter of this thesis will investigate what some of these challenges have looked like.

The extension of mediating capabilities to “the Folk” could have implications for aesthetic ideology, which excludes “kitsch”, folk art, commercial art, and handicrafts, by invoking the rhetorical means by which ruling class identifications define visual art and artists. Recognizing some “Folk Art” as a subcategory of “Art, like recognizing some landscapes as beautiful and worth preserving, while rejecting others, had to thus remain the prerogative of the elite, one that prescribes the necessary cultural selection for the prospective artists and communities that wish to attain elite patronage. This was accomplished during the 1980s and 1990s through ideological funding, and funding cuts, to museums and galleries (and many other cultural agencies).
Removing the “Folk” from folk art and historiography

When outport communities called upon academics and students of art and journalism at the newly founded Memorial University in St, John’s to intervene on their behalf against the Newfoundland and Canadian government campaigns to depopulate Newfoundland’s coastline, the response changed the course of history and the culture of the province, and cemented the place of visual arts in the politics of Newfoundland within Canada.

The evidence of these struggles is most easily viewed in rural museums that must attempt to counter and compete with the draw of the large urban museums and galleries, such as St. John’s’ “The Rooms,” which offers the officially promoted provincial art and cultural history to business travelers and tourists, in an attractive, curated, efficiently organized and commercially oriented venue.

The interpretive and economic struggles of Newfoundland folk museums vis-à-vis large urban museums, national and international political lobbyists, can be partially understood as struggles concerning “authorization,” with the urban elite interpreting rural history in ways that promote their preferred understanding of the historical relationship between them and the “Folk.” The sealing industry and seal hunt and whaling industry are therein presented by the urban elite as historic attributes of historic and rural lifestyles, not the evidence and product of long histories of exploitative relations between them and rural Newfoundlander, upon which (their) urban wealth was built. In urban museums, such as The Rooms in St. John’s, sealers and whalers
appear as noble historic savages, who lived in a time and place completely apart from St. John’s.

Small rural venues’ beginnings are often local and tourism focused, and they are usually either part of socialized cost-recovery cultural/historical projects, or a venue created and maintained to support local artists and artisans while disseminating local historical and cultural information. Many smaller venues perform all of these tasks for their community, as well as provide seasonal employment for locals, especially youth or displaced traditional workers, (these venues are usually seasonal). As with the Lewisporte, By the Bay Museum, and the South Dildo Sealing and Whaling Museum, small venues generally do not have stable core funding for permanent professional curatorial staff. Lewisporte, by far the larger centre, has had some funding for curation over the years, but usually shows or exhibits have been “pitched” by local artists to the board, or by the board to local artists (themed shows). Shows have been awarded to the winners of juried competitions or correspond with the coordinates of available funding grants from various levels of government. If the provincial government wishes to advertise a particular aspect of local culture or history, then most small museums are willing to partly or wholly temporarily transform their space to conform to the required funding parameters. This sort of provincially funded “cultural selection” removes authorial control from local populations, and such arrangements usually benefit the institution by either adding to the quantity or quality of the permanent collection or by funding the care and/or collection and display of certain types of artifacts, or by subsidizing the maintenance of the venue.
The South Dildo Museum exhibits a collection of locally donated artifacts accompanied by typewritten, unpublished local histories, with a small area to sell merchandise at the entrance. The museum is located in a defunct one-room schoolhouse that was purchased by a local family so that the town could preserve its history. The entry cost is nominal. The average size of coastal villages in Newfoundland remains under 500, as is the case of South Dildo, Lewisporte is unique in that its population numbers about 3000. Nonetheless, due to their small populations and marginal economies, neither towns’ museum is self-supporting. Funding must be found from afar. Nonetheless, in Lewisporte and South Dildo, one can observe obvious ongoing visual resistance to the typical treatment received by rural Newfoundlander in “official” Newfoundland and Canadian visual arts representations, even though since 1983 this has become progressively more difficult for small communities to accomplish.

In 1983, John Mc Avity, the executive director of the Canadian Museums Association wrote, “The era of growth and expansion of the last 2 decades is clearly over and today we face the realities of a new era-cutbacks in grants and donations, mounting museum deficits, reduction of programmes and the shelving of very deserving plans. It is ironic that these are happening without any apparent reduction in our attendance.” In 1982-1983, 50% of all Canadian museum directors left their positions. By 2011, however, after another round of harsh cuts in the 1990s, falling attendance “since 1989” at North American museums had been noted.

In 1995-1996 the Canadian Museums Association Programming federal funding was further cut by 38%, and another rash of director resignations followed, creating a turmoil “reminiscent of 1992-1983.” Diminished government funding had led to the
pursuit of private-public co-funding arrangements (partnerships) and the political administration of funds from varying levels of government was used to attract private co-funding. Many small museums in Canada that do/ did not reflect popular Canadian political cultural assumptions, or the narratives of the incumbent elite and government, have been defunded, and closed, in the aftermath of the 1980’s and 1990’s cuts.  

Until the restructuring of government funding, the traditional mandate of public education toward civilized ideas and mores went largely unchallenged in Canadian museums, and the perennial vexatious problem was how to attract the broader public in order to educate them. The museum/gallery viewer or audience began gaining more attention from museum boards, curators and funders for both theoretical and economic reasons after 1983. Qualitative measurements of “success” were partially forfeited in favour of quantitative measures for the sake of appeasing private sponsors and/or political funders, which in turn led to museum studies including the studies of the viewing public or audience, in order to learn about their educational and recreational preferences and cultural consumption habits. The funding gap between “Folk” museums and urban museums, in mission, focus, and funding has only grown since these changes. The museums found in large centres reflect the necessity of large, temporary, “infotainment” exhibitions, meant to draw cultural tourists, and funding through the incorporation of commercial venues, such as gift shops, cafes, as well as internet terminals and virtually guided tours of electronically interactive exhibits as parts of packaged museum “experiences.” Today’s urban museum displays are “spatially designed to facilitate a consuming, rather than a learning, public.129

1Two telling examples of defunding-closures are those of the only Ontario Poorhouse Museum in Kars, Ontario in the early 2000’s (as Conservatism consolidated in that area of rural Southern Ontario and the closure of the Shandro Heritage Museum in North Eastern Alberta, during the same period.
Small rural museums such as the ones discussed herein are neither spatially nor economically capable of providing the commercially packaged “museum experiences” that cultural tourists have come to expect. 25% of all small, rural museums in Canada closed between 1983 and 2010. With the end of Federal government funding for tourism in Canada in 2014, more rural museums will predictably be forced to either cater to the dictates of cultural tourism in order to endure. This, in turn, will require further cultural selection processes that would eliminate the preservation and presentation of political counter-cases to Canadian mainstream ideas concerning regional political economic history.

The sorts of cultural selection processes necessitated by economic hardship in conjunction with the demands of attracting ecological and cultural tourists away from larger centres are guided by the knowledge that cultural tourists do not pay to view unadorned modern politics, pollution, or poverty. Tourists pay to view cultural quaintness and historical fiction as the depoliticized contemporary cultural reality of exploited and poor people. Any host community must seem happy by dint of their connection to ancient cultures, they must be “Natural” people, “the timeless keepers of nature’s secrets.” Both cultures and their relations are distorted by this process. “Tourism promotions teach the tourists how to see, and the tourist attracting region’s people how to be.” This defines the asymmetric nature of the cultural exchange begotten of cultural tourism, a slice of politically cleansed cultural experience for much needed currency. In “Postcards from the Andes: the politics of representation in a reimagined Peru, "Teresa E.P. Delphin explores the way in which a particularly “depoliticized landscape is presented to tourists, and banked on by the state,” even as
the American military maintains extraterritorial vigilance, and often overt control over what it terms as dangerous internal “political division, terrorism and poverty”\textsuperscript{135} in the same territory. Such bifurcated visions, which include traditional societies living in untrammeled natural settings made unsafe by ignoble “insurgents” who must be guarded against for everybody’s safety, attract travel and tourism money to many similarly situated regions and nations, while granting wealthy tourists a positive vision of their, (and their governments’), political and economic role in the world, producing an ideologically positive feedback loop in the politics of the wealthy, and in the economies of tourist attracting regions. For Inuit and Newfoundlanders, this is the nature of the relationships between their small, remote, hometowns and the people and governments of Central Canadian and American Eastern Seaboard tourists.

Tourism centred politics and voyeurism, are extensions of the same colonial impulse,\textsuperscript{136} with changes of scene that are negotiated politically, rhetorically, between the socio-economic elite and the remainder of society-be they near or far away. In North America these attentions have been historically led by commercial interests studying peoples for exploitative purposes. Since Flaherty’s documentary \textit{Nanook of the North}, the Inuit and other Northern peoples have been studied with particular attention to cultural differences from the (urban) mainstream, and analyzing and adjudicating which practices are moral, and which constitute hindrances to (the studied populations’) socio-economic and/or moral development. Helen Creighton, the early Canadian folk-studies pioneer established poor rural Nova Scotians as “folk” through similar processes, and later Diamond Jenness’ anthropological studies and Farley Mowat’s writings about the Inuit and Newfoundlanders would do the same.
Mainstream academics, politicians and cultural producers have developed markets for their interpretations of these cultures, including a market catering to commercial interests, much as Flaherty did in the 1910s, and markets for cultural/ecological tourism from Ontario and the Eastern Seaboard of the United States of America. These interpretations of culture express social relations that are the ideological foundations of the political economics of alienation, territorial expansion in the creation of Canadian political geography. The cultural contradictions brought to both Inuit and Newfoundlanders as they attempt to negotiate Northwest Passage resource extraction agreements that don’t further disadvantage their peoples are daunting. The present politics of tourism is still underpinned by the assumptions of landscape essentialism allotted to Inuit and Newfoundlanders by the Canadian Group of Seven Painters, Flaherty, Mowat and modern ecologists. In an effort to better understand the struggles of these colonized peoples, like MacKay and Wiener, I believe that “we need to negotiate beyond assertions of ecological communities or biocenoses, and our uses of humans and nature politically,” and to retrieve what MacKay calls the “transformative potential” of thoroughly researched, documented, unenriched and uncleaned cultural histories of the rural working populations of Canada.

Some Eastern Arctic and outport Newfoundland artists and politicians have been attempting to conserve and retrieve the transformative potential of their cultures for decades, against a background of growing remote community reliance on tourism. This thesis will discuss and analyze imagery invoked by cultural producers in relation to larger colonial discourses.
Chapter 2
The Invention of the Canadian Inuit

This chapter poses and attempts to answer the question: How do the prominent, naturalized European visual landscape rhetorical discourses; the “Folk” and the “Canadian wilderness”, affect ongoing political negotiations between the Canadian federal government and the internally colonized peoples along the Northwest Passage?

Answering these questions will begin by examining the molding and invention of the Canadian Inuit in the image of European “Folk” (landscape essentialist pre-moderns) tradition by Robert Flaherty in his experimental modern documentary film, Nanook of the North, first screened in Toronto in 1920. Flaherty's Nanook was not alone on Toronto’s modern visual art scene in 1920. The Group of Seven Canadian Painters were also exhibiting their overtly rhetorical, nationalist, modern paintings. Their paintings presented a depopulated pristine “wilderness” vision of newly annexed Canadian territories, that welded modern landscape images to the European colonial terra nullius legal tradition, which held that land not permanently inhabited and/or improved (by agriculture or industrial development) is “empty,” and thus ripe for colonization. How and why, politically, economically and socially, these two visual rhetorical discourses became the touchstones for the politics of internal colonization in Canada (the territorial expansion of the Canadian administrative state) will be considered to lay the foundation for understanding how visual rhetoric has become the public face, so to speak, of the political struggles and negotiations between the Government of Canada and the peoples of the Northwest Passage: Inuit and Newfoundlanders.
The Canadian federal government has been creating Arctic National Parks for Inuit communities to manage and parading support for traditional Inuit culture before the media in hopes of laying the legal bases for sovereignty claims to control and benefit from exploration drilling permits beneath the Arctic Ocean and future transportation corridors through the Northwest Passage. It is both possible and probable that Eastern Arctic Inuit and Northern Newfoundlander communities will never benefit from the planned resource development and transportation bonanza being negotiated at the national and international level as the NorthWest Passage becomes navigable. Understanding the history of these visual arts discourses, and how they continue to affect Canadian politics, both domestic and international, should help mainstream Canadians understand how to shape their political opinions and actions regarding the ongoing, high-stakes, political pageantry that naturalizes this preservation of systemic disempowerment amongst these Northern peoples.

Canada’s interest and claims along the Northwest Passage are more recent, more purely exploitative, and more culturally transformative to colonized communities than many southern or urban Canadians likely understand. Viewed through the prism of landscape art as rhetoric, the resettlement era of the 1940’s and 1950’s in the Eastern Arctic and Newfoundland constitute a single, large, administrative expansion of the Canadian state into the Northwest Passage. This chapter will identify the place of Robert Flaherty’s *Nanook of the North* within the movement of this Canadian visual art rhetoric while discussing the relocation of the people of Inukjuak, Nunavik, and then move to some discussion of the influence and repercussions of Farley Mowat’s writings concerning the Caribou Inuit during the 1950’s and 60’s to both Canadian public policy
and Inuit culture. From the Arctic to Newfoundland, this thesis will follow Mowat’s search for landscape-essentialist pre-modern cultures, and the economic consequences left to these communities in the wake of the great ecologist.

Canada’s visual art history as colonial history begins with what is now Canada as British North America and New France, and the exploitation of the resources of these colonies to enrich competing global colonial empires.

The first European drawings emanating from Northern North America were produced by crewmembers, captains and soldiers beginning in the 16th Century for European audiences interested in evident natural resources and prospective transportation routes. While not artists, these men were trained by European artists to draw landforms, nautical charts, cityscapes and fortifications so as to assess the location and accessibility of natural resources for the exploitation of their patron nation. Produced during a period of hagiography (the writing of history as the accomplishments of great men), these landscapes often also alluded to themes of noble and brave men exploring or conquering a large, looming, malevolent “nature.”

British settlement commenced in central Northern North America by way of land allotments to soldiers, many of whom had topological training at the Royal Military Academy of Woolwich, and often produced “stiffly descriptive” landscapes. The training of the Canadian eye and the Canadian artist began with colonial European traditions being imported to the New World along with members of the European elite. In Canada West, (the southern and eastern portions of what is now Ontario), designated the administrative and banking centre for the Anglo British North American colonies, the landed elite lived in small urban centres, composed of the
appointed temporary imperial administration, post-military service men’s families who had typically been granted large lots, British empire immigrants and United Empire loyalists. Canadian artists and art were European and imported. Art guilds were established mainly as a way to advertise local representatives or practitioners of European styles and genres.

During the early 19th Century, landscape similarities were exaggerated between Britain and British North America (BNA) in order to raise the interest of potential immigrants and investors to newly available territories. British colonial art patrons preferred portrayals of their holdings in BNA as similar as possible to those of their rural holdings in Britain, rendered in the courtly style of realism, preferring their landscapes appear “civilized.” Thus the Annapolis Valley of Nova Scotia was portrayed as similar to the English countryside, and public gardens, modeled after English public gardens, were established in several Canadian cities. Southern Ontario towns and cities established during this era were dubbed Guelph, London (on the Themes River) and Stratford, in attempts to lure interest from prospective British settlers.

In Quebec, the defeat of New France brought British military officers in the later half of the 18th Century, who while “not trained as artists, were trained by artists”, often, “the leading watercolourists of their day.” In answer to a new market in Europe for pictures of far-away places, these officers painted numerous pieces. This piece by Thomas Davies was painted circa 1772, of Chaudiere Falls, Quebec. Davies attended the Royal Military Academy and his drawing master was the French Gamamiel

---

5 Halifax Public Gardens were created from a commons in 1832 by the local horticultural society, and subsequently extended in 1867 and 1877
6 The names of some places in Southern Ontario, such as Guelph, were assigned in advance of the advertisement of land, especially by the Canada Land Company, to facilitate subsequent settlement, other southern Ontario communities with British associated names from the same era: London, Stratford and York to name but a few.
Massiot. He was known for rendering landscapes with such precision that “even two centuries afterward, the precise location of his scenes can be identified”.

Thomas Davies. A View of Chaudiere Falls, circa 1792, water colour.

**Canadianization of the Elite**

British landscape sensibilities developed from the mid-18th Century along two lines: one continued to emphasize a “charmingly” literal and realistic portrayal, the other began highlighting the “sublime” emphasizing the majesty and potential danger of nature: “A favourite subject of the era was a tiny figure perched precariously on the edge of a waterfall or watching its thundering flow from below.”
Prior to Kornelius Kreighoff (1815-1872), Canada was thought to have no art tradition of its own, because the vast majority of the fine art was produced in service of an offshore colonial elite. Kreighoff, however, was respected by the Canadian elite, and by 1867 was arguably Canada's most prominent landscape painter, offering up as content the Canadian landscape with reference to the Canadian non-aboriginal experience. Kreigoff’s works often showed Upper and Lower Canadians of European descent enjoying North American seasonal activities, and portrayals of French habitants traversing the ice, Huron villages in autumn, and sugar maple forests awash in bright arboreal colours unseen in the British countryside. His works represented a turn away from the representation of British North America as an extension of the British countryside. The British influence, however, is still visible in *Saint Anne’s Falls,*
the subject, nature, is magnificent and the figures are assumed to be in awe of the natural scene that the viewer shares with them.

Kreighoff’s artistic legacy was a nascent Canadian consciousness founded upon a distinctively northern and North American experience that would be put into service by the Group of Seven as the foundation for a Canadian nationalism, and in turn, a distinctively Canadian form of colonialism.⁷

British public policy concerning the Canadas had always been torn between colonization to protect territorial claims against their ambitious neighbour to the south, and efficient resource extraction which motivated the establishment of small settlements with temporary colonial administrations, rather than local or responsive governance. Politically, these tensions formally ended with the US trade reciprocity treaty of 1849. Yet, as the elite continued to have divided allegiances well into Confederation, the remnants of this cleavage dominated the visual arts. As well, European interest in affected landscapes from British North America continued to exert economic influence on the art produced in the Canadas, so Kornelius Kreighoff, while popular amongst the elite in Montreal and Toronto, still found most of his patrons in Britain.¹⁵¹

In Canada West (Southern Ontario), the expansion west had begun with the 1821 purchase of Rupert’s Land from the Hudson’s Bay Company, after the easily accessible arable land had been allotted and in response to mounting population pressures. As with the east, explorers and traders were followed by surveyors, scouts, land speculators and colonists. Railroads were built, and indigenous people alienated

---

⁷ A.Y.Jackson, p.1 N.B.Stylistically, A Y Jackson was decidedly a “modern” whose style springs from studies of the impressionist school.
from the land through a plethora of methods. In the expanded Canadian state, culture was to come from the East, and weather from the West. High culture, however, struggled in Eastern Canadian cities because the elites were very small, and from the beginning, British North America’s “culture” was a classed affair, with a theatrical performance, for example, costing about two week’s wages for an average worker in St. John.\(^{152}\) The inaccessibility of art and art education for the Canadian elite became politicized as the colonies were about to achieve Confederation, as is witnessed by Kreighoff’s 1858 letter to A.T.Galt, the Minister of Finance for the colony, in which Kreighoff pressed for the establishment of European aesthetic education in Canada to eradicate challenges arising from second generation elite youth, who seemed to identify with “common” Canadian art forms. European art techniques, theory, and history, he argued, are inextricably linked to the protection of British moral values. In his plea, Kreighoff acknowledges the link between elite historiography and aesthetics in the context of changing relationships between the elite and underclasses. Kreighoff argued that the traditional values of Britain, including their very conservative class system, must be the founding values of Canada.\(^{153}\)

Kreighoff’s concerns were perhaps overstated and self-serving, but they seem to have been shared. In 1857, Edgerton Ryerson had established the Canadian Educational Museum, which housed the only continuous display of paintings in Canada West and every piece was a commissioned copy of a European work.\(^{154}\) Typical of the elite of 1867, Ryerson worked hard to ensure that English Canadian schools celebrated British culture, idealized British history, and inculcated British values.\(^{155}\) As a result, in 1867 “[T]he British North America Act created a nation but
not a nationality\textsuperscript{156} and the “sentimental attachment to Britain” amongst the elite remained strong, even among the Canadian born. For 30 years after the skilled workers’ Mechanics Institute of Toronto’s first art exhibition in 1848 (later to become the Canadian National Exhibition),\textsuperscript{157} attempts to organize onshore elite support of Canadian painters repeatedly floundered. While Confederation (1867) had brought about a flourish of art support in the name of establishing a non-British, and non-American, Canadian national consciousness, most early attempts failed. The most ambitious elite attempt included the creation of the Ontario Society of Artists (OSA) and the Union of Artists, an umbrella organization planned to span the new nation. The OSA’s failure was brought about by embezzlements perpetrated by board members, followed by media disparagement of the organization, and negative critiques of their Canadian collection drawn from a negative assessment of the potential for Canadian education and the development of a Canadian culture.\textsuperscript{158}

During the late 1870s and early 1880s the Governors General (Marquess of Dufferin and Lorne) agreed to become the official patrons of the regionalized versions of the defunct Union of Artists, and in 1882 the National Gallery of Canada opened to derision and controversy.\textsuperscript{159} The culmulative effects of scandal, a northern hemispheric economic recession in the 1890s, and the elite preference for European subjects and styles meant that there were few Canadian landscape painters, and little interest in Canadian landscape paintings amongst the English Canadian elite until after the turn of the century.

During the intervening quarter century between Kreighoff and the Group of Seven, the westward expansion of the Canadian state commenced upon the
negotiation of a series of treaties with aboriginals inhabiting Northern Ontario and the then Northwest Territories (later Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta). The Canadian government, under Clifford Sifton’s Homestead Act, advertised the new western territories as vacant arable land similar to the Eastern European breadbasket regions to attract prospective settlers more accustomed to prairie farming conditions, including severe inland weather patterns.

The Canadianization of the elite, the rise of essentialism and nationalism globally, and the economic ambitions of the Canadian elite for developing the regions from the Red River to Victoria in advance of potential American claims defined pre-WWI Canada.

Critical acceptance in Britain continued to be the marker of success for most Canadian artists, after which the Canadian elite would prove more receptive, particularly to new styles. During the late 19th and early 20th Centuries, a number of landscape art styles and schools developed in Europe, and young Canadian artists continued to travel to Europe to study art and were exposed to these schools and styles, often in advance of the Canadian elite. French artist Monet, who named Impressionism when he exhibited his work, *Impressions*, and other pieces reflecting his commitment to the idea that one can never paint a subject, rather, one paints an impression of that subject.¹⁶¹ Monet’s philosophy and method greatly influenced future members of “the Group”. According to Monet, methodologically, the Impressionist painter produced paintings in the moment, to capture the immediate essence of the subject. “The impressionists did not tend toward the creation of transcendent Beauty: they wanted to solve problems of pictorial techniques”¹⁶¹ in order to express the
experience of “epiphanic vision...without God”, documenting “a materialist ecstasy.” Tom Thomson, “the Group’s” mentor, practiced a version of Impressionism fervently, admonishing his colleagues to create many sketches while on location in the wilds of Georgian Bay and beyond, and to simplify their visions later in studio.

Art Nouveau arose in the late 19th Century in Europe and arrived in Canada in the early 20th Century. It was a critical school within art that condemned decorative art as a “slavish imitation of the past,” and turned to organicism/organic-growth for inspiration. In Canada, this critical attitude was adopted by many commercial artists. The original members of the Group of Seven began their landscape studies while working as Art Nouveau influenced commercial artists for Grip Art Design Studio. Bengough’s Grip Magazine initially catered to Art Nouveau tastes in Toronto, and after the magazine’s demise in 1894, Grip Art Design Studio of commercial art and design continued, and became known for its production of book covers, illustrations and posters, with impressionist and modernist sensibilities. The young artists employed there, as well as other local commercial artists, became more well known to urban workers through their production of commercial art, than to the newly onshore Canadian governing and professional elite, in advance of their debut as the Group of Seven (Grip employed Lismer, J.E. H.MacDonald, Varley and CW Jeffreys, who in turn worked with Tom Thomson).

Before their “Grip days,” members of the Group of Seven Canadian Painters, whilst studying in Europe, were exposed to a number of aesthetic trends. Landscape artists and Naturalists of the late 19th and early 20th Centuries regularly invoked the sublime and the romantic in their paintings. The sublime, like the romantic, is a “mode”
or “style,” rather than a “school” in visual art, and each continued to exert influence in modern art as the relationships between humanity, nature, science and God continued to be matters of deliberation. Sublime colouration was usually achieved in saturated hues and compositionally pieces exhibited large dominant or “latched” centres, and often a peripheral centre to the lower far right or left of the geometric centre. The desired effect found the viewer “overawed while losing a sense of [one] self.” The sublime would typically feature a dominant, light suffused and dynamic “nature” as related to peripheral, overwhelmed, and usually human figure(s). One can spot the influence of the Sublime in landscapes throughout Canadian post-Confederation history.167

Initially a moniker for the late 18th Century artistic response against the vogue historical Latin-references and anti-emotional rationalism, the Romantic was associated with a desire to return to nature in order to reconnect with emotions during an era of pervasive urban industrial rationality.168 Romantic influences in painting were, and continue to be, “linked by affinity to a number of styles”169. Thus artists, such the Group of Seven’s Varley, was a romantic modern painter, having held that if a painting “lacked feeling” it was of “no interest.”170 As a descriptive term “romantic” generally notes an socially generated appeal to prioritize (or at least acknowledge) emotional content in art.

Tom Thomson’s enduring influence on the Group of Seven was cemented before his death in Algonquian Park in 1917. Grip employees and like-minded modern painters had adopted Thomson’s method of landscape painting during their many short trips to central and northern Ontario with Thomson acting as tutor and guide. His method, which included producing many fast sketches and paintings on location, resulted in the
creation and preservation of many Group of Seven sketches and preliminary paintings. “The Group of Seven saw Thomson as an archetypal Canadian artist and patterned themselves after him. ... They wanted to represent the quintessence of Canada in a new visual language.”¹⁷¹ ... Like some before them they “concentrated on the magnificence of the landscapes, but they did not feel it necessary to rely on the shop warn conventions of naturalism.”¹⁷²

Thomson drowned while his young colleagues were at war. Most of those now known as the Group of Seven had painted together under Thomson’s mentorship, and discussed group exhibits before 1914. Young enough to serve either as volunteers or conscripts in the Canadian war effort, eventually AYJackson and Varley were selected to be a part of the pilot War Artist programme, designed to keep elite-favoured and promising young artists off the battlefield, and produce both visual documentation and propaganda. The Canadian War Artist programme introduced future members of “the Group” to prominent figures in the Canadian military, once their artistic capabilities and propagandist potential were assessed as more valuable to Canada than their fighting capabilities. These young Canadian artists’ explicitly modern art style became better known in both Britain and Canada as the result of the War Artist programme.

After returning from the war, AY Jackson, Arthur Lismer, Frank Johnston, J.E.H. MacDonald, Frederick Varley, and Lawren Harris declared Canadian landscape art “independence” by creating “a modern art tradition for a modern country”.¹⁷³ With Tom Thomson, French Impressionism, modern Nordic painting and the St. Lawrence school (landscape painting) of the Eastern United States as their inspirations, the Group of Seven was born. Toronto’s influential medical Doctor Callum was their first patron and
supporter, and Lawren Harris, a talented modern artist and heir to the Massey Harris fortune, supported his colleagues when necessary as they worked toward their first national and international exhibitions.

Much of the initial and harsh criticism of Group of Seven representations of northern/northwestern Ontario and the Canadian Rockies emanated from the guardians of the European realist landscape tradition amongst the Canadian elite. Canadian art critics of the early 20th Century proclaimed the Group of Seven’s “un-civilizing” of Canadian landscape art a potential deterrent to successful European colonial pursuits in Canada, and publicly railed against the Group’s “wild” depictions of Northern Ontario, and “uncivilized” depictions of Canada’s western landscape because these would be “uninviting to settlers, tourists, and investors.” It was not until the Group toured Britain, and achieved international critical acclaim, that acceptance came in Canada. With Canadian critical acclaim came patronage and support from the University of Toronto.

The Canadian government and the established railroad interests returned to their pre-WWI colonial ambitions in 1918, and the first order of the new era was completing the corruption riddled, colossally expensive, state underwritten, semi-private rail link through the western mountain ranges to Victoria, British Columbia. Convincing Ontarian business investors of the necessity of subsidizing this rail expansion became a pressing necessity for the CPR and the post war federal government. Thus those parties embarked on a visual arts campaign to advertise the newly annexed territories as essentially Canadian, and completing the rail link as a feat of triumphant modern nation-building.
Initially photographers were hired to accomplish this rhetorical feat.\textsuperscript{177} Later, Notman, the former royal photographer, hired painters to help complete the job, introducing composite visual creations to the landscapes advertising Canadian national parks to Americans and Britons on behalf of the railroad companies. Later, the Canadian railroads would prefer paintings because the “upper classes had begun to shun photography…so that by the 1860s photography and camera work were largely relegated to documentation, pairing photography with physical reality and facts, and painting with imagination and cognitive ideals.\textsuperscript{178} By the turn of the Century in Canada, in the railroads’ Boards’ judgments, the photography of the day could not evince sufficient emotion from viewers.\textsuperscript{179}

Members of the Group of Seven and Canadian Medical Association members were granted some of the first promotional rail tours through the Rocky Mountains to see Canada’s newly minted mountain parks, tourist destinations with exclusive rail access created for the benefit of the Canadian Pacific Railroad (CPR), as an incentive to complete the trans-Canada rail link promised in the British Columbia Terms of Union with the Canadian government.\textsuperscript{180}

The Group of Seven gained international acclaim and national acceptance as they introduced and advertised new Canadian territories to central Canadians, Europeans and Americans.\textsuperscript{181} By 1931, when they had their last show of modern landscape art, the Group’s style had become the defining style in Canadian landscape art.\textsuperscript{182}

The Group of Seven argued that Canadian landscape art should be essentially Canadian, and that building Canada as a North American nation required a complete break with the European past. The Group of Seven was not alone, however, in
introducing modern visual arts to the Canadian elite. By 1920, a second innovative visual art discourse had been developed addressing recently acquired territories in Canada. Beginning with Robert’s Flaherty’s *Nanook of the North* (1920), an anti-modern and romanticized understanding of the relationship between pre-colonial cultures and landscape had begun to permeate Canadian sensibilities, defining pre-colonial peoples as “untainted pre-moderns,” exhibiting exemplary moral characteristics and insights founded in a worldview both drawn from and influenced by their unmediated experience of their local, Canadian, physical geography. In Canada, Flaherty’s vision has been forcefully reasserted during each new territorial expansion of the Canadian administrative state, and usually in conjunction with the modern “wilderness” visions of the Group of Seven.

According to Jonathan Bordo’s 1992 article “Jack Pine-Wilderness Sublime or the Erasure of the Aboriginal Presence from the Landscape?,” pre-colonial inhabitants of Canadian wilderness are rendered invisible by visual representations that frame Canadian cultural expectations of new territory as self-evidently beautiful, fragile and depopulated, so that it may be appreciated as Canadian “wilderness” or “wilderness sublime.” However, pre-colonial people are not purged as easily from a landscape as from a landscape painting. I argue that in regions of newly annexed Canadian territory, the assertion of this Canadian “wilderness ethos” has been coupled with Flaherty’s anti-modern landscape essentialism, in a colonial contract of sorts, which holds that so long as the pre-colonial people remain pre-modern; persisting in a state of protected, if not splendid, isolation from the corruption of modernity, they are deemed both the products and protectors of uncorrupted natural processes.
These anti-modern images, in turn, are often adopted by colonized communities, and their defenders, as rhetorical means to politically and/or commercially viable forms of culture, which may attract both tourism (economic support) and political support from the colonizing population.\(^\text{184}\) Inevitably, when the pre-colonial people fall from their “state of grace”, they are judged not only to have separated from, but to have become habitual, proximate and growing threats to the pristine wilderness that Canadians are so often stirred to both imagine and defend. I further argue that a rhetoric of disparagement portrays the colonized peoples as somehow dangerous to both their environment and themselves as the result of “cultural loss.” The Canadian aesthetic rhetoric of displacement then rationalizes state administrative expansion on aesthetic and moral grounds, promoting the imposition of the Canadian wilderness aesthetic upon newly annexed territories as policy. Thereafter, proposing the displacement/resettlement of the (now corrupted) pre-colonial peoples becomes an increasingly acceptable political option amongst the colonizing population.

Bordo argues that the Group of Seven’s iconic landscapes affect “the erasure of Aboriginal peoples” from Canadian landscape art and expectations.\(^\text{185}\) He holds that pre-colonial inhabitants of Canadian wilderness have been rendered invisible within the Canadian landscape, creating an expectation of “terra nullius” in the colonizing society. This initial, psychic displacement is illustrated by visual representations that frame Canadian cultural expectations of the new territory as self-evidently beautiful, fragile, and depopulated, so that it may be appreciated as Canadian “wilderness” or “wilderness sublime.”\(^\text{186}\)
Canada’s prevailing landscape aesthetic that Bordo dubs “wilderness sublime” was founded on the nationalist visions of the modern artists and political activists, the Canadian Group of Seven Painters (1910-1925). When read as rhetoric, the Group of Seven’s contribution to the nascent nationalist discourse was to establish that Canadian art has a unique modern style and that Canadian wilderness looks like this (see *West Wind*, above), that it is self-evidently beautiful, and worth protecting intact.

The Group of Seven’s wilderness aesthetic features naturalistic, slightly abstracted, weather affected, depopulated landscapes. Bordo, using sketches and preliminary drawings by Varley and Thomson, argued that the erasure of the aboriginal presence from the Canadian wilderness was affected, at least in part, by the deliberate
removal of First Nations references and the substitution of stylistically anthropomorphized, that is, physiologically similar natural figures, such as trees, \(^1\text{87}\) for the displaced aboriginals.

In Thompson’s “West Wind”, shown above, the aboriginal presence in the sketches was a small group in a canoe, in the lower centre of the scene. In the final piece this is a stylized tree branch. Bordo also documented the later titular change, which similarly removed allusions to First Nation presence.\(^1\text{88}\)

Bordo further argues that this landscape aesthetic framed the cultural expectation of “terra nullius,”\(^1\text{89}\) for Canadians, as they expanded westward across the Laurentian and Pre-Cambrian Shields toward the then Northwest Territories.

In the most westerly part of the country, along the coasts of northern British Columbia, a modern painter named Emily Carr had begun to paint Northern British Columbia landscapes which included Aboriginal presence, mainly in the form of their art.

**Emily Carr, a study in transition from salvage documentary urges to Canadian wilderness as *terra nullius*.**

Emily Carr was a native of Victoria, British Columbia, born in 1871. She first travelled northward to see the British Columbia coast in the first decade of the 20\(^\text{th}\) Century, and was sufficiently enamored of the First Nations (mostly Sitka, later mostly Haida) art that she encountered that she returned “determined to preserve on paper and on canvass, the Indian villages and their vanishing totems and she vowed to travel
throughout the province to experience them first-hand.” 190 In 1913 she stated, “Two things help and spur me on. The love I have for these simple gentle folk and the desire to leave in this, my own Province of British Columbia, a collection of the things that she need not be ashamed of when they have ceased to exist.” 191

The largest collection of Carr’s work is found in the Vancouver Museum in downtown Vancouver, British Columbia. Carr’s images reached mass circulation and public knowledge after each of the four large post-humus retrospective exhibitions in 1945, 1971, 1990 and 2006. 192 Carr is included in many Canadian painting retrospectives as a modern painter after the style of the Group of Seven, but was nonetheless their contemporary. This is largely because she did not receive national attention as a landscape artist until after she had participated in the Western Indian Art Exhibition at the National Gallery in Ottawa, which was catalytic in changing the direction of her painting career.

Carr shared the strong documentary urges of many historians, ethnologists and artists of her day concerning Aboriginal people.

By the end of the 19th Century and beginning of the 20th Century “Non-Native writers …repeatedly commented on the decline of the Aboriginal populations of North America and the apparent disappearance of their cultures due to dwindling population, oppressive legislation, and coerced assimilation. One visible symbol of this change was the on the Northwest coast was the removal of totem poles by museums and others from their original sights. This had been the catalyst for Emily Carr’s project, initiated in 1907, to paint the totem poles and house fronts in situ.” 193

Carr never found unaffected Folk in her travels. During her first trip to Alaska she wrote in her journal of the northern Aboriginal towns that were catering to tourists on steamers in the years after the Alaska Purchase (1867): “The shops are jammed and mobbed, high prices paid for shabby stuff manufactured expressly for the tourist trade. Silver
bracelets hammered out of dollars and half dollars by Indian smiths are the most popular articles, then baskets, yellow cedar toy canoes, paddles, etc. Most people who travel look only at what they are directed to look at. Great is the power of the guidebook-maker, no matter how ignorant.”

She then wrote about the level of ignorance shown in the tourism guide “Muir’s Travels in Alaska” that claimed that the “Tlinkets are one of the strangest peoples on the earth.”

When she first presented her “Indian Paintings” in 1913 with her “Lecture on Totems” she explained some of the totem designs and meanings, and stated, “I [would] like to leave behind me some of the relics of [Canada’s] first primitive greatness. These things should be to Canadians what the ancient Briton’s relics are to the English. Stylistically similar to the Group of Seven, Carr suffered the same negative critical reception as the Group during their early days in Toronto. The responses to her work in 1912 and 1913 made it obvious that “at this time British Columbians were generally unprepared for any deviation from the English landscape tradition. Disheartened by a lack of acceptance of her new work in Vancouver, Emily decided to close her studio.” Her early paintings were to languish in obscurity for decades.

After leaving Vancouver, Carr was to spend many years as a political cartoonist, art teacher, landlady and potter in and around her native Victoria, before returning to painting. While in Victoria she potted and made use of designs she had recorded during her visits to Aboriginal communities, and unlike when she sketched and painted totem poles for documentary purposes, she professed feeling guilty for “prostituting Indian art,” even though she felt she had kept the designs “pure.” Carr was torn when
she wrote of the kiln to her friend Sophie, which demonstrates to some extent the humiliation Carr must have felt when participating in activities that she had condemned only a few years before.

Above is her 1912 “Totem Walk,” watercolour.

Below her 1912, “Totem Poles, Kitseukla” oil on canvass.

Initially, Carr painted many slightly abstracted modern (post-impressionist) landscapes that included Aboriginal art and symbols, especially totems in villages or as landscape features. The images of the totems are meant to be accurate, the backgrounds stylized.
During her many trips north between 1907 and 1913, Carr visited and befriended some Haida people who had settled on the coastline of their traditional territories, and other Aboriginal people, further North (Sitka and Tlingit), some of whom had settled in formerly Russian (Alaskan) settlements, and were living in small water accessible fishing/hunting/trading villages. During her trips, Carr recorded the totems and conditions, and wrote of the poverty of the First Nations that she visited. She developed a long-term friendship and correspondence with Aboriginal basket weaver, Sophie Frank (over twenty years), and her friendship with Clara Russ (both Haida) was documented in her later book, *Klee Wyck*.

In 1924, the chief ethnologist of the National Museum in Ottawa, Marius Barbeau articulated his response to the apparent decline of the Aboriginals and the "loss of a mythical, precontact cultural purity" in his remarks introducing Indian Days in a book concerning the Canadian Rockies. He also began working toward an exhibition of Canadian Indian Art to help educate the public and motivate support for some Aboriginal art preservation schemes. Due to his dismay upon learning of the removal of many totem poles from West Coast First Nations (Barbeau had studied British Columbian Aboriginal groups while writing his PhD), he attempted to have a national park created to permit the preservation of the totems that remained in situ and unsold between the Nass and Skeena Rivers in 1924.

In 1927 Carr was invited by Barbeau to exhibit in Ottawa, in the Western Indian Art Exhibit at the National Museum of Canada. At the exhibition and in his published texts, Barbeau implicitly and explicitly bore witness to what he spoke of as the demise of a once proud people. The exhibition, and meeting Barbeau, as well as many members...
of the Group of Seven, seemed to mark a change in Carr’s focus and philosophy concerning Aboriginal people.

The exhibit included the Director, Eric Brown’s public “lament for the death of the Indian, that is the tragic loss of his authenticity through assimilation and colonization, and as a call to recognize the Indians’ invaluable contribution to Canadian culture.”

The exposure and the positive reviews of the exhibit in the *Ottawa Citizen* may have helped relaunch Carr’s painting career, but Carr herself wrote of being disappointed by the poor attendance, and sullen mood of the exhibit. Overall the exhibit’s Ottawa reviews were mixed, and regardless of more positive reviews in Toronto, Carr’s paintings found few buyers. She nonetheless used the proceeds from the few sales to head north the following summer to paint, after various members of the Group extended much needed encouragement for her reestablishing her painting career. In 1927 she also began a long friendship with Lawren Harris, who was to influence her art and career for the next two decades.

During her 1928 painting trip to the north, she wrote, “Few old poles are left, few old type houses, and very few old people...The young people are fast absorbing white man’s ways and are half ashamed of these things now.”...Moray contends that Carr’s paintings took on Barbeau’s “idea of recording the native tragedy,” and from 1928 on she seemed to identify “Indian art as something that belonged to the past.”

Carr would soon follow the Group of Seven’s modernist and impressionistic lead away from her initial focus of documentary-like inclusion of First Nations art (presence) in her landscapes, to an impressionism that drew directly from the landscape without the necessity of mediation. From 1931-1937 Carr became a sort of “Tom Thomson of
British Columbia”, using a renovated van to travel with her menagerie of pet animals to remote British Columbian woodlands, sketching and painting, which culminated in her first successful Vancouver exhibition, which was held in 1938. Her landscapes on exhibit were wilderness paintings of the British Columbian forests.

Emily Carr, “Forest Landscape #1”, 1939, oil on wove painted on plywood. 214

Carr had her first heart attack in 1937 while preparing for what would be her first successful Vancouver painting exhibit, with the encouragement and mentorship of Harris. 215

While preparing for exhibitions scheduled in 1939, Carr suffered a stroke, and her painting career was at an end. She returned to writing, and produced Klee Wyck and a collection of short stories about her early visits to Aboriginal communities. “By 1937, in Klee Wyck...death and dying had become thematic” in her stories of Aboriginal
communities. That *Klee Wych* was better accepted than either the 1913 or 1927 exhibits is reflected in the fact that she won the Governor General’s award for Canadian literature for *Klee Wyck* in 1942. By that time she had not painted First Nations’ subjects in over a decade, and her long-time friend, Sophie Frank had died. Carr remained in frail and failing health until her death in 1945.

Carr’s transition from painting impressions drawn from documentary sensibilities for what seemed to be immanently threatened aboriginal art traditions, to the unmediated modern “wilderness” of the Group of Seven highlights and parallels the transition in the Canadian imaginary. Carr’s transition and eventual admittance into the Canadian modern painting pantheon shows how a modern Canadian landscape artist came, by dint of market necessity and the changing aesthetic sensibilities in the Canadian art world, into conformity with the visions of the Group of Seven. Critical and public acceptance followed Carr’s conversion to the Group’s vision, demonstrating that by that time (1930), “wilderness sublime” had come to define the Canadian wilderness aesthetic from coast to coast.

**The Group of Seven and the Arctic**

As a result of their critical acceptance by the Toronto and Ottawa elite, several of the Group of Seven members traveled to the Canadian Arctic and the northern shores of Newfoundland during the 1920s and 1930s, as guests of the RCMP and the Canadian Government. The first was A.Y. Jackson, who was later joined by friend Frederick Banting, a doctor and co-discoverer of insulin, and later Lawren Harris. When
Group members went north, their landscapes became even more wilderness focused and abstract, and because they were invariably painting while aboard ships, their landscape subjects tended to highlight harbours, fjords, coastlines and icebergs. In the few paintings that include Inuit-and there are a few-the Inuit presence is progressively abstracted becoming indiscernible from the landscape.


In the summer of 1927, Jackson traveled to the Arctic in the company of Dr. Banting, on the steamer Beothic - chartered by the Canadian government to take supplies to RCMP posts. Jackson considered the trip to be a great adventure, and when the boat pulled in to shore, he and Banting would wander about and paint. The settlement of Pangnirtung is on Baffin Island, and Jackson wrote that: "Pangnirtung, as I first saw it, was the metropolis of the North. It stood on a long fjord surrounded by big hills, and many Eskimos lived there in skin tents, with hundreds of dogs." Jackson was greatly impressed by the rugged coastline of Baffin Island, and the contrasts between the snow capped mountains rising from fjords and the colourful tumble of native life on the grassy meadows at their feet.
Witness herein the transformation of this Arctic landscape to what Umberto Eco refers to as the Sublime, complete with “saturated landscape hues”, inspiring, transcendence, and “translucent cerulean to cobalt blue and biomorphic shapes.”

Lawren Harris. *Eskimo Tent, Pagnirtung, Baffin Island*, oil on canvas, 1930.

Of the Group of Seven, Lawren Harris arguably produced the most well-known paintings of Northern Newfoundland and the Eastern Arctic. Harris also produced the most abstracted landscapes of the Group’s members, and so many figural references would be eliminated during his process simplifying sketched images of landscapes in studio. Both the iceberg and landscape paintings he produced often make titular reference to the nearest point of land. In his North Shore Baffin Island, which has the same subject matter as the three other representations in this sample, all references to the exact location and inhabitants is absent. Note the disharmonic lines emanating from the clouds and heavy colours on the left, this is a formally unbalanced piece that shifts the eye to the right, causing a sort of sense of motion rather than quietude, the result for the viewer being not unlike the sense of motion encountered when staring at the water while remaining stationary on a wharf. This gives the viewer a sense of presence, and

---

8 This is an expansion upon the comments of Carolle Gagnon, 2012.
the painter some control over the initial focus and trajectory of the viewer's eye “into” the channel.

This transition, of Arctic metropolis to awe-inspiring, depopulated Northern wilderness, I submit, is another example of the establishment of what Bordo calls the Canadian “wilderness sublime,” this time in the Canadian Arctic.

Bordo argues that “the constitution of the landscape image as a space absent of human presence holds the key to understanding the new wilderness ethos.”222 He further asserts that this visual art tradition has educated our geographical expectations and colonial intentions for a century. Bordo gives us a sense of how important it is to understand the participation of visual art within rhetorical campaigns, but he cannot account for the 1920 incorporation of Inuit into the Canadian landscape through the visual arts, as seen in Nanook of the North. As well, Bordo does not account for the motivations of early Canadian elite, because his work has remained focused on the amelioration of cultural loss in aboriginal communities.

For the purposes of this thesis, the landscape visual art of the Group of Seven and Nanook of the North will be considered components of the same Canadian visual art rhetoric that began in the 1910s in Toronto, and was motivated by the material interests of the newly naturalized Canadian economic elite, and reflected their interests. The visual arts documentation and subsequent dissemination (framing) of these interests became the aesthetic rhetoric that established where, when, why, and how “beauty” and elite resource interests converged.
Flaherty’s *Nanook of the North* arguably holds a formative place in the Canadian pantheon of cultural assumptions drawn from visual art sources. It is thus unfortunate that the critical response to *Nanook of the North* drawn from film theory, such as that of William Rothman, has tended to lift *Nanook* out of historical context, both as a work of early 20\(^{th}\) Century visual art amongst others, and as a work addressed to a Canadian audience with a well-defined interest in the subject material. This leads to an underestimation and misunderstanding of the continuing impact of Flaherty’s work.

In Rothman’s *Documentary Film Classics*, Flaherty’s *Nanook* is correctly assessed as an early and important contribution to the art of documentary film making, but a contribution marked by the unequal relationship between Flaherty and the Inuit he filmed, resulting in an unfortunate and destructive stereotyping of Inuit culture.\(^{223}\) Rothman both assumes and focuses on the unequal nature of early twentieth inter-racial relationships and the power dynamics between filmed subjects and the camera operator, especially when raising questions of correspondence and truth claims.\(^{224}\) By arguing that “in reality, nature itself, the natural environment on breathtaking display in *Nanook of the North* was-is facing mortal threat,”\(^{225}\) Rothman fails to interrogate Flaherty’s romantic landscape footage, which connects the film to contemporary visual art forms, such as those produced by the Group of Seven.

*Nanook of the North* with special attention given to its contribution to landscape art as rhetoric answers a number of questions better than the literature from film studies, such as why, and why when, *Nanook of the North* was made, and why and how the film was initially received. It is to such a treatment of *Nanook of the North* which we will now turn.
In 1920 *Nanook of the North* debuted in Toronto. Flaherty was able to produce his experimental documentary film form with funding from the French Revillon Frères trading company which had a three-decades long presence in the Canadian North, (1906-1936), and in the Eastern Arctic, for a very short while, rivaled the Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC).²²⁶

It was the fur trade and the quest for the “Northwest Passage,” the fabled and long-sought transportation route across northern continental North America to Asian markets, that opened Arctic and sub-Arctic transportation routes. The coastlines of the Canadian portion of the “Northwest Passage” line six sub-regions, including coastal continental Northwest Territories and Nunavut, the High and Eastern Arctic, all of which, if and when occupied, are and were occupied by Inuit. The Hudson Bay region, is occupied by Inuit to the east and west, and in the southernmost portions, like James Bay, is occupied by Inuit, Ojibwa and Cree. Quebec’s northerly and northwestern coasts are inhabited by Inuit, including the area known politically as Nunavik. Labradorian coasts are inhabited by Innu and Inuit, and finally, northern coastal main-island Newfoundlanders are largely of Irish descent. *Nanook of the North* was filmed on the northwestern shores of Quebec, in the mid to late 1910’s.

A short lesson in Arctic trade and international history is necessary to establish why *Nanook of the North* was made when it was made, where it was made, and why, and why the North was on the minds of the Canadian elite at the time of the documentary’s release in 1920. This should clarify why and how Flaherty’s experimental documentary film, created to illustrate the good relations between a
French fur trading company and the noble “Eskimo”, and demonstrate the potential of the documentary film form, became such an important contribution to the 1920 Canadian elite quest for knowledge of the North, and the people they should expect to find there.

Until the 19th Century, it was artistic depictions rendered by explorers and soldiers that educated Europeans about the North American Arctic, usually while appealing for more funding from (competing) European governments and private patrons seeking a lucrative northern trade route to Asian markets.
This drawing, rendered by a British adventurer was paid for by the British Crown. Note the proportionate size of the icebergs in relation to the vessels, and the utter absence of other living beings in the portrait. Also notice the way that “nature” (seascape) in this painting is portrayed as imminently dangerous. Lines direct the viewer in a counter clockwise fashion from the far right of the piece toward the top and then down the cloud formations to the dramatic climax of the piece, the ice berg looming perilously over the lone ship. The icebergs surrounding the scene frame the adventurers as interlopers in an unwelcoming environment. The latitude is just south of Baffin Island, where the largest seasonal settlement of Eastern Arctic Inuit lived at the time. Historiographically this drawing would be considered “hagiographic;” visual history as the history of great men (explorers facing the vicissitudes of nature), while stylistically this shows romantic influences.

As the 19th Century progressed, European and American economic interests, mostly in pursuit of “train” (animal oils) used extensively in urban lighting in large European and North American industrial centres, warranted the mapping of the coastlines in the High Arctic. Depictions of train related Arctic sea mammal “fisheries” of whales and seals became commonplace in Britain and North America. These maps often included estimates of the mineral resource potential of Arctic coastlines, focusing on coal, copper, gold, and iron. By mid-century depictions of the ceremonial launchings of the annual seal hunt from St. John’s, illustrations of explorers rendering whale train
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9 Seal Interpretation Centre, Gros Ile, August 2008. “Traps” first demonstrated to Newfoundlanders and Madeleinit by the Inuit on the Labrador sealing front. These were subsequently used by Newfoundlanders for sealing and as cod traps, and are still in use in some sealing operations in Canadian waters. Traps are described as “the traditional method” on the Iles de la Madeleine. Seal Interpretation Centre, Gros Ile, August 2008.
into barrels at remote arctic locations, and the annual multi-national marine mammal fisheries were published in European and American journals.

Arctic Whaling. 18th Century engraving, depicting Dutch whalers hunting Bowheaded whales in the Arctic. 228

In 1821 a merger was arranged between the North West Company (NWC) and the Hudson Bay Company (HBC) by the British colonial government. The Hudson Bay Company instantly became the unchallenged trading and governing agency for the whole of Rupert’s Land. Later, in 1870, the Hudson’s Bay Company sold much of its trade charter territory to the Government of Canada, maintaining title, including resource rights, to areas immediately surrounding trading posts.10

Until the 1880s, transportation and resource extraction remained the sole goals of American and European attention to the regions surrounding the Northwest Passage,

10 The pattern of granting tracts around transportation and trade centres to private companies continued well into Canadian Confederation, and so the railroad companies came to own large “land allowances” through many towns and cities.
including Hudson Bay. Thus resource and military cartography were the celebrated accomplishments of successful explorers, even as the marine resources of the region were extensively depleted by Northern European and American fleets of commercial whalers.\textsuperscript{229} Public accounts to Americans and Europeans continued to highlight the activities of publicly and privately sponsored polar explorers, undertaking “thinly guised and well publicized resource mapping expeditions.”\textsuperscript{230} Inuit inhabitants of the Arctic were encountered and acknowledged as guides or traders in many reports to patrons.

In 1880, after it had become clear that a route through the Northwest Passage was unlikely,\textsuperscript{231} Britain transferred ownership of the British High Arctic to Canada. Most of the benefits from known marine resources had been privatized and many marine mammal species were either in a state of significant depletion, mostly due to the commercial train industry, and/or rendered moribund. Train was technologically eclipsed by vegetable oil extraction/reduction processes by 1890.\textsuperscript{232} Britain lost interest in the Republic of Newfoundland, as well once considered the gateway to the Northwest Passage, the island portion of the Republic stood largely deforested, and the region would soon suffer the first North Atlantic (cod) fisheries collapse.\textsuperscript{11} With the entire region deemed relatively resource-less, the only Canadian activity for decades in the Southern, Eastern, and High Arctic, including the Hudson Bay region, would be in response to the demonstrated ambitions of other nations, such as Norway, America, and Newfoundland.\textsuperscript{233} The Manifest Destiny driven Americans openly considered the expansion of their Northern holdings eastward after their 1867 purchase of Alaska from Russia,\textsuperscript{234} and regularly sent highly publicized expeditions to the Eastern and High

\textsuperscript{11} Deforestation due to wooden ship building in the 19 Century is a known fact along the western coast of Newfoundland, and in the 1890’s Newfoundland experienced the region’s first fisheries collapse. (Shandro 2008).
Canadian responses were formal, and tepid, and requests for the licensing of American whalers, for example, were routinely rejected or ignored.\textsuperscript{236}

Between 1898 and 1902 Norwegian Captain Otto Sverdrup and 16 crewmembers spent four winters aboard the \textit{Fram} in the High Arctic north of Canada. During that period they mapped and claimed for Norway 260,000 square kilometres of previously uncharted and “undiscovered” territories.\textsuperscript{237} When the news and documentation of this expedition reached the Canadian elite, it particularly roused the interest of Captain J.E. Bernier, a Quebecker and skilled mariner with polar exploration ambitions. Upon looking inland from the Arctic coasts he found coal, reported mineral potential, and counter-claims from the Republic of Newfoundland, The United States of America, Norway and Holland, based in evidence of ongoing economic pursuits (winter camps, etc.) by Scottish, Dutch, and American whalers and French traders, and this provided a salient economic argument for an assertion of Canadian sovereignty in the High Arctic.\textsuperscript{238} In 1903 the Canadian Government began patrolling the Arctic in an attempt to assert sovereignty, particularly against the Norwegian claim. Bernier was subsequently given an Arctic land grant and associated mineral resource rights, for coal mining in Strathcona Sound, and the command of an annual sovereignty/exploration voyage.\textsuperscript{239} He emphatically believed that the 20\textsuperscript{th} Century would mark the move from exploration to resource interests in the Arctic.\textsuperscript{240}
Bernier’s mineral map for the coal claim on his Arctic island.  

So far as the Eastern Arctic and Hudson Bay Inuit were concerned, much remained the same as the fur trade became incorporated into most groups’ annual routes between seasonal settlements. While there were war related shortages, and wildlife population cycles and crashes, there was not an enormous amount of contact with the rest of the world, beyond the annual sailing of the HBC supply boats, and a handful of missionaries, until after the 1917 Russian Revolution. From 1918 to 1921 Canada and the United States of America sent troops into northeastern central Europe to assist in the fight against the newly formed Communist government of Russia. The American realization that Canada bordered Russia increased the strategic importance
of the Arctic for North American defense, especially, one might argue, in the aftermath of the Winnipeg General Strike in 1919.

Throughout the 1920’s the British Government negotiated with the Norwegian government for title over the High Arctic territory claimed by Sverdrup, which included Sverdrup and Ellesmere Islands. In the aftermath of the Russian Revolution oil was discovered in Norman Wells, Northwest Territories (1920) and in 1921, oil was discovered by the USA Oil Company in a region of the High Arctic between Russia and Norway. Because the United States did not recognize the government in Russia, they negotiated access to these High Arctic oil supplies through agreements with Canada,\(^242\) which led to concern from the Hudson Bay Company that “foreign governments” might encroach on their resource claims in the north. In 1923 the Canadian government limited foreign ownership in oil development to 25%.\(^{243}\) In 1929 the global markets collapsed, and the northern hemisphere entered into an era of prolonged economic depression. In 1930 Norway renounced all claims to Northern North American territory, after a diplomatic exchange with Britain resulted in a ratified agreement that included British compensation for Captain Sverdrup of $67,000.\(^{244}\) This portion of the High Arctic was immediately granted to Canada.

**Robert Flaherty and the World of 1913**

During the period when *Nanook of the North* was filmed, the Arctic fur trade was volatile and extremely competitive.\(^{245}\) By 1915 the fur trade began undergoing a period
of waning transition as regional resource disparities in the Arctic had increased, with some areas already extensively overexploited. Posts in regions where resources had become depleted were abandoned or moved, and the already fierce competition between fur companies was exacerbated in regions still reporting abundant arctic foxes.\textsuperscript{246} International pelt prices were volatile too, and post managers sometimes demanded many more pelts to repay “stakes” (outfitting loans in kind), or in exchange for trade items, than either they, or the Inuit traders, had anticipated in the pre-season.\textsuperscript{247} Many of the Inuit who were dependent on the fur trade for a considerable portion of their living, by 1920, had become caught in a feedback-loop of diminishing returns, and the trading companies began preparing to transition from the increasingly marginal profits of the fur trade to store operations in the North.\textsuperscript{248} Robert Flaherty’s documentary \textit{Nanook of the North} is to some extent the story of an Inuit community increasingly tied to the fur trade as it entered this period of transition.

In France the Lumiere Brothers recorded the first, short “documentary” films in the mid 1890’s. These films typically recorded singular events, such as a shift change at their own factory.\textsuperscript{249} Theoretical and technological advances in the visual arts and natural sciences in Europe were matched by a popular fascination; people wanted to watch moving pictures, and read, about science and its potential. Scientific metaphors became common currency in social and political analyses. Karl Mobius’, theory of biological interactions within biological communities, or bio-zones, like Darwin’s theory of species’ evolution, quickly became metaphorical fodder for international politics. Mobius’ theory was adapted and adopted first by conservatives asserting that intricate and necessary balances were essential and upheld in human as well as biological
hierarchies. (Later, in 1935 Tanis (Tansley?) adapted Mobius’ theory to include references to the geographical limitations of interactive species communities, conceptualizing “ecosystems”). Darwin’s (1859) theory of natural selection in species evolution was adapted and adopted as a metaphor for political and economic liberalism (competition seeding scientific, economic, and intellectual innovation and progress), and later to the idea of “social Darwinism” (natural selection processes within human communities) as well.

To this teleological contextualization, I must add that in urban industrialized Europe a romantic anti-modern sensibility, idealizing pre-modern morals and conditions, witnessed a renaissance of rural landscape production/reclamation in the form of forest parks and English country gardens, and a concurrent renaissance of romantic rural landscape painting. Escapes from industrial urban landscapes to suburban “natural” settings were thought therapeutic by the British elite, and in Canada the creation of the first public gardens in the east and the first National Parks in the Rocky Mountains were partly in answer to this imported elite yearning which also accounts for the European romantic influence upon, and to some extent, the European market for, Kreighoff’s transitional Canadian landscape paintings. Flaherty brought all of these European discourses to Canada in Nanook of the North, and the most important and lasting impact of his movie is felt today in Canadian political discourses surrounding the Northwest Passage. Nanook of the North not only reflects Flaherty’s commitments to a number of European discourses, the film contains the foundational inspiration for reappropriating and integrating Canadian First Nations, Inuit, and later Newfoundlanders into the Group of Seven’s “wilderness.”
Modern Art and Modern Artists, Toronto, 1920

In 1920, Flaherty and the Group of Seven were responsible for the introduction of Canadians to the Inuit, (then “Eskimo”), and the new, and potentially important, Canadian Arctic territories. Coincidentally, that same year hailed the discovery of oil in Norman Wells, Northwest Territories, which led to a renewed interest in the Canadian “Northwest Passage,” the long sought and potentially valuable intercontinental transportation route.

In film studies, Nanook of the North occupies a particularly important place as the first documentary film. This is why even though the film’s information and interpretations may be outdated, the movie continues to be shown, and to receive critical scrutiny concerning the nature of truth on display in the film, as well as to probe the nature of truth in documentary films more generally. The film also exercises some authority for the same reason it did in 1920, that is, southern ignorance and curiosity concerning the Arctic and its people, the Inuit.

Nanook of the North’s venue: Port Harrison/Inukjuak

Inukjuak is a Northern Quebec Inuit community located on the eastern coast of Hudson Bay, and has a small protected harbour, for which the site was chosen in 1906 for a trading post by the French trading company, the Revillon Frères. The site was then named Port Harrison. Flaherty financed his experimental film with funding from the Revillon Frères trading company, which, during its short-lived involvement in the Arctic fur trade, were the only competition to the Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC). The community of Inukjuak is now situated at the historic site of the trading post in the
documentary. Nanook’s people made annual treks that included the Belcher Islands and the area around Port Harrison, but like most other trading post sites, Port Harrison was selected for marine accessibility, rather than its proximity to hunting grounds, and Port Harrison had never been a summer or winter settlement site for local Inuit. It is the descendants of Nanook’s people that settled the town at Port Harrison, and renamed it Inukjuak, (“the giant” was/is the Inuit name for the area around the harbour) some three decades after Flaherty’s film.  

The portrayal of the Canadian landscape in Flaherty’s work is in league with the modern aesthetic sensibilities of the Group of Seven, and so while he describes the climate and landscape in harsh and unflattering terms, it is framed, centred and backlit to generate a feeling of reverence.

According to film scholar Rothman, nature in Flaherty’s Nanook is self-evidently beautiful and threatened by the presence of human beings, a view not dissimilar to the visions of the Group of Seven, but not, I contend, rooted in Flaherty’s film. Rothman’s
concluding remark concerning *Nanook of the North* should suffice to spell out the depth of his conviction on this point:

What is noble and what is savage, in human nature as everywhere, are two faces of the same reality, the sublime and beautiful reality that is the subject of *Nanook of the North*. But this reality-nature itself-is also facing a mortal threat, a threat that cannot be said to come from within the order of nature, although it cannot exist apart from nature either. *Nanook of the North* is torn between acknowledging and denying the reality of this threat, in which the movie itself is implicated.254

Nature, however, was not the subject of *Nanook of the North*. If it had been, perhaps Flaherty would have filmed the charismatic megafauna centred piece that Rothman would like to have had him produce. If art is rhetorical, including Rothman’s, then it is both part and product of a process of negotiation toward defining or framing “reality”. Rothman uncritically accepts the Canadian wilderness ethos, as defined by Bordo, and uses it to frame his analysis of *Nanook of the North*. Rothman’s textbook concerning documentary films begins with *Nanook of the North*, (it is the first documentary film), and in his analysis he seeks and finds racial, colonial and technological power imbalances and implicates humanity, as elucidated by Flaherty, Nanook and the trader, in the progressive destruction of nature. There is a lot of Rothman in this framing of Flaherty’s work. Arguably, rather than a film about “the glorious bounty of nature and an appalling testimonial to the magnitude of the slaughter sanctioned and exploited by the “white trader” (that is, by the fur trade that also sponsors Flaherty’s film),”255 *Nanook of the North* was (and remains) an advertisement for the Revillon Frères, glorifying the relationship between a “benevolent” trading company (and patron) and a group of noble, pre-modern, people who had not yet relinquished their biocenoetic (landscape essentialist and tending toward natural balance) understandings. The (mostly eclipsed)
stereotyping of Canadian Inuit as the happy Canadian “Eskimo” that initially resulted from this advertisement of a positive commercial relationship between Nanook and the Revillon Frères, like Rothman’s ecological interpretation, was a product of audience reception and contextual framing of the film.

Rothman makes much of the deliberately staged anachronistic hunting sequences in *Nanook of the North*, asserting that these scenes portray Nanook and his society as being backward, uncomplicated, and “savage.” In my view, however, the hunting sequences served to frame *Nanook* as a pre-modern man, eeking out an existence in a harsh and uninviting, if beautiful, environment to which he belonged. The omission of guns and ammunition achieves both a portrayal of a more simple, savage or distant society from western civilization, as Rothman would hold, and of Nanook as the holder of important biocenoetic knowledge. Perhaps the hunting reenactments should be considered valuable because they record rare glimpses into traditional Inuit hunting methods before they completely disappeared from living memory. There are other workable explanations for the omission of guns and ammunition that may have influenced Flaherty’s choices as he came to edit and present his movie, such as that by
1920, *noble* savages could not be portrayed as armed, because it might have drawn associations with the armed and ignoble workers of the Russia. The anachronistic walrus and winter seal hunt footage may have been the result of a shortage of staked ammunition from the trading companies that year. If pelt prices had dropped, or Nanook had not been ammo-staked, it could have led to his use of traditional seal hunting methods, as recorded in the movie. Winter seal hunts were sometimes individual hunts, but the meat and oil, which were not traded at that time, were shared, and neither food sharing nor caching are portrayed at all. This is most likely because it was in no way relevant to the relationships Flaherty was attempting to portray, but the fear of showing communist-like sharing practices may have influenced the decision to omit this material as well. That the hunting sequences are historic reenactments seems to reinforce the idea that Flaherty is trying to demonstrate Nanook’s people’s intimate understanding of their environment. These reenactments establish that Nanook’s people are not completely severed from their landscape essentialist/biocenoetic understanding by the trading company’s influence, a point made painfully obvious by the facts that they do not eat when they cannot successfully hunt, and do not rely on the trading company for anything particularly important to their survival.

The “sleeping sequence” as it has come to be called is a segment of the film when after building an ice igloo Nanook’s family retires for the night together between layers of sealskin. Flaherty makes no allusions to the obvious presence of a second adult woman sharing the bed, an omission Rothman claims is rooted in colonial attitudes, which Flaherty demonstrates by “consistently underplaying both the complexity of the social structures, different from ours” citing the “unacknowledge second woman” as
The “sleeping scene had a different significance in the 1930s, 40s and 50’s when “traditional Inuit sleeping habits”—something few knew about from any other source—began to be blamed for widespread disease amongst the Inuit. Rothamn also claims that the “sleeping sequence” is the “warmest, tenderest, most intimate passage in the film.”

While Rothman may have been incorrect about the motives for the withholding of information concerning the second adult woman in Nanook’s family unit in the sleeping scene, which was likely to avoid acknowledging bigamy practiced amongst the Inuit. The elite of early 20th Century Canada demonstrably believed that marriage was necessarily monogamous, and had used the full weight of their government to ensure that it remained monogamous. Long before Nanook of the North, before the turn of the 20th Century, the Mennonites had been forced to relinquish polygamy (but not pacifism) in order to immigrate to western Canada from the United States, Prussia and Russia. While Flaherty’s avoidance of addressing bigamy amongst the Inuit could have been to portray the Inuit as more simply socially organized than they were, as Rothman argues, it is more likely that Flaherty was aware that bigamy and polygamy were punishable criminal offences in Canada.

In the film Nanook’s family seems happy, if occasionally hungry, in their northern home, which paralleled with contemporary European ideas that equated rural
landscapes with nature, poverty with simplicity, and modernity with the corruption of social values. According to Flaherty, the trading company exchanged luxuries for luxuries, trinkets for furs, and not collateral for culture. Rothman rightly notes that throughout the film Nanook is praised for his knowledge and ability to wrest the necessities of life for his family in what is repeatedly referred to as an unforgiving environment. Nanook is referred to as a great hunter and a leader of his people, yet he struggles to provide sufficient food for his family, and we are told in something of a lament for a friend, that two years after the film’s completion Nanook died of starvation. This underlines both the precarious situation of Nanook’s community in the 1910’s, and the absolute connection between the forces of nature and Nanook’s fate.

Flaherty demonstrated a belief that isolation from modernity protected biocenoetic/landscape essentialist values and that these values were noble, again in his later, and stylistically similar, documentary film, Man of Aran, (1934). Man of Aran documented the lives of the people living on the remote Irish Aran Islands, and received almost identical criticisms for similarly anachronistic, staged, footage demonstrating/asserting essentialist relationships between the subject people and their environment. Cumulatively, what Nanook documents best is the pre-modern essentialism that seemingly generates Inuit cultural nobility. I would argue that not only was Flaherty’s anachronistic footage staged in order to suggest these particularly biocenoetic/landscape essentialist relationships, but that Flaherty, like the Group of Seven, created a novel, visual rhetorical method that worked, delivering their messages in timely and commercially viable forms to an independently motivated audience.
The film demonstrates a warmth and admiration for Nanook’s people, and does appear to carefully hide his full relationship with the community. In his critique, Rothman picks up on this as well, but argues that Flaherty is willfully hiding his interloper status, and that of his patron and camera, which “threatens the very lifestyle he portrays.”

Rothman seems to suspect that Flaherty was motivated to render invisible traces of his own colonial attitudes and technology, (including the camera), and the power relationships that they arguably entailed, in order to shirk responsibility for any cultural menace his, or their, presence might have offered the Inuit. Rothman’s explanation seems implausible and perhaps anachronistic. “White” Americans in 1920’s were neither expected, nor typically inclined, to hide any sense of racial or technological superiority for the sake of credibility, nor to conceal technological threats to other (presumably equally valued?) cultures. Manifest Destiny was, after all, about God designating America as the nation fated to expand His domain throughout the North American continent, and Robert Flaherty was a white American.

The film does however conceal the full nature of Flaherty’s relationship with the community. Flaherty was in an intimate relationship with a woman of the community, and the father of interracial children who were members of that Inuit community, so he had something to hide. Interracial relationships were very much frowned upon in Canada in 1920, and some were illegal in both Canada and some American states. If the nature of his interracial relationship become known in 1920, Flaherty’s reputation and credibility could have suffered, and the prospects for his experimental film form along with them.
By 1920, with few interruptions, the HBC had monopolized the fur trade on the Eastern Hudson Bay coast for 200 years, but when in 1906 the Revillon Frères moved closer to Nanook’s people, at Port Harrison, it created some regional competition that increased the trade value of fur, and eliminated the necessity of long distance detours for fur trading. Flaherty was funded in order to encourage the identification of the Revillon Frères trading company (in today’s parlance, to promote their image as a “good corporate citizen”) and Nanook’s happy community. The “happy Eskimo” that Flaherty created was a stroke of genius, both making the Revillon Frères look benevolent and unobtrusive while presenting isolated pre-modern peoples as inherently more contented than their corrupted urban counterparts. Flaherty’s successful merging of his and the Revillon Freres’s motives would have meant nothing, however, had the Canadian elite not been particularly interested in the North in 1920.

“The sterility of the soil and the rigor of the climate no other race could survive; yet here, utterly dependent on animal life, which is their sole source of food, live the most cheerful people in all the world—the fearless, loveable, happy-go-lucky Eskimo.” This marks the beginning of Canadian cultural knowledge about the Inuit.

The happy Eskimo of the daunting yet beautiful northern landscape that Flaherty introduced his urban audience to in 1920, had no guns, game or ammunition shortages, and no involvement in the company staking systems. Any of these would have been indications of the preexisting economic relationships between Inuit and Europeans (HBC traders), which Flaherty did not want to acknowledge. Flaherty films a happy Eskimo involved in a newly established relationship with the Revillon Freres trader as if
the former/other economic relations had never existed. (Avoiding the acknowledgement of the competition is not an uncommon commercial advertising method).

Understanding the staking system in particular could go a long way to understanding much of the content of the film. Rothman, like Flaherty before him, does not account for the staking system, and the effects of pelt price volatility, on the potential trading benefits brought to Nanook and his family. Perhaps staking was so well known in 1920s that Flaherty felt its inclusion unnecessary and/or overly time consuming. But Flaherty’s failure to address the staking system certainly seems to have led to misunderstandings of the implications of the trading exchange. We cannot learn from either Flaherty or Rothman, for example, whether it was common knowledge amongst the Canadian audience that some hunting gear and necessities were provided to Inuit hunters before the season, as a loan in kind, the cost of which was deducted from the balance due upon the delivery of pelts (a process known as “outfitting” or “ammo/grub-staking”). Nor do we know whether this same elite knew that in 1920 (the year of the release of Nanook), the HBC announced that it would no longer “stake” Inuit hunters.269 If there were problems with obtaining seal for food during the 1920’s, and there must have been for Nanook to starve, they were likely problems related to a shortage of guns and ammunition, because as Rothman notes, seals had been harvested with guns for some time, even though snow holes in the winter. The diet of the coastal Inuit had been, and continued to be about 90% seal well after the introduction of the fur trade.270 Data from geographical and anthropological records indicate that the 1920s should have been good years for Arctic and subarctic seal hunting,271 and in Nanook’s region, Inuit continued to rely on “country food” (mainly
seals) for many decades after the film. In bad years for fox, and after 1920, most trading posts operated as “company stores,” creating communities of stake-debtors. We do not know what sort of harvest, or price, Nanook experienced in the year of the filming, but if he had been “ammo staked” the year prior, and encountered a poor year, he might not have been staked again, which would have greatly impaired his ability to hunt for food. Perhaps this is why Nanook was reported to have met his own demise so soon after the movie.

From Nanook of the North to Martha Flaherty on the Iberville in 1953

Around the time that Nanook of the North debuted, the trading companies were operating in volatile fur markets creating a period heightened competition. They began to grub and ammunition stake hunters and trappers in accordance with each hunter’s perceived ability to repay the loan. When the price of furs went down considerably, and/or when ammunition became unavailable or in short supply, the companies, through their “servants” (traders/post managers) would ration ammunition and food to only the best hunters/trappers. These companies had their own currencies, and set their post supplies prices to reflect an expected 25% profit on all traded goods after transportation, and servants who failed to achieve mandated profits lost their jobs. The company allocated and shipped what were designated to be sufficient supplies annually to their servants. There were often shortages of particular exchange items, such as ammunition, in which case a reduced amount, or sometimes none at all, would arrive at the post. Traders often had to ration supplies and decide who would get “relief” in times of need, and many traders found themselves surrounded by small,
seemingly permanent, Inuit settlements comprised of the old, the diseased, and those without the means to trap. Referred to as “post natives,” these people often suffered food shortages, and their prolonged presence around the posts resulted in increased contact with post visitors exposing them to contagions. Epidemics became frequent.

In 1920 the HBC established a post/store in Port Harrison, and both of the Companies slowed their involvement in the fur trade. In the 50 years that the region surrounding Port Harrison had been officially Canadian territory, absolutely no governing functions had passed from the fur trading companies to any level of Canadian government.

The Canadian federal government, from 1880 onward, when it did deal with the Arctic, dealt with the eastern Arctic apart from its Inuit populations. Between 1880 and 1890, the Government created an eastern Arctic game preserve (musk oxen populations had been hunted to near extinction in the Western and High Arctic), and attempted to have Scot, Newfoundlander, and American whalers apply for licenses and obtain permissions to access Arctic natural resources. By 1922-1924, American whalers, Greenland Inuit, and Danish and American explorers were flaunting Canadian sovereignty assertions, and the only population effectively excluded from access to dwindling arctic resources was the Canadian Inuit, who were increasingly starving and diseased. In 1922, J. E. Bernier removed many Inuit from one community for treatment in the south for tuberculosis. At that time Inuit trade and contact with American whalers remained more frequent than the annual contact with the Canadian supply boat, as was evidenced by the Inuit transition to (repaired) wooden-framed whaling boats left behind by US whalers.
In 1923, the RCMP, who had regularly disparaged the trading companies’ behaviour toward Inuit in dire straits, failed to respond when two Inuit reported to A. Joy of the Pond Inlet detachment that 13 Inuit from one community on Hudson Bay had starved to death after being forced to eat their dogs, and 2 Inuit remained missing.\textsuperscript{283} The plight of these Inuit came to the House of Commons, and in 1924 Inuit welfare was transferred to the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs.\textsuperscript{284} The move changed little, as Government policy under Prime Minister Meaghan remained firm: government agents were ordered to “leave them [Inuit] alone,” for fear of reproducing the “learned dependency” witnessed on southern Canadian Indian reservations.\textsuperscript{285}

In 1927, when Frederick Banting accompanied his friend, A.Y. Jackson of the The Group of Seven Painters on the annual Arctic patrol (and during which Jackson painted the first of the \textit{Eskimo Tents}, \textit{Pangnirtung}, appearing on page 46 in this thesis), the difference between what Jackson and Banting observed and documented could not have been greater. While Jackson recorded and painted “Eskimos living in skin tents surrounded by snow-capped mountains rising from fjords…and the colourful tumble of native life on the grassy meadows at their feet”, upon returning from that same voyage, Doctor Banting wrote a scathing confidential report to the Canadian government, and letter to the Hudson Bay Company, concerning their negligence and mistreatment of the Inuit.\textsuperscript{286} Banting had witnessed the unannounced closure of a series of East Arctic (HBC) trading posts while on his voyage, and believed that for medical reasons the Canadian state should administer government in the Arctic. Seemingly appreciating the wariness of Canadian politicians to discuss the Arctic people, as opposed to the transportation and resource potential of the region, Banting went to the press. He
reported to the *Toronto Star* newspaper that tuberculosis and flu had killed many Inuit at Port Burwall during the previous year, and that the trading companies’ responses to these epidemics, in his opinion, had been below contempt.287

Discourses connecting Canada’s purported territorial claims to the Arctic with the welfare of the Inuit had become popularized by missionaries, medical personnel, and Danish explorer Rasmussen, all of whom made public statements to the press after perceiving intransigence on the part of the Canadian government in response to their expressions of concern over the welfare of the Eastern Arctic Inuit. All cited the deplorable conditions of the Inuit as a reason to consider wresting responsibility for the Inuit welfare away from the trading companies.288 They seem to have converted Interior Minister Finnie,289 but the depression had arrived in Ottawa, and there was no political will for costly change. In 1930 even the cost of patrolling the decades-old game preserve in the High Arctic that was first created to assert sovereignty against Greenland’s claims was deemed prohibitively high, and was abandoned. Canadian government policy continued to deal with Inuit apart from Arctic territories, while in Quebec, the province failed to acknowledge the Inuit’s existence entirely, except, that is, as a potential federal responsibility.

Apart from the occasional answer to the clarion call of potential counter-claims to Arctic resources in the form of sovereignty establishing strategies (such as the ignored demands that the US license whaling vessels at the turn of the 20th Century), the Canadian government had demonstrated no history of interest in the Eastern Arctic Inuit or their wellbeing before World War II.
Political Snow Jobs: a pathological political parlance propels policy.

Not all of the people employed in sovereignty assertion strategies were as disinterested in the Inuit as the Federal Government of Canada. To be fair, by 1927 the RCMP had been given some responsibilities for Inuit wellbeing surrounding (sovereignty asserting) detachments in the Eastern Arctic and Hudson Bay, including Port Harrison/Inukjuak, and these detachments had displaced some church sponsored health care and food “relief” efforts. During the depression era (1929-1939), every level of government in Canada, fought, and then responded hesitantly, and differently, to the idea of public responsibility for the rising number of unemployed and/or destitute. One of the first and most prolonged jurisdictional battles over destitute people was waged over the welfare of the Quebec Hudson Bay Inuit, including the community of Nanook’s people (then referred to as Port Harrison Eskimo). Begun by the mutual refusal of the Quebec and Canadian governments to repay destitution relief allowances to the Hudson’s Bay Company as early as 1924, both levels of government were preparing to go to court by 1928, and the Hudson’s Bay Company indicated that no future relief would be issued to Quebec Inuit until the jurisdictional matter had been settled. All parties acknowledged that these Inuit were starving, while insisting that this matter, like the Inuit, were clearly the responsibility of the other parties. In 1931, the Government of R. B. Bennett stated that the position of the Dominion Land Office remained that neither Quebec nor Manitoba Inuit were covered by the 1924 Amendment to the Indian Act, which dictated that the Northwest Territories’ Inuit affairs be taken up federally under Indian Affairs. The HBC contended that all Inuit should be considered Indians, and thus qualify for federal relief, which could be administered by HBC store
managers. When approached to negotiate shared costs for Inuit relief by the federal government in 1933, Quebec Premier Taschereault stated that he was unaware of any Inuit living in Quebec. As their very existence became a matter of debate, the plight of many Quebec Inuit worsened. Indeed, “even when faced with starved and frozen bodies in igloos, there was a stubborn, financially convenient attitude that resisted the need for social assistance.” Re Eskimos was not settled until 1939.

After 1924, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) became the Canadian government contact for most Inuit, and their presence in the Arctic quickly became an irritant to many missionaries and the trading companies. RCMP “G Division” members would regularly report the flagrant levels of exploitation of Inuit by the companies, while advocating the transfer of relief-distribution powers away from the companies, and to themselves, for responsible administration. Church missionaries were reported to distribute food relief preferentially to Christian converts, and the Revillon Frères and HBC had developed policies of rationing government relief in ways that “encouraged” hunting. All of these institutions resisted government inroads into the direct assistance of the Inuit, fearing the loss of government subsidization for their local Inuit behaviour modification programmes.

During this period any suggestion that the Inuit were the makers of their own circumstances was countered by RCMP reports. The RCMP stations were never sufficiently supplied to support growing groups of desperate and sick Inuit who settled around the stations and for whom RCMP members often felt responsible. Some members responded by sharing as much as they could, lobbying for more supplies, and under Larson in the G Division, members began meticulously recording the fate of the
Inuit around them in the belief that when the Canadian government understood the dire circumstances of the Inuit, something would be done.\textsuperscript{300} Larson himself wrote a scathing letter requesting the Government intervene to assist starving Inuit.\textsuperscript{301} In 1928, the RCMP reported of the James Bay and Hudson Bay coastal Inuit that: “These natives have been in long contact with the traders and are now dependent upon many imported commodities. It would be of doubtful benefit to attempt to re-establish them in their original mode of living”, and further, that the Inuit were “slaves of tradeposts,” which rendered them “good subjects for any experiment, as their outstanding characteristic is to work industriously under the direction of a whiteman.”\textsuperscript{302} This last suggestion may appear coarse, if not racist, when taken out of context, but should be considered a reasonable indication of the RCMP officers’ general frustration with the aloof federal policies that saw the creation of “post Inuit” in the first place. Other RCMP members were clearly racist, and believed that the Inuit should be forced to move and assimilate, or be allowed to die along with their moribund culture.\textsuperscript{303}

In 1933-1934, the first relocations of Inuit occurred. The Government of Canada moved Inuit from Baffin Island, on behalf of the Hudson’s Bay Company, to (previously uninhabited) Dundas Harbour near the HBC’s newly established trading post, for the purpose of exploiting arctic fox. The resettlement was both a disaster, and permanent. Both the HBC and the federal government appeared to believe that the relocation would result in the other paying for future Inuit “relief” should it ever become necessary. Within two years, the Hudson Bay Company and the federal government were bickering over the fate of these same Inuit, while those same Inuit lost members of their small community to starvation.\textsuperscript{304} The Government of Canada and the Hudson Bay Company
publicly invoked an efficiency argument for cultural respect as an alibi for their mutual abrogation of responsibility and the subsequent denial of any form of assistance to these Inuit. Inuit, according to the government and the HBC, were deemed so inherently knowledgeable about, and in tune with, their Arctic environment that the provision of relief to starving Inuit was not only unnecessary, but paternalistic and culturally destructive, threatening the development of their biocenoetic/essentialist understanding of the land that had ensured Inuit welfare for millennia. Thereafter the sentiment that it would be preferable to watch the Inuit starve than to watch their proud culture be defiled as they became dependent on handouts was openly believed and enforced by many northern administrators. The noble biocenoetic Inuit had replaced the happy Inuit in Ottawa by the beginning of the 1950s. Reduced in numbers and unable to obtain sustenance in the aftermath of World War II's privations, the James Bay, Hudson's Bay and Eastern Arctic Inuit would be ready to “negotiate” when the Government of Canada had further sovereignty concerns.

During World War II a number of significant changes occurred in the Arctic. First of all, Norman Wells (a central Canadian Arctic location) became a strategically important source of North American oil, and subsequently the Alaska highway was built in 1942, and the Canol pipeline in 1943, with accompanying airstrips. International flight over the North Pole had become possible, but refueling stops were necessary, so refueling stations were built after the war to service air traffic. Arctic air travel made northern interior mineral resource exploration much more possible, and surveying, staking, and mineral exploration commenced almost immediately after the infrastructure for flight was built.
As WWII came to a close in 1944, the Canadian Department of National Health and Welfare was created. With its new mandate, and the knowledge that the Americans were looking north for their future security and mineral resources, the Government of Canada approached the very conservative government in Quebec with regard to the welfare of the Inuit within their borders, in response to “rumours” of death and disease on the Quebec Hudson Bay coast.\footnote{310} In fact, epidemics were raging on the eastern coast of Hudson Bay and all across the Arctic. The federal government equipped the RCMP northern supply boat, the *Nascapie*, with an x-ray machine, and promptly found “epidemic” levels of tuberculosis amongst the Eastern Arctic Inuit.\footnote{311} By this time the fates of Canadian Inuit in different regions of the north had been completely politically severed from each other. Missionaries plead with an indifferent government for a federal floor on fur prices and a government takeover of stores and posts from the trading companies (primarily the HBC, but also the Baffin Trading Company, which was formed in 1940). The establishment of weather and defense stations and mines commenced, and Inuit of the western Hudson Bay, the High Arctic, and the Northwest Territories seeking relief, medical assistance and work, gravitated toward these sites. Once they arrived, Inuit were promptly relegated to outlying areas around these hamlets, creating nascent northern slums of snow igloos and scrap wooden shacks, all largely at the insistence of the Federal Government of Canada, in the name of preserving “Inuit independence.”\footnote{312}

After 1945, mining and defense interests in the High Arctic, and the area around Churchill Manitoba, which was selected as the rail supply link to the Arctic for American military defense initiatives, replaced interest in the Eastern Hudson Bay.\footnote{313}
Eastern Hudson Bay regions, Inuit communities remained seasonally migrant, were only seasonally accessible by boat or plane, and any mineral wealth remained largely inaccessible. The area received very little public attention, and in the 1950s the public image of the Inuit, and the eastern coast of Hudson Bay, were still largely drawn from dated visual art representations of Robert Flaherty and the Group of Seven. Tuberculosis and starvation had become a scourge along the Hudson Bay coast, and RCMP G Division head, Larson, on at least two occasions, brought doctors, food, and medical provisions (one under the auspices of Queen’s University in 1947), to these communities as part of his patrol. Larson provided annual reports to the Canadian federal government that monitored the health and status of the Inuit, mostly by analyzing the documented instances of HBC emergency “advances” granted to families when they were either teetering on the edge of, or already losing members to starvation. The northeastern coast of Hudson Bay became known as the “Hungry Coast” when the boats to carry furs to Europe were rerouted and put into the service of supplying British war efforts during World War II after which the supplies of ammunition dried up, all but ending the fall duck hunt and caribou harvests. The stage was set for the post-war Inuit relocations on “humanitarian” grounds.

Port Harrison/Inukjuak

Port Harrison built up gradually, in 1927 an Anglican Mission was established, and 1935 an RCMP station. These were followed in 1947 by a nursing station after a year that saw the Inuit of Hudson Bay particularly stricken by starvation and epidemics, and in 1951 a day-school was established to service Inuit children. Permanent settlement by
Inuit at Inukjuak (the Inuit renamed the town) came after the school was built, so that they could be close to their children while they attended school. Other Inuit settled in Inukjuak to be close to healthcare services in the aftermath of a number of epidemics. Two years later, in 1953, a group of Inuit from Inukjuak were involuntarily relocated north by the Government of Canada. According to the Inuit, this relocation occurred so that the Inuit could “act as flagpoles,” in an action that “represented this country’s efforts to occupy the uninhabited High Arctic”…(2000 km away)…“and counter the feared expansionist activities of other nations.”\(^{318}\) While the case for sovereignty was never presented publically as the motivation for resettling these Inuit during the post war period, there is evidence beyond their testimony that the assertion of Canadian sovereignty in conjunction with a not entirely sincere belief that returning of Inuit to “natural” conditions would result in their biocenoetic cultural knowledge ending the costs associated with “post-Inuit.”

**The Canadian Arctic and the Canadian Rhetorical Aesthetic of Disparagement and Displacement,** Port Harrison/Inukjuak, Canada

The return of the boats from war service and the opening of the North for military (flight) and further mining exploration did not benefit nearby communities, many of whom were relocated in advance of private development projects, in order to permit them to remain “independent”, or “self-supporting,” even as reports of starvation mounted.\(^{319}\) The post-war era saw a revival in the seal fur market in Europe, but the RCMP Constable at Port Harrison in 1949 reported that “the seals in the area that could be traded were rare, the white fox, plentiful, but fetched an impossibly low price, the caribou were gone, and other supplies of game were dwindling.”\(^{320}\) In his opinion, if the
conditions of even the best Inuit hunters/trappers were not improved, the land would provide “enough for him to starve on but not enough to give him a sufficient supply of food.”

That year the Canadian government began outfitting (providing essential supplies such as ammunition and food in advance of a hunt as a part of a social programme) Inuit of Inukjuak. According to that same constable, “the only time when the natives can obtain their supplies of meat for food and dog feed is when they receive the outfits in the form of relief so that they can go away from the coast to hunt.”

Many RCMP Officers had less generous interpretations of the Inuit plight as conditions worsened on the eastern coast of Hudson Bay. Officers claimed that it was the “welfare payments” (relief) received in lieu of country food and clothing that caused rampant demoralization and caused “conditions to get worse, because “while natives are all good hunters they will not hunt what little there is of country product, being willing to depend on what they get on relief.”

At Diana Bay officers claimed the country products (game) “had been fairly plentiful but the hunters would not hunt and depended mostly on relief” and “the natives were acting very independent and sulky and would not work when offered work, if this did not prove to their liking” and “at the present time they just don’t seem to care.”

While condemning the Inuit refusal to return to a more productive lifestyle, epidemics and deaths by starvation continued to be explained with vague references to Inuit (group) sleeping habits, which had remained unchanged during their transition from temporary to permanent communities around posts and stations. Later, after some tuberculosis hospitals and nursing stations were erected across the Arctic, disease was again explained by “post Inuit lifestyle,” including a lack of hygienic practices and
healthy food in snow-slum igloos and shacks, and, again, traditional Inuit sleeping habits.\textsuperscript{325}

In 1953 and 1955 the Canadian government, under the guidance of Henry Larson, now a federal civil servant, and the auspices of the Department of Northern Resources and National Affairs, offered a nominally voluntary programme of relocation to the people of Inukjuak and the other large remaining Inuit community on the Eastern Hudson Bay on the coast. Select families were offered this programme based on assessments of destitution, their having at least one surviving adult male to hunt, and their willingness to agree to repay the cost of the voyage which would be loaned to them from a fund set up by the government.\textsuperscript{326} In 1953 there were 89 people from Inukjuak relocated to the previously uninhabited Ellesmere Island, along with six families relocated from the Inuit settlement on Baffin Island to help the Inukjuak people to adjust to the darkness of the winter season.\textsuperscript{327}

The moves were poorly planned and executed, and promises given that unhappy Inuit could return to their original community after two years were found to be largely empty.\textsuperscript{328} Returns to nurse ailing family members were occasionally permitted after compassionate appeals were made and, of course, the passenger in question agreed to pay for their own return voyage.\textsuperscript{329}

In response to the deplorable and deteriorating state in which Mowat found the Caribou Inuit, Mowat arranged to have their conditions brought up in the Canadian House of Commons. He was publicly denounced as a liar in the House. Mowat contacted journalist friends in New York, and together, over the next five years, they changed the public discourse in Canada concerning the North and its people by
publically exposing the genocidal consequences of Canadian Federal policies concerning the Inuit. \(^{330}\) This *Life Magazine* cover is one of the most internationally well-circulated artifacts of the visual rhetoric produced at the time concerning Canada’s poor treatment of the Inuit, and it cemented Mowat’s international reputation and authority concerning the Canadian North, and publicized his belief that Inuit were uncorrupted premoderns.

By the early 1960s offshore Newfoundland oil explorations had commenced, and in 1964 Diamond Jeness, a leading Canadian anthropologist, reiterated the federal government’s self-serving mantra, proclaiming that the Inuit’s greatest problem was “the inroads made upon these noble and self-sufficient people by the white fur trade culture”. He further sited “the white man’s demands and superior tools,.. which had forced them to surrender their freedom and resign themselves to the lot of helots labouring for
That the Inuit pre-fur-trade culture no longer existed, nor could, had not shaken the anthropologist’s faith in the Inuit’s biocenoetic cultural knowledge to ensure their survival. He openly supported Inuit resettlement for sovereignty purposes, stating that “there can be no doubt that Canada would immensely strengthen her claim to sovereignty over the uninhabited islands in her Arctic sector if she established either Eskimo settlements or (and) scientific research stations on those islands that are most readily accessible by sea or by air. I say Eskimo settlements, not settlements of white men, because no ordinary white man is content to make his home where…medical, educational and other facilities are either non-existent or totally inadequate. …They [Inuit] will gladly settle in any part of it provided they can kill enough seals and caribou…and trade for guns, ammunition, and a few other articles they require from our civilization.”

Inuit and Newfoundlander resettlements along the Northwest Passage officially ended in 1974, with Inuit and Northern Atlantic fishing boats still tied-up in the aftermath of the first OPEC (Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries) price shock. During the seventies sealing became proportionately more important to maintaining Inuit and outport Newfoundland and Labrador economies as sculp (seal pelt) prices had risen sharply, while fish prices, and the inshore fishery, continued to decline.

The Canadian Department of Fisheries and Environment began extending Canada’s claim to natural resources to a 200-mile jurisdictional limit, up from 12, in 1977, and changed its name to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans in 1979 to reflect that Canada’s resource extraction/sovereignty concerns in the North Atlantic and Arctic extended beyond the fisheries, to the ocean floor. The move, which eventually
changed international maritime law, was popularized in Canada and abroad as a measure to manage and protect commercial fish stocks, particularly Northern Cod, on the Grand Banks off of Newfoundland. By 1984 offshore oil production had begun.\textsuperscript{12} Almost immediately upon the initial seal products ban in Europe (1984), the Canadian government turned to a new source of potential wealth in the Northwest Passage, buried beneath the icy waters. Beginning in coastal Newfoundland waters, there has now been offshore oil exploration and production on the easternmost edge of the Canadian Northwest Passage for a decade and a half. It is to the post war territorial expansion of the Canadian administrative state over Newfoundland and Labrador that we now turn.

\textsuperscript{12} Hybernia was discovered in 1979, and Terra Nova in 1984.
Chapter 3  
Canadian Visions for Newfoundland

The Introduction to Shannon Ryan's *Seals and Sealers: A Pictorial History of the Newfoundland Seal Fishery* reads:

Newfoundland's origin as a colony and its later economic, cultural and political development rested on and was shaped by two fishing industries, the cod fishery which drew European fishermen to Newfoundland and the seal fishery which made it possible for them to stay….

By 1715 after two hundred years of constant European contact, Newfoundland had about three thousand permanent English residents, and these people had become integral to the large migratory fisheries with its headquarters in the southwest counties of England, especially Devon and Dorset….They could grow very little food except cabbage and turnips, after the 1750s, potatoes….The introduction of potatoes, the British conquest of New France and the American Revolution encouraged Newfoundland shipping and growth.

By 1850 Newfoundland had 20,000 permanent European inhabitants. The market for saltfish seemed unlimited, and traditional fishing harbours such as Harbour Grace, and St. John’s became overcrowded for the size of their drying facilities. Consequently the local ship owners began sending their ships and fishing crews to the Labrador coast for the fishing season. The development of the northern cod fishery populated by small southern boats coincided with the rapid growth of another industry—the seal fishery.\(^{334}\) (Shannon Ryan, Introduction.)

Ryan’s encapsulated history of Newfoundland rightly attributes the island’s habitability to the cod and seal fisheries, however the Avalon Penninsular cod fishery’s capacity crisis was not the origin of the seal fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador. By attributing the seal hunts’ origin to the expansion of economic activities of Southern Newfoundlanders, Shannon commits a sin of omission that reinforces current Canadian and European ideas about the seal hunt—that its origins are colonial, and not in a subsistence activity for Inuit and Northern Newfoundlanders. Northern Newfoundlanders had integrated spring seal hunts into their annual fisheries decades
before the large organized hunts of the south. Indeed, the fate of Northern Newfoundlanders has been tied to the fate of Inuit from the beginning of permanent settlement along the island’s northern coast, as it was the Labrador Inuit who first demonstrated seal and cod trapping to Newfoundlanders (and Madeleinot) on the Labrador sealing front. These traps were subsequently used by Newfoundlanders for sealing and cod fishing, and are still in use in some sealing operations in Canadian waters. Traps are described as “the traditional method” of sealing in sealing museums in Newfoundland and on the Iles de la Madeleine.335

Almost all of the seal oil exported from Newfoundland during the 18th Century came from northern harbours. By the turn of the 19th Century, the fishermen had begun to go out in small ships for seals in the spring of the year. Depictions of Labradorian Inuit teaching Newfoundlanders how to hunt seals were elevated to historic significance, even though the large commercial hunts out of St. John’s never incorporated traditional seal trap methods

Plate number 88 in Devolpi’s *Newfoundland: A Pictorial Record*, “Seal Hunting in the Gulf” by Henry Yule Hind, was an illustration in *Explorations in the Interior of the Labrador Peninsula*, London, 1863.
Depictions of the pack-ice surrounding Newfoundland became commonplace in Britain and North America (although mainly in American journals) as the market for “train” (animal sourced oils) rose during the 19th Century. “The ships from the [southern] fisheries were idle in the spring when the ice-whelping harp seals were plentiful, and so the fishing boats headed for Labrador could now extend their seasons336. By mid-century, depictions of the ceremonial launchings of the annual seal hunt from St. John’s, and dramatic depictions of shipwrecks on the ice in pursuit of train became newsworthy in Britain.

Shanon Ryan, Seals and Sealers: A Pictorial History of the Newfoundland Seal Fishery. This sketch documented the departure of the fleet from St. John’s around 1860.337

Further technological innovations brought steamships and many of the outports and small operators could not afford to replace their sailing vessels. Thereafter the ownership of sealing vessels became consolidated, largely to the Avalon Peninsula. This combined with an insatiable demand for oils resulted in very large and profitable years for the seal fishery.338
The price of seal and whale oil collapsed with the electrification of urban lighting, which relied on fossil fuels (largely petroleum) for industrial electrical generation. By the 1940s, the last large sealing steamships were beyond repair or had been taken out of commission. The seal hunt became a small hunt executed by local landsmen and motor vessels by the 1970s. When in the 1980s a market for whitecoat pelts could no longer be found, motor vessels stopped participating, and sealing reverted to what it had been in the 18th Century—a small, widely distributed landsmen operation.

This chapter will discuss how the Newfoundland pack-ice became Canadian Territorial Waters, and how the invocation of the Canadian wilderness aesthetic enabled the displacement of outport Newfoundlanders and the destruction of their economic foundations in order to protect Canadian “wilderness,” thereby permitting the Canadian colonial exploitation of Newfoundland’s resources.

Newfoundland: European colonial documentary advertisement as the template for communication with the new colonial government in Ottawa

Like pre-Kreighoff Canada, Newfoundland’s pre-Confederation artistic representations reflected the needs and interests of European colonial powers. Centred around the activities in the administrative centre of St. John’s, the first few hundred years of non-Aboriginal depictions of Newfoundland are of oceanic economic pursuits (fishing fleets, sealing fleets, various maps and shipwreck/storm depictions), European styled traditional churches and gatherings, and documenting “progress” in the colony toward “civilization.”

13 In Newfoundland, “landsmen” is a label applied to novice or inshore fishermen, whereas “baymen” are full-time, offshore fishers. In Newfoundland this division is culturally significant, as most fishing villages are exclusively associated with one fishery or the other, and their lifestyles are organized around fishing related activities.
Resource extraction was the sole goal of European colonial pursuits in Newfoundland, beginning with the fisheries on the Grand Banks. Negotiated terms of control of Newfoundland coastal fisheries were a part of every European peace treaty from the 16th Century until the end of the 19th Century.

After Newfoundland was granted independence (1832) it took some time to overcome the history of the rule of British ship’s captains along the coast, and a series of British appointed, seasonally present, colonial governors overseeing the export of resources to British trade destinations from St. John’s. By mid-century, Newfoundlanders began to produce some artwork, but initially, as in Canada, representations conformed to European ideas of landscape and civilization.


In 1846 the first prints were produced in St. John’s, Newfoundland, by Rev. William Gray, a local clergyman. As print production began, the Newfoundland literati
began recording their own pictorial histories as “Newfoundland histories”. Subsequently, the dispersed members of the literati, mostly consisting of teachers, merchants, (ship) captains, and clergy, developed a print and sketch based landscape tradition. Stylistically, Newfoundland’s 19th Century landscape aesthetic developed in a similar fashion to Canada’s.

The Newfoundland fisheries suffered its first recorded collapse in 1894. Within a few years, vegetable oil extraction/reduction processes technologically eclipsed the demand for train. The fisheries remained the mainstay of the island nation’s economy. The coastal forests had largely fallen to European shipbuilding interests during the 19th Century. By the turn of the 20th Century, Newfoundland had few remaining exploitable resources on offer to her colonial master. Britain quickly lost interest in Newfoundland. Under pressure to reorient trade (resource extraction) westward to North America, a narrow gage railroad was built across the island and a port located at Port-Aux-Basque, on the most southwestern tip of the island.

By 1928, the cost and logistics of Newfoundland’s ill-fated railroad experiment combined with the first rumblings of the Great Depression saw Newfoundland ask Britain for a loan. A British Royal Commission advised conditionally granting Newfoundland the loan in 1934, upon the suspension of responsible government. The appointed Commission Government administered the provincial economy for 15 years in a fashion that reduced social expenditures in a dramatic and often devastating fashion. The Great Depression (1929-1939) was particularly unmerciful to outport Newfoundlanders, with salt cod prices collapsing under global deflationary pressures,

---

14 Deforestation of the Newfoundland coastal forest was due to exporting lumber for wooden ship building in the 19 Century. This is a known fact along the western coast of Newfoundland.
and St. John’s and British merchants abandoning the service of struggling outports. During the period of Commission Government, some 49 small communities closed-out after fish prices had become so low that the maintenance of fish stages, wharves, boats and homes using supplies purchased on credit from merchants became more than 100% of the predicted compensation for prospective catches (compensation levels, of course, were dictated by the merchants). The people who left these outports generally moved to larger, nearby outports, where they had relatives and could continue share-fishing, supplemental agricultural production, and flake processing. Housing had never been included in outport fishing incomes; fishing families had inherited or built homes with materials scavenged from their home islands for centuries. Out of necessity, when outporters moved, they moved their houses.

Nearing the end of their administrative mandate (set for 1949), the Commission initiated a convention to reassess Newfoundland’s financial position and find a way forward for Newfoundland that would guarantee Newfoundland’s future economic stability. The return of responsible government became conditional upon a referendum: 1. The resumption of responsible government, 2. Confederation with Canada, and 3. Commission Government renewed for 5 years.\(^\text{344}\)

The remnants of the Newfoundland state in the aftermath of the “Commission Government” and World War II consisted of an extensive universal health care programme, policing in St. John’s, a few moribund wartime training bases, and little else. Newfoundland incomes hovered at or about the 50% mark compared to average Canadian incomes in 1949, and 57% by the 1970’s.\(^\text{345}\) Direct transfers in the form of old age/widow/disability pensions and “able bodied relief” were 10 to 25 % of the Canadian
average. By voting for Confederation, Newfoundlanders were to become members of a prosperous welfare state, Canada, poised for a period of rapid economic growth. As the result of successful campaigns by Joseph Smallwood’s pro-Confederation forces, many outporters supported Confederation in exchange for promised improved social services and future economic development.

Newfoundlanders’ pensions and social services rates rose more quickly than wages after Confederation. The Canadian federal government’s assumption of responsibilities for the fisheries and “government wharves” (infrastructure), coupled with the opening of Canadian bank branches in larger outports, brought hope to many outporters that it might be possible to establish a cash economy, thereby ensuring the survival of their communities.

In 1947 Newfoundland had two notable political cleavages: class and religion. These cleavages roughly corresponded to those found in Ireland – urban industrial poor were usually of Irish descent and Roman Catholic, the educated and powerful urban elite were of English descent and Protestant; and the rural population was mostly of Irish descent, poor, and identified strongly as either Protestant or Roman Catholic.

During the pro and anti-confederation campaigns that ensued from 1947 to 1948, many outports received their first ever visits, and political wooing, from St. John’s politicians. In 1947, outport populations were approximately 50% of Newfoundland’s population, and over 80% of these outports had no paved roads, no electrical or sewage services, received no radio or television signals, and had no telephone or regular postal services. Some larger outports, like Campbeltown, had their first road
paved in anticipation of pro-Confederation votes.\textsuperscript{350} (Known as “Joey’s Roads,”\textsuperscript{15} these short, discontinuous, stretches of pavement still run through many coastal villages, as a testament to their pro-Confederation votes.)

Despite the Committee’s and politicians’ dire warnings, and miles of pavement and promises, the results of the two referenda yielded contradictory and contentious results. Joseph Smallwood, the last Prime Minister of Newfoundland, on the authority of the narrow and contested pro-Confederation results of the second referendum in as many years, negotiated the Terms of Union with Canada.

In 1949 on March 31, Newfoundland became the 10\textsuperscript{th} province of Canada. Newfoundlanders had new, Canadian, colonial masters, who, like the British before them, operated mainly through the capital of St. John’s. Along with the local elite, the Canadian federal government concentrated on efficiently exploiting Newfoundland resources for their own purposes. Most outporters experienced an improved standard of living upon the introduction of Canadian social programmes. World War II training grounds nestled amongst the outports became American airport bases during the Cold War, requiring roads, services, and providing non-fisheries jobs. Joseph Smallwood had negotiated a National Park for Newfoundland in the Terms of Union in order to gain federal assistance for road building and provide a “natural playground” for the enjoyment of Avalon Peninsula elites. He had also negotiated transfer payments from the federal government to help the province establish services comparable to those experienced in mainland Canada. Outporters, however, soon came into direct conflict

\textsuperscript{15} This may be a localism of the north-central region, as I have never heard the term used elsewhere. It is what the people of Grandfalls-Windsor, Lewisport and Campbellton, Newfoundland call these stretches of pavement.
with Canada’s ambitions regarding the exploitation of the number one export commodity from Newfoundland: fish.

A Fish-Tale

Canadian offshore and longliner fisheries expanded catches by 500% between 1950 and 1957, while the inshore fishery catches dwindled. The largest market for Newfoundland fish was the United States, and the United States market was developed for fresh-processed Canadian imports rather than the salt cod produced by the Newfoundland inshore fishery.\textsuperscript{351} The province of Newfoundland began a village relocation programme in the early 1950’s signaling that provincial services would never be extended to “dying outports.”

In 1957, there was a fish stock failure. The outporters of Fogo Island explicitly and publicly connected the Canadian Department of Fisheries’ policy of developing offshore fishing fleets to inshore catch failures, and the Department’s determination to evacuate the outports. Outporters predicted that stock depletions would spell the outright collapse of not only the inshore fisheries, but of the midrange and offshore fisheries, which the Department promoted as the route for economic development for rural Newfoundland. Outport fishermen began lobbying for regulations or quotas for the offshore fisheries in order to preserve the cod stock.\textsuperscript{352} The Department, the federal government of Canada, and the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador responded with a public campaign claiming that the real reason for decreasing catches in the inshore fisheries was “crowding.”\textsuperscript{353} According to government experts (mostly Department of Fisheries and Memorial University fisheries institute scientists and assorted economists and rural
development experts), there were too many inshore fishers, using inefficient, archaic equipment. The cure for “crowding” was expedited resettlement programmes with tighter controls. Key to the federally controlled resettlement policy was ensuring that evacuated communities would henceforth be directed to designated “Growth Centres,” all of which were harbours with government subsidized private fish processing plants servicing the offshore fishery.

Inshore fishermen’s warnings that fish stocks were being generally and irreversibly depleted began to be used as evidence by their detractors to argue that the inshore fishery must be ended to ensure the viability of the offshore industry.354 The trickle of resettlement triggered by the Smallwood government’s unwillingness to extend services to expensively inaccessible outports was insufficient for Canadian purposes, but resettlement became the tool of choice for the Department of Fisheries in its drive to alienate inshore fishers from coastal waters.355

Resettlement and the Pack-Ice

In 1959, Premier Smallwood announced that over 50,000 Newfoundlanders, inhabiting over 300 out-ports with “No Great Future,” would be relocated to larger, land accessible centres, so that basic social services could be established and/or maintained.16 The proposed number of Newfoundlanders to be resettled constituted approximately 80% of all out-ports dwellers; almost 25% of the total island population.

The provincial programme was a nominally voluntary programme, and resettlement committees were legislated to assist people with their decision of whether to relocate to

16“No Great Future” is the title of Joey Smallwood’s 1959 political speech announcing the beginning of the Resettlement programme on the island of Newfoundland, as well as the name of the exhibit pertaining to Resettlement. http://www.mun.ca/mha/resettlement/rs_intro.php
a designated “growth centre” or forgo all provincial services, and any assistance for future economic development.\textsuperscript{356}

In 1960 Joseph Smallwood wrote “Our Case: Premier Smallwood’s Statement of Policy.” “Our Case” opens with a rebuke of the Diefenbaker government’s threat to discontinue transfer payments to the government of Newfoundland and Labrador. The remainder of Wentworth’s \textit{Newfoundland: The Fortress Isle} combines a brief, easy language, illustrated history of Newfoundland, with Joseph Smallwood’s curriculum vitae and political opinions, rendered in unblushingly hagiographic terms. The book, published for the Government of Newfoundland and dedicated “To the people of Newfoundland” is modeled after the only other book one was sure to find in every outport home, the ubiquitous Family Bible.

Outside of the capital region, literacy rates remained low, and the only educated person regularly associated with many outports were members of the clergy. In most outports, or small clusters of related outports, churches had been erected shortly after the original settlement, and were the only social institutions. Church attendance rates were high, and one of the few books most homes had was a denominational Family Bible.

Family Bibles served a multitude of social purposes, from the reinforcement of early literacy and the inculcation of values for youth, to the small section reserved with designated pages for the recording of family births, baptisms, deaths, marriages and appropriate religious rites/ sacraments. Outport churches typically kept community records, and had their own small fishermen’s memorials and cemeteries.
Like Family Bibles, “Our Case” contained a section in which to record births, christenings marriages and deaths, with the addition of one’s address on the Day of Confederation. The opening of the records section declares that the book is of enormous historical significance, and that it should be “kept and treasured by Newfoundlanders at home.” On page eight of his text Wentworth quotes Smallwood’s response to Newfoundland dissent: “Grow up or die.”

Outport identity was strongly occupational and religious, and it was the clergy that articulated (and often orchestrated) responses to political pressures “from away.” The island’s clergy were divided concerning Resettlement initially, with the Roman Catholic clergy being more likely to resist resettlement because the designated relocation centres were Protestant. Eventually some families were left to over-winter on “temporary” islands, in transit to progressively distant “Growth Centres,” and still others would move to approved communities only to be resettled again within a few years. Hardships for resettled families in their new communities began to be public knowledge as well. Over time, most clergy, either leading or following their parishioners, came to positions against Resettlement.

Outport Newfoundlanders did not perceive Resettlement as voluntary. During the Resettlement era, Newfoundlanders began a tradition of resistance making use of documentary film, photography and alternative political processes, which eventually amalgamated with a National Film Board of Canada programme and became known as the “Fogo Process.” Begun with the live filming of the Tilting Fishermen’s Meeting in 1957, in which the fishers of Fogo island strongly rejected resettlement and presented co-operative mid-lining boats and fish processing to initiate economic development for
outports, clearly stated that they believed that it was the intention of the Canadian and Newfoundland government to enrich themselves by over-exploiting the fisheries, and predicted an outright and permanent collapse of the fisheries as a result.\textsuperscript{361} The Fogo Process (and analysis) was accepted and copied widely because it provided a succinct analysis of the federal motives for the Resettlement programme, and allowed outporters to combine their concerns for the future of fish stocks with their fight to keep, and develop, their communities. The Fogo Process also acknowledged and advertised the betrayal of the promises of Confederation made by Joseph Smallwood to outport Newfoundland.

Resettlement spawned the aesthetic traditions that under-gird the Newfoundland nationalist resistance to Canadian cultural and material control of “the Rock.”

According to Bonavista Fagan, “Never before in the history of Newfoundland did the artistic community respond in such numbers and with such intensity to a social issue….”\textsuperscript{362} And according to Parcival Copes,

\begin{quote}
The political opposition to the Government’s handling of resettlement has been reinforced through a highly emotional criticisms of resettlement and of its works by both professional and amateur contribution to the popular press….This is usually expressed as total opposition to the resettlement process.\textsuperscript{363}
\end{quote}

By the early 1960s outport campaigns against Resettlement had high profiles and had involved and gained the support of many of Memorial University’s intellectuals and the St. John’s stationed Canadian media. They were soon to be joined by the internationally celebrated defender of traditional Northern lifestyles, Farley Mowat.
After his time in the Arctic attempting to defend and protect the Caribou Inuit, Mowat moved to Burgeo, in 1962, a south central outport Newfoundland community, and became active in the ongoing anti-Resettlement campaigns in the region.

Mowat added his own influence by partnering with some prominent Newfoundland artists responsible for producing some of the innumerable images of community evacuation which were popularized as Resettlement resistance rhetoric. Photographic images, visual art images, and tape recorded radio documentaries were commonly used to document the evacuation of communities. Depictions of Resettlement became iconic in Newfoundland.

David Blackwood’s prints are “the best known on the subject of Resettlement.”

This print is by David Blackwood, entitled “Gram Glover’s Dream” (1969) and was produced the year after his family’s resettlement from Bragg’s Island in 1968.
Blackwood’s Grandmother is in the centre looking back at the Glovers’ ancestral home. The viewer shares the ancestor’s vantage, while sharing Gram Glover’s sense of displacement, hesitancy and loss. Blackwood was probably the most well-known Newfoundland artist to partner with Mowat during his time in Burgeo. Blackwood’s anti-Resettlement prints remain on display in the Resettlement portion of The Rooms (the provincial museum in St. John’s).

While it is the case that while Blackwood’s prints still hang in St. John’s, “the most enduring images of departure are not,” however, “the lines of people leaving home; rather it is that of moving a house from one out-port to another…while not unique to the resettlement programme … has become closely associated with that scheme.” Over ice on the Northern, Western and Southwestern shores, and over water where the winds and waves permitted, resettled Newfoundlanders ensured that politically sympathetic artists and/or photographers recorded their evictions from their outports. These images were produced and priced to be broadly distributed as rhetoric, and are still sold on every corner of the island, and typify the Resettlement images found in most Newfoundland homes.
On the Ground

During Resettlement municipalities were organized by the provincial government out of “naturally” associated outports, and Improvement Committees were organized to lobby for everything from the extension of Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (radio) signals and electrification to federal support for local development plans.\textsuperscript{367} Resettlement Committees, sent to “inform outporters of their options,”\textsuperscript{368} were often followed by anti-resettlement documentary filmmakers, photographers, journalists, students and artists. Rumours of a list of prioritized resettlement targets permeated the island, but the government never divulged whether a list existed beyond Growth Centre designations.\textsuperscript{369} How “Growth Centre” designation was achieved remained opaque. Organized groups of fishers in large outports could not obtain loans for boat building or wharf repairs while the government refused to clarify whether they were slated for resettlement.\textsuperscript{370} Following the Fogo Process’s success, anti-resettlement documentaries were made and screened in larger centres and interviews and Resettlement and Improvement Committee meetings started to be routinely recorded. Outport Newfoundlanders’ resistance did not, however, result in unchallenged success.

The threshold for consent necessary for Resettlement dropped progressively from nominal unanimity (100%) in 1952 under the provincial programme, to 90% under the first Federal-Provincial programme (1954-1965), to 80% during the Second (1965-70), to a final low of 60% during the last years of the Third Resettlement programme (1970-73).\textsuperscript{371} Payments to individual households increased from an average of $301 per household under the provincial programme to an average of over $2,000 by the last few
years of the Department of Fisheries’ programme. The church had such sway that being forced to leave church buildings behind presented further anti-Resettlement sentiment amongst outporters, and to keep wavering clergy onside as Resettlement proved less beneficial to parishioners than the governments had promised, the Canadian Department of Fisheries began supplying barges to transport outport churches (but not houses).

Pro-Resettlement provincial and federal reports claimed that inshore fishermen objected to resettlement because they suffered from having little or no “industrial work ethic.” Their unscientific (traditional) fishing methods and dire predictions were merely a smokescreen for engrained dependency masquerading as a “traditional lifestyle.” A fisheries institute was appended to Memorial University in 1964 in St. John’s, in order to transform “retrainable” inshore fishermen for the offshore fishery. Older fishers, thought to be poor candidates for “adjustment,” were to be offered a pension to retire from the industry-provided they moved from the outport. Newfoundlanders were publicly declared to be less rational/intelligent than mainland Canadians, and traditional outport lifestyles and diets were deemed responsible. For this, on mainland Canada, “Newfie” jokes abounded. Education became an added incentive to move from the outports when it became clear that elementary school-boat services would be discontinued for those who remained on mostly resettled islands, and that the secondary school network begun for rural portions of Newfoundland would punitively exclude both the Great Northern Peninsula and the South/southwestern coast entirely.
By 1979, when the Department of Fisheries and Environment changed its name to the Department of Fisheries and Oceans to reflect that Canada’s resource extraction/sovereignty concerns in the North Atlantic extended beyond the fisheries, the cod stock had already collapsed. The federal government’s exploitative gaze now fell on the ocean floor, and began international negotiations for a potential 200-mile jurisdictional limit (up from 12), to preserve the remaining Atlantic cod stock and Grand Banks fisheries and to regulate the use and exploitation of the pack-ice. Regulating the use of the pack-ice would, however prove complicated, as traditional and ongoing use of roads or paths (including ice-roads or paths), whether privately or publicly held, legally give rise to “access rights” to said paths in Canada.

**Newfoundland’s Pack Ice: Annual extension of landscape**
Pack-ice surrounds much of the Northern, Western and Southwestern Newfoundland in the late winter and early spring, providing winter transportation routes between small coastal communities for the transport of provisions and social gatherings, and small but important subsistence and commercial seal hunts. Due to the lack of flash photography in most outports, photos were generally taken outside, and in conjunction with social gatherings, most of which occurred in the winter. The same ice that permitted winter travel also prevented winter fishing seasons, so fishers could participate in the social season in their regions. There are many historic photos of outport families using the pack-ice for social and transportation purposes (in some families these were the only photos ever taken). Outporters could also prove their participation in a traditional seal hunt, as it was to ensure that Newfoundland outporters could eat seal meat during Lent that the Roman Catholic Church declared seals “fish,” and the spring seal hunt has since always been referred to as a “fishery,” by Newfoundlanders, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant.

Traditions surrounding the winter social season in outport Newfoundlanders’ seasonal calendars abound, the most well-known of which is probably “Mummering.” Throughout Newfoundland’s colonial era, some traditions were encouraged, while others were slated for elimination by the government in St. John’s in the name of the forcible civilization of outporters, who were poor and largely, but not exclusively, of Irish descent. Heavily frowned upon by the Anglican clergy and government in St. John’s, Mummering; a theatrically costumed travelling multi-community New Year’s Eve-Day kitchen-party, was deemed backward and unchristian
and was criminalized. Yet the traditional celebration, a remnant of Irish pagan spring renewal rites, was never abandoned in the outports, and it became a form of anti-resettlement and anti-St. John’s theatre during the Resettlement era.¹⁷

As the ice ablated Newfoundlanders gradually retreated to their villages, and the relative isolation of the fishing seasons, and land-based seasonal subsistence activities would commence. Practices such as the traditional supplemental production of sheep and vegetables on communal land were also deemed “more suitable for 19th Century peasant societies”³⁷⁷ by St. John’s governors than twentieth century Canadian society, and were strongly deterred through policy. Share-fishing and flake-curing cod were declared hopelessly inefficient.³⁷⁸ Traditional sealing, however, was acknowledged as necessary to prepare for the outport fishing season, and to keep outporters off of “relief.” Outporters entered the Resettlement era understanding that the government in St. John’s a malevolent dictatorship.

Life in the outports had always included trap method sealing by necessity. Following the collapse of the 19th Century train market, the waterproof fishing attire made from adult seal skins became standard outport outfitting, and flipper pie became (and remains) a popular seasonal meal in the outports.³⁷⁹ For over half a century the seal “fishery,” had remained an outport subsistence occupation. Conducted with traps dragged across the pack-ice on sledges, the annual hunt was small and concentrated on adult seals, the males of whom loitered at the edge of the pack-ice, necessitating the skill of “copying” for placing and tending traps. Traditional methods and equipment for

---

¹⁷ Mumpering had been criminalized in the 1860’s in Newfoundland, but was never quit by outporters. In the 1960s as anti-St. John’s anti-Resettlement theatre, mumpering made a reappearance. While it had never been formally decriminalized, the old law was not enforced by the constabulary after Confederation. Mumpering was frowned upon by the Newfoundland elite, and unheard of in most of Canada.
sealing were also used for cod fishing, and so the equipment and outfitting could be used productively when winter food supplies would have been largely expended.

**Geoff Butler:** “Fish Stages, Copying,” Pastel.

### Ice as occupation and recreation, fish stages and copying.

Copying is the name given to the practice of vaulting from one ice-pan to the next with the assistance of stilt-like vaulting poles at the edge of the pack-ice, it is a necessary skill for those tending seal traps. Practicing copying remains a popular, if dangerous, past-time of outport youth.

Thematically, Butler’s pastel concerns transitions. The ice is ablating, but Newfoundlanders are enjoying their last few days on the ice. The youngsters in the foreground are “copying,” physically hopping from the ice to the land, symbolically representing their community’s seasonal retreat from ice. The pending return to the
fishery is anticipated with the repeating vertical pattern of the stilts supporting the copiers and the stilts supporting the fish shacks (“fish stages”).

Resistance to resettlement during the early post-Confederation era was forged by anti-Canadian Confederation politicians and outport communities with the assistance of Memorial students and faculty members. Visual images were central to these political struggles, initially because they often broadcast the political concerns of communities that had low English literacy rates and limited access to communication and media resources, who wished to communicate with audiences that were distant, literate, and increasingly using visual media for news (mass circulation magazines and television). Mowat would spend years disparaging the federal government’s resettlement policies in Newfoundland, all while portraying both Inuit and Newfoundlanders as the remnant (and endangered) Canadian “Folk” to Central Canadians and Americans.

Farley Mowat’s continued search for landscape essentialist pre-modern societies.

Mowat was harshly criticized for working against Newfoundland’s outport Resettlement campaigns,\textsuperscript{381} and derided as “from away” by Pro-Resettlement Newfoundlanders and the Newfoundland Government because his writing “romanticized outport poverty” as a cultural artifact, making outporters into European versions of “noble savages.”\textsuperscript{382}
In 1968 Mowat and photographer Jon Devisor published *This Rock Within the Sea: A Heritage Lost*, their contribution to the discussion concerning the ongoing Resettlement attempts featuring Burgeo, the outport in which Mowat lived, and Francois, a nearby outport on the south central coast of Newfoundland. In this book Mowat writes of their first intentions:

To celebrate the closed universe of sea and rock, plants and beasts, wind and fog that occupies the primordial coasts of Newfoundland. But we particularly wished to celebrate the qualities of the people of that coast.

They are an Antaean people, adamantine, indomitable, and profoundly certain of themselves. They are a natural people who have not lost, as we have lost, consciousness of unity with the natural world around them….They are a people who accept hardship, and who, from the crucible of their endurance, had created the conditions requisite to human happiness. They are supremely effective human beings; and they are
amongst the last inhabitants of this planet who still appear-or recently appeared-to possess the answer to that nagging question, ‘Who and what am I?’ (Foreword, p1)

While writing “in defense of the way of life of a people who have been dispossessed, support of their right to that life and of the virtues inherent in it…,” he lamented that “we who had come to chronical human life in its most admirable guise remained to witness and record the passing of a people.” (Foreword, p2)

Mowat produced a material analysis of Resettlement. In his chapter “The World of Water” Mowat claimed:

A low price for the catch is, and has always been, the basic handicap of the fisherman in Newfoundland. Before the Second World War, most of the offshore fishery, (as opposed to the shore fishery carried on from small boats fishing close to home) was done by schooners equipped with fleets of dorys. Men often went out for months for aboard these vessels; they starved and froze and all too often drowned while hand lining or jigging from open dorys far from land. If they survived they were lucky to even a
starvation wage…. The sea is abode of riches, but precious little of that rubs off on Newfoundland fishermen. It is a point the modern bureaucrats carefully avoid discussing when they site the poverty of the outports as an excuse for closing them down. …this is the poverty of exploitation and not essential poverty at all. They would do well to alter the imbalance between the earnings of the fishermen and the earnings of the plant operators and middlemen, as a just and honest means of restoring the viability of the outports whose deaths they so blindly and callously seek.

The sealing game, once a great one in Newfoundland, is now almost at an end. Like so many other activities upon the sea which Newfoundlanders were unexcelled, this too has been allowed to fade. Before Confederation thousands of men journeyed from all over the island to the Avalon Peninsula each March to “muster” on the scores of sealing ships and steam off to the ice. The outports of the Sou’west Coast contributed their share of “swillers” (sealers) and the sealing brought in the only cash money that many Newfoundlanders ever saw.

But now in 1968, only one Newfoundland ship still goes to the ice and she carries a mere sixty swillers. A multi-million-dollar harvest has been abandoned to Norway and to Norwegian-controlled vessels sailing out of Halifax flying the Canadian flag.

In Norway, Iceland, the Faeroe Islands, Finland and the USSR, it is government policy to provide meaningful assistance to coastal dwellers so that they can make real progress toward achieving a good way of life compatible with modern standards, and in a manner of their own choosing.

It seems, in 1968, Mowat’s only objection to the seal fishery was that Norwegians benefitted disproportionately to Newfoundlanders from the exploitation of the shrunken “harvest.” He believed that sealing would remain a small, moribund operation, mostly exploited by foreigners. While many Newfoundlanders had been warning that Federal fisheries policies were destined to cause a permanent collapse of the cod fisheries, Mowat chose to argue for the necessity of state support for the continuing physical and cultural isolation of Newfoundland outporters from the modern word by lobbying for government price supports for outport fishers so that they could stay and fish, if they wished. That is because when fishers of Burgeo claimed “there is still plenty fish in the
sea and we’re the byes could catch ‘em,” Mowat honoured that knowledge claim, and railed to defend it against Newfoundlander and scientific evidence to the contrary. Mowat believed, based on these fishers’ cultural knowledge, that their noble way of life could be maintained in splendid isolation, and that the Government would force it to an unnecessary end. Mowat backed Burgeo outporters’ claim to cultural knowledge about the state of the fisheries because outporters had, to his mind, “on a foundation of sterility and desolation … built their small, strong worlds-bastions of courage and endurance and endurance wherein there dwelt a resolute and prideful race.”

During the years of Resettlement, Mowat’s comments concerning how poor these people had been for centuries due to their continuous exploitation by colonial masters in the global fish and seal economies transitioned to a cultural eulogy for those very forms of exploitation, because those relations had permitted outporters to maintain what he perceived as unmediated knowledge of their landscape.

During the same period, Western European economies, successfully rebuilt after World War II, were flourishing, and brought renewed interest and markets for Arctic seal products and the North Atlantic pack-ice. Norwegian Karl Karlsen quickly moved in to service this renewed demand, setting up business in Nova Scotia and facilitating an expansive commercial seal hunt. The Karlsen Shipping Company quickly developed relations with Newfoundland outporters (and the people of the Iles de la Madeleine, Quebec) that closely resembled those of the British and St. John’s sealing merchants from the 19th Century. Foreign owned boats would launch in the early spring, and outporters could make enough money to prepare for the fishing season, thereby
avoiding the specter of Resettlement, and rebut the growing tide of prejudice against them for being the essential material for anti-Newfoundlander stereotypes.

In 1974 the official, federally subsidized Resettlement programmes, ended. Since Joey Smallwood’s infamous “No Great Future” announcement over 20,000 Newfoundlanders from 247 outports had been resettled, and almost 30,000 Newfoundlanders, from over 700 outports, had refused to participate in the programme. Of those outports that refused resettlement some, such as Fogo on Fogo Island, remain. Others, such as Petites, were abandoned in 1983, after the European Community boycott of Canadian seal pup pelts.

**The Rhetoric of Moral Disparagement in Newfoundland**

As with the Northwest Passage Inuit, Resettlement officially ended in Newfoundland and Labrador in 1974, and there as well, outport fishing boats were tied-up in the aftermath of the first OPEC shock, making sealing more important to maintaining their communities’ economies.

While Newfoundlanders defined themselves within Canada, Mowat, began defining Newfoundlanders, and Newfoundland, for Canadians. By the early 1970’s Farley Mowat’s articulate and emotional descriptions of the noble qualities of wild and domesticated animals and his defense of North America’s wild peoples and places, had gained him international credibility as a Naturalist.

During the early 1970’s Mowat became instrumental in recasting the pack-ice as a frozen extension of “Canadian coastal waters” in need of protection from the people of Newfoundland, in order to protect marine mammals. The completion of this transition
necessitated wholesale changes in the legal, moral, and material status of Newfoundlanders’ traditional activities on the pack-ice. Mowat accomplished the transition with rhetoric of displacement, by framing the only potentially noble Newfoundlanders as an extinct people of the past, and then denouncing all outporters, and their cause, when he repatriated himself to mainland Canada.\(^{389}\)

In 1972 Mowat, while still residing in Burgeo, published *A Whale for the Killing*. Based on the true story of the brutal behaviour of a group of outport Newfoundland men toward a stranded, pregnant mink whale in their harbour, Mowat’s retelling of his heroic attempts to rescue the whale, and the retrograde behaviour of these outport men shocked Canadian mainlanders and Newfoundlanders alike. Mowat relocated to Cape Breton Island after declaring that Newfoundlanders had abandoned their traditional ways. Later he would declare that Labradorean Inuit had similarly lost their traditional moral/cultural claims to hunting charismatic marine megafauna.\(^{390}\)

In the following year (1973), Mowat fictionalized an illustrated history of the pre-Confederation Newfoundland seal hunt in *Wake of the Great Sealers*.
their vessels. His prints memorialize 19th Century shipwrecks, triumphs, and tragedies on the pack-ice.

Mowat’s text in “Wake of the Great Sealers” wavers between a romanticized eulogy to a hardscrabble but noble people, and a portrayal of Newfoundlanders as uneducated, unscientific, barbarians who must be dragged into the 20th Century for their own, and nature’s, protection, a position much closer to those of the governments and governing agencies that he had roundly condemned during the past quarter century.

In this second presentation of Blackwood’s prints Mowat’s description of pre-Canadian Newfoundlanders frames and thereby subtly but decisively alters the viewers’ expectations as to the prints’ meaning. Mowat is addressing a Canadian audience as a Canadian in this work. He portrays Newfoundlanders as primitive, pre-moral, pre-Confederation people. This is Mowat’s opening text in Wake:

They were a people out of time—a breed of men whose certainty and hardihood, whose courage and tenacity, linked them more closely to the ancestors of our species than ourselves. They were one with nameless and long-forgotten beings to whose essential qualities we owe our dominance. They were essential men. Farley Mowat, 1973.

The illustration that follows demonstrates how Mowat’s changed pinion was first transmitted through the invocation of visual art. Gram Glover’s Dream appears earlier in this chapter accompanied by its original text. I rely on the analysis developed in Quest for the Folk, in which Ian MacKay demonstrates how attendant text contextualizes visual art (photography in rural Nova Scotia) by “framing” or emphasizing certain aspects and particular interpretations of the art. MacKay argues that changes of attendant text (including titular text) change the viewer’s expectations and interpretations of visual art, and that such changes direct, reflect and reinforce the
political and economic assumptions of the viewing public, and those who identify with the subjects (for example descendants, members of the same profession or community).


Most of the text and illustrations in *Wake* were drawn from pre-Confederation historic documents. This illustration, originally a part of Blackwood’s “Resettlement Collection”, was not, and nor was its attendant text. This print, re-framed, illustrates the final text entry in *Wake*. In *Wake*, set in 1931, the print is used as the background for the dying utterance of a prescient pre-Confederation outport sealer.

According to Mowat,
Jacob, me son, take a good look at it now, for ‘tis all going out afore long. This old island fed we people so long as we took no more’n we had to have. That’s how it was when I was a youngster. Now ‘tis all changed and gone abroad. “Tis the gold they’re after these times, and I don’t say they’ll give it up until there’s nothing more to take. The seals will go under, aye, and the whales and the fish too. Then the people will have to get out of our old rock. The way she’s pointing, they’ll have to haul their boats, bar up their houses and take to their heels. I believes t’will be a bad lookout my son.391

Mowat’s text insinuates an anachronistic moral link between Resettlement and a market driven avarice of pre-Confederation outport. The text also portrays seals, whales and fish as endangered species and posits causal links between species shortages and outporters having abandoned historic moral codes, which dictated that they take “no more’n [we] had to have.”18 I argue that this is the moment of a decisive shift from the creation of moral anachronism to the rationalization of colonial displacement and that this shift invokes the Canadian wilderness aesthetic as its foundational cultural intuition.

In his 1984 Sea of Slaughter, Mowat also publicly recanted his former support of traditional Inuit whaling practices in terms that denote his belief that the Inuit had lost their biocenoetic/ landscape essentialist cultural understanding of their environment as well:

The situation that the surviving bowheads (whales) find themselves in is tragically ironic. While modern man has given over deliberate slaughtering of them, his industrial practices indirectly threaten their tenuous hold on life. What seems sadder is that they are still being killed by native peoples, who have now become the bearers of Western cultural attitudes toward animate creation…and who no longer need the bowheads for their own survival.392

Mowat’s public reversals regarding both Inuit and Newfoundlander traditional sealing and whaling activities, and subsequent embracing of an ethic of marine mammal/animal rights, created an institutionalized sort of social amnesia concerning the etiology of

---
18 This shift is alarmingly similar to the one made to limit the First Nation’s Fishery on the Great Lakes to “traditional”-read, non-commercial, subsistence, fishing practices.
Resettlement. It also created an animus in Canada, against Newfoundland outporters, and Labradorian Inuit communities where the spring seal hunt had become a source of commercial income. Mowat’s writings about Newfoundland’s national and provincial history transformed Newfoundlanders into anachronistic Euro-barbarians, from whom photogenic Canadian mega fauna, such as whales and seals, would have to be protected. Soon thereafter Mowat’s public about-face would be invoked rationalizing and promoting public policy changes that would devastate these same communities.

The successful media campaign against the Canadian spring harp seal hunt that resulted in the banning of Canadian seal products from import into Europe in 1982 had the effect ending the Inuit commercial seal hunt as well.
Mowat’s change of opinion concerning the sealing industry is evidenced in his later description of the historic sealing industry and sealers of Newfoundland.

These tough and implacable seafarers had come to realize that the main patch could probably not be reached except with vessels strong enough to brave the pack and big enough to shelter crews from bitter temperatures and killing blizzards.…

Bigger boats were built to look for it. …although the main patch [of seals] continued to allude them, they made fortunes anyways.

From its beginnings the search for the main patch had been expensive in terms of lives and vessels lost. But in 1817 a ferocious storm of the kind that sometimes devastated the whelping patches brought desolation to many a northern outport. The sealers landed only 50,000 sculps that year and paid a fearful price. At least twenty-five vessels were crushed and lost in the pack, taking nearly 200 men to icy deaths.393

He then goes on to abridge the transcript from Professor J.B. Jukes (Professor of what or where is not stated or referenced), an observer on the Topaz in 1840 who witnessed the hunt.

We passes through some loose ice on which the young seals were scattered, and nearly all hands went overboard, slaying, skinning and hauling…. 
When piled up together, the young seals looked like so many lambs and when from out of the bloody carcasses one poor wretch, still alive, would lift up its face and begin to flounder about, I could stand it no longer and, arming myself with a handspike, I proceed to knock on the head and put out of their misery all of those in whom I saw signs of life…One of the young men hooked up a seal with his gaff. Its cries were precisely like those of a young child in the extremity of agony and distress, something between shrieks and convulsive sobbings… I saw one poor wretch skinned while yet alive, and the body writhing in blood while after being stripped of its pelt…the vision of (another) writhing, its snow white woolly body with its head bathed in blood, through which it was vainly endeavouring to see and breathe, really haunted my dreams. 

In his *Sea of Slaughter*, Mowat’s conflates the history of the traditional outport and historic commercial (train) seal hunts. Indeed, by the late 1970’s Mowat and his friend, Paul Watson, of Greenpeace (later of the Sea Shepherd Society), had declared both the means and methods of the traditional and commercial seal hunts in Newfoundland aesthetically and morally appalling, inhumane, unnecessarily dangerous, unscientific and unsustainable. 

By the summer of 1964 it had become brutally obvious to everyone involved in the business that ice seals were destined for commercial, if not actual extinction……Those departments of the Norwegian, Canadian, and Soviet governments entrusted with the regulation and protection of fisheries were fully aware of what was happening. They had been briefed by their own scientists, most of whom it must be said in all fairness, were predicting a devastating collapse of harp and hood populations unless the mayhem on the ice was quickly halted.

Norway and Canada ignored the warnings. The Canadian Department of fisheries stated that they would not interfere with free enterprize and the rational harvest which was of great importance to the Canadian economy.

The Norwegians pointed out that they harvested seals in international waters..and would accept no restraint on her freedom to “fish” on the high seas.

Licensing ships and aircraft was a mockery, Even had the fee imposed been realistic, it would have had little or no effect unless the number of licenses was limited, and it was not. Supervision of the slaughter
in 1965 by fisheries officers consisted of counting the sculps delivered by planes and ships—a rather rough count too, since the quota was exceeded by some 4000 whitecoats.\textsuperscript{397}

...Landsmen, small vessel operators, gunners and netters everywhere remained free to take all the seals, young or old, that they could kill.\textsuperscript{398}

In Mowat’s reported interview with Brian Davis, formerly of the New Brunswick Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (SPCA):

‘Maybe its pompus but what I saw changed my life....Words don’t describe that kind of barbarism. It couldn’t be allowed to go on. Somebody had to stop it. I never had any doubt what I had to do’.\textsuperscript{399} Davis waged his war to save the seals...

And later of his own visit to the ice pack with John de Vissor:

In the spring of 1968, photographer John de Vissor and I went to the Gulf to observe this ‘most tightly regulated operation of its kind anywhere in the world.’ It was a grim experience. On one occasion, de Vissor watched an aircraft hunter club his way through about 30 pups, killing 6 and wounding a number of others before leaping to another pan and abandoning his victims. On two occasions, I saw pups return to consciousness while being skinned alive.

I talked to members of the Brian Davies contingent and to the rival “official” observer group led by Mr. Tom Hughes of the Ontario Humane Society...I talked to the Fisheries officers, scientific experts, and ordinary sealers. I concluded that the massacre was just that—an almost uncontrolled orgy of destruction conducted by, and for, people who were prepared to commit or countenance almost any degree of savagery in order to maintain a high rate of profitability.

My visit to the Gulf convinced me that... although the cruelty was a real enough problem...the main issue issue was whether the ice seals could survive at all in face of the enormous and virtually uncontrolled destruction they were suffering.\textsuperscript{400}

Criminalizing one of the few sources of income for a population full of resentful people was not, however, easily accomplished. The “Seal Wars,” as Watson (and Mowat) dubbed the international anti-sealing campaign, lasted a decade and ended in 1983 and 1984, with the banning of imported harp seal pup furs (commercial seal products) by
the European Community, and the legislated end of the spring seal pup hunt by the
Canadian Federal government. It was Greenpeace, a self-declared group of "artists and revolutionaries" hailing from Vancouver, that imposed the Canadian landscape aesthetic onto the Newfoundland sea ice, institutionalized Mowat’s rewritten narrative of Newfoundland history, and materially alienated Newfoundlanders from their traditional activities on the pack-ice.

Bridgette Bardot's reception on the Îles de la Madeleine, collage.

In 1976, Greenpeace gained international notoriety when Paul Watson, accompanied by French film star, Brigitte Bardot, disrupted the spring harp seal hunt off the Canadian Madeleine Islands in a staged event for international media. Bardot, greatly admired in Europe, called Canadian sealers "bouchers" (butchers), and many unflattering French adjectives, while pleading for a European boycott of Canadian seal pup pelts. Because Bardot gave many French interviews, the French Canadian and
European press paid particular attention to her opinion. Of Greenpeace’s celebrity supporters over the decades, Bardot is the only one acknowledged in the Sealing Museum of the Iles de la Madeleine, Quebec, for her participation in ending the spring seal hunt. In Newfoundland the ban is usually attributed to Greenpeace and meddling Europeans.

Describing their campaign as a war (Seal Wars) Greenpeace ramped-up their anti-sealing campaigns in the United States of America and Ottawa after Bardot’s appearance brought them international attention.

This post card is an example of the visual rhetoric (anthropomorphization) invoked during Greenpeace’s and the Sea Shepherd Society’s subsequent anti-sealing campaigns.

By the beginning of the 1980s, the disruption of the North Atlantic spring seal hunt had become an annual international event, and Greenpeace’s broadly circulated images of white-coats (harp seal pups) had transformed the North Atlantic pack-ice into an internationally acclaimed Canadian “nursery” for “baby” seals. Sealers were
portrayed as morally bereft, sadistic “baby killers” who must be stopped to put an end to the “slaughter of innocents.” From 1973 to 1983 images of blood on the pack-ice and anthropomorphized “white-coats” flooded the media in Europe and North America from February through to April. Seals became the celebrated photogenic megafauna of the pack-ice, and protecting seals from Newfoundlanders became a celebrated international cause. The North Atlantic pack-ice was constructed aesthetically and politically as an environmental setting of ethereal beauty, and ecotourism became a way for wealthy celebrities to experience and promote the conservation of pristine nature while disrupting the annual hunt.

In 1990, Mowat, who had written so eloquently in condemning the Canadian government’s treatment of the Caribou Inuit, whilst documenting a people who had rejected the corruption of modernity and perished in his 1959 *The Desperate People*, renounced the Labrador Inuit because in his opinion they had lost their essential bond with their environment. According to Mowat, the Inuit had become sufficiently corrupted to be a threat, just like Europeans, to their environment. On the negative consequences of ending the commercial seal hunt in Canada for the coastal Inuit he stated:

> By eliminating the seal hunt, by making it unacceptable in our society, we deprive the Inuit of Labrador and Greenland of a market for sealskins so they can’t earn enough money to buy gasoline and ammunition to shoot more seals. But they are not now living in an aboriginal state; they are living as modern man, therefore they must conform to the restraints that are vital to the survival of all of us.

The European moral argument for protecting harp seals is anchored in the anthropomorphic images popularized in Europe during the Seal Wars, which was so
successful that Europeans interested in continuing the ban on Canadian seal products have continued to produce anthropomorphizing images, to exhibit at home and in Canada. Here is a current example.

Ecotourism-Swiss photographer Sven Mayer and seal hamming it up.

This is an ecotourism-promoting anthropomorphic vision for Canadian territorial waters, taken by Swiss photographer, Sven Maier and exhibited in the Iles de la Madeleine Aquarium in the summer of 2008. The photos in the exhibit were accompanied by text that described the emotional similarities between seals and human beings. Maier is an example of the naturalists, environmentalists, and animal rights activists, who have tried to encourage ecotourism as a means for coastal communities to recover some of the income lost from the seal hunt. Yet for all of its advertised ethereal beauty, ecotourism in Atlantic Canada’s remote regions has proven a difficult sell. In the Sealing Museum on the archipelago, the anthropomorphization of seals is attributed to Europeans.
The rules that should ensure the “survival of us all,” apparently do not include sealing communities, as the harp seal population approached the numbers approximated at the time of John Cabot’s first voyage (1497) to the North Atlantic, (7-10 million),\textsuperscript{408} when in the spring of 2009, Peta, the Sea Shepherd Society (Paul Watson’s group) and other animal rights activists were once again on the pack-ice railing against the remnant Canadian seal hunt.\textsuperscript{409} The European Parliament proclaimed the Canadian Seal hunt “inhumane”, and banned all commercial seal imports (again) a decision the World Trade Organization permitted to stand on “moral” grounds in 2011. The European Community did not, however, condemn First Nations’ traditional (read subsistence) seal hunts. In response, the Inuit have publicly railed against this distinction because of its racist and colonial implications.\textsuperscript{410} Harp and hooded seals (the two species of arctic, ice whelping seals) have never been endangered species, but they look like some southern seals that are, and northern seal pups continue to provide particularly photogenic candidates for anthropomorphization by animal rights campaigners. Set against a background of pink-streaked dawn or dusk affected light sources, a viewer can barely distinguish the horizon in this National Geographic photo, and the reflective white coat of the seal in the foreground provides a “shimmering” contrast. (Under full light conditions seal pups, like other camouflaged ice animals, are difficult to discern).

By evicting Newfoundlanders and protecting the Canadian pack-ice and its megafauna, Mowat, Greenpeace, the Sea Shepherd Society and the Canadian state, unwittingly established the North Atlantic pack-ice as Canadian territorial waters and “wilderness sublime.” This 2004 National Geographic photograph portrays the Canadian pack-ice as depopulated and beautiful, complete with an anthropomorphized natural figure and back-lighting inspiring a sense of reverence.

Yet, Resettlement images remain the vision of Canadian territorial waters for Newfoundlanders.

Combined, these factors help explain the consistent failure of Canadians to comprehend Newfoundlanders’ seemingly anti-Canadian and anti-environmentalist (anti-animal rights) nationalism, in concert with the Inuit, which conflicts with the images peddled in the cultural tourism industry, which are built on the images of the Group of Seven’s and Robert Flaherty’s interventions a century ago.

With an understanding the origins, functions and effects of the Canadian landscape aesthetic as rhetoric, and how it has developed over time to be the opaque foundation of Canada’s internal colonial relationships of exploitation, we will turn to an alternative visual rhetoric. This rhetoric neither developed, nor continues in a political vacuum, and so there have always been oppositional statements and analyses from the communities adversely affected and corresponding reassertions attempting to conserve the aesthetic status quo. These processes leave neither group—the colonizers nor the colonized—unaffected. The next chapter will discuss both resistance against and a reassertion of Canada’s landscape rhetoric to illustrate the reflexive nature of the discourse.
Chapter 4
Resistance and reassertion

There have always been Inuit and Newfoundland artists who insist on understanding colonization as materially motivated, and speak directly of the consequences of the material and cultural changes that their communities have been experiencing. These communities (and their artists) have a number of common experiences resulting from Canadian colonization; they were relocated *en masse*, their economic foundations and territory were effectively alienated, and they suffered public and group repudiation at the hands of Mowat, Greenpeace and the Sea Shepherd Society after Mowat’s well-documented, and failed, search for MacKay’s “Folk.”

While this thesis deals with the publicly addressed visual rhetoric produced explicitly by these communities to counter Canadian colonial visual rhetoric, many Inuit communities have taken actions in order to preserve future community members’ access to the artifacts which would enable the unmediated retelling of oral histories. Bordo, in his 2003, “The Keeping Place” documented social memory preservation processes amongst some Inuit that protect sites and artefacts for the interpretation of “culturally specific or cultural insiders of different times…”. Dubbing these alternative repositories of community custodial storage “Keeping Places,” Bordo documents acts of cultural and historic resistance as re-appropriation not meant to address a larger public; a sort of cultural cryogenics. It should be noted that these communities are attempting to ensure their community’s “Inuitness” through changing times, and that while artists have been entrusted with representing their communities to the Canadian public, the actual motivation of all of these artists and
politicians is ensuring their community’s survival. Later in this thesis Zacharia Kunuk’s *The Fast Runner*, designed to address present and future mainstream North Americans as well as document cultural lore for present and future Inuit. witnesses;” will be discussed, but more often these activities are separate and mutually conditioned.

This portion of this thesis will review publicly addressed artistic interventions into the Canadian rhetorical landscape, the first in the form of a book of interviews granted to Sue Cowan and Rhoda Inuksuk by Artic Bay Inuit soapstone carvers entitled *We don’t live in snow houses now*. The next, drawn from Northern Newfoundland, will highlight the early 1990 museum exhibits of the oil paintings and words of Lloyd Horwood, a painter living on Twillingate Island, Newfoundland. In both cases the seal hunt is dealt with as a cultural artifact and an economic engine of the past. Horwood’s work includes an example of Newfoundlander attempts to reverse the discourses that had begun separating Inuit and Newfoundlanders during the “Seal Wars.” The review of Horwood’s work will be followed by a short discussion of the cover art and content of Kunak’s, *The Fast Runner* (2002), which will bring us full circle, to the visual art of film, culture, the Inuit, and the ongoing politics and imagery of the Northwest Passage. Finally, the reflexive adaptation and reassertion of the Canadian landscape aesthetic as rhetoric, in the book *This Marvelous Terrible Place* will be examined.

Inuit and Newfoundlander communities have entrusted their visual artists with the definition and representation of their changing cultures within their new geo-political circumstances, in the hope that they can move Central Canadian and American public opinion in support of their negotiating positions visa-vise the Canadian government. These are public campaigns, meant to reach out to southerners, and other communities
in similar positions, and these artists have both demonstrated community support and proclaimed rhetorical intentions.

Cowan and Innuksuk’s book was written to introduce the Inuit culture of 1974 to southerners almost 40 years ago. It is unfortunately the case that this book can likely accomplish the same feat now, because between resource related territorial expansions, Southern Canadians have rarely shown sufficient interest in the area to generate a market for knowledge about the topic. The book’s front cover photo is of an ice igloo, and on the back cover is a photo of Arctic Bay, with its houses and school in 1974. The text is bilingual, English and Syllabics, including the covers, to ensure that this cultural record is available to the Inuit of Arctic Bay first, but to Central Canadians as well, and to assure the audiences that the interviewees and interviewers are willingly responsible for the content. The snow igloo and the attendant text on the front cover represent a synecdoche-presenting southerners with that which they expect, and absenting it simultaneously.

Front Cover of We don’t live in snow houses now. Julien Beleveau. Photo, undated.

The back cover substitutes a photo of 1974 Arctic Bay in winter for the ice igloo.
Back Cover Text: “I still remember it all clearly and if I were to go back to that life I could do it all exactly as I was taught. It’s just that we don’t live in snow houses now.”

Inside the book, interviews are accompanied by historic photos documenting the early lives of Arctic Bay artists, the building and settlement of the hamlet, the development and marketing of carvings by the artistic cooperative, and updated photos of the artists, their art, homes, families, co-operative building and of exhibitions held in the Arctic and Ottawa.

“We don’t live in snow houses now” is a direct quote from the Inuit artist, Imaruit Taqtu, one of many Arctic Bay artists interviewed by Susan Cowan and Rhoda Innuksuk. Taqtu records the material changes in the north and the intergenerational transitions in response to the Inuit’s changing role within the global economy. Arctic Bay, the town in which the interviews were conducted had grown from 50 to 300 in fewer than 10 years, and from around 10 souls (an extended family camp) a decade before that. While Arctic Bay had been an HBC trading post site in the past, it was the establishment of permanent houses circa 1966 that brought most of the Inuit to the
old camp to stay.416 Both Arctic Bay and nearby Strathcona Sound had been sites of Bernier's prospecting decades before, and the opening of a mine in nearby Strathcona Sound was the regional economic engine in the early to mid-1970s.

The book is divided into subject areas, and carefully chronologically structured, so that the transition away from hunting for the trading companies in exchange for tokens, the WW II ammunition and transportation shortages, the game shortages and hungry 1950s, the establishment of a permanent settlement with a day school for children, representative democracy and the artists' cooperative, along with the rise of mining exploration and preparations (late 1950s to 1970s), are followed by the most recent American, Canadian, and European scrutiny of the seal hunt as these Inuit began to gain much more attention from resource interested southerners.

The Inuit artists who were interviewed had many points of emergent consensus. The first and most pronounced was that the Inuit very much reject the tradition that has grown up in the south of understanding and writing about the Inuit culture as if they were “still living in snow houses, surviving only through constant combat against a hostile environment.”417 The most succinct critique of the habit of white southerners to presume to know or speak on behalf of, and attribute qualities to Inuit was delivered by Oorebecca Issuqqanqituq,

There is something else I would like to say. I don’t like it when white people come to study the Inuit in order to write books. A lot of what they say isn’t true, a lot of it is just nonsense, but the people down south believe it because they don’t know what it’s like here. It always irritates me, especially when people say the Inuit are like this, or do that, for such and such a reason. We do find out too, because there are young people who can read English and translate parts for us, especially parts that we find funny. Part of why it’s funny is because it isn’t true. I would like people who write books to hear this, to know that some of them are not correct. I would like the next people who write books about us to understand us better before they write them.(Cowan and Inussuk, 83.)
In the immediate aftermath of the Arctic resettlement era, Arctic Bay Inuit lived in a small, relatively new community established after the collapse of the fur trade. Built on an historic fur trade camp, Arctic Bay fronts onto a boat accessible harbour, and the Inuit call the area Ikpiarjuk, which means “pocket.” The region’s history with both European and the Dorset cultures are known, and even after earlier anthropological excavations, historic evidence of each remains nearby.

There are no anachronistic photos, but older interviewees analyze the game shortages of their earlier lives (the 1920’s) through the lens of traditional religious practices, and one woman, Atoat, speaks extensively of the difficulties of transitioning to Christianity as a young adult, and the heavy-handedness of the missionaries who converted her family. Many of the elderly interviewees analyze the game shortages and other struggles of their early lives alternately through traditional and Christian lenses. Younger interviewees seldom discuss religion, and tend to discuss technological, economic, and cultural changes with reference to Inuit and personal political and economic history.

If there is one profound message that should be taken from this book it is that Robert Flaherty’s noble Nanook, Jenness’s noble Inuit, and Mowat’s noble People of the Deer (inland Caribou Inuit) no longer exist, and no longer could exist. The Inuit interviewees of 1974 Arctic Bay could remember the days before permanent settlement, but only one expressed a wish to return to a traditional “camp” lifestyle, although many expressed anxieties concerning the speed of change, and the future of their community. Some worried about the future fate of Arctic Bay after the mine closed, and the white workers moved on, and southerners again lost interest in the area. There were also
many references to the better services already available to nearby Strathcona Sound, where the white, temporary, and transient mine-working population was increasing.

Interviewees lived in a culture quite different from that of their own youth; a modern Inuit culture. The first interviews concern the history of the place, and the next concern the gathering of Inuit families in Arctic Bay, their former conditions, followed by their opinions concerning the ensuing cultural and economic changes, life in Arctic Bay, and their visions for the future.

Initially the HBC would only purchase seal and fox pelts in exchange for tokens, but with the economic transition away from the fur trade after World War II and the ongoing shortages (game, ammo and transportation vessels), an interest was shown by different traders and RCMP officers in northern-themed soapstone carvings. When the regular visitations of boats resumed after 1957, the HBC trader started to buy soapstone carvings to market in the south. With the opening of Canadian weather stations in the north and with mining interests rekindled due to recent improvements in flight, geological and communications technology, the American and Central Canadian yearning for information concerning the north was once again roused.

Carving came to the people of Arctic Bay as they converged and settled there, Inuit carvings were already being produced for southern markets in other High Arctic communities, and some of the first carvers in the community report being taught carving by relatives from other northern communities. Only two had practiced commercial decorative carving before settlement in Arctic Bay.

In 1957 Attagutsiak, an interviewee, helped southerners put the original markers around the proposed lead and zinc mine in Strathcona Sound (slightly more inland),
and helped build the docks. In his interview, he recounts the arrival of Arctic Bay’s church, housing, and hospital buildings during the preceding 18 years. He stated he wanted Inuit to become trained to take advantage of economic opportunities that present themselves as the resources of the Arctic were exploited. He also discussed the development of the Arctic Bay housing co-op and community council (1969).  

Initially, Arctic Bay women who needed money would carve local soapstone in anticipation of a southern boat’s (still annual but unreliable) arrival. A widow, Elisapee Kanangnaq Ahlooloo, in need of sustenance for herself and her children, was “staked” in the old tradition by a Hudson’s Bay clerk, so that she could carve for the weatherman (the worker at the weather station), and in her words, “that was the first time I ever made anything for anybody- and since that time I have never stopped.” Other first generation carvers report that after years of ammunition shortages and periods of starvation before settling in Arctic Bay, by the late 50s and early 60s, RCMP officers would offer “the going price” to encourage the production of soapstone carvings to transport on the annual boat. Notably those older community members who report living close to historic posts during periods of starvation claimed that during the most difficult periods the white traders and officers would try to help nearby Inuit, but at some point these white “governments” “didn’t know what to do, so they did nothing.” Others report being brought to settlements after being rescued by RCMP officers who found the surviving remnants of their families in emaciated and sometimes diseased states in their isolated and remote family camps.

Soapstone was easily found in the area and over time soapstone carving became a seasonal supplementary form of income for Arctic Bay’s older people, youth, and
young women with children who were left in town when the men went hunting. Eventually, again with some “staking” by a trader, and contributions by a number of community members, Oorebecca, and her husband, Issuqanqituq began the artists’ co-operative to purchase carvings produced in Arctic Bay. Soon after, and with some public education, the carvers became co-op members. As game became ever more scarce, and snow machines remained sufficiently unreliable to make successful hunting trips less frequent, carving became an integrated seasonal part of many family incomes, and the regular diet of the community also began to change.

Kalluk (who is deemed by interviewees to be the community’s leader, as well as the leader of the Community Council) began the drive to achieve “hamlet” status very quickly upon the beginning of a Community Council, so as to have better representation and negotiating positions vis-a-vis Strathcona Sound, which had already been declared a “hamlet,” while taking shape next to the mine (and with which Arctic Bay had to share political representation until their status changed).

The book spans the transition from dog teams to unreliable snow machines in local transportation, and from boats and dogsleds to flights for further distances. Single extended family camps with identifiable dialects have converged within this amalgamated community, along with different hunting methods concerning seals, experiences concerning the transition away from the fox trapping for trade, and caribou hunting for clothing and food. When the mining company announced its intentions to open a mine and build a town in nearby Strathcona Sound, it meant more frequent shipping opportunities, both south for carvings, and north, for food and supplies. The diets of Arctic Bay residents had already changed away from the Inuits’ historically
protein rich (largely marine mammal) diets. The young and middle aged men interviewed hunted seals as much to provide elders with the dietary supplementation of meat that they craved, as to continue a male-oriented Inuit traditional pastime/rite. Men of every generation interviewed could recall the first time they successfully hunted a seal, and it remained a rite of passage. While every man could discuss having caught his first seal, the only identifiable seal hunting image in the book was taken from a distance, and on the page opposing Enoogoo’s interview. His sentiments typify those of the men who had straddled the change, “I don’t hunt foxes now; this winter I haven’t seen a single trap. But, in the spring, I’m one of those who goes out seal hunting. At the same time I have carving to do. Our rent has to be paid, so we usually sell the skins to go toward the rent.”

Some years prior a Hunting Association had been formed, and the community’s men had made decisions such as disallowing solo hunting trips due to the dangerous prospects of snow machine breakdowns. There are photos of Arctic fox pelts suspended on a washline behind a house in the community to cure, and so some active Arctic fox trapping was still occurring, although not discussed at any length in the book. These photos illustrate the combining of settlement and pre-settlement pursuits; cultural continuity within change.

There are elders who lament the passing of traditional relations with the young, who now attend schools to learn about the world, and other elders who use the young to help them understand the ideas and markets of the south. There is a rock solid consensus concerning the value of carving to the Inuit way of life. Maintaining that way of life, now regulated by the south, can be testing. Southern administrators make seemingly arbitrary rulings that interfere, especially with young women with small
children, in their successfully going about their community and working lives. In 1976 the Inuit of Arctic Bay still maintained a well-defined and patriarchal division of labour, thus men travelled for meetings and education, and women stayed with, or travelled with, the children. Paingun Kanajuk, for example, reported that after being elected to the position of pricer in the co-op,

In the fall I was told that I was told that the pricers had to go to Ottawa. I did not want to go because I was still breast-feeding my youngest child, and my husband felt that the children were too young to be left without somebody to look after them. He did not want me to leave, and as I am his wife, I listen to him because he has always treated me well.

Nobody could tell me how long we were to be away, and the more I thought about it the angrier I became. ...I felt the government were manipulating us and using us as servants. I asked Kalluk, who is our real leader, if it was possible that a substitution could be made, and he thought it should be possible.

Then I was told that it was not possible because the people in Ottawa were in charge, and that one could be arrested or charged for disobeying or not listening to the authorities.

I was told that the three of us were chosen by the [white people] at the little co-operative in Ottawa. I wasn’t happy about that either. I was so angry that we hadn’t been told in advance, asked whether or not we wanted to go, whether or not we were replaceable, and told how long we would be away, that I could not keep silent about it. (Cowan and Inuksuk,113.)

With southern interest came many attempts at control of the administration of the Inuit community, and there was an ongoing struggle between leaders of the community, the mining company and its representatives and minions, and the administrative state in Ottawa. Kalluk expressed concern that Arctic Bay’s fate was often discussed and negotiated in the absence of the Inuit of Arctic Bay, citing a letter that he had been made aware of wherein a mine representative proposed moving the entire community
to Strathcona Sound without consulting the residents or leadership of Arctic Bay.\textsuperscript{436} Kalluk, clearly cognizant and sharing Inuit fears of further involuntary resettlement, at one point enumerated the advantages of Arctic Bay’s location in answer to the unwelcome threat to their home. Kalluk’s drive to achieve “hamlet” status was partly in answer to such threats, as well as to have better representation and negotiating positions vis-a-vis Strathcona Sound, with which they had to share political representation, and which had inexplicably already been declared a “hamlet.”\textsuperscript{437}

Reappearing panoramic landscape photos of the community are on display in the book and often include the rock signage on the side of the mountain behind the community proclaiming “Arctic Bay”, installed by Captain Bernier’s crew in 1872, a year that his ship, the “Arctic” wintered there. This book was written as a cultural record, and to tell Canadians about Arctic Bay’s Inuit artists’ culture, struggles, and aspirations, and to emphasize the duration of cultural contact, which has spanned centuries. The community is referred to by both names, and names like Spence Bay appear untranslated in the syllabic text. These Inuit artists were proud of their community, they appreciated its prehistory and immediate history, were engaged in the community as members and intended to ensure its continuity.

At the time of his interview, Kalluk was further pushing for Arctic Bay to be included in a committee with the mining company, “so that if the mining company wants to buy more land, there will be someone to negotiate and control it.”\textsuperscript{438} He also insisted that the Inuit of Arctic Bay would not sell their interest in the land, “We don’t mind helping them to get the oil or the minerals from the mine, but we would refuse to sell our land.”\textsuperscript{439}
There were other frustrations borne of remote policy making’s effect on the community. For example, in the aftermath of having the dog population reduced, Arctic Bay had a growing polar bear problem. The bears were coming into town and were a threat, yet the federal government had declared that there was a shortage of polar bears and had issued a very restrictive hunting/cull quota. The people of Arctic Bay, with no avenue of review or appeal, and no means of obtaining assistance, were trying to obey the regulations by chasing the bears out of town with snow machines. The polar bears would often return.

The interviewees were called upon to compare their present conditions to the conditions they experienced before moving to Arctic Bay, and discuss what they liked and disliked about living in the community. Lew Philip had been a child in the 1950s, and as a survivor of the starvation endured along the Hudson Bay, compared the conditions of 1974 to the conditions he grew up under. He addressed the period of starvation during his youth directly by discussing how little food there had been and how his father had been forced to burn a sled and boat for heat before he was forced to kill one of their last two dogs to feed his children.\(^440\) He claimed to have not been ill since that episode of starvation that saw his family, already reduced in numbers, move to a permanent settlement. He strongly preferred settled living, and had never starved again. While Philip believed it was important to pass on his knowledge concerning traditional camp-life to his children, he believed that neither he nor his children could ever be self-sustaining in a traditional Inuit camp life, which was a lifestyle of the past. He carved, had a working wife, and their children, he contended, would go to school.
and learn about how to function in a developing Arctic. Itinerate camp culture was no longer Inuit culture in 1974, it was Inuit cultural history.

Many photos of the artists were taken in their homes. They emphasize their way of life, highlighting typical working-class Canadian household furniture of the time (chrome-legged kitchen table sets and the like), photos on the wall, electrical appliances, and the continuing preference for Inuit produced, traditional, outerwear. (Many inside photos include one person wearing such garb).

Kalluk and the young to middle-aged members of the artists’ coop and settlement council were responding to the pending opening of the mine by consulting with other communities, such as Rankin Inlet, so that they could manage their community while the mine remained operational and transition smoothly when the mine had closed.
There was an insufficient pool of bilingual English/Inuktitut speakers available at that time for the council to be as effective a negotiating body as they would have liked, something the community felt would change with the return of some of their students. Tellingly, only one person interviewed for the book gave his interview mostly in English.

By 1974 Arctic Bay Inuit had developed modern cultural practices such as commercial carving in co-ops and lobbying for hamlet status to cope with modern problems, and were consulting with similarly situated Inuit communities to anticipate and plan for change.

Portions of the closing statements of Bob Barnabas and Lew Philip provide a reasonable synopsis of the sentiments concerning the past, present and future of Arctic Bay.

Bob Barnabas:

In those days, before we were with the qullunaat (Canadians of European descent) the Inuit used to hunt to the best of their ability. There were periods of hunger when people died of starvation; my uncle and grandfather died that way. Sometimes we had to eat the dogs that had already starved to death and sometimes people would even eat other people….

Today, the Inuit are not like that. They no longer have to wake up in frozen clothing, nor do they ever starve…in Canada, no one is hungry anymore. The qullunaat are helping the Inuit in this way and the Inuit now live in warm houses….But the older generation is not too happy about it. The reason is food; they remember when they used to eat meat, and they know they are no longer free to hunt as they please.

In the old days the Inuit had very difficult times. Today they are gradually catching up to the qullunaat. Our progress is slower….In this region the Inuit should be informed and helped to understand about co-operatives and the co-op movement.

When I started to carve we didn’t make much money… and we only purchased necessities. Now we are buying expensive items and spending a great deal of money. Often the expensive items break down and the money has been wasted. Now we are controlled by the qallunaat, using money for almost everything, including our rent.
The Inuit have to do what they believe is right because their way of thinking is not the same as the qullunaat. (Cowan and Inuksuk, 177.)

Lew Philip:

The first time I saw a white man was in 1957…before that we were living out in camp.

That was a bad year; there was a long period of starvation.

When we got back to Arctic Bay that spring we had nothing. We didn’t want to go back out to our camp because we had nothing.

After we came to Arctic Bay my father started working for the mine. I think there were very few families in Arctic Bay back then, I think just my wife Sarah’s family until my family arrived. We were the kids of Arctic Bay. That fall a teacher came to Arctic Bay and we started school. At the time I didn’t know a word of English.

I started carving because my father carved.

I didn’t understand anything about the government for a very long time—how they go about things that have to do with the native people. I first became interested in understanding about it about four years ago. I learned things from working for them, to find out what they are doing to the people. And of course there are some things that I don’t like and others that I agree with, but we all know so many people that have been pushed into doing things they don’t want to do. As you know, when we are told to do something by the government we do it. But carving is strictly on your own and if I were ever to really disagree with the government (which I probably won’t, but if I do), I can probably make my living carving.

As long as my children are in Arctic Bay they will go to school and I will teach them the old ways too. …I know that they will have to go somewhere else for school, but even then they will still be taking their holidays here in Arctic Bay in the summer and they will still be our kids.

I can’t say which life I would have preferred to live. I don’t think I could go back to the old life because I don’t think I would be able to support my family.

If Inuit Tapirisat and the Community Council are strong enough, and the government will listen to them, the Inuit ways of life will not be forgotten. (Cowan and Inuksuk, 179-184)
The interviews highlight the ways that members of the artists’ co-op have, as voluntary leaders of their community, responded to the rapid and ongoing changes brought to the Arctic. Their strategies privilege which they believe should be preserved from their culture, and define their culture both with reference to their own pasts, present and in opposition to some of the stereotypes that they understand exist in the powerful South.

One emergent consensus seemed to be that after but a few decades, carving had become a cultural tradition, and that ice-houses were of the past. The question of whether those who had experienced both camp life and settled life in Arctic Bay would prefer one way of life over the other was met with mixed and ambiguous responses.

The implications of the changes to Inuit culture in the twenty years after World War II are understood differently by different generations of carvers, and differently by carvers from different regions. The experience of starvation in the early 1950s was formative to the thinking of survivors, who clearly expressed the desire to prepare their children for the future of an Arctic shared with resource exploitation based development.

There is evidence of an ongoing process of cultural selection driven from within the community, and a strong and negative reaction to acts of control over their community decided upon or administered by outsiders. Arctic Bay is a small, new and amalgamated community populated by residents who are aware that they are still building their community, and wish to secure its continuity with cultural traditions that weld the best of the old ways, such as traditional Inuit clothing, with practices that correspond to their new circumstances, such as participating in the artists’ co-operative and defining themselves for Southern audiences by participating in the creation of we don’t live in snow houses now.
Within a few years of the publication of “We don’t live in snow houses now,” Lloyd Horwood, a Newfoundland fisherman already once resettled and left to adjust in the aftermath of the end of the spring seal hunt, and five scant years later, the cod moratorium, began painting and writing poetry expressing the anger and loss endured by northern coastal Newfoundlanders at the loss of their livelihoods. These are the people who fought Resettlement, and battled to end the harmful international offshore and mid-liner fishing and dragging practices encouraged by the Canadian Federal Government, while publically predicting the resulting cod stock collapse. And they are the people of the traditional seal hunt, the Newfoundlanders who have the most common cause with the Inuit.

In Newfoundland, the transformation after Resettlement was no less drastic than that of the Arctic. First and Second generation Canadians continued to fight the labels affixed to them by Mowat, and the relegation of their economy and culture to Celtic barbarian megafauna.

The Newfoundland commercial spring seal (“whitecoat”) hunt had been banned by the time of Lloyd Horwood’s exhibitions, but whitecoats, as advertised by Greenpeace, remained the public face of Canadian sealing, and the entire international market for seal products had collapsed. While harp and hooded seals (the two species of Arctic, ice whelping seals) have never been endangered species, the northern cod stock finally collapsed in the 1980’s. A codfishing moratorium was put in place by the Canadian federal government upon the stock becoming “commercially extinct” in 1992. The cod stock has never recovered. Economic hardship brought from colonial administrative decisions had resulted in decades of hardship and significant depopulation of rural
Newfoundland by the 1990s in favour of St. John’s, Nova Scotia, Toronto and Alberta. Newfoundlanders call this (ongoing) phenomenon “going down the road.” The Newfoundland Government began to sell eco-tourism and cultural tourism to remaining rural Newfoundlanders and launched aggressive mass media marketing campaigns advertising rural coastal landscape and people to Ontarians and New Yorkers.

In 1992, Horwood’s works were exhibited in the By the Bay Museum of Lewisporte, the largest coastal town near his home on Twillingate Island. Horwood produced these paintings (and poetry) for political purposes, and these particular works were never intended for sale.

The exhibit was entitled The Hunt and was an historic overview of the seal fishery in Northern Newfoundland, including the understanding of Newfoundland fishers that the ongoing inshore fishery collapse was in part due to the increased pressure on inshore fisheries created by the growing number of seals. Seals do not prefer cod, and often only eat the liver, leaving the remainder of the dead fish for sea birds or other fish, and the evidence of seals having ravaged inshore cod was often found in otherwise nearly empty nets in the nine years between the European ban on Canadian seal products and the imposition of the cod moratorium.

Horwood’s exhibition and its attendant local press, makes it quite clear that unlike many artists and writers from away, Northern outporters have understood themselves and the Inuit as sharing a way of life that developed through economic necessity and cultural exchange before Confederation. Because the Canadian government continues to negotiate the fate of these Newfoundlanders separately, and on racially defined

---

19 Going Down the Road was the title of a movie concerning the economic migration of Newfoundlanders to “the west”-in this case Toronto
grounds, the fates of Inuit and Northern Newfoundlanders have been separated in public discourse. In Central and Southern Canada, and along the American Eastern Seaboard, the rise of landscape essentialist claims for political and tourism purposes has been visually connected to (presumably unchanged) First Nations cultures, and in the North to Inuit culture. Northern Newfoundland outporters, on the other hand have been portrayed as quaint, partially civilized, pre-modern Celtic Folk inhabiting the Rock.

I have arranged this sampling of Lloyd Horwood's exhibition in as close to his designated chronological ordering as possible.
As discussed in Chapter 3, Inuit were the first seal hunters and taught Northern Newfoundlanders how to hunt seals. Thus historic overviews of the seal fishery or hunt usually begin with the Inuit. In the above image, the use of the gun demonstrates that this is a post-contact image and the clothing are of Inuit design, so one would assume that the hunter is an Inuit. These paintings that illustrate the Inuit historical connection to sealing in Newfoundland acknowledge the origins of the Newfoundland outport integration of sealing into a regionaleconomy as learned through cultural exchange.

The Inuit at Prayer: The Plea, oil on canvas, Lloyd Horwood.

This painting demonstrates that Newfoundlanders and Inuit sealers hunted in the same harbours and in the same fashion, after the Inuit taught Newfoundlanders how to find and harvest seals. The shack is a typical fish shack, in which the seals (in the left corner of the painting), would be partially processed before being transported, either to merchant ships or back to the fishers’ outport. The boat and clothing of the fishers has
transformed, and it is not possible to distinguish the race of the man sitting on the rock, but the title implies that one of these men is an Inuk.

Millions of Harp Seals are increasing...It's up to you to take a stand to stop the seal hunt ban.

The Newfoundland seal fishery grew quickly in the mid-19th Century (see earlier Chapter) into an international spring event dominated by Avalon Peninsula fleets (sailing from Harbour Grace, St.John’s and Carbonear). Outport men would have to travel to these ports to muster with the fleet. The days are still relatively short in late spring, and often the sealing ships would travel over-night to where the seals could be found (a fact likely responsible for the number of dawn and dusk portrayals of the seal hunt on the pack ice). These boats were leaving the pack ice after the hunt, as is evidenced by the bootprints and blood in the foreground. The size and number of ships on the horizon of this painting indicate which historic period the painting portrays, (late 19th Century to early 20th Century).
This painting illustrates a more recent version of the Newfoundland seal hunt, which had returned to the Inuit fish-trap styled hunting along the Northern Shores. This painting was based on the artist’s relatives’ seal fisheries off Dorel, Newfoundland. There were already many more seals than there had been for decades by the time of Horwood’s exhibition, due in part to restrictive quotas, and because seal skins without a market were of limited value to fishers. The number of seals continued to explode, but the new focus of the rising tourism industry lurks in the background: the region was becoming known and advertised as “Ice Berg Alley.” The iceberg calving and migration past the Northern shores of Newfoundland, while still annual, is mostly over by the traditional July and August summer vacations of mainland Canadians, and so the
transitioned fishing-boat tour services in the north are generally combined whale/iceberg boat tours (whale migration being more dependable).

The annual migration of harp seal along the Labrador-Newfoundland coast was our natural resource. Lloyd Hoorwood, oil on canvas.

Alone and unharrassed on the ice, female harp seals whelp and nurse for a very short time, after which they leave their young. The males “hang around” the outside edges of the pack ice, which is where they were traditionally trapped (trapped seals drown). Male seals are large and will hunt and eat young seals, which cannot swim, so pups are kept sufficiently far from both the edges of the ice and any diving holes the females use for hunting forays. In order to hunt the adult male seals sealers would have to take many more risks than hunting whitecoats, including copying from pan to pan. They would also have to walk past the whelping grounds, which were on thicker, more stable ice.
Lloyd Horwood was concerned that I have better images for this portion of my thesis, and so wrote out the locations and circumstances of these paintings for me. This is the reverse of his photo of the painting that began my interest in the rural Newfoundland artists’ response to the damage wrought by the “Seal Wars”, both to the reputation of rural Newfoundlanders, and their economies. The all-capitalized typed text:

CULLING THE HERD: KEEPING NATURE IN BALANCE

TWO ADULT HARP SEALS WATCH

OUR NATURAL RESOURCE BANNED BY GREENPEACE
Was on the plate underneath the following painting at the Lewisporte By the Bay Museum during the exhibit.

Lloyd Horwood’s paintings were accompanied by verse that discussed the Newfoundland seal hunt in cultural and economic terms, and urged people to rethink the seal hunt ban. His argument was that the seal and cod fisheries were economically necessary, culturally important, morally and ecologically inter-related. Too many seals and continuous offshore overfishing had already diminished the inshore fishery. Diminished catches were inversely related to the seal population and the Federal licensing of off-shore long-liners and draggers.

Like the artists of Arctic Bay, Lloyd Horwood was anxious to dispel the pre-moral ignoble savage labels that had ensured the loss of both of the original economic
engines available to the people of Northern Coastal Newfoundland; the cod and seal fisheries.

In a 1989 interview concerning his exhibit, “The Hunt”, Horwood claimed that “he decided to devote his paintings to a cause that would be in an exhibit telling people the story that wasn’t told by Greenpeace in Europe. ‘That we do not skin seals alive,’” and to “show my displeasure and discomfort that this story by Greenpeace was false and told to the naive people of the world. The paintings tell the true story of the ban. …The bottom line in his effort, he said “is there will be a serious shortage of fish stocks. The seal explosion is of no benefit at all, why do we need ten million seals?”

Along with Horwood’s letter of permission to use his art and words he sent me this photograph, knowing I am much younger than he, would never see such a fishing stage, accept for as part of an historic restoration project for tourists.

In the year of my first visit to the museum, 1992, the cod moratorium was brought into effect. For outport and Northern Newfoundlanders, who had been lobbying for
smaller offshore catch limits, protection of the “nose and tale” of the Grand Banks against overfishing, and disallowing draggers, it was the final blow when John Crosby closed the historic North Atlantic cod fishery, declaring the stock “commercially extinct.” The federal government offered a few programmes to reeducate young fishers, and Memorial University set up a series of studies to follow the fate of unemployed fishers and fish plant workers.

It should be noted that the sensibilities of Central Canadians have changed in the intermittent 20 years since Horwood’s exhibitions, and that contemporary sensibilities concerning “authorization” more or less hold that European descendant North Americans are _de facto_ colonizers, and as such are beneficiaries and participants in colonial discourses and practices. As a result it is unlikely that a Northern Newfoundlander of European extraction could paint or exhibit materials such as this exhibition today without suffering reproach from those with assorted political interests. In defense of Horwood and other Newfoundlanders who hope to present their case to mainland Canadians, the Inuit have unwaveringly expressed solidarity with Newfoundland’s sealing communities.

From the 1970’s and onward, as the period of Inuit and Newfoundlander relocations ended, a rhetoric of solidarity concerning the seal hunt that has arisen, and been accompanied by the art, and voices of artists, who reject the premises of ecological and cultural tourism as potential economic engines. While both the Inuit and Newfoundlanders understand that cultures, like languages, and people, must change with political, economic, technological and physical-geographical changes to ensure their continued viability, these colonized peoples argue that they should be able to
define their shared and independent interests whether material and/or cultural
themselves. A consensus amongst the colonized appears to be emerging that cultures
reduced to theme parks in costume mainly, and often only, serve tourists and other
opportunist voyeurs, and many have chosen a path of reistance.

Since the ban of the spring seal hunt and the cod fishing moratorium,
Newfoundland premiers have become representative of a hard-boiled Newfoundland
nationalism and quirkiness. The Newfoundland government transitioned from
attempting to educate North Americans about the realities of the fishery (who could
forget Premier Brian Tobin being cast as “Captain Turbot” in New York after showing
the small, “baby fish” that had been caught in illegal Spanish nets in 1994? to Danny
Williams flying Canadian flags at half-mast years later when the federal government
attempted to default on the Atlantic Accord, which included transitional equalization
payments to Newfoundland as offshore oil royalties began to flow. Thereafter
(Conservative) Premier Williams waged a successful campaign during the next federal
election dubbed “ABC” (anybody but Conservatives) that saw the federal Conservatives
expelled from office on the island.

In recent years, political, economic and media interest have become more
attentive to the Inuit as international debates concerning resource rights on the
continental shelf and transportation and defense rights and responsibilities are decided
through international scientific research and political negotiations. Prime Minister
Stephen Harper now visits the Far North annually (during the parliamentary summer
break, when politicians tend to what is known colloquially as the “Barbecue circuit”) to
attract media attention to support Canadian sovereignty claims.
The most high profile, recent Inuit visual art displaying the Canadian Arctic and Inuit for mass North American markets was the 2002 motion picture, *The Fast Runner*, directed by Zacharias Kanuk, a Nunavut Inuk. Pictured here is the DVD Insert Cover Art, which presents a landscape essentialist, biocenoetic pre-modern portrayal of Inuit in a Group of Seven-like wilderness setting.

The sightlines of the two pictures here meet in front of the runner, at the bottom left hand portion of the DVD cover art. The pastel colours radiating from the arctic sunset and reflected off the icy tundra fade into the back of the figure of the “fast runner”, hinging the two pictures together, whilst crating a sort of blanketing over the runner’s bare skin. The light in the upper picture is on the right, and the lines created by the runner’s profile draw the eye upward and to the left. Note the similar colouration and lines to the Brian Skerry’s “Chilling on the Ice” from Cahpter 3. The female figure, partly obstructed by the line of the runner’s face but hinged by the runner’s hand, ensures a
good view of the woman’s tattoos. Ancient tattooing rituals of many Inuit groups indicated that a woman was married, and one can assume she is probably the runner’s wife. Whereas the runner is connected by the sun’s rays, the woman fades into the direct sunlight emanating from the nearly disappeared Arctic sun. Insofar as the radiant pastel sunlight is spread to “blanket” the runner, it is used affectively, and the pastel hues are suggestive of comfort, if not protection from harsher realities.

Like the front cover produced by the Arctic Bay Inuit of 1976, the 2002 DVD cover art was designed to attract southerners by showing them that which they expect to see. By contrast, the content of the film, similarly to we don’t live in snow houses now, goes some way toward wrestling southerners’ ideas about the Inuit past, and present, away from people like Flaherty, Jenness and Mowat.

The film presents an Inuit traditional moral narrative with an eye to preserving the narrative of a community dealing with the aftermath of division sewn by a corrupt shaman. The film was created as a cultural artifact (on updated media) for an Inuit audience, while inviting southerners of Canada and the United States, whose attention is now returning to the Arctic in force, to view the film for entertainment and educational purposes. Fast Runner, was filmed as a traditional narrative, and so it is set in the past. It educates different audiences differently. For the Inuit, it is a moral lesson concerning how to heal a community, and how to preserve their culture with new media. For Southerners, the film works as a sort of “counter-Flaherty.” While recounting the moral and political drama surrounding a small community’s trials as they cope with a dire external threat, the film contains some solid historical corrections to the record created by Flaherty. Inuit traditional life is portrayed as including competition between both male
and female community members, and between communities. Polygamy and arranged marriage are represented without apology. There are no simple, happy Inuit to be found.

There are many striking landscape visuals which remain incidental, while the cultural content is presented in an unvarnished fashion, with some content left opaque to cultural outsiders, as is often the case with cross cultural and translated matter. The duplicitous relations between shamans and community members are an anti-dote to the smiling, innocent Inuit of Canadians' Flaherty based stereotypes. The form and content of *The Fast Runner* declare that Inuit will define the content of their culture, past and present, firstly, for themselves, and then for the acquisitive masses of the south.

**The Reassertion of a Renounced Rhetoric: Newfoundland and Naturalists: *This Marvelous Terrible Place***

*This Marvelous Terrible Place* is an example of a transitional presentation of visual art that reasserted Mowat's colonial social contract, while responding, after a fashion, in answer to charges of heartless pre-modern barbarity levelled against Newfoundlanders during the Seal Wars. The book argues against charges of cultural loss levelled by Mowat with arguments in favour of his original understanding of the Inuit, and argues that Newfoundlanders are the “Folk” of a quaint Celtic homeland. The racial divide signaled in *This Marvelous Terrible Place* between Inuit and Celtic Folk (which neither Flaherty nor Mowat ever asserted) remains today.
The Reassertion of the Canadian Rhetoric: Mowat’s contract renewed

*This Marvelous Terrible Place* (1988) was produced by professional photojournalists Yva Momatiuk and John Eastcott and contains interviews with stories from Newfoundlandersto accompany each photo. The book was funded by the National Geographic Society (which has provided funding for generations of photographers), and *Equinox Magazine*. First compiled and published in 1988, it was reprinted in 1998, and so the printings book-end Horwood’s exhibitions: produced between the end of the seal fishery and the cod moratorium. The photos and interviews begin in Labrador, as all Newfoundland documentaries must, with the Inuit. Momatiuk and Eastcott, over a number of years, nearly retrace Mowat’s steps. The result is a book promoting and naturalizing the Mowat “Folk” vision of the Inuit and Newfoundlanders, but as having distinctive essentialist origins, the Inuit are presented as culturally landscape essentialist peoples of North America, Newfoundlanders are presented as remnant pre-modern Europeans.

The authors deal with resettlement and hunting in Inuit and European descendant communities in Newfoundland and Labrador in isolation from each other, and demonstrate well their assumptions concerning the nature of each culture. The authors include interviews with many cultural producers from away, and primary producers from Newfoundland and Labrador. Like most English language texts wanting to demonstrate the unique cultural qualities of European descendant Newfoundlanders, the accents of outporters (rather than the interviewed South African immigrant, or the Inuit) are preserved with innovative spelling.
Resettlement

After a brief recounting of the history of the Inuit settlement at Nain—which dates to Moravian Missionaries and Arctic whaling in 1771, the authors explain that "[A]fter World War I decimated the cod fishery and fur industry, the missions began to close and many Inuit left. Later the Newfoundland government resettled the rest." The photojournalists, however, do not explain the lapse of some 40 years, and a second war, before the Inuit Resettlement documented in the book, nor do they discuss Hebron's preceding conditions, something they emphasize when dealing with European descendant communities that were similarly resettled after WWII. Photos of the couple's Inuit guides are accompanied by the story of the 1956 Resettlement of the Inuit of Hebron (initially a Moravian mission settlement on the Labrador coast) to Nain, (a larger Moravian mission town), as related by Tony Williamson, the former Director of the Labrador Institute of Northern Studies.

Tony remembers how Joshua Obed, the chief elder of Hebron, stood up and gave a speech. ‘This is our home, and we don’t want to leave,’ he said with tears rolling down his cheeks. ‘But if we must, I’ll lead the way for others.’ While the Inuit brass band stood amongst the rocks playing ‘God Be With You Till We Meet Again,’ the Obed family piled into a trap boat and headed out of the Bay toward Nain, one of the few mission settlements that survived. (Eastcott and Momotiuk, 13.)

The authors dealt with resettled European descendant Newfoundlanders by emphasizing pre-existing starvation, feelings of lack of choice, and the necessity of immoral behaviour to survive in these towns.

“We was forced out”

In the transcribed interview with Ivan James, formerly of Parson’s harbour; It was leaving behind a way of life you were brought up to. It was different, definitely different.
First one family went, then another, and once it got down to a pretty small crowd, the young ones wouldn’t stay there. I don’t know what if you’d call it we was forced out, but that’s what I would call it. (Eastcott and Momatiuk, 25.)

Starvation (no photo)

Joe Symes, retired fisherman Port Aux Basques, discussing the 1930’s.

I only got to grade four because I had to come out of school owing to starvation. I used to wait for hours, hours and hours, for my poor father to come with something to eat. He’s left and gone over to Rencontre, a place three miles from we. And in those days they didn’t call it relief, they called it dole. When he got back to the house, he had 12 pounds of flour and a quart of molasses. My poor old mother, she’d make up this water and molasses and flour and put it in the oven. That’s what the people called “lassy mogs.”

There was food in the stores, but they just wouldn’t let us have it because we didn’t have nothing to pay for it with. Just what we could get for our fish, three-quarters of a cent a pound, salted. ..The only thing that kept us alive was that we reared our own vegetables. But we had no pork or beef. (Eastcott and Momatiuk, 61)
The difference between Symes’ understanding of historic outport poverty, and a later, urban cultural producer’s romanticized understanding of outport cultural landscape essentialism is highlighted in the authors’ interview with Davis Quinton, the CBC (television) host of “Wind and Sea”:

I’m constantly astounded by the ability of outport Newfoundlanders to make a living from the sea. … They live happily in what for many other people would be an inhospitable place. They can build a house and tell a story, make a fence and sing a good song or take an axe, go to the woods, find the right curve on a juniper stick and make the part of the boat they need, without any training or a blueprint in their hands, this place becomes livable, and the axe becomes a tool instead of a weapon. (Eastcott and Momatiuk, 20.)

Apart from the fact that most people would identify an axe as a tool rather than a weapon, the authors’ reliance on cultural outsiders to source their “Folk” analyses should be noted. The preceding photos and quotes weave a narrative that starving outport Newfoundlanders were forced out of their homes by low fish prices, but they remained, nonetheless, fully constituted Folk.

Momatiuk and Eastman move directly from Nain to Francois, one of the most central and southerly outports and one featured in Mowat’s This Rock Within the Sea, and we find that Francois, unlike many of the outports surrounding it, had successfully resisted Resettlement, and were “still talking about it.” There is no mention of Mowat, who wrote forcefully to allow outporters of Burgeo and Francois to stay in their homes.

The photojournalists judge Inuit and Newfoundland outport hunters by different standards. Hunting is presented as a moral and cultural practice for the Inuit, and an historic, now unnecessary evil for Newfoundland outporters of European descent. The
following quotes demonstrate the nature of the division created by cultural producers and Federal policies between these colonized peoples.

**Hunting on the Height of Land**

This excerpt is from a transcribed story told by Tony Williamson, international development director, St. John’s.

The first caribou hunt I went on is particularly vivid. It was late April. I went with Jerry Sillitt, who is now the head elder, Tom Barbour, Fred Atsetada and others. We went with dogs, crossing the neck of the land north of Nain and into Webb Bay. …

On the third day, we encountered caribou—a small company of about 40 or 50. We anchored the dogs to keep them out of the action, and the men ran forward and got 15 animals. They didn’t have scopes, only the old British .303s and 30-30s. (Eastcott and Momatiuk, 122.)

After a recovering from a few mishaps on the difficult return trip, he goes on to comment on the resilience of Inuit members of the hunting party:

That attitude and sense of humour were symptomatic of the Inuit ability to survive in the north. There was also a tremendous bonding between people who struggled together in situations that, if you didn’t cooperate, could be life threatening. These people had done this as a matter of course all of their lives….

The people I was hunting with seemed to have a total character change since leaving Nain. In the country they were more alert and seemed to grow in stature. In Nain, they had been diminutive and argumentative, here, they acted like kings who knew what they were doing. They were more in harmony with themselves and their environment. You could see them just shining. They were happy.

Nain is an artificial environment. In the old days, people came there just to trade, to go to church and then return to their camps. Only when they started to live there for longer periods of time, with no real reason for being there, did the unhappiness, disagreements and alcohol abuse enter the picture. …
Government planners tell the Inuit, ‘You must live in a centralized community. Do this. Do that.’ But the Inuit can’t relate to it. Theirs is an intrinsically cooperative society, while ours is a competitive one…. (Eastcott and Momatiuk, 122, 123.)

The authors spent much of the first weeks of their multi-year project in Labrador with a host family that had recently moved to Nain from Goose Bay. John Terriak had relocated, along with his young family, to learn to function in a less urban, Inuit majority community, where there was a stronger connection to his Inuit past and family. In the words of the photojournalists the family wished to “return to their Inuit roots, their families and the land.” While the photojournalists were in Nain they documented their host family’s conditions, which were fairly basic (no running water) and that John had “begun to carve whale rings and miniature ulu (women’s) knives for the newly arrived teachers and nurses at the hospital,” stating, in an echo of the attitudes of anthropologists and civil servants of the past, “It isn’t much, but it keeps them off of welfare.”

In the passage that first indicated the authors’ understanding of the connection between traditional hunting methods and Inuit cultural essentialism first asserts that while times may have been tough for the young family, “John is learning to hunt and how to run his sled and the boat-how to be an Inuk, a man.” Of John’s determination to learn to live off of the land, the photojournalists declare that “seeing how stubbornly he tries to find that missing link to his Inuit past, the sure footprints left by his ancestors on this land we know he will.” This declaration, rife with landscape essentialist “Folk” assumptions, is the expression of the belief that John’s Inuit lineage, rather than his Inuit neighbours and ongoing self-education and flexibility (he seems to be the only carver in the community), will ensure his family’s wellbeing.
When dealing with hunting practices amongst European-descendant Newfoundlanders, by contrast, the authors attempt to repair outporters’ reputations in the aftermath of the “Seal Wars” by portraying the seal hunt as an evil in which Newfoundlanders had participated under duress. The outporters interviewed herein are clearly defensive concerning sealing (and whaling) and reported that they would never have indulged in such inhumane behaviour if they had not been threatened with starvation and/or resettlement.

*Jack, John Eastcott and Yva Momatiuk This Terrible Marvelous Place: Images of Newfoundland and Labrador, photo* 455

This photo accompanied the interview of Lloyd Rideout of Cottle’s Island. Rideout was a sealer and fisher, and related the story of the orphaned seal, Jack. Rideout cared for the young seal after finding him isolated and near death some 20 miles away from any other seals. He had the distorted body shape of a seal near death due to starvation, and there were no cracks in the ice that would have allowed Jack to attempt to fish, or learn to swim. Rideout built him a pen and fed him canned milk until one day, some months later, he escaped. Rideout looked for him, concerned that he might get caught in a fishing net and drown, but the seal was never found. 456

He then related:

They called us barbarians. We were called crazy. We wanted the privilege to kill, beat the brains out of those young seals. We probably didn’t even need the
money—that’s what the world thought we were like. Nobody kills seals because he likes to kill them. (Momatiuk and Eastcott, 23)

One assumes that “they” are interlopers from away, such as Mowat, Greenpeace, Paul Watson, and the Sea Shepherd Society.

![Mature harp seals on pack ice, Flat Rock.](image)

This photo accompanied the transcribed interview with Jack Troake of Harts Cove, and illustrates an attempt of both an outporter and the authors to reframe the seal hunt as an economic necessary evil of the past, that Newfoundlander have now been civilized away from.

**My ancestors were rogues and murderers and pirates.**

I think it was right and proper to stop killing the white-coats. I hunted them 11 years, there was nothing else we could do to make one penny at that time of year. So Jesus, what could we do? I had a house full of kids. I had to feed them, clothe them and give them an education. If you can go kill white-coats and make $400 or $500 dollars, what can you do? Not go kill whit-coats because someone in New York said that you can’t go kill them, that it’s a crime? To me that’s bloody ridiculous. But times have changed and we haven’t got to do that anymore....
I love animals, any kind. I can’t recall ever killing an insect, but I can kill seals...when I really need the money. But if I went out and killed a thousand seals and jumped on a plane to Florida, blew the money and came back home, I’d say don’t kill another seal, you don’t need it. I’d join the Greenpeace.

This bloody little rock of ours was populated by our ancestors who came here because there were two things: fish and seals. When Britain went along with the States and put the ban on seal products, I said “I’ll never sing God save the Queen, the King, Prince Charles or any of them.” My ancestors were rogues and pirates from Great Britain. We’ve been here a long time. We’re starting to get more civilized now....We’ve got an enormous seal herd. If we are to maintain a fishery, we must have a seal fishery. (Momatiuk and Eastcott 46,47,51.)

Troake’s sentiments echo many of Lloyd Horwood’s, that the seal hunt ban directly harmed their communities, that Newfoundlanders have been unfairly labeled anti-animal, that seals are becoming too populous, and he refutes the idea that the income from the seal hunt was too small to be significant to outporters. His tone however is one of defeat rather than one of defiance. He knows that the seal hunt is gone, and that the seal population has grown exponentially since the ban. He also links the deepening fisheries crises to the rise in seal populations. Unlike Horwood, however, Troake expresses these opinions as a conundrum.

Ian MacKay claims that “Folk” affected culture can afford rural communities a sense of identity and attract some tourist dollars, but at a cost. “Folk” are generally considered unable to understand or adapt to modern conditions, and thus their communities are inevitably poor. In This Wonderful Terrible Place, the European-Newfoundlander “Folk” have not morally “caught-up” with the rest of Canadian civilization, and so do not understand that certain behaviours are unacceptable in civilized societies. It seems that the “Folk’s” moral sensibilities began improving only
after being constrained by laws that protect Canadian values and territory. The portrayals of hunting continue to illustrate the authors’ opinions.

For the authors, Newfoundlanders of European descent have no legitimate claims to hunting rights. Thus there is no accounting in the book for the historic fact that moose were brought to the island by the Newfoundland government to provide outporters of the island of Newfoundland with a stable, self-renewing land-based protein source, after a scourge of starvation and hunger based epidemics at the turn of the 20th Century. The failure to differentiate between the nature of commercial marine mammal harvests and moose hunting in Newfoundland, equates morally and legally constrained commercial marine mammal hunts with subsistence moose hunting. If the authors had framed moose hunting as a necessary and learned subsistence activity, like the Inuit caribou hunt described by Williamson, the hunter’s pride in his accomplishment, and not the moral reproach of a native New Brunswicker would have been the focus of the following interview. (Perhaps they would have interviewed a moose hunter.)

Mary Pratt had spent her married life in Salmonier, Newfoundland. In her interview, she claimed that while her images were of Fredericton, where she grew-up and was educated, that if she hadn’t spent time in “this terribly lonely place,” she never would have painted.458 She described both loving and hating Newfoundland outport life, and then finding painting after a near nervous breakdown borne of home-sickness and social isolation.

The authors recorded her description of the photographing of a newly harvested moose as requested by a local man who wanted her to paint a portrayal of his moose hunting accomplishment:
There was this moose, split open and bloody, hanging from the crossbars of his wrecking truck.

I was so disgusted, so affronted that he would show me anything so awful and not know what he was showing me. To my credit, I didn’t throw up or faint or do any of the usual feminine things. While I was photographing, he kept saying, “Do you want me to shove the legs further apart? Do you want me to move the crowbar around?” This was everything a man does to a woman, that man does to nature. It was just horrendous; the legs spread out and held out in this almost clinical atmosphere, with all these mechanical things governing the hopeless body.” (Eastcott and Momatiuk, 77)

Pratt apparently did not understand what this man showed her. Moose are a valuable protein source, and with the ban on seals and the failure of the cod stocks, moose meat seemed destined to become more important.

What of other European descendant hunters? Henry Mahle, the only interviewed Newfoundlander who had been an outport whaler reported:

I had two whalers when whaling was banned in 1974. My living was taken away from me, and I didn’t feel very good about that. I was only taking small minke whales, but they didn’t differentiate between the species. The minkes are not an endangered species. Every part was utilized: the meat went to Norway and Japan: the blubber was rendered for oil and used in the manufacture of soap, medicine, paint, ammunition and other industrial applications.

Don’t get the impression that I love to kill animals; I don’t. I hated to shoot every one I shot, but you can’t let that control your business. You have to make a living, even if you don’t like that part of it. (My emphasis.)

I never worked on land for pay in my life. (Eastcott and Momatiuk, 51)

Mahle’s sentiments, that people who misunderstood the nature of his hunt and the species he had hunted, had taken away his livelihood is a familiar Newfoundlander refrain. In This Marvelous Terrible Place, Mahle’s proclamation that he does not enjoy killing animals is also part of a seemingly defensive pattern, answering to charges
levelled particularly against European descendent hunters of charismatic megafauna by wildlife protection /animal rights groups: that they take more than they need and that they are sadistic animal killers that enjoy hunting as sports-hunters might.

In the spring of 2009, Peta, the Sea Shepherd Society, and other animal rights activists were once again on the pack-ice railing against the remnant Newfoundland/Madeleine seal hunts. Images of whitecoats and Canadian “Euro-barbarians” were used again in anti-sealing campaigns in Europe and North America. The European Parliament proclaimed the Canadian Seal hunt “inhumane,” and renewed their ban on all commercial seal imports. In 2010, the World Trade Organization upheld the European Community’s right to continue the ban on “moral grounds.”

Many central and western Canadians responded by agreeing that the seal hunt should be abandoned because it is “uncivilized,” “an embarrassment,” and fails to provide sufficient income to either sealers or the federal purse to make its protection or promotion worthwhile.

The European Community did not condemn the Inuit traditional (read subsistence) seal hunts. Newfoundlanders, however, were granted no such indulgences. In response, the Inuit have publicly railed against this distinction because of its racist and colonial implications.

Inuit know very keenly what it is like to be colonized and marginalized. We will not detach ourselves from solidarity with non-aboriginal sealing communities in Atlantic Canada just to make it easier for European animal rights groups to wash their hands of the callous hardships they impose.

-Mary Simon, president of the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami
Yet the forces trying to detach the Inuit from Atlantic Canadian sealers before the Canadian public have gained strength over the last two decades, and it is to this ongoing rhetoric we will now turn.
Chapter 5
Something old, something new, something borrowed and something blue

Since the 1980s, the Canadian governing elite have strongly advantaged colonized peoples who make landscape essentialist cultural claims in political negotiations and mass media, because it maintains their prerogative to define the terms of negotiation before the Canadian public and international economic actors. Thus while many regional artists and politicians offer up voices and images of resistance from “the wilderness,” their images and arguments are rarely publically aired or deliberated upon. With the visual imagery of cultural and ecological tourism and the privileging of traditional, historic, or cultural claims over unvarnished economic claims, the political-economic elite in Ottawa have ensured that Canadians continue to reproduce an understanding of the terms of asymmetric economic negotiations concerning access to resources along the Northwest Passage through the refractive lenses of racial differentiation and cultural voyeurism.

The push to cultural conformity with the requirements of economically necessitated catering to cultural voyeurism for negotiation and tourism purposes came from both within and without Inuit and Newfoundlander Northwest Passage communities. Many communities have embraced any and every opportunity to reduce their dependency on government transfers, which have diminished since the federal restructuring of cultural funding (such as National Film Board and public museum funding) in the 1980s. The impact of ecological and cultural tourism and ongoing economic duress is hard to measure, but the visual rhetoric attests to the continuity of the colonial discourses that have divided these people in the Canadian imagination.
Canadian/Inukjuak Inuit Relations

During the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Affairs hearings of the 1990’s many of the resettled Inuit, including Martha Flaherty, the granddaughter of Robert Flaherty, stated plainly that their relocation was coerced. While few, if any, of the relocated Inuit disputed that their conditions were very poor and deteriorating, none felt that they were given any alternative to resettlement as a means to ameliorate their conditions. These Inuit asked for $10,000,000 in compensation and the option of returning to their original homes. After decades of summarily dismissing their demands, the Canadian government, once again looking north for resources, “settled with the surviving relocated Inukjuak Inuit, and their families, in 1996.” This policy change is an example of the resource motives of the economic elite turning northward to the Northwest Passage, and the Inuit negotiating a future founded in their awareness of their unique position in Canadian politics.

Since the Oka standoff of 1990, some First Nations and ecological lobbyists have publically linked land rights negotiations with the idea that traditional First Nation cultures promoted (and promote) a more harmonious, respectful relationship with “nature” than European cultures, because of their biocenoetic mores. David Suzuki is a well-known Canadian bio-geneticist who hosted CBC television’s popular science series, “The Nature of Things” for over two decades. For example he recently released a short video on “The Role of First Nations” in saving the environment. During the video recording he claimed that “Indigenous people around the world are fighting to protect the land to which they belong…we need to learn from them…so as to have a culture and a future based on where we live.” While such claims may or may not be true
depending on which traditional cultures one refers to, First Nations in Canada have garnered more public support over the last 20 years when traditional cultural knowledge and intentions are first publicly proclaimed with attendant visuals establishing their negotiators as culturally “authentic.”

The extent to which the Canadian media and public accepted this reworked rhetoric concerning colonized peoples, naturalizing the conflation of the Canadian legal concept of *sui generis* First Nation constitutional rights, (which means that their rights are unique, and generated independently of the Canadian state), with rights generated from landscape essentialist cultural claims, and allotting authentic landscape essentialist claims only to Aboriginal cultures, can be illustrated by the words of Sudbury journalist and author, Mick Lowe. Lowe was singularly publically supportive of the Innu negotiating positions and activities (such as work-site blockades) concerning the proposed open-pit mine in Voisey’s Bay in the late 1990s, and his writings were meant to stir Canadian public to support for the Innu.

This passage was published in his book *Premature Bonanza* with reference to a February 8, 1998 meeting he attended in Davis Inlet, between Labrador Innu and INCO (International Nickel Corporation) negotiators. He recounts his reaction to a paternalistic (likely insurance inspired) sign posted by INCO management urging the arriving Innu to wipe their foot-ware to prevent wet floors from becoming slippery and potentially dangerous in the company’s trailers:

Here were some of the most respected elders of the Innu Nation, a people whose abilities to survive for millennia in one of the most hostile environments on the face of the planet and a representative of a far-away mining company who had arrived in the community only hours before offering a doubtless well-meaning, if somewhat simple minded “safety tip”
to a group whose collective wisdom about safety and survival on their land might have inspired admiration, awe and the most profound respect.

The moment was surreal, ironic, and absurd.\footnote{467}

Realistically, it is impossible that anyone present in the INCO trailer would have had millennia of experience dealing with wet construction trailer floors in any sort of foot-ware, anywhere. Lowe’s reverence for the Innu is founded on his belief that their “collective wisdom about safety and survival on their land” (a landscape essentialist cultural claim) had permitted them to survive for millennia, without any reference to the Innu’s overlapping land claims and history of struggle with the with the nearby Inuit (who assumedly would also possess millennia of experience and collective wisdom about survival in the north) or the hundreds of years of economic relations between the Innu and Newfoundlanders and Europeans during which they seem to have garnered the wisdom to erect blockades and appeal to the press in their battle with INCO.

Continued reverence for Aboriginal/Indigenous cultural claims has meant that Eastern Arctic Inuit have continued to experience support for their “traditional” (non-commercial) seal hunt from the Canadian Federal Government and mainstream Canadians. In the same week as the Europeans were considering the renewal of the decades-long seal product ban in May 2009,\footnote{468} Canadian Governor General Michaeelle Jean participated in a traditional feast in Rankin Inlet, Nunavut and was photographed (the visit was attended by national media representatives) eating the raw heart of an arctic seal. Jean’s act was greeted with gratitude from Inuit and Newfoundlanders, and with mixed responses throughout the country.
Jean defined the act as “defending aboriginal traditions.”

She was thanked by both Inuit and Newfoundland sealers. The response from Bruce Friedrich of PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals) was damning, “The Canadian Governor General’s sick PR stunt is a predictable, if revolting attempt to save a dying industry.” According to Rebecca Aldworth, the Humane Society of the United States of America’s Director of Canadian Wildlife Issues, the Governor General’s “performance” in Rankin Inlet “was yet another cynical attempt by the Canadian Government to blur the lines between Inuit subsistence hunts and the industrial scale slaughter of seals for their fur which is conducted almost entirely by non-aboriginal people in Canada.”

These explicitly different rules applied to Inuit and Newfoundlanders concerning seal hunting and consumption are clearly tied to the Inuit being authorized by southerners to practice only “traditional,” “cultural” forms of seal hunting and use, and only for subsistence or cultural (non-commercial) purposes. Inuit whaling, which is more tightly regulated, has also been recently permitted, but only as a cultural rite. If the Inuit were to accomplish a successful reopening of the commercial seal hunt, they too would
lose their pre-modern status and all of their exemptions from the harsh treatment doled out by environmentalists, animal rights activists and the federal government to non-aboriginal Northern Newfoundlanders. Yet if the Inuit cannot lobby for economic development beyond traditional hunts, cultural rights and ecological tourism, the economic actors expanding into the Arctic, who have the Canadian Federal Government onside (the government has already granted many Arctic exploration permits to multinationals), will continue to have the Inuit at their mercy, which is exactly where they have been throughout the Canadian colonial period.

**Ecological Tourism and Inukjuak**

Efforts to attract southern ecological or cultural tourists to the Arctic must appeal to similar Central Canadian and American sensibilities concerning “nature,” the “environment” and the Inuit. To lure southern tourists, this is how the Nunavik Inuit (Northern Quebec) describe the Eastern Hudson and Ungava Bay coasts:

An immense, pristine territory lying north of the 55th parallel...Imagine 507,000 square kilometres of truly wild tundra, taiga forest, scenic mountains, majestic rivers and countless lakes! This unspoilt region is home to a rich array of plants, fish and other wildlife, uniquely adapted to the north.473

On the Inukjuak link, one finds a landscape shot, and a description of the Inukjuak landscape as “silently beautiful.”
The heavy and dark sky suggests the “tragic sublime” insofar as it inspires a daunting sense of awe. This is the vision of the Canadian North that southern audiences are seeking to view and explore. It also offers some measure of the extent to which the local communities have conformed (or will, during tourism seasons or for political purposes) to southerner’s voyeuristic expectations.

Every Nunavik page is headed with “Nunavik,” (followed by the syllabic for the same), “Friendly, Beautiful and Wild” and a small map of Northern Quebec rising from a body of water with a kayaking Inuk in the foreground. The Nunavik Tourism website introduces the Inuit people under the headings “The Inuit: Life in Harmony with Nature.”

Inuit and their ancestors have lived in harmony with nature for thousands of years. Even though the Inuit way of life is more diversified than in the past, hunting, fishing and gathering activities for subsistence purposes remain central to life in Nunavik.

and “A Noble People”:

While the vastness of this immense region can prove unsettling for visitors, the cheerful and friendly manner of the region’s inhabitants, the Inuit, will quickly put you at ease.

These are Canadian Inuit advertising (largely) to Southern Ontarian audiences in the English language. Flaherty’s Inuit, and Flaherty’s and the Group of Seven’s Arctic landscapes are all present.

In answer to renewed interest in the Arctic, “Iceberg Alley” was later more explicitly connected to the Inuit, and away from the Newfoundlander of the Northwest Passage. Not only has the attention of Southerners shifted, but the annual migration of calved icebergs can no longer be depended upon east or south of the Great Northern
Peninsula of Newfoundland and Labrador. This is the Canadian Geographic cover illustration for March-April, 2006:

The cover photo of “Titanic Ice: the perils of iceberg alley” is reminiscent of the fear and awe of nature encouraged in John Ross’s 1888 drawing of the Northwest Passage (shown in chapter 2), with the reference to the absented imperiled ship in the text (Titanic). The Titanic hit an iceberg in the North Atlantic well south of Iceberg Alley (although there are icebergs that the far south in the Northern Atlantic during winter and early spring). The distress calls were received first, however, in Newfoundland, and then in Nova Scotia. There is a Titanic Cemetery in Halifax, N.S. and a Titanic (and other ice-berg related sinkings) Museum in Twillingate, Newfoundland’s historic lighthouse, where the SOS was first received. The viewer of Titanic Ice is to appreciate the danger to the brave new explorers of the Northwest Passage (geophysicists,
photographers, politicians and journalists): the latest heroic explorers of Canada’s “last frontier.” Note the “Swimming with belugas” and “new oil from old wells” at the top of this “Travel and Adventure Guide” cover. (Parenthetically, it is endangered belugas calving in the St. Lawrence that may now offer a hurdle to a planned eastern oil pipeline destination).

The Globe and Mail coverage of the North has been affected by the nature of interest in the region led by business and the Canadian Government. The Globe and Mail is used to reach this same readership by the Nunavut and Newfoundland and Labrador governments to appeal for tourists. As the Globe’s advertisements and features are tailored to the Southern Ontario professional and business classes’ desires and expectations, and the newspaper is circulated and sold nationally, these 2011 images should be considered a sampling of the Southern Ontario and the larger Canadian educated, professional and business classes speaking to each other, and the Inuit speaking to them.

This is what the Northwest Passage looks like to the Canadian and international economic elite: “Skilled Labour Shortages Loom in Newfoundland”, December 17, 2011, B 7, the accompanying image for this article is a resource map reminiscent of Bernier’s, which highlights the continuity in Canadian investors understanding of their interests along the Northwest Passage. The article also advertises the Northwest Passage and its resources as Canadian. The United States, however, has never recognized the Northwest Passage as Canadian territorial waters. Thus there is some evidence of campaigning in these visual presentations, and I assume it is associated with the new, more sensitive approach by the Canadian federal government to the
Eastern Arctic Inuit. There must be as many advertisements of sovereignty as possible during this period of international negotiation. The Canadian case in many ways rests on the same rules that made it difficult to take the ice from under Newfoundlanders’ feet, so Canadian politicians are showing the world that the government is interested in the Inuit, and that Canada has a demonstrable claim based on continuous use and attention to the Northwest Passage.

The following report on the Group of Seven’s showing in Britain is significant for two reasons: (1) it signals that British acceptance remains important to the Canadian elite; (2) it shows that Canada wishes to inform the renewed international interest in knowledge concerning Northern North American geography as a result of the ongoing Northwest Passage oil exploration and pending shipping opportunities.
“Painting Canada” ran at the Dulwich Picture Gallery, Gallery Road, London, until January 8, 2012; dulwichpicturegallery.org.uk. The show appeared at the National Museum of Art, Architecture and Design in Oslo, Norway, from January 29 to May 13; and at the Groninger Museum, in Groningen, the Netherlands, from June 3 to October 28, 2012.\textsuperscript{477}

The \textit{Globe and Mail} also publishes reviews and stories written by Canadian tourists, and this feature appeared in the Life and Arts Section in 2013. The author recounts his memorable and “authentic” travel vacation North during winter, describing the frigid temperatures, sleeping in an ice igloo, peeing under the Northern Lights, and bravely partaking in the ritual Inuit greeting ceremony by eating raw seal meat. While Northern adventure vacations and cruises are on the rise as Canadians and the international community become more attentive to the potential bonanza beneath the polar seas, it is still the case that “authentic” Inuit culture, as opposed to historic theme park Inuit culture, is no longer experienced in snow houses.
Celtic Folk on the Rock

As has been the case since colonial rule, Newfoundland’s benefits from resource development are concentrated in St. John’s. The Canadian government has delivered faint support for seal hunting communities in Newfoundland since the closure of the commercial industry. When pressed, the Federal government’s claim has been that the Newfoundland seal hunts have never been economically important enough to jeopardize important European trade relations. Greenpeace continues to lobby against any seal hunts in Canadian waters, and the Sea Shepherd society with occasional celebrity boosters such as (American) Pamela Anderson and (Briton) Paul McCartney, arrive on the pack ice annually to interfere with planned seal harvests. Newfoundlanders who publically support the hunt or a return to a commercial seal hunt are often publically maligned by international animal rights activists and/or mainland Canadians. After the cod moratorium, Newfoundland’s “Ice-berg Alley” was widely promoted and many fishers and sealers were re-educated to become entrepreneurs in the ecological tourism industry, which gave them a way to renovate and repurpose their boats and a chance to remain in their hometowns. From St. John’s grocery store lobbies to the murals outside bank branches in downtown Port Aux Basques, icebergs, coupled with the annual migration of whales, became emblematic of the province’s attempt to bring ecological tourists, and their money, to Newfoundland and Labrador.
By 2000, environmentalists were already predicting that the iceberg parade would become unreliable after May in most of Newfoundland, and so could only be reliably found during high tourism season (June 15 to Labour Day, the first full weekend Monday of September) on the Northwestern most Peninsula, 479 hours north of the much advertised Gros Morne National Park, and nearly 1000 km from St. John’s. The icebergs advertised are the hulking masses that Canadians have come to identify with
Iceberg Alley, not the straggling “bergy-bits” of late summer, and humpback whale tours, which are very popular as well, finish by late August. The art is, as the text implies, supposed to give the viewer a sense of awe when considering the size and power of nature, much like the sublime. The viewer’s eye first rests on the icebergs and then the implied motion of the whale tale with the water falling off it. The viewer is the imaginary centre, viewing the orange hue of the horizon and saturated repeated colours of the icebergs, water and sky, with the whale tale heading away from them. The view presented is from on the water, as the outline of land is visible on the other side of the awe-inspiring natural display. It draws the viewer to imagine or anticipate the sensations of being there.

Cultural tourism to Newfoundland began to be advertised to Central Ontarians and Eastern Seaboard Americans as safe, quaint, cultural experiences of the Celtic past after the entry of Ireland into the European Community and the announcement of L’Anse Aux Meadows being adopted as a UNESCO Heritage Site (both in 1973) inspired the welding of a pined-for North American Celtic myth of origin to rural Newfoundland’s (heavily Irish-influenced) culture and distinctive English dialects. The 1960 discovery of the ruins of the long fabled Nordic village in L’Anse Aux Meadows provided an historic site for the development of a landscape/nationalist myth of origin for European descendants in Northern North America, just as the as the distant Yosemite sequoias once did for New Yorkers. The European community provided a large economic boost to Ireland (through fiscal transfers), permitting the international investment community and the United States government to help barter a series of peace agreements within the war-torn nation, which gave Ireland new air of democratic
and economic stability. By the 1990s Ireland was being referred to as the “Celtic Tiger.” Ireland has suffered many periods of mass outmigration, including large migrations to the Eastern Seaboard of the U.S., Central and Eastern Canada and pre-Confederation Newfoundland. When North American and Canadian Celtic became internationally marketable, Newfoundland was poised to be one of the lead beneficiaries.

“The only thing more interesting than the hundreds of dialects you’ll find here are the characters who speak them.” The Gander landings of stranded New York bound airlights on September 11, 2001, introduced many grateful New York travelers to rural Newfoundland, and cultural and eco-tourism advertisement campaigns targeting New
Yorkers followed. Note the direct appeal for American tourists to remember that their dollar is worth more in Newfoundland.

Like the Inuit, Newfoundlanders have had to learn to cater to Central Canadian and Eastern Seaboard American expectations. Below is an advertisement for an iceberg-whale watching tour boat associated with a private iceberg-lore museum and gallery in Twillingate (an island off the central Notre Dame Penninsula). While there continue to be stranded icebergs in most years, iceberg tours are a sunset industry in this part of Newfoundland due to climate change. The visual representation of Cecil Stockley as Newfoundland’s new noble landscape essentialist, the “iceberg field pioneer” is an example of the incorporation of cultural tourism’s increasingly required “Folk” appeal.
Captain Cecil Stokely looks remarkably more like an Inuk in the first page of his pamphlet than in his photo (on the last page) in this attempt to project the essence of the nobler “Folk” for his small business. Stokely declares himself an “iceberg viewing pioneer,” which is an odd claim, but he was likely one of the first in the business on the Penninsula, (almost all of the tour boats in Twillingate are repurposed fishing boats and their captains are repurposed fishing boat captains). The quotes on the pamphlet
concerning the “enormous icebergs” and many species of marine mammals for view in Twillingate are from a Toronto Sun journalist, and are addressed to Ontarian tourists.

The Ongoing Visual Art Rhetoric

Since the turn of the 21st Century, Newfoundland provincial, Inuit territorial, and federal politicians have worn sealskin vests, coats, and parkas in public (especially for parliamentary question periods and press releases in which they are scheduled to speak) as visual statements in support of the industry. While Southern Canadians continue to respond negatively to these exhibits, there is restraint in their responses insofar that they have the power to enforce their sensibilities by preventing the reestablishment of a commercial hunt and tolerating Inuit traditional hunts in the name of cultural pluralism.
In 2014, Central Canadians and American Eastern Seaboard dwellers are once again being appealed to for tourist dollars through Globe and Mail advertisements, inviting them to “follow the path of history’s great explorers,” and, like A.Y. Jackson, “Find a warm welcome in Inuit hamlets; explore the world’s most dynamic ice fjords; deepen your northern knowledge; view wildlife, experience remote landscapes, visit historical sites.” These modern day explorers will be shown what they have paid for, and they will see what they have been conditioned to expect through colonial discourses. They will not see Inuit as survivors of the 1950s starvation and resettlements. They will not understand the hardships brought by the end of the commercial seal hunt. And like A.Y. Jackson, they will not appreciate how their attentions (and tourist dollars) support the continuation of Canadian colonial relations, banning these communities from economic development and enforcing further cultural selection. They will experience landscape essentialist “Folk” in the pristine Canadian wilderness.

Rural Newfoundlanders continue to represent their history, culture and economic struggles to Canadians through their art, artists and politicians, and as is the case with the Inuit, Newfoundlanders are arguing for a return to the seal hunt, both as a traditional rite and an economic necessity for their continued survival in their struggling home communities. They are granted no cultural immunities by Central Canadians, Europeans and Americans, and mainstream spokespeople quickly dismiss Newfoundlanders as barbaric modern moral evolutionary failures, who threaten the Canadian wilderness. The public maligning of Newfoundlanders, with Seal War
imagery, recurs each spring creating an atmosphere of fear amongst pro-sealing Newfoundlanders.

In 2010 Miss Newfoundland and Labrador, Sara Green, wore a seal-skin coat in support of the sealing industry while aboard a float in the Saint John's Santa Claus Parade. She later reported internet death threats and the unauthorized use and modification of her image in a photo taken during the parade. These photos are taken from the CBC coverage wherein she announced her intentions to join in her family's seal hunt in the following year. The modified photo was posted by a group calling themselves F***YOUNEWFOUNDLANDHANDSOFOURSEALS.

Rural Newfoundlanders rarely have the national spotlight to define their own culture or history to Canadians in uncontroversial, non-threatening settings. They use their small museums, into which tourists may wander, to do so.
South Dildo is a small town on the Avalon Peninsula with a four hundred year history of European presence. The town’s small museum discusses the inauspicious history of the first settlers, accompanied by some copied journal entries by John Guy, Governor of Cupids, Newfoundland, in 1615.

Leonard Lahey, a local historian, gives the unadorned reason for their being few images of the original settlers, and why they teetered on the verge of starvation for years.

The history of the hamlet is reported to have begun in 1612 when John Guy, Governor of Cupids explored the area in hopes of finding and creating trade ties with local Beothuks. Not finding any Beothuks, he returned to map and set up a fish processing camp the following year…

As was the case throughout the province at this time it was considered illegal to settle in Newfoundland. It was not until 1813 that lands were granted and the building of houses was legalized.

Fishermen who came to Newfoundland faced numerous problems. Many of the Devon captains did not want to feed the fishermen on the return voyage as they were required, so they made commitments with New England captains for the fishermen to be sold as white slaves. Fishermen hid from their government, employers and the New England white slavers. They settled in the area without rights or privileges, hoping they would not be discovered.

The next mention of the town made on record was an order from the British colonial government for fishers to move to temporary quarters and prepare to repel the French issued in 1711.

Lahey, the local historian who wrote the town history for the museum, acknowledged a lack of local records accounting for the town’s original settlers that was due not only to the hidden nature of the community, but because “a fire in Harbour Grace is supposed to have destroyed all of the earlier records from the area.” He filled
as many gaps as possible with economic facts and local family (oral) histories. All of the above quotes were taken from his typewritten history of South Dildo displayed in the South Dildo Whaling and Sealing Museum, in July 2013.

The town remained isolated from governance except for the tyrannical ship’s captains (who became governors of harbour hamlets upon being the first captain to arrive from Britain each year) until Newfoundland was granted independence in the early 1800s. Residents participated in all of the island’s seasonal economic activities, including the fisheries, and commercial whaling and seal hunts until they became eclipsed or criminalized after Confederation with Canada.
The museum is unapologetically supportive of a return to a commercial Atlantic seal hunt, seal products, and seal hunting gear, along with newspaper coverage and many donated photos of local sealers and whalers are displayed above the (encased) typewritten histories.

Below are photos of the seal products and local art available for sale in the small entrance of the museum.
Conclusion

Landscape representations in Canada continue to underpin the naturalized assumptions concerning internally colonized peoples, and have been pivotal in presenting depoliticized histories and romantic landscape essentialist cultural ideas as the cultural present of Inuit and rural Newfoundlander communities. Farley Mowat’s writings and political interventions into Canadian colonial politics in the last half of the 20th century and the early 21st Century interpreted and welded the idea of the existence of North American pre-modern “Folk” to Flaherty’s Inuit and outport Newfoundlanders, and posited them as essentially constituted by The Group of Seven’s uninhabited wilderness visions of newly annexed Canadian territories. In doing so, Mowat created (and had illustrated) a new, visual arts-based discourse, which constituted a new “colonial contract” which dictated that Inuit and Newfoundlander claims to resources on (their historic) newly annexed Canadian territories must be presented in landscape essentialist cultural terms.

Inuit and Newfoundlander communities have appealed to their visual artists (amongst others) to act as political representatives, in order to combat Canadian colonial visual discourses, first during the federal government’s resettlement processes of the 1950s and again since the 1970s and 80s, against the racial divisions between historic sealing communities created by the Canadian federal government’s policies concerning seal hunts.

In the aftermath of the destruction of their economic bases, many Inuit and Newfoundlander communities have turned to portraying themselves as the friendly, landscape essentialist people that Canadian and American cultural and ecological
tourists wish to see. This has had many deleterious effects on Inuit and
Newfoundlander communities. The first is that it incentivizes cultural selection
processes in their visual self-representations to Central Canadians that undermine, if
not contradict, their negotiating positions with the federal government of Canada over
resource development along the Northwest Passage by conforming to the primary
condition of Mowat’s colonial contract, that they remain biocenoetic guardians of the
wilderness and not behave as modern self-interested communities. Another deleterious
effect of the cultural portrayals dictated by colonial voyeurism (cultural tourism) is that it
mystifies the material and political implications of colonial resource exploitation policies
and relations, in order to provide tourists with advertised “authentic” cultural and
wilderness experiences. This directly contradicts the ongoing attempts by artists and
politicians to present their cultures as modern cultures entitled to define and represent
themselves, and negotiate resource based economic development, rather than
Canadian defined “traditional”, “cultural” or “subsistence” rights. Finally, the racial
division created by Canadian policies concerning the seal hunt deprives both Inuit and
Newfoundlanders of the only remaining, historically shared, naturally renewing natural
resource that could provide them long-term sustainable economic security.

Potential oil deposits and shipping lanes for resource extraction corridors in the
high arctic have created an incentive for the improvement of Ottawa’s relationships with
the coastal Inuit. Already referred to as “Canada’s last frontier,” the race to claim both
the waters and the potential underwater oil reserves in the high arctic is an international
one. Canada has become anxious to exert sovereignty over the arctic, after suffering
years of bad international publicity surrounding the appalling conditions of many, particularly northern, First Nations and Inuit communities.

Canadian eyes were looking North when Tanya Tagaq was awarded the 2014 Polaris Prize (for the best Canadian original, full length sound recording) for her album, “Animism” in September of this year. Tagaq is an Inuk throat-singer and internationally acclaimed musician who has been involved in projects that include reinterpreting Flaherty’s *Nanook of the North* with a politicized soundtrack comprised of her modern and traditional Inuit music. Reactions to her promotion of seal products, which she urged Canadians to eat and wear during her televised Polaris Prize acceptance speech, followed by “And F*** PETA”, were telling.

Don Mathews, in PETA’s official response to Tagaq’s comments, recommended that Tagaq read-up on his organization’s policies, as she obviously did not understand that “our fight always has been against the east coast commercial slaughter, which is run by white people who bilk Canadians for millions of dollars in taxes to prop-up the non-existent seal trade….But Inuit should be allowed to hunt.” In that Tagaq has called for a commercial seal hunt, controlled by (Inuit) sealing communities, and the development of Canadian and international markets for seal products, Mathews should be seen as either unschooled as to her positions or to be pushing the racist colonial discourse for his group’s political convenience. (Mathew’s insinuation that Ms Tagaq does not read enough to have a relevant opinion concerning the seal hunt and its detractors seems at least presumptuous as well.) PETA’s position is very similar to the positions of many urban and southern groups, such as the United States and Canadian Humane Societies. In March 2014 Rebecca Aldworth, the official spokesperson for the
Canadian Arm of the International Humane Society stated that “recent reports on the (Inuit pro-sealing) protests are mixing up subsistence sealing in Canada’s north with the commercial hunt... Animal protection agencies oppose sealing in Atlantic Canada by non-aboriginal people.... Commercial sealing advocates have long attempted to blur the lines between their globally condemned industry and the socially accepted Inuit subsistence hunt. Insofar as this racial differentiation also reflects the policy divide in Canada and many European governments, it is fair to assume that it is designed to appeal to, and likely reflects, mainstream opinion. These recent episodes demonstrate that Mowat’s version of the Canadian colonial contract still seems in force, and the racial/cultural divisions between Inuit and Newfoundlanders continue to define the axes of political debates in Canada as the Canadian government seeks to expand the Canadian administrative state, again into the Northwest Passage.

Those of us who wish to understand Canadian politics and policies pertaining to the Northwest Passage, so that we may intervene or act ways that don’t further reinforce Canadian visual colonial rhetorical discourses and the exploitative relations that they mystify and reaffirm must inform our deliberations with the best possible understandings of the colonial discourses that surround us. I am convinced that reading Canadian landscape art as visual rhetoric produces valuable insights toward that end.

As the national debates and international negotiations concerning the Northwest Passage and the sovereignty and resource rights pertaining to the Arctic Continental Shelf are ongoing, (and the Inuit remain the only circumpolar people), those who would like to understand the ongoing negotiations and their attendant visual supports materially and strategically; that is, politically, should try to understand the politics of the
visual art discourses and policies made based on the assumptions that they mystify and naturalize, that continue to divide these communities, and restrict their political and cultural discourses in ways that maintain, reinforce, and will likely extend the current colonial relations and policies preferred by the Canadian Federal Government.
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