Picturing the Thelon: Natures, Ethics, and Travel within an Arctic Riverscape

by

Bryan S. R. Grimwood

**A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of**

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Geography

**Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario**

**© 2011
Bryan S. R. Grimwood**

Library and Archives
Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

ISBN: 978-0-494-87769-2

Our file Notre référence

ISBN: 978-0-494-87769-2

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

ABSTRACT

As a special and changing trans-regional waterway located in Arctic Canada, the Thelon River elicits multiple and often incommensurable perceptual visions (e.g., “homeland,” “wilderness,” “heritage,” and “resource frontier”). This dissertation engages interdisciplinary literatures, diverse theoretical perspectives, and case study research to flesh out relational geographies of nature, ethics, and travel associated with the Thelon. Attention is directed to the touristic and inhabitant dimensions of the riverscape, specifically those enacted by wilderness canoeists and residents of the Inuit settlement *Qamani'tuaq* (Baker Lake, Nunavut).

The dissertation follows an “integrated article” format and consists of an introduction, five substantive chapters, and a conclusion/summary. Each substantive chapter is oriented by objectives relating to the broader instrumental research purpose, which is *to enact (i.e., to understand, envision, and cultivate) relational ethics for and within the Thelon River watershed*. This intention was designed to work with, and respond to, contemporary thinking in human geography, philosophy, and tourism studies that considers “nature” as the ongoing convergence of multiple social-ecological-cultural relations, an ontological position that challenges many conceptual and material foundations of (environmental) ethics.

Descriptive, normative, and affective aspects of enacting relational ethics are interspersed throughout the text. Drawing on community-based, participatory, visual, and experiential research methods, I illuminate: the “natures of canoeing”; the Thelon River as a moral terrain; the expression of nature-culture values in and through different Arctic mobilities; and the various human and non-human traces within the riverscape that

suggest how practices of making and remaking the Thelon are manifestations of responsibility to and for others connected to personal and social-cultural identity. These suggestive and purposeful interpretations are the effect of “engaged acclimatization,” a methodological vision of responsible research characterized by processes of relationship building, immersion, learning, and activism. Moreover, recurrent patterns and themes are synthesized and presented in the summation. Here, I argue that the enactment of relational ethics for and within the Thelon can be characterized by the interaction of five modes and/or attributes: place, perception, partnership, philosophy, and practice. Fostered by some of the limitations identified in the moments constituting this dissertation, ongoing and anticipated future research is also discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation has been possible because of the supportive contributions of my research advisory committee. As the primary supervisor throughout my PhD studies, Dr. Nancy Doubleday has encouraged me to engage as a compassionate researcher and to build relationships for positive transformation. Her trust in my abilities, her dependability, and her acute awareness amid complexity are traits that I hope to model as a student supervisor. Thanks to Drs. Claudio Aporta and Doug King for their guidance and leadership as co-supervisors, and to Drs. David Fennell and Fiona Mackenzie for their consistent intellectual inspiration. Dr. Gita Ljubicic has been an influential adviser who often assumed supervisory-like responsibilities. Her mentorship in the field, in the classroom, and in the preparation of this manuscript has been exceptionally valuable.

This research benefited from the generous funding support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the International Polar Year (PPS Arctic), Carleton University and the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies, the Northern Student Training Program, and Tourism Cares. In-kind support was provided by First Air, the Canadian Canoe Museum, and Dr. Bob Henderson. This dissertation has also benefited from the feedback of various journal editors, conference session organizers, and discussants. Thanks to Drs. Erin Sharpe, Heather Mair, Dawn Trussell, Bryan Smale, Andrew Holden, David Fennell, Heather Castleden, Monica Mulrennan, Anne Godlewska, Sarah de Leeuw, Caroline Desbien, Emilie Cameron, and Leila Harris.

Carleton's Department of Geography and Environmental Studies and Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs are acknowledged for providing a healthy and motivating environment to carry out this research. Natalie Pressburger was a delight to

work with and deserves more gratitude than an annual bottle of wine can express. Thanks also to DGES Chair Dr. Michael Brklacich, Graduate Studies Chairs Drs. Doug King and Fran Klodawsky, Elsie Clement, Judy Eddy, Judy Donaldson, and Drs. Michael Pisaric and Chris Burn for assisting with NSTP applications. Fellow DGES Graduate Students, and the brilliant Jessica Dunkin and Brendan Haley, were exceptional colleagues to study with and ensured that conversations stayed lively. Thanks also to Morgan Ip, Shawn Donaldson, Kelly Karpala, and Carmelle Sullivan.

Vera Avaala was my mentor, guide, and closest friend in Baker Lake. This research would not have been as meaningful to me personally without her willingness to share her stories, knowledge, home, and love. Ma'na. I miss you. I am also indebted to Alex Hall of *Canoe Arctic Inc.*, who sorted through my jargon to find value in a proposed research project and contribute his energies and extensive knowledge of the Thelon. David Pelly was also an important source of information and encouragement.

My utmost gratitude goes to the Thelon River canoeists and the residents of Baker Lake that participated in the research. Their enthusiasm to share insights, experiences, and memories made this project come alive. I am thankful for the time spent together within the riverscape, be it in our minds or on the water or land. For their kindness, I am indebted to the students of the Nunavut Teacher's Education Program in Baker Lake, and to Kiah Hachey, Hilu Tagoona, Joan Scottie, John Avaala, Sue MacIssac, Patsy Attungala, Valerie Pudnak, Andy Parker, Eva Noah, Tammy Mansbridge, and David Ford and the staff at the Jessie Oonark Gallery. I appreciate the support received from various community organizations in Baker Lake, including Qillautimiut, the Hamlet Office, the Hunters and Trappers' Organization, the Itsarnitaqarvik Inuit Heritage Centre,

and the Nunavut Arctic College. Thanks also to the Nunavut Research Institute for coordinating the research licensing process, and to Percy Tutannuaq and the Innirvik Support Services who provided excellent translation for community research reports.

Not a day passes that I overlook the privilege of living with the unwavering encouragement, patience, care, and love of my family. The values and any wisdom resonating within these pages is directly linked to the lessons learned from my Mom and Dad, Jonathan, Ann-Christine, Bert, and Jayne. Thank you all for the constancy of your support, which has enabled me to explore new horizons. My wife, Kate, has been an extraordinarily gracious and effective listener, reader, and sounding board. She has inspired new ideas and clarity, and has nurtured me through this dissertation by sharing her very best energies and love. Our beautiful daughter, Edyn, with her laugh and spunk and gentleness, ensures that our home overflows with joy. Thank you Edyn for choosing your mom and I as your parents.

CO-AUTHOR STATEMENT

Chapter Four of this dissertation is currently in press as a co-authored peer reviewed journal publication. In accordance with Carleton University policies, the co-authors have read and agreed to the following statement outlining the role of Bryan S. R. Grimwood as lead and contributing author (see Figures i, ii, and iii):

“As the co-authors of ‘Engaged acclimatization: Towards responsible community-based research in Nunavut,’ which is forthcoming in the peer-reviewed journal *The Canadian Geographer*, we acknowledge Bryan S. R. Grimwood as the article’s sole lead and contributing author. Synthesizing diverse literatures and drawing on aspects of his experience as a research assistant, Bryan conceptualized, wrote, and revised this methodological article with minimal input from his team of co-authors. We are acknowledged as the co-authors primarily because of our roles as Principal Investigators in the projects that supported Bryan’s research assistantships (see Table 4.1 in the dissertation). While initial drafts of the article were delivered to us for review and comment, our contributions in this regard were minor to the development of the article.

The term, ‘engaged acclimatization’ itself, emerged in discussion between Bryan and Nancy C. Doubleday alone. Subsequent development, writing and revision, as stated above, were entirely the responsibility of Bryan.

The methodological vision of engaged acclimatization has significantly oriented Bryan’s approach to carrying out his independent PhD research. It also represents a significant contribution to the understanding and practice of community-based participatory research with Nunavummiut. For these reasons, we fully support the inclusion of the article as a component in Bryan doctoral dissertation.”

CO-AUTHOR STATEMENT

As the co-authors of "Engaged acclimatization: Towards responsible community-based research in Nunavut", which is forthcoming in the peer-reviewed journal *The Canadian Geographer*, we acknowledge Bryan S. R. Grimwood as the article's sole lead and contributing author. Synthesizing diverse literatures and drawing on aspects of his experience as a research assistant, Bryan conceptualized, wrote, and revised this methodological article with minimal input from his team of co-authors. We are acknowledged as the co-authors primarily because of our roles as Principal Investigators in the projects that supported Bryan's research assistantships (see Table 4.1 in Bryan's dissertation). While initial drafts of the article were delivered to us for review and comment, our contributions in this regard were minor to the development of the article.

The term, "engaged acclimatization" itself, emerged in discussion between Bryan and Nancy C. Doubleday alone. Subsequent development, writing and revision, as stated above, were entirely the responsibility of Bryan.

The methodological vision of engaged acclimatization has significantly oriented Bryan's approach to carrying out his independent PhD research. It also represents a significant contribution to the understanding and practice of community-based participatory research with Nunavummiut. For these reasons, we fully support the inclusion of the article as a component in Bryan doctoral dissertation.

Dr. Nancy C. Doubleday

26/7/2011

Dr. Gita J. Ljubicic

Dr. Shawn G. Donaldson

Dr. Sylvie Blangy

Nov 7th 2011

Figure i. Co-author statement signed by Dr. N.C. Doubleday and Dr. S. Blangy.

Gita Ljubicic <gljubicic@gcrc.carleton.ca> 8 November 2011 10:59
 To: Natalie_Pressburger <natalie_pressburger@carleton.ca>
 Cc: Bryan Grimwood

Dear Natalie,

I have read the co-author statement to be included in Bryan Grimwood's PhD thesis regarding the article "Engaged acclimatization: towards responsible community-based research in Nunavut", which has been accepted for publication in The Canadian Geographer. I agree that this statement accurately reflects my contribution as co-author, and support this paper being included in this thesis.

Please let me know if you need any additional information.

Sincerely, Gita

Gita J. Ljubicic, Ph.D.
 Assistant Professor, Carleton University
 Department of Geography & Environmental Studies
 1125 Colonel By Dr., B349 Loeb Building
 Ottawa, Ontario
 K1S 5B6

Office: A325 Loeb Building
 Email: gita_ljubicic@carleton.ca
 Phone: 613-520-2800 x2566
 Fax: 613-520-4301
 Web: <http://www.straightnorth.ca>

Figure ii. Written statement from Dr. G. J. Ljubicic indicating agreement with the Co-Author Statement

Shawn Donaldson <Shawn.Donaldson@hc-sc.gc.ca> 8 November 2011 08:30
 To:
 Cc: Sylvie Blangy, Nancy Doubleday <doublen@univmail.cis.mcmaster.ca>, Nancy Doubleday <doublen@mcmaster.ca>, gita_ljubicic@carleton.ca, natalie_pressburger@carleton.ca

Hi Bryan,

The purpose of this email is to state that this paper represents your work. It should definitely be in your Ph.D. thesis because role of me and the other co-authors was very minimal and the intellectual work was yours.

If you need any additional information or require further details please let me know.

Best of luck with your defence.

Sincerely,

Shawn

Dr. Shawn Donaldson, Ph. D.
 Head/Chef
 Population Biomonitoring Section/Section de la bio-surveillance de la population
 Chemicals Surveillance Bureau/Bureau de la surveillance des produits chimiques,
 Health Canada/Santé Canada
 Phone/Tél. : 613-946-7496, Fax/Télex. : 613-941-6921
 Email/Courriel : Shawn.Donaldson@hc-sc.gc.ca
 URL1 : <http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/index-eng.php>

Figure iii. Written statement from Dr. S. G. Donaldson indicating agreement with the Co-Author Statement.

RESEARCH OUTPUT

At the time of writing, the following research output related to this thesis has been published, accepted or submitted for publication, or presented¹:

Journal Articles

- **Grimwood, B. S. R.**, Doubleday, N. C., Laidler, G. J., Donaldson, S. G., & Blangy, S. (in press). Engaged acclimatization: Towards responsible community-based research in Nunavut. *The Canadian Geographer*.
- **Grimwood, B. S. R.** (2011). "Thinking outside the gunnells": Considering natures and the moral terrains of recreational canoe travel. *Leisure/Loisir: The Journal of the Canadian Association of Leisure Studies*, 35 (1), 49-69.
- **Grimwood, B. S. R.**, & Henderson, B. (2009). Inviting conversations: Friluftsliv, relational geographic thinking, and outdoor learning. *Norwegian Journal of Friluftsliv*. <http://norwegianjournaloffriluftsliv.com/index.html>
- Ip, M., **Grimwood, B. S. R.**, Kushwaha, A., Doubleday, N. C., & Donaldson, S. G. (2008). Photos and Plants Through Time: Monitoring Environmental Change in the Canadian Arctic with Implications for Outdoor Education. *Pathways: The Ontario Journal of Outdoor Education* 21(1), 14-18.

Book Chapters

- Dunkin, J., & **Grimwood, B. S. R.** (under review). Mobile habitations in canoescares. In Duncan, T., Cohen, S., & Thulemark, M. (eds.), *Lifestyle mobilities and corporealities*. London, UK: Ashgate.
- **Grimwood, B. S. R.** (in press). The social science ontology of environment: Challenges to human exceptionalism. In Holden, A., & Fennell, D. (eds.), *Handbook of tourism and environment*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- **Grimwood, B. S. R.**, & Fennel, D. A. (2011). Meditative thinking for polar tourism codes of ethics. In Grenier, A., & Müller, D. (eds.), *Polar tourism: A tool for regional development*. Montreal, QC: Presses de l'Université du Québec à Montréal.

Research Reports

- **Grimwood, B. S. R.** (2011). Picturing Kangirjuaq (the Thelon): Natures, ethics, and travel within an Arctic riverscape. 2010 research summary for community research participants. Available from author.

¹ Chapters Two, Three, and Four are drawn directly from articles in print or in press. I identify the original citation in a footnote at the beginning of these chapters.

- Laidler, G. J., & **Grimwood, B. S. R.** (2010). Report on the results of a research-planning workshop in Gjoa Haven: Qanuittumik takuvit? Workshop held from February 17 - 19, 2010 in the Qaggivik building (Gjoa Haven Elder's centre), Gjoa Haven, Nunavut. Report date: March 22, 2010. Available at: <http://www.straightupnorth.ca/Sikuliriji/GH-SummReports.html>.
- **Grimwood, B. S. R.** (2010). "Picturing the Thelon River" report for Baker Lake residents and representatives following field research activities, May 04-19, 2010, in Baker Lake, Nunavut. Report date: June 2010. Available from author.

Conference Presentations

- Ip, M., Consaul, L., Doubleday, N. C., Donaldson, S. G., **Grimwood, B. S. R.**, Harper, K., Hermanutz, L., Johnstone, J., Ross, F., Van Oostdam, J. (2011). *IPY legacy: Case studies of endogenous initiatives arising from research collaborations*. Paper presentation at the International Arctic Social Sciences Association Conference, Akureyri, Iceland.
- **Grimwood, B. S. R.**, & Doubleday, N. C. (2011). *Tracks and traces: Natures, travel, and practices of responsibility within an Arctic Riverscape*. Paper presentation at the Association of American Geographers Conference, Seattle, WA.
- **Grimwood, B. S. R.**, & Doubleday, N. C. (2011). *Picturing the Thelon River: Geographies of nature and responsibility within an Arctic Riverscape*. Paper presentation at the Ottawa-Carleton Student Northern Research Symposium, Carleton University.
- **Grimwood, B. S. R.**, Doubleday, N. C., Donaldson, S. G., Charette, D., Consaul, L., Ip, M., & Ross, F. (2010). *Mobilizing knowledge and capacity: Education and outreach activities of "Photographs and Plants Through Time"*. Poster presentation at Understanding Circumpolar Ecosystems in a Changing World: Outcomes of the International Polar Year, University of Alberta.
- **Grimwood, B. S. R.** (2010). *Picturing the Thelon River: A research workshop*. Workshop presentation at the conference for the Council of Outdoor Educators of Ontario, Kinark Outdoor Centre, Haliburton, Ontario.
- **Grimwood, B. S. R.**, Doubleday, N. C., & Donaldson, S. G. (2010). *Engaged Acclimatization: Research(ing) Responsibility in an Arctic Riverscape*. Paper presentation at the Conference for the Canadian Association of Geographers, University of Regina.
- Doubleday, N. C., Donaldson, S. G., Ip, M., **Grimwood, B. S. R.**, Charette, D., & Van Oostdam, J. (2010). *Photos and plants through time and food choice research: Collaborative community research*. Paper presentation at the IPY Conference, Oslo, Norway.

- **Grimwood, B. S. R., & Henderson, B. (2009).** *Inviting conversations: Friluftsliv, relational geographic thinking, and outdoor learning.* Paper presentation at the Henrik Ibsen: The Birth of “Friluftsliv”: A 150 Year International Dialogue, Conference, Jubilee, Celebration, Trondelag University College, Norway.
- **Grimwood, B. S. R., Doubleday, N. C., Donaldson, S. G., Ip, M., Vlasova, T., Charette, D., & Van Oostam, J. (2009).** *Collaborative community-based workshops in Cape Dorset, NU: Reporting on and extending from an IPY research design.* Paper presentation at the conference for the Canadian Association of Geographers, Carleton University.
- **Grimwood, B. S. R. (2009).** *Cultivating ethical environmental leadership: Prospects from moral and relational geographies.* Paper presentation at the Canadian Jacques Maritain Associate Conference Sustaining Ethical Leadership: An Interdisciplinary Conversation, Carleton University.
- **Grimwood, B. S. R. (2009).** *Nature(s) and ethics in environmental education and (human) geography: Reflections on interdisciplinary exchange.* Paper presentation at the 5th World Environmental Education Congress, UQAM.
- **Grimwood, B. S. R. (2009).** *Exploring nature-culture ethics by canoe: Relational thinking, morality and nature-based travel in Canada’s cultural geography.* Paper presentation at the Ontario Research Council on Leisure Symposium, University of Ottawa.
- **Grimwood, B. S. R., & Fennell, D. A. (2008).** *Nature experiences of wilderness travel guides: Meditative thinking in research and practice.* Poster presentation at the Conference for the Canadian Association of Geographers, Ontario Division, Brock University.
- **Doubleday, N. C., Donaldson, S. G., Vlasova, T., Kushwaha, A., Ip, M., Charette, D., & Grimwood, B. S. R. (2008).** *Human experience of cryospheric change in Nunavut, Canada: Preliminary findings.* Poster presentation at the Ninth International Conference on Permafrost (NICOP), Fairbanks, Alaska.
- **Doubleday, N., Donaldson, S., Charette, D., Grimwood, B. S. R., Manning, A., Pearce, R., Adlard, B., Kushwaha, A., & Ip, M. (2008).** *Impacts of a changing arctic treeline: Photos and plants through time.* Poster presentation at the IPY PPS Arctic Annual Conference, Memorial University.
- **Grimwood, B. S. R. (2007).** *Conceptions of nature: Linking geography and outdoor education.* Paper presentation at the conference for the Canadian Association of Geographers, Ontario Division, Laurentian University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>ABSTRACT</u>	<u>II</u>
<u>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</u>	<u>IV</u>
<u>CO-AUTHOR STATEMENT</u>	<u>VII</u>
<u>RESEARCH OUTPUT</u>	<u>X</u>
<u>TABLE OF CONTENTS</u>	<u>XIII</u>
<u>LIST OF TABLES</u>	<u>XVII</u>
<u>LIST OF FIGURES</u>	<u>XVII</u>
<u>LIST OF APPENDICES</u>	<u>XVIII</u>
<u>CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION</u>	<u>1</u>
1.1 A “PUT IN”	1
1.2 THESIS STRUCTURE	5
1.3 CONCEPTUAL FRAMING AND SYNTHESIS	9
1.4 TOWARDS THE ENACTMENT OF RELATIONAL ETHICS	14
1.5 SUMMARY OF RESEARCH PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES	16
1.6 SUMMARY OF RESEARCH CONTRIBUTIONS AND INNOVATIONS	17
<u>ENACTING THEORETICAL AND REFLEXIVE RELATIONS</u>	<u>21</u>
<u>CHAPTER TWO “THINKING OUTSIDE THE GUNNELS”: CONSIDERING NATURES AND THE MORAL TERRAINS OF RECREATIONAL CANOE TRAVEL</u>	<u>22</u>
2.1 INTRODUCTION	22
2.2 THE NATURE OF CANOEING	24
2.2.1 PERSONAL, SOCIAL, AND ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS	24
2.2.2 CRITIQUES AND CONCERNS	26
2.2.3 REMEDIES AND CONTINUED CAUTIONS	28
2.2.4 TOWARD THE NATURES OF CANOEING	31
2.3 GEOGRAPHY AND ETHICS: MORAL GEOGRAPHIES AND RELATIONAL THINKING	33
2.4.1 MORAL TERRAINS	38
2.5 REVEALING MORAL TERRAINS WITHIN AN ARCTIC RIVERSCAPE	41

2.5.1 LEAVING TRACES, BUILDING RELATIONS	44
2.5.2 LEAVING TRACES, NEGATING AND ADAPTING RELATIONS	47
2.6 CONCLUSION	52

CHAPTER THREE SOCIAL SCIENCE ONTOLOGY OF ENVIRONMENT: CHALLENGES TO HUMAN EXCEPTIONALISM **55**

3.1 INTRODUCTION	55
3.2 CASE STUDY BACKGROUND	57
3.3 CRITICAL REALISM	59
3.4 PHENOMENOLOGY OF PERCEPTION	62
3.5 SOCIAL NATURE	65
3.6 ONTOLOGICAL MULTIPLICITY	69
3.7 CONCLUSION	72

PORTAGE ONE **75**

ENACTING METHODOLOGICAL RELATIONS **77**

CHAPTER FOUR ENGAGED ACCLIMATIZATION: TOWARD RESPONSIBLE COMMUNITY-BASED RESEARCH IN NUNAVUT **78**

4.1 INTRODUCTION	78
4.2 WHAT IS ENGAGED ACCLIMATIZATION?	81
4.3 LOCATING ENGAGED ACCLIMATIZATION	84
4.3.1 INDIGENOUS RESEARCH AND METHODOLOGY	84
4.3.2 COMMUNITY-BASED PARTICIPATORY RESEARCH	85
4.3.3 RESEARCH ETHICS	86
4.3.4 RELATIONAL GEOGRAPHY	88
4.3.5 PROJECT OVERVIEWS	90
4.4 CRAFTING RELATIONS: AN INTENTION OF ENGAGED ACCLIMATIZATION	94
4.5 LEARNING: AN APPROACH FOR ENGAGED ACCLIMATIZATION	97
4.6 IMMERSION: A PRACTICE OF ENGAGED ACCLIMATIZATION	101
4.7 ACTIVISM: AN EFFECT OF ENGAGED ACCLIMATIZATION	105
4.8 CONCLUSION	108

PORTAGE TWO **111**

COMMUNITY-BASED CASE-STUDY RESEARCH	112
RESEARCH MODULES	113
COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH	115

ENACTING EMPIRICAL AND INTERPRETIVE RELATIONS **117**

**CHAPTER FIVE ON THE TRAILS OF RIVERSCAPE PRACTICES AND
VALUES: MOBILITIES AND MORAL TERRAINS OF ARCTIC TOURISM AND
INUIT INHABITATION** **118**

5.1 INTRODUCTION	118
5.2 BACKGROUND	119
5.2.1 THE THELON RIVER: A SPECIAL AND CHANGING PLACE	119
5.2.2 ARCTIC TOURISM	121
5.3 RELATIONAL MOMENTS OF DEPARTURE	124
5.3.1 MORAL TERRAINS	124
5.3.2 MOBILITIES	127
5.3.2.1 Mobile ethnography	128
5.5 DOCUMENTING AND REPRESENTING RIVER TRAILS	131
5.5 RIVERSCAPE PRACTICES AND VALUES	138
5.5.1 EMPLACEMENT	139
5.5.1.1 Practices of imagination/representation	140
5.5.1.2 Practices of the body	144
5.5.1.3 Practices of return	147
5.5.2 WAYFARING	151
5.5.2.1 Paddling practices	153
5.5.2.2 Motorized practices	154
5.5.2.3 Walking practices	156
5.5.3 GATHERING, OR CRAFTING COMMUNITY	159
5.5.3.1 Invitations	160
5.5.3.2 Constructing camp	162
5.5.3.3 Sharing food	164
5.6 CONCLUSION	167

**CHAPTER SIX “TRACKS AND TRACES”: ENACTMENTS OF
RESPONSIBILITY WITHIN AN ARCTIC RIVERSCAPE** **169**

6.1 INTRODUCTION	169
6.2 RESPONSIBILITY, TOURISM, AND RESEARCH	172
6.2.1 TOURISM ETHICS	173
6.2.2 CRITICAL TOURISM SCHOLARSHIP	176
6.2.3 SYNERGIES AND POSSIBILITIES	177
6.3 RELATIONAL ONTOLOGY AND RESPONSIBILITY	179
6.3.1 MULTIPLICITY	180
6.3.2 RESPONSIBILITY	182
6.4 CASE STUDY RESEARCH OF AN ARCTIC RIVERSCAPE	186
6.4.1 THE THELON RIVER: WILDERNESS, HOMELAND, AND CHANGE	186
6.4.2 THELON CANOEISTS AND INHABITANTS	189
6.4.3 RESEARCH METHODS	192
6.5 TRACKS AND TRACES	195
6.6 MAKING TRACES PRESENT AND ABSENT	198
6.6.1 MAKING TRACES ABSENT: LEAVE NO TRACE	198

6.6.2 MAKING TRACES ABSENT: FOLLOWING A HARVEST	200
6.6.2 MAKING TRACES PRESENT: INUKSUIT	202
6.6.4 MAKING TRACES PRESENT: THE GUIDE	205
6.7 REFLEXIVE SUMMARY	208
CHAPTER SEVEN RIPPLES	211
7.1 THESIS SUMMARY AND SYNTHESIS	211
7.1.1 PLACE	213
7.1.2 PERCEPTION	216
7.1.3 PARTNERSHIP	217
7.1.4 PHILOSOPHY	219
7.1.5 PRACTICE	220
7.2 ONGOING AND FUTURE RESEARCH	221
7.2.1 PROJECT EXTENSIONS	222
7.2.2 PROSPECTIVE PROJECTS	224
7.3 A “TAKE OUT”	228
REFERENCES	230

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.1	The Research Contributions of <i>Picturing the Thelon</i>	18
Table 4.1	A Summary of community-based projects in Nunavut that have informed the development of engaged acclimatization	91
Table P2.1	Research activities that occurred in Baker Lake, Nunavut	114
Table P2.2	Research activities that occurred with Thelon River canoeists	114
Table 5.1	Descriptive Details of the Experiential River Journeys	132
Table 5.2	Descriptive details for the July 10 – 20, 2011 canoe trip participants	136
Table 6.1	An overview of research modules involving participants	194
Table 6.2	Frequencies of human and wildlife traces	197
Table 7.1	Summary of Purposes and Objectives	214
Table 7.2	Descriptive Summaries of Chapters Two through Five	215

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure i.	Co-author statement signed by Dr. N.C. Doubleday and Dr. S. Blangy	viii
Figure ii.	Written statement from Dr. G. J. Ljubicic indicating agreement with the Co-Author Statement	ix
Figure iii.	Written statement from Dr. S. G. Donaldson indicating agreement with the Co-Author Statement.	ix
Figure 1.1.	Conceptual Framework and Synthesis	11
Figure 2.1.	A Framework for Moral Philosophy.	35
Figure 2.2.	The Thelon River watershed and neighbouring Nunavut communities.	42
Figure 2.3.	A fleet of canoes on the shore of Baker Lake.	49
Figure 2.4.	A canoe in storage.	49
Figure 2.5.	Abandoned canoe with a cracked hull.	50
Figure 2.6.	A canoe tied down to a qamutiik.	52
Figure 3.1.	Encounters within the Thelon River watershed.	59
Figure 4.1.	The locations of participating Nunavut communities.	92
Figure 4.2.	Boy Scouts marching near Cape Dorset, NU in July 1969.	97
Figure 4.3.	On the shores of the Thelon River.	103
Figure P2.1.	The empirical research design of <i>Picturing the Thelon</i> .	113
Figure 5.1.	Google Earth map showing the trails of experiential river journeys that departed from Baker Lake, Nunavut.	133
Figure 5.2.	Google Earth screen shot showing the experiential river journey taken by canoe in July 2010.	135
Figure 5.3.	Archaeological finds, like arrowheads and other stone tools, were the focal point of many photographs taken by canoeists.	143
Figure 5.4.	A canoeist knapped stones to get a “sense” of the historical tool-making practices used within the Thelon River valley.	146
Figure 5.5.	Embodying family heritage near Beverly Lake.	147
Figure 5.6.	An Inuk hunter keeps a hand on the motorboat’s throttle while attaining river rapids.	155
Figure 5.7.	An “exodus” to inspect tundra vegetation during an ATV journey.	156
Figure 5.8.	“Tourists sneaking up on muskox made a humorous site”.	157

Figure 5.9.	A hunter and his son (background) carried the harvested caribou meat back to camp.	158
Figure 5.10.	Canoeists found reprieve from the heat and bugs by swimming in the river.	162
Figure 5.11.	Canoeists erected a mesh tent to escape biting insects.	163
Figure 6.1.	The Thelon River is one of many special places in the Territory of Nunavut.	187
Figure 6.2.	A place to lunch during the journey to Halfway Hills.	203
Figure 6.3.	Inuksuit indicating the direction from which caribou travel.	204
Figure 6.4.	Inuksuit indicating a good location for fishing.	204
Figure 6.5.	Canoeists followed the guide on various hikes to wolf dens or archaeological sites.	206
Figure 6.6.	The guide unearths arrowheads and other stone tools that he has buried at various locations along the Thelon River.	207
Figure 6.7.	A selection of stone tone tools revealed by the guide.	207
Figure 7.1.	The five modes/attributes of enacting relational ethics.	214

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A	Carleton University Ethics Clearance Form	271
APPENDIX B	Nunavut Research Institute	272
APPENDIX C	Sample Informed Consent Form Used In Baker Lake	274
APPENDIX D	Sample Informed Consent Form For Canoeists	276
APPENDIX E	The Principles of Leave No Trace	278
APPENDIX F	Sample Information Script For Canoeists	279
APPENDIX G	Instructions Distributed to Canoeists for Volunteer Photography Collection	281
APPENDIX H	Instructions Distributed to Canoeists for Volunteer-Employed Photography	282
APPENDIX I	Log Book Distributed to Volunteer Employed Photography Participants	283
APPENDIX J	Codes Derived from Content Analysis of Inhabitant and Canoeist Photographs	284
APPENDIX K	Abstract Submitting for Oral Presentation at the 2012 IPY Conference	290
APPENDIX L	Community Consultation Visit Report	291
APPENDIX M	Report from Research Visit #1	295
APPENDIX N	Report from Research Visit #3	298

To Kate. With Kate.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

To think relationally about a journey means that the point of departure becomes the destination, that the journey's end becomes a beginning. Just as the relational journey is inscribed upon a landscape or mapped upon a page or in the mind, it is also lived and sensed by the traveller and bound to the human and non-human others encountered on the traveller's trails. Indeed, the relational journey is an event of persistent transformation; the traveller always on the move, both affecting and affected by the paths of others.

This dissertation reflects such a journey. Research objectives mingle with outcomes, applications with theory, and lived-experiences with literature. Conclusions are derived en route and meanings are anticipated, reflected upon, synthesized, but always provisional. While it is my privilege to author this thesis—to make decisions about the journey's substance and structure, to navigate obstacles and possibilities, and to articulate in certain ways the trails forged and followed—so too has it been my privilege to engage with a supportive cast of people, things, and places. It is with respect and gratitude towards these relations that I immerse into the interwoven layers of this dissertation.

1.1 A "Put In"

"When we first saw them they were caribou, and they seemed to be swimming. I was still holding onto my rifle, aiming, and we suddenly got to them and they turned into white men paddling." (Inuit Elder Basil Tuluqtuq, cited in Mannick, 1998, p. 197)

Nineteen sixty-two was the dawn of a new moral order stretching across the Thelon River watershed. It was the year that wilderness-canoeing pioneers, Eric and Pamela Morse, led a 24-day journey across the Canadian sub-Arctic “barrenlands,” inscribing the Thelon as a recreational canoe travel destination. Departing from their southern Canadian home, and following river trails sketched by early Euro-Canadian visitors to the Thelon—adventurers and big game hunters, government surveyors, trappers, biologists, and RCMP officers, who advanced the colonial project in the area around the start of the twentieth century—the Morse party of four set the stage for subsequent “wilderness” canoe expeditions (Morse, 1987; Pelly, 1996, 1997), a style of journey that is packed with and propelled by certain systems of value (Baker, 2002; Baldwin, 2004; Erickson, 2008; Newbery, 2003). As a canoe destination, the Thelon entered into, for example, the circulation of a particular “nature narrative,” one that views travel as an escape from the everyday, as environmentally benign, and fundamental to a particular Canadian nationalistic identity (Erickson, 2008; Haun-Moss, 2002).

Such value-based plotlines contrast with the semi-nomadic hunting traditions of Caribou Inuit, Thelon “riverscape” inhabitants whose Indigenous homelands, livelihoods, customs, and identities continue to be configured in relation to the migratory patterns of barren ground caribou (Gordon, 1975). The effects of these contrasting values are not all as innocent as the perceptual one recalled by Basil Tuluqtuq and noted above. As with other styles of nature tourism (Braun, 2002), the tendency in canoe discourses is to venerate a romantic notion of a “past primitive” while obscuring the contemporary presence of Aboriginal inhabitation. Such slippage occurs in two Thelon River trip descriptions published in the popular Canadian magazine *Canoeroots*. The first reads:

“Though the area is *now empty of people*, signs of ancient human life are everywhere” (Finklestein, 2007, p. 23; emphasis added). Three years latter, the following: “*Once a veritable highway for nomadic Inuit hunters, the legendary Thelon travels 900 portage-free kilometers from Whitefish Lake, NWT, to Baker Lake, NU*” (No author, 2011, p. 18; emphasis added). Curiously ignored in both instances are the contemporary living realities in *Qamani’tuaq* (“where the river widens”; known also as Baker Lake, Nunavut), an inland Inuit settlement of roughly 2000 people located at the eastern terminus of the Thelon. For Qamani’tuaq residents, the Thelon is hunting and fishing territory, and serves as a consistent source of nourishment in the form of drinking water, social bonding, and cultural memory. In the words of Anautalik², an Inuk Elder from Baker Lake, “The River is a livelihood for the Inuit. It’s got a lot of things” (personal communication, July 28, 2010). The effect of the *Canoeroots* trip descriptions is to re-inscribe the colonial myth that the Canadian North is a peripheral wilderness, a landscape of loss, and a place to cross but not to inhabit (Braun, 2002; Saul, 2008; Shields, 1991).

This thesis draws on case study research of the Thelon River in Arctic³ Canada to flesh out relational geographies of nature, ethics, and travel. As a special and changing place that elicits multiple perceptual visions—homeland, wilderness, heritage site, resource frontier, to name a few—the Thelon is an archetype for locating and exploring the *promises of incommensurability*. Adapting this phrase from Turnbull (2007), who instead referred to *problems*, the promises of incommensurability arise in the presence of “multiple, incompatible ontologies and perspectives” (p. 140) and underscores the

² “Anautalik” is the self-selected pseudonym of a friend, mentor, and guide that contributed to this project as research assistant and research participant. The thesis is infused with references to her extraordinary generosity and knowledge contributions.

³ “Arctic” is used here for simplicity. As I explain elsewhere, the Thelon is actually a trans-regional river flowing from the Subarctic and into the Arctic (Bone, 2009).

challenges and opportunities of working with difference without “subsumption into one common or universal ontology” (p. 140). Echoing Ingold (2011, p. xvii), it is about identifying with difference as the fundamental mode through which people and/or things relate. Shifting also from Turnbull’s concern with the emergent mappings of science and Indigenous knowledge, the principal focus of this thesis relates to the touristic and inhabitant dimensions of the Thelon River; particularly, those enacted by wilderness canoe travellers and residents of Baker Lake (henceforth, Thelon “inhabitants”). More specifically, the thesis reflects research carried out in collaboration with canoeists and inhabitants to document and share knowledge (i.e., stories, experiences, events, and encounters) about the Thelon, and to use this information to foster shared understanding and enhanced social and ecological responsibility for and within the riverscape.

These multi-layered aims surfaced through my engagement with social science literature concerning the phenomena of “nature” and nature-based tourism, my initial and direct participation in community-based research in Nunavut, and my professional experiences guiding wilderness recreation and outdoor education programs, especially those involving the canoe. In effect, I began to scrutinize my presumption that canoeing was an innocent mode of nature-based travel offering widespread personal, social, and environmental benefits (Grimwood, 2005). How does canoeing enact nature in particular ways, and by whom and for whom? How do these canoe-natures authorize certain voices and silence others? How do canoe-natures conceal other practices within a landscape, and to what effect? But in terms of this thesis, my commitment has been to move a step beyond these important critical questions and to explore and articulate possibilities for

canoeing differently⁴ (and by extension, enacting nature differently). What does canoe travel look like when spaces of nature are engaged as a homeland? How might multiple practices in and of nature converge to support the enactment of more responsible modes of travel and living? How can this vision for change foster inclusivity, connection, justice, and participation (for example, among visitors and inhabitants of a particular Arctic place)? What metaphors might we use to speak of these promises and possibilities? To these ends (or are they beginnings?), it has been helpful to: a) perceive nature-based travel and tourism as a moral and relational space; b) envision the potential for enhancing responsibility within the practices of recreational canoe travel; and c) locate these possibilities within the multiple contexts and trajectories of place.

1.2 Thesis Structure

Picturing the Thelon is an integrated article style thesis. Sandwiched between the introductory and concluding chapters (i.e., Chapters One and Seven, respectively) is the main body of the thesis, which consists of five substantive chapters that each function as stand-alone papers suitable for publication. These five chapters (i.e., Chapters Two through to Six) are organized into three sections that reflect components of a conventional dissertation. Two interludes, or “portages,” help to establish connections between sections and convey valuable content and project details that escape individual chapters. The dissertation’s conceptual framing and synthesis, presented below in Figure 1.1, also fosters cohesion amongst chapters. Importantly, this construct is an aggregate of proposed trajectories and reading across the forthcoming chapters for recursive patterns and emergent themes. As such, it represents a project synthesis, wherein each chapter

⁴ I would like to acknowledge a lost but not forgotten email from Bruce Erickson that helped put me on this track. Reflecting on his own research (Erickson, 2009), Erickson wondered how the many critiques of canoeing could be translated into alternative practices.

fleshes out the different domains and attributes in particular ways and in various degrees. Prior to explaining the specific dimensions of the framework, it will be helpful to present brief summaries of the forthcoming chapters.

The first section following the Introduction, *Enacting Theoretical and Reflexive Relations*, includes Chapter Two and Chapter Three. These chapters work together to forge linkages between relational ontologies and ethics. Chapter Two provides important conceptual, theoretical, and reflexive groundwork for the study. I review a diversity of literature, including various critical perspectives that situate canoeing within hegemonic discourses of nature, to demonstrate that a multiplicity of natures are embedded within canoescapes. Then, drawing upon geographic approaches to ethics, I articulate a relational approach to responsibility couched within the geographical metaphor *moral terrain*, which follows precisely from Figueroa and Waitt (2008). These abstractions are brought to life through narrative accounts of my initial encounters within the Thelon riverscape. Memories and materialities of place are created alongside my personal commitments to repeat community research visits. Thus, not only does this chapter contribute to positioning the thesis theoretically and within a range of interdisciplinary literature, it also helps to position myself—as researcher-canoeist—within the contexts of the study.

Chapter Three expands these relational underpinnings through the explanation and analysis of four philosophical/theoretical “moments” in the social science ontology of environment. The moments include: critical realism, phenomenology of perception, social nature, and ontological multiplicity. I argue that each moment presents a different challenge to the binary visions associated with human exceptionalism, the fantasy that

humanity alone is different from and superior to all other entities existing on Earth (Haraway, 2008). While the premise of nature/culture is an ontology of division and determinism, the moments reviewed in this chapter have each helped to shift ontological discussions towards metaphors of mobilization, configuration, and impermanence. These challenges to dualistic thinking are critically analyzed and interwoven with research possibilities for nature-based tourism grounded in a case study example from the Thelon River.

A short portage brings readers to the second section, *Enacting Methodological Relations*. This section consists of Chapter Four and a subsequent lengthier portage. Whereas this second portage cuts through the terrain of the community-based case study research methods employed in the thesis, Chapter Four illuminates the surfacing of a relational methodological approach to formulating responsible research relationships with Inuit communities from an “outsider” researcher perspective. Drawing on my research experiences in several community-based research projects in different Nunavut communities, the chapter introduces and explains “engaged acclimatization.” This neologism refers to embodied and reflexive relational processes that facilitate endogenous constructions of knowledge by approaching research ethics as a lived experience, initiating and nurturing relationships as a central component of research, and centering methods on circumstances within participating communities. After locating engaged acclimatization with resonate literatures, including Indigenous methodologies, community-based participatory research, and relational geography, the chapter sketches out four aspects of engaged acclimatization: crafting relations, learning, immersion, and activism. In the discussion of each, I integrate specific insights derived from field notes,

observations, photographs, critical reflections, and literature that have brought this understanding to the fore. Importantly, not only has engaged acclimatization oriented my approach to co-creating knowledge with residents of Baker Lake and canoeists, it has also emerged as a vision for my broader research engagements and practice. This is reflected in the substance and style of the final two substantive chapters.

In the third section, *Enacting Empirical and Interpretive Relations*, Chapter Five and Chapter Six weave together the products of community-based case study research with interpretive insights and understanding. Chapter Five draws on relational geographic perspectives of ethics and mobility, and the mobile ethnographies of experiential river journeys with Thelon River inhabitants and canoe travellers, to expound accessible and inclusive value-based metaphors to shape and inform Arctic travel and tourism. Specifically, I tease out suggestive narratives that depict cultural practices as the expression of certain nature-culture values; namely, *emplacement*, *wayfaring*, and *gathering*. These nature-culture values, I argue, are categories of becoming, connection, and participation. They not only refuse discourses of universality and totalization, but they also help create equitable spaces for different actors to work together in thinking through and responding to Arctic social-ecological-cultural change. Locating the riverscape practices that express these values contributes simultaneously to understanding and cultivating a relational ethics for and within the Thelon.

Chapter Six calls attention to the enactment of Thelon River responsibility, particularly in relation to the “tracks and traces” of human and wildlife activity. Foregrounding the practices and lived-experiences of canoeists and inhabitants as revealed in participatory photographic interviews, and oriented theoretically by

ontological multiplicity and aspects of Levinas' philosophy of responsibility, the chapter presents two fundamental arguments: first, that the Thelon is made and remade through the travel practices of canoeists and residents; second, that certain practices of (re)making the Thelon function as expressions of responsibility to and for others connected to personal and social-cultural identity. To illustrate these positions, I present four suggestive and purposeful narratives concerning the making present and making absent of certain tracks and traces. These relational performances and understandings illuminate positive possibilities for enacting cross-cultural, touristic, and responsible relations in and of place. In addition to articulating this vision of relational responsibility (i.e., ethics) for and within the Thelon, the chapter helps to bridge critical tourism scholarship and tourism ethics, two recent "turns" in tourism studies that, in different ways, advocate for the centrality of responsibility in tourism.

The final chapter draws the dissertation to a close. It is composed of a thesis summary and synthesis, and descriptions of anticipated future research based on research outcomes and limitations.

1.3 Conceptual Framing and Synthesis

I noted above that the journey represented by this dissertation is an event of persistent transformation. As readers progress through the individual chapters, they will detect elements of ambiguity, uncertainty, accommodation, and volatility. Such is the nature of thinking relationally and enacting relational ethics. Such is the nature of learning and doing qualitative and community-based research. Embracing this constancy of transformation and change, however, does not mean there are no grounds for stability.

Relations converge or are assembled to establish provisional foundations from which we may depart and to which we may return.

Figure 1.1 illustrates four interrelated sources of stability associated with this thesis. Together, these four domains, represented by the perforated rings linking, or assembling, various attributes, convey the dissertation's substance and scope. Despite their hierarchical appearance, these rings are actually envisioned as nested or mutually embedded layers. Much like the iterative nature of qualitative research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000), each domain informs, and is informed by, the others. Thus, the order of appearance is somewhat arbitrary, though a degree of intentional structure is used to bear resemblance to interdisciplinary frameworks used elsewhere in the tourism and outdoor recreation literature (Fennell, 2006; Plummer, 2009). Furthermore, the varying thickness of the rings represents the magnitude of each domain: the denser the ring, the broader the domain. In addition, porous boundaries mark the domains as malleable, influential, and accommodating in relation to other unspecified areas. The porosity also signals my partial knowledge. Accordingly, each domain is understood as situated and contingent, rather than a definitive category.

The top ring reflects both the higher order objectives and outcomes of the thesis. *Enacting Relational Ethics* refers to the study's fundamental purpose—that is, to understand, envision, and cultivate relational ethics for and within the Thelon River. The five modes and/or attributes—perception, partnership, practice, philosophy, and place—identify the recursive and emergent patterns circulating within the diverse content and meanings of the forthcoming chapters. At times, the appearance of the modes/attributes within the text is unequivocal. Other times they are more covert. Nevertheless, as an

Figure 1.1. Conceptual Framework and Synthesis

ensemble, these modes/attributes represent the product of theoretical, reflexive, methodological, interpretive, and empirical project components, which taken together, articulate the innovative and cumulative contributions of the thesis as a whole. I elucidate these modes/attributes in the concluding chapter.

The second domain reflects the primary disciplinary knowledge areas associated with this research, both in terms of the fields of study informing my engagement with relationality, and those to which I seek to make a contribution. My tendency, however, is to stay close to contemporary geographers that have embraced relational thinking as a useful countermeasure to the pitfalls of dualistic thinking. The intellectual precursors to the “relational turn” in geography are many (Braun, 2008; Castree, 2003b). Sauer’s (1925) recognition that landscapes are altered by human activity, which presented an initial and forceful challenge to environmental determinism, was fundamental to the emergence of schools of inquiry (e.g., cultural ecology) that emphasize society and nature relations (Braun, 2004; Schein, 2004). Glacken’s (1967) historical analysis of Western thought added philosophical depth and understanding to these relations, while others assumed phenomenological orientations to reveal the essence of human experiences in nature (Relph, 1976; Tuan, 1974). As critical approaches gained traction in the twilight of the twentieth century, geographers discovered value in questioning the epistemological and ontological conditions of the discipline, including foundational concepts like “nature,” “society,” and “culture” (Castree, 2005; Johnston & Sidway, 2004). Social nature approaches, which I discuss at length in Chapter Three, have further advanced these critical lines of inquiry and integrated into their analytics a dimension Castree (2001) described as a normative prognosis (i.e., how things should be changed). It is at

this juncture that relational thinking and debates about relational ethics have become most prevalent. While it is not my intention to provide here a more thorough review of these geographic antecedents, I do wish to acknowledge that my research is performed in their spirit.

Third, the mobilization of Arctic Riverscape relations constitutes the applied area of study. The relations in focus throughout this thesis are those associated with the lived-space dimensions of Thelon River tourism (specifically recreational canoeist travellers), inhabitation (specifically residents of Baker Lake), and research (specifically engaging as a community-based researcher). During research familiarization and consultation visits to Baker Lake, the importance of locally relevant project objectives was felt and comprehended. As such, the following applied project purpose was developed and used in communication with all research participants and community representatives:

The project involves working with wilderness tourists (canoe travellers) and Inuit inhabitants (Qamani'tuaq residents) to document and create knowledge about the Thelon River, and to share this knowledge within and between groups in order to cultivate understanding and enhanced social and ecological responsibility in relation to this special and changing place.

As implied, the mobilization of these knowledge relations is intended to generate care, responsibility, and positive possibilities for and with the human and non-human inhabitants of the Thelon River.

The final domain sketches out the basic design of the underlying empirical research. The project engaged case study research and the principles of community-based and participatory methodologies. Primary data collection methods included photographic

interviews, experiential river trips, and community workshops with Thelon River canoe travellers and Baker Lake residents. Importantly, this research emerged in relation to the process of engaged acclimatization discussed in Chapter Four. Further specific details about the research design are elaborated in the second portage and in Chapter Five and Chapter 6.

1.4 Towards the Enactment of Relational Ethics

As I explain in Chapter Two and note elsewhere in the thesis, relational thinking jettisons the either/or categories of dualistic thinking by recognizing and envisioning relationships as the primary “unit” of reality (Bai, 2004; Haraway, 2008; Massey & collective, 1999). Much of this work has raised doubts about the ontological purity of nature and culture (Latour, 1993; Braun, 2004; Proctor, 2009). From a relational perspective, environment and nature are not strictly “environmental” or “natural” phenomena, but the configuration of various material, conceptual, discursive, corporeal, and intersubjective interactions. This ontological view has in turn raised questions about the suitability of these categories for deriving ethical or political weight (Braun, 2008; Castree, 2003a; Latour, 2004; Whatmore, 1997, 2002). For example, the tendency in environmental ethics to appeal to fixed natural properties of autonomous or sentient entities becomes problematic (Braun, 2004; Castree, 2003a). If the ontology of a polar bear, for instance, is crafted through diverse social-nature relations, and therefore malleable and provisional, what are the grounds for determining the intrinsic value of this charismatic mammal?

In this thesis, I adopt a relationship with ethics as an everyday activity, practical and down-to-earth, and involving personal and social processes of reflection,

imagination, experimentation, and becoming (Jickling, 2005). Ethics is understood as a commitment to events as spaces through which new ways of thinking and doing may come into being (Popke, 2009). In Smith's (2009) words (which I quote again in Chapter Six), ethics "provides a basis for questioning the way things are, informs how we might relate to others, and is a mode of being in which we exercise our *individual* responsibilities in concert, though not necessarily agreement, with others" (Smith, 2009, p. 270-271). So rather than a suite of strict rules, infallible codes that constrain individual self-interest, or social norms rooted in human nature, ethics is employed here as an exercise integral to our subjectivity and in balancing our individual capacities and social relations. This perspective seems appropriate for engaging relational ontologies.

But what do I mean by *enacting* this kind of relational ethics? According to Law (2004), enactment refers to the continuing processes of production and reproduction that bring relations, and thus realities or representations of realities, into being. To *enact* relational ethics, therefore, means to create or engage with circumstances in ways that are conducive to the unfolding or emergence of individual and collective capacities for constructing positive new realities. This creative engagement comprises descriptive, normative, and affective dimensions. Given that the production of knowledge has real world effects, the processes for understanding how relational ethics are performed in a certain context must themselves be viewed as important mechanisms in the relational configuration. Accordingly, as specified in my purpose statement, enacting relational ethics in and through this dissertation entails understanding, envisioning, and cultivating these positive possibilities.

1.5 Summary of Research Purpose and Objectives

Picturing the Thelon is a thesis based on case study research oriented by instrumental and intrinsic intentions (Stake, 2000). These intentions have been embedded within the discussions above. In this section, a summary of these guiding aims is provided using clear expressions of the dissertation's primary instrumental purpose, applied intrinsic purpose, and principal research objectives.

1. The principal instrumental purpose of this dissertation research has been to *enact (i.e., to understand, envision, and cultivate) relational ethics for and within the Thelon River watershed.*
2. The applied intrinsic purpose of this dissertation research has been to *work with wilderness tourists (canoe travellers) and Inuit inhabitants (Qamani'tuaq residents) to document and create knowledge about the Thelon River, and to share this knowledge within and between these groups in order to cultivate understanding and enhanced social-ecological responsibility in relation to this special and changing place.*
3. The dissertation includes various primary research objectives related to individual chapters. These objectives include:
 - a. To envision enhanced responsibility amid the multiple natures of recreational canoe travel and, by extension, to argue for the consideration and practice of outdoor leisure as a moral space (Chapter Two);
 - b. To challenge, or contribute to the movement away from, the binary visions associated with human exceptionalism (Chapter Three);

- c. To foster responsible community-based research relationships with Inuit communities in Nunavut (Chapter Four);
- d. To develop accessible and inclusive value-based metaphors to shape and inform Arctic travel and tourism (Chapter Five);
- e. To demonstrate how different travel practices that (re)make the Thelon function as expressions of responsibility to and for others connected to personal and social-cultural identity (Chapter Six);
- f. To develop resources and engage with positive possibilities for enacting cross-cultural, touristic, and responsible research relations in and of place (Chapters Four, Five, and Six).

1.6 Summary of Research Contributions and Innovations

As stand-alone papers, Chapter Two through to Chapter Five are structured such that they each contribute interdisciplinary insights and innovations. Table 1.1 summarizes these chapter specific contributions. The table identifies for each chapter the principal knowledge areas (as per Figure 1.1) and sub-fields contributed to, as well as the specific insights and innovations conveyed. This summary helps to clarify the breadth and depth of significance that this thesis contains for the production of interdisciplinary knowledge.

In addition to the research contributions of individual chapters, there are at least three other innovative elements of *Picturing the Thelon* when taken as a whole. First, the dissertation contributes descriptive and suggestive understandings of the Thelon River watershed from the shared perspectives of wilderness canoeists, Inuit inhabitants, and reflexive research. Importantly, these understandings have been achieved in partnership and through the application of community-based, participatory, and visual methods

Table 1.1 The Research Contributions of *Picturing the Thelon*

Chapter	Principal Knowledge Areas and Sub-Fields Addressed	Insights and Innovations
Two	Tourism and Recreation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outdoor recreation • Nature-based tourism Human Geography <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nature – society relations • Moral geography 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Synthesizes an interdisciplinary literature to explain the “nature of canoeing” 2. Draws on relational geographic approaches to ethics to envision enhanced responsibility within a particular recreational activity (canoeing) 3. Expands understanding of outdoor leisure as a moral space and agent of social change
Three	Tourism and Recreation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tourism and environment Philosophy and Ethics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ontology of environment • Relational ontology 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Juxtaposes seminal constructs in the ontology of environment and applies them to tourism research 2. Analyzes theoretical approaches that challenge the binary visions associated with human exceptionalism
Four	Human Geography <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Research methodology • Relational geographies • Arctic geography 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduces and explains the methodological process of engaged acclimatization 2. Expands understanding of responsible community-based and participatory research with Arctic and Aboriginal communities 3. Articulates research ethics as lived experience
Five	Tourism and Recreation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arctic travel and tourism • Mobilities • Tourism Ethics Human Geography <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arctic mobilities • Moral geography Philosophy and Ethics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Descriptive ethics • Relational ontology 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fleshes out cultural and Arctic riverscape practices that express nature-culture values 2. Constructs new metaphors for thinking through and responding to social-ecological-cultural change 3. Infuses into Arctic tourism research relational understandings of ethics and mobility 4. Introduces mobile ethnography as a methodology for Arctic travel and tourism research 5. Positions Arctic tourism within broader spheres of human experience and social theory
Six	Tourism and Recreation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Responsible tourism • Critical tourism scholarship Human Geography <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nature – society relations Philosophy and Ethics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Descriptive ethics • Relational ontology • Environmental responsibility 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduces the potential of interpreting the tracks and traces, or the material presences and absences, of a riverscape 2. Identifies the expression of responsibility connected to identity in practices of (re)making of nature spaces 3. Employs responsibility to draw together tourism ethics and critical tourism scholarship literatures

adapted from International Polar Year (IPY) research (Doubleday et al., 2008, 2010). In

light of contemporary contexts of Arctic change, such learning-centred, inclusive, and

knowledge sharing approaches to research can be helpful mechanisms for creating safe social spaces of inter-cultural and inter-regional understanding (Tester & Irniq, 2008) and, I would argue, Arctic participation.

Second, *Picturing the Thelon* is an important augmentation in the academic study of tourism. While other tourism scholars have often integrated into research elements of relational thinking (e.g., Franklin, 2004; Jóhannesson, 2005), ethics (e.g., Fennell, 2006; Smith & Duffy, 2003), and human/cultural geography (e.g., Hall & Page, 2006; Williams, 2009), there are only a few examples of these three spheres converging (e.g., Cloke & Perkins, 2005; Figueroa & Waitt, 2008; Waitt, Figueroa, & McGee, 2007). Thus, on the one hand, this dissertation instills within Tourism Studies novel interdisciplinary and empirical insights relevant to tourism ethics, nature-based tourism, and Arctic tourism. On the other hand, the thesis also functions as a theoretical and methodological model for researching place-based relational ethics, which can be adapted to suit a potentially diverse array of tourism contexts.

Finally, this thesis contributes to fleshing out both the theoretical and applied aspects of relational (environmental) ethics. Castree (2005) has remarked that a fundamental challenge to relational thinking in geography is to translate the philosophical outlines of post-natural ethics—which, by the way, he indicates are well established (see e.g., Latour, 1993, 2004)—into substantive moral principles such as justice, rights, and obligations. For Castree, Whatmore's (1997, 2002) formulation of a relational ethics within hybrid geographies stands out at an important starting point. The associated work of Cloke and Jones (2003) and Figueroa and Waitt (2008) yields five elements of relational ethics that might be operationalized as additional substantive principles. These

include moral agency, otherness, relational ontology, blurred distinctions between facts and values, and environmental justice. Missing from these discussions, however, is dedicated attention to how *doing research* can create circumstances that enable relational ethics to flourish. As I repeat throughout the thesis, we know that research is a social process with real world effects. Research that engages relational ethics as an orientation or issue is, therefore, also a political commitment that can enact relational ethics within the contexts under investigation. How might this matrix of the theoretical-methodological-empirical be performed? Inviting and negotiating the principal purpose of this dissertation—to understand, envision, and cultivate relational ethics for and within the Thelon—will engender elements of a response.

ENACTING THEORETICAL AND REFLEXIVE RELATIONS

CHAPTER TWO

“THINKING OUTSIDE THE GUNNELS”: CONSIDERING NATURES AND THE MORAL TERRAINS OF RECREATIONAL CANOE TRAVEL⁵

2.1 Introduction

The promise of outdoor recreation and leisure as an agent for social change is often founded upon a particular, albeit widespread, conception of “nature” as biophysical space separate from the activities of society and culture. Experiences within this nature are touted to foster personal, group, and environmental benefits that migrate with participants back into broader social spheres (Foster & Linney, 2007; Gillet, Thomas, Skok, & McLaughlin, 1991; Hanna, 1995; Palmberg & Kuru, 2000). Some research, however, unpacks these assumptions of nature and society that serve as foundations for outdoor leisure (Brookes, 2001; Hogan, 1992; Martin, 2004; Mullins, 2009; Mullins & Maher, 2007; Ryan, 2002; Waitt & Cook, 2007). The dichotomous pairing of wilderness/civilization, for instance, is scrutinized for hiding influences that human discourses have upon and within spaces of nature, thereby rewriting misplaced modern assumptions (Braun, 2002; Cronon, 1995a; Hinchliffe, 2007; Latour, 1993).

This essay contributes to unpacking nature/society in spaces of outdoor leisure by considering the many natures at play in the spaces of recreational canoe travel. Previous work shows that recreational canoeing can perpetuate ideologies of nature that are commodified, colonial, nationalistic, and gendered (Baker, 2002; Baldwin, 2004; Erickson, 2008; Haun-Moss, 2002). Insights gained from this writing point to the “multiplicity of natures” (Hinchliffe, 2007) entangled within a localized enactment of

⁵ This chapter was originally published as: Grimwood, B. S. R. (2011). “Thinking outside the gunnels”: Considering natures and the moral terrains of recreational canoe travel. *Leisure/Loisir: The Journal of the Canadian Association of Leisure Studies*, 35 (1), 49-69.

canoeing; however, theoretically informed and prescriptive prognoses for practicing canoe travel differently are underdeveloped. McDermott (2004), Stewart (2004a, 2004b), and Mullins (2009) are notable exceptions. The intention of this chapter is to outline an approach for envisioning enhanced responsibility amid the multiple natures of recreational canoe travel and, by extension, to argue for the consideration and practice of outdoor leisure as a moral space.

Ethics tends to be viewed as a restrictive, adjudicating, or moralizing endeavour suitable only for privileged intellectuals or evangelicals (Proctor, 1999). In contrast, I adopt a relationship with ethics as an everyday activity, practical and down-to-earth, and involving personal and social processes of reflection, imagination, and experimentation to create new ways of being (Jickling, 2005). It is an ethics that, like Popke (2009) writes, commits to events as spaces through which new ways of thinking and doing may come into being. This orientation is couched significantly in geographical approaches to ethics, and follows applications in leisure contexts by Matless (1994) and Waitt and colleagues (Figuerola & Waitt, 2008; Waitt & Cook, 2007; Waitt, Figuerola, & McGee, 2007).

The chapter begins by introducing the “nature of canoeing,” a perceived and physical leisure-wilderness space that holds popular currency as a mechanism for social change. A diverse literature illustrates, on the one hand, objections to this hegemonic nature of canoeing and, on the other hand (and more important to my aims here), the multiplicity of natures enacted within canoespaces. Then, to service the envisioning of responsibility amid multiple canoeing natures, I articulate conceptual and theoretical underpinnings of this dissertation research; namely, a relational approach to responsibility described using the geographical metaphor *moral terrain*, which follows

precisely from recent work by Figueroa and Waitt (2008). These abstractions are subsequently exemplified with narratives derived from my own encounters as researcher-canoeist within a particular Arctic riverscape. One encounter involves a sardine can, the other, a photographic mission. These reflexive narratives help soften criticism directed towards certain nature-cultures, and convey my efforts to enact more symmetrical relationships among northern residents and non-residents.

2.2 The Nature of Canoeing

2.2.1 Personal, Social, and Environmental Benefits

At first glance, the Canadian canoe experience (Raffan, 1999) affords imperative opportunities for abating the deleterious condition labeled “nature deficit disorder” (Louv, 2005) or decelerating society’s advancement and the end of nature (McKibben, 1989). Consider the words of Pierre Trudeau:

What sets a canoeing expedition apart is that it purifies you more rapidly and inescapably than any other. Travel 1000 miles by train and you are a brute; pedal 500 miles on a bicycle and you remain basically a bourgeois; paddle 100 miles in a canoe and you are already a child of nature. (cited in Raffan, 1988, p. 10)

Of course, canoe experience is not homogeneous. For some people it is an obsession, or a way of life, while for others it is terrifying, extraordinarily difficult, or the least memorable part of attending summer camp. Canoeing ranges from independent or commercially guided multi-day expeditions along remote rivers to afternoon outings on urban waterways, through conservation areas, or in provincial parks. As an activity, canoeing functions as an intermediary among contexts of leisure, tourism, outdoor education and recreation, and adventure (Hall & Page, 2006; Plummer, 2009). In all

forms, however, canoeing carries with it a relationship to those things, places, and experiences identified as “natural,” even if only because of the canoe’s origins in the forest (Raffan, 1999).

Granted this relationship, the nature of canoeing denotes a double meaning whereby the *biophysical nature* traveled by canoe is held as an *intrinsic property* of the canoe trip activity (for reviews of common uses of nature, see Castree, 2005; Demeritt, 2002). Thus, *it is only natural to canoe in nature*, and beneficial derivatives of these touristic engagements might persist in everyday life (Raffan, 1988). Horwood (1988), for example, describes the canoe trip as a doorway to our primitive selves, whereby people learn to recognize their bodies, artifacts, and social relationships as natural extensions of the world and responsive to it. While traveling by canoe, nature becomes teacher, transferring meaningful lessons and values about simplicity, connectedness, humility, renewal, and reprieve from technological excesses (Grimwood, 2005; Patterson, Watson, Williams, & Roggenbuck, 1998; Pohl, 2006). For Hvenegaard and Asfeldt (2007), canoe travel fosters a sense of belonging, knowing, and feeling in a wild place that increases environmental concern and action. Indeed, conservation campaigns have benefited immensely from canoeists who have become public ambassadors of wilderness with significant political clout and representation (CPAWS/MEC, 2009; Hodgins, 1988; Raffan, 2004).

From the sociobiological perspective of biophilia (Kellert, 2005; Kellert & Wilson, 1993), these beneficial derivatives of canoeing are predictable. According to Kellert (2005), the drivers of nature experiences are embedded in the biological and cultural foundations of human nature. Contact with non-human nature is essential to our

emotional, cognitive, and moral competence. In other words, nature experience has positive effects on human health and well-being (Mitten, 2009).

2.2.2 Critiques and Concerns

Researchers and practitioners are often warned, however, about blindly accepting these terms. In most cases, according to canoeing icon, Bill Mason (1988), the enjoyable and relaxing escape of a canoe trip does little to enhance a person's relationship to the land.

What is more, the flipside to apparent social-environmental benefits of canoeing appears to be a multi-edge sword, unsheathed through the critical consideration of recreational canoe travel as a process of social hegemony in relation to Canadian ideologies (Haun-Moss, 2002). According to Mullins (2009), the "outdoors subculture" values human-powered and non-consumptive activities (like canoeing) as environmentally responsible, benign, and authentic ways to experience remote and rugged wilderness, and contrasts the perceived anthropocentric and environmentally degrading activities (like hunting) that rely on motorized and consumptive practices. However, far from a guiltless pastime that does not pollute, make noise, or alter landscapes, wilderness canoeing, in both historical and contemporary contexts, has played a major role in compromising spaces designated as wilderness. Hodgins (1988), for a Canadian example, points to the canoe's historic role within the nature-subduing, empire-building enterprises of the Hudson's Bay Company and Northwest Company, and to the fact that typical linear journeys of modern day canoe travel requires the consumption of vast quantities of fuel to access destinations by bush planes, cars, and trains. In addition to such global scale effects, canoe travel contributes to localized socio-

environmental impacts on tourist destinations, including soil compaction at campsites or the introduction of cultural values divergent from norms of host communities (Plummer, 2009). For wilderness travelers, learning and practicing “minimum impact” skills, like Leave No Trace ethics, have become the benchmark for responsible travel and teaching environmental skills (Priest & Gass, 1997). In effect, these practices are rooted in an ideology of wilderness and reinforce notions that humans are alien to and without impact upon the landscape (Mullins & Maher, 2007; Ryan, 2002).

Also of a critical bent is the implication of the nature of canoeing in the production of a particular, albeit hegemonic, Canadian nationalistic identity and imagination that is gendered, colonial, and perpetuates class distinctions (Baker, 2002; Baldwin, 2004, 2009; Erickson, 2008; McDermott, 2004; Newbery, 2003; Shields, 1991). Canoeing may be coded as a heroic masculinized quest into, and crossing of, wilderness—identifiable in the fur trade, early mappings of Canada, boys private summer camp traditions, and the urban-living majority that embark on canoe quests for their annual two week holiday (Benidickson, 1997; Hodgins & Hobbs, 1985; Raffan, 1999). Accordingly, the wilderness canoe journey helps enshrine as a rule in Canadian living a gendered opposition between nature and civilization (Shields, 1991). Both McDermott (2004) and Newbery (2003) extend from these insights to show how the lived-body experiences of women canoeists are much different. Following Saul’s (2008) perspective, the movement of canoes passing through wilderness resonates with a colonial discourse that perceives the Canadian North as a place to be crossed and not lived in. The former perception is tied to northern economic development and security, for example in the case of early Canadian fur trade or in present-day military initiatives devised to protect

Canadian northern sovereignty. The livelihoods of Aboriginal and other northern residents are often left trivialized (Baldwin, 2004; Saul, 2008).

Erickson (2008) explains these exclusions in terms of how wilderness becomes a fetishized and anachronistic space; that is, an uncivilized but endangered space located outside of history, mourned for and deemed in need of protection by the leisure class, and which systematically denies Aboriginal Peoples, for example, opportunities to participate fairly in contemporary society (see also Braun, 2002; McClintock, 1995). Both Baldwin (2004) and Baker (2002) uncover similar themes in their respective analyses of boreal forest politics and the spatial productions of Algonquin Provincial Park. As a set, this literature identifies how colonial narratives and social hierarchies are implicated in the wilderness-nationalism discourses of canoeing. In effect, the Canadian wilderness ideology, which so often gets packed between the gunnels of a canoe, disguises a reality of northern exploitation by southerners (typically men) for profit (Shields, 1991).

2.2.3 Remedies and Continued Cautions

To offset these critical perspectives, outdoor researchers and practitioners have implemented remedial conceptual frameworks and program delivery strategies. In an Australian outdoor education context, Stewart (2004b) describes canoeing as a means to an end. He is particularly concerned that outdoor programs not in tune with the particularities of *place* run the risk of perpetuating colonial views of places being empty of history. Canoe journeys with students are, therefore, focused on exploring the multiple ways humans use, understand, and impact a river system. Stewart (2004b) explains that

on these journeys we travel enough distance to see different aspects of the Murray [River] but not too far that the focus becomes the activity of canoeing (that is, we use canoes to see the river, not canoe the river for the sake of the activity). (p. 52)

Stewart does not emphasize the personal or group development narrative that involves overcoming hardships, like long paddling distances or grueling portages, and which positions nature as playing field (Hogan, 1992). Instead, canoeing functions as a vehicle for accessing the necessary lessons of place, which help decolonize nature and foster improved relationships with the land. River experiences for Stewart are thus a process of engaging the emotions and intellect in order to develop understanding of place.

Place-based experience showcases an approach to canoe travel where nature is not framed as undifferentiated space. However, Stewart (2004b) overlooks the relationship of sensuous and embodied practices in the emergence of place (Abram, 1996; Massey, 2005). Mullins (2009), conversely, considers how movements and skills involved in canoe tripping engage participants within landscapes and shape social interactions and place meanings. Applying Ingold's (2000) dwelling perspective, Mullins re-figures common themes of a canoe trip (e.g., challenge, social-group interdependence, and navigation) to demonstrate that "landscape" and "place" are always a work in progress. The development and meanings of place are shaped by canoeists' movement through them, connecting canoeists to other social and ecological narratives within changing landscapes. Thus, the traces we leave behind are of critical concern because they are enmeshed within continued processes of place-making (Mullins, 2009).

Despite these re-workings of the nature of canoeing in terms of place-based learning, skill, and movement, concern remains warranted in regards to the potential

power differentials at play within canoescapes. Expressions of these asymmetrical power relations can manifest in many ways, not least of all in contexts concerning Aboriginal identities.

For example, from a decolonizing perspective Lowan (2008, 2009) examined Outward Bound's Giwaykiwin wilderness-based Indigenous education program, which typically centres on a 10 – 15 day canoe trip for creating opportunities for students to reconnect with the land and their Indigenous cultures. Although admirable in aim, Lowan reveals that divergent Outward Bound and Aboriginal philosophies are unequally weighted, favouring the former in program delivery. Outward Bound's stated approach to personal development—which entails overcoming the physical, emotional, and intellectual challenges of nature-based expeditions, and is rooted in Kurt Hahn's early 20th Century training model for British sailors—is at odds with Aboriginal worldviews that situate humans as part of the natural world. Even when tempered by an awakened sense of place among instructors and students, Lowan argues that Outward Bound and Aboriginal learning outcomes are incompatible and inconsistent with projects of decolonization, primarily because the Aboriginal content is devalued and underemphasized. Increased Elder involvement and Aboriginal instructor development, cross-cultural staff training, and selecting appropriate course locations are steps that might enhance Outward Bound's ongoing program development (Lowan, 2008, 2009).

In so far as Outward Bound is tied to certain British ideals, Baldwin's (2009) critical geography of whiteness complements some of Lowan's concerns. Baldwin's point of interest is the Boreal Rendezvous environmental campaign, which celebrates the integral role of the boreal forest to Canadian identity and well-being through a series of

multi-day canoe trips on different Canadian rivers with high-profile Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal participants (Raffan, 2004). Scrutinizing two *texts* produced during this canoe-conservation campaign, and framing “whiteness” as a value system (i.e., not reducible to phenotypic difference or a monolithic identity), Baldwin argues that instead of performing nature as purified and anachronistic wilderness space, canoeists play out a politically innocent form of whiteness that explicitly recognizes First Nations as long-time occupiers of the boreal forest. While this *liberal whiteness* might be a necessary step in decolonizing geographies, Baldwin argues that it enables those practicing it to disregard their relation to white privilege, which in this case, is embodied by canoeists’ mobility of subjectivity positions—that is, they identify with First Nations on the moral grounds that the boreal forest is threatened. The paradox here, according to Baldwin, is that, despite good intentions, liberal whiteness can only be forged from a hegemonic position of privilege, one that assumes First Nations peoples occupy an authentic margin.

2.2.4 Toward the Natures of Canoeing

While I have attempted to distance myself from the particular views of other authors cited above, I am cognizant that my selection of material reviewed bears political import. My intention, however, has not been to condemn nature, canoeing, or programs that have taken meaningful strides forward in education and conservation. Rather, the preceding review is meant to show the diversity of natures enacted relative to different spatial representations of recreational canoe travel. Nature is far from homogenous, despite popular modern conceptions that nature is entirely distinct from society. The hegemony of the nature of canoeing may exist, but so too do other natures (Hinchliffe, 2007). The literature discussed above points towards the discursive, material, and

performed natures that become entangled with the localized enactment of canoeing.

Within a canoescape, nature may be played out as:

- redemptive or nourishing space associated with human and nonhuman evolution;
- timeless space that may facilitate spiritual renewal, or oppress Others by making invisible living histories within a landscape;
- located space for intellectual and emotional contemplation;
- emergent space encountered through movement, skill, and stories of place-making;
- social space that becomes shaped by hierarchies and influences of power.

Indeed, when it comes to canoeing, nature is far more than biophysical entities or the intrinsic attributes of the activity.

Many implications follow from this recognition. As Hinchliffe (2007) argues, there is likely some productive work that natures can do. Thus, the natures of canoeing are not fated to remain always enmeshed in current social hierarchies; interventions can be and are being made to enact natures differently (as implied by Outward Bound and the Boreal Rendezvous programs). Revealing those natures presently being made might be the work of descriptive empirical studies, while those that ought to be made necessitate more normative, or prescriptive, considerations.

In regards to formulating a prescriptive case, a number of departure points may prove helpful. I use the remainder of this paper to sketch out two instructive and interrelated maneuvers used within geographical studies of ethics which, when considered together, become suitably framed by the metaphor *moral terrains* (Figueroa & Waitt, 2008). Conceptual abstractions are later illustrated with reflexive narratives of my

performance as researcher-canoeist within an Arctic riverscape and, as intimated in the introduction, will help mitigate concerns regarding how nature and canoeing have been framed thus far.

2.3 Geography and Ethics: Moral Geographies and Relational Thinking

The realm of ethics encompasses a formidable intellectual heritage dating back to Greek antiquity and the introduction of the written word in Western civilization (Abram, 1996). Complex and nuanced theoretical and applied ethical debates are often left to the systematic reflections of moral philosophers. Recently, geographers have encouraged the association between geography and ethics; an offshoot of the normative turn in social theory that contests value-free science through the recognition of socially constructed knowledge (Sayer & Storper, 1997). While ethics may always have had a place within geography via the normative grids of Enlightenment rationalism, the contemporary geography and ethics movement entails a determination to look to philosophers gesturing towards geographic space (Kobayashi & Proctor, 2004; Smith, 1997).

Also evident in this scholarship is attention to moral beliefs and practices distributed across space, or performed in particular contexts (Smith, 2000). This work has been termed “moral geographies” and characterized empirically as thick descriptive ethics (Proctor, 1998, 1999). According to Matless (2009a), moral geography considers “the way in which assumptions about the relationships between people and their environments may reflect and produce moral judgements, and how the conduct of particular groups or individuals in particular spaces may be judged appropriate or inappropriate” (p. 478). For Proctor (1999), this place-based ethical inquiry marks an

opportunity for understanding human morality in more practical terms than placeless strands of normative and meta-ethical inquiry.

Applications of moral geography (Proctor, 1995; Smith, 2000) provide some cushioning to the critiques of environmental ethics, an applied ethic familiar in outdoor leisure contexts (see Figure 2.1). Plummer (2009), for example, observes the frustrations of pragmatically minded theorists who assert that debates within environmental ethics (i.e., the ranging representations of anthropocentrism and non-anthropocentrism) are overly complex and trivial, and have very little influence in the domains of science, activism, or policy-making. The high degree of abstraction and quest for universal principles entrenched within environmental ethics has come at the expense of systematically grounded or context-sensitive ethics (Light & Smith, 1997; Smith, 2000). Geographers have contributed corrective measures here by critically evaluating the normative bases of environmental preservation and politics, revealing the rootedness of environmental ethics by appealing to the geographic metaphor of place (Cresswell, 2004; Smale, 2006).

In addition to rooting ethics with thick, descriptive, and place-based accounts, geographers are contributing to the development of relational environmental ethics. In a recent report, Braun (2008) acknowledges a marked shift from dualistic to relational ontologies within geographic studies of society-nature relations. This announcement matches growing attention to relational thinking in broader contexts of human and cultural geography (Castree, 2003b; Massey, Allen, & Sarre, 1999). Dualistic traditions, attributable to Cartesian impulses of human exceptionalism (Haraway, 2008), are reflected by an assortment of binary pairings that appear to order the world; for example,

mind/body, self/other, object/subject, or human/animal (Haraway, 1991). In nature/culture debates, culture succumbs to what is determined to be natural law or, the reverse, societal advancement results in atrocities upon nature. Both of these positions, however, function as two sides of the same coin whereby those things considered natural are rendered mute or inactive and culture is the assumed domain of agency (Hinchliffe, 2007).

Figure 2.1. A Framework for Moral Philosophy. Source: Fennell & Malloy (2007)

Relational thinking jettisons either/or categories, recognizing instead “the important elements of interconnection which go into the construction of an identity” (Massey & collective, 1999, p. 12). Rather than a world made up of purified forms that

frequently mix, for example between pristine wilderness and human civilization, relational thinking envisions relationships as the primary “unit” of reality (Bai, 2004; Haraway, 2008). An entanglement of human and nonhuman relations that are at once conceptual, ideological, material, discursive, practical, dynamic, and political, blurs the boundaries between presumed substantive entities. It is, as Hinchliffe (2007) refers, a shift from an ontology of division and determinism, to an ontology of configuration, mobilization, hybridity, and impermanent relations that form more or less durable bodies.

At least two things are clear from these developments in relational thinking. First, “nature” and “environment”—as they are commonly employed—are no longer suitable categories from which to derive political or ethical weight (Braun, 2008; Castree, 2003a; Proctor, 2009). Proctor (2009) explains that to the extent that environment is understood as nature and that nature is revealed through science, then environment invariably carries with it an objectivist hue. Such objectivist epistemology is said to be at the core of the human/nature dualism and, by extension, the contemporary environmental crisis (Bai, 2004; Haraway, 1991). It posits the environment as the stuff sensed in separation to humans, a separation that must presumably be overcome. So, while humans may be connected to the environment, concerned about it, or learn to become one with it, this line of thinking implicitly rests within binary origins. Humans and environment started as two separate domains.

Castree’s (2003a) related argument is that, in terms of environmental ethics, the majority of theorists adhere to an ontology of material essentialism; “the idea that entities in the world—be they people, animals, microbes, lakes or what have you—ultimately have a set of immutable properties that are relatively or absolutely autonomous from

those of other entities and relatively enduring” (p. 3-4). The tendency among environmental ethicists is to appeal to these fixed properties to anchor their claims about ethical considerability. However, under the rubric of relational thinking, no longer is there a simple division between humans as moral agents and non-humans as mere moral subjects (Figueroa & Waitt, 2008). Relational configurations demand the re-consideration of ideas and meanings of political rights and ethical subjectivity (Castree, 2003a).

Second, although pure categories of nature and environment are disputed, relational thinking does not resort to hard-line social constructionism where reality is reduced to conceptual or ideological constructs (Cronon, 1995b; Evernden, 1992). Rather, relational thinking recognizes the materiality of the world in a renewed fashion, different from objectivist or determinist epistemologies. Whatmore (2006) summarizes how these materialist returns have been taken up in cultural geography. First, there has been increased attention to bodily movements in the world, such that landscapes are co-constituted by more-than-human bodies and a lively world. Second, the category “human” has been interrogated; demonstrating that what counts as human is, like other identities, co-fabricated through socio-material relations. And third, constitutions of subjectivity are shown to occur out in the world rather than within internal individual dimensions (Whatmore, 2006).

These materialist returns work against broader humanistic commitments in geography by emphasizing the “livingness” of the world in which bodies and worlds are always co-constituted and being made and remade (Whatmore, 2006). A result of this has been a politics of nature that must invariably be a kind of active experimentation where bodily senses and affective registers are prioritized over talk and text, what counts as a

research subject is extended, and knowledge and expertise are redistributed beyond the academy (Braun, 2008; Popke, 2009; Whatmore, 2006). Following Braun's (2008) remarks, the conjunctions of radical uncertainty in complexity and the capacity of bodies for affect are important ways forward to a more informed, inclusive, and fair environmental ethics.

In the next section, I elaborate upon one particular approach to relational environmental ethics used by geographers. It attends to the specificities of place, navigates the multiplicity and normativity of natures, and embraces the capacity of affective bodies. This is endorsed as one manoeuvre for enacting responsibility amid the multiplicity of canoe natures.

2.4.1 Moral Terrains

In a portrayal of conflicting perspectives concerning old-growth forests in Pacific Northwest USA, Proctor (1995) explains that disputes between preservationists and wise-use supporters are not based on whether people should care about nature, but rather about how and why nature ought to be cared for. Within these forest conflicts are "divergent ideas on what nature is and should be, what our role in nature is and should be" (Proctor, 1995, p. 288). The ancient forests are depicted as a terrain of many contested perspectives of right and wrong, all of which are enmeshed with particular and culturally loaded ideas of nature. The multitude of possible ethical orientations overlaying this particular space of nature is what Proctor refers to as a contested moral terrain.

Introduced in this way, moral terrain is intimately tied to studies in moral geography and, even more so, to conceptualizations of moral landscapes (Matless, 2009b; Setten, 2004). This latter work refers to the association of certain landscapes with

schemes of moral value, and entails the consideration of how moral values are extended in space or located in particular environments through exercises of power; for example, in terms of moral order being equated with natural order or privileging the interests of particular individuals or groups over others (Matless, 2009b). Accordingly, Baldwin's (2009) account, presented above, may be read as such an exercise: new political strategies employed in conservation admirably recognizes the presence of Aboriginal Peoples, yet for Baldwin, this shift resonates with an exclusive capacity to alter subjectivity positions, underscoring power differentials within the landscape.

However, moral terrain also functions as a conceptual tool for understanding the entanglement of ethics in particular and everyday spaces. Following Waitt and colleagues (Figueroa & Waitt, 2008; Waitt et al., 2007), applications of this spatial metaphor allow epistemological certainties to be resisted, maintained, or enlarged through affective, sensuous, and place-based encounters. Specifically, Figueroa and Waitt (2008) conceive moral terrains

as the web of values layered over places through discourses that establish normative practices and socio-environmental belonging. At the same time, moral terrains are inscribed onto bodies through affective responses to touring...[including] interest, enjoyment, surprise, disappointment, pride, shame, contempt, and anger. Bodily affects are understood as living, performative emotions that enable people to come to know and build or negate relationships with other human body-selves as well as non-human entities. (p. 328)

This is an important framework not only for beginning to understand the multiple moral layers enmeshed within a canoescape, but also in terms of how resistance or

affirmation of these layers may become embodied in practices and performances. Here, ethics is not just about abstract ideas, universal norms, or codes of conduct dispersed through discourses such as ecotourism or minimum impact. Ethics is also situated, affective, and corporeal, and open to negotiation. It becomes, as Popke (2009) articulates, an ethos that is attentive to bodily encounters, without submitting them to an *a priori* set of rules or moral judgments. Ethics, in this vein, is not about adjudicating action or enforcing conduct, but is instead about committing to *events* as spaces through which new ways of thinking and moving may come into being (Popke, 2009). Conceived in these terms, the terrain of ethics affords a first step towards showcasing through empirical means how responsibility functions amid the multiplicity of natures.

Indeed, the study of moral terrains underscores the significance of thinking relationally about travel destinations (Figuerola & Waitt, 2008; Waitt et al., 2007). It bypasses thinking dualistically about tourism destinations as scenic landscapes, a perception that tends to prioritize Eurocentric ideas of pristine natural spaces (“natural landscapes”) or hide the spatial practices of non-humans (“cultural landscapes”). Tourists are conceived not as disembodied and gazing consumers of landscapes—a view caught up in colonial and rationalistic discourses that frame landscapes as passive, objectified, and distanced from the viewer—but as constituents in responsible place-making where situated values and embodied knowledge are derived from running, walking, smelling, listening, or tasting the land (Waitt et al, 2007). The materiality of the world is experienced through affective and corporeal registers, opening possibilities and generous sensibilities to encounter and engage responsibly with others.

2.5 Revealing Moral Terrains within an Arctic Riverscape

As indicated above, when considering relationships as the primary units of reality, boundaries are blurred between entities that tend to be considered in substantive terms (e.g., mind/body, nature/culture, self/other, subject/object, and even ontology/epistemology). This is difficult conceptual territory to navigate, but it is productive because it jettisons binary categories that, as per Haraway (1991), result in the dominance of one over the other.

Correspondingly, the blurred boundaries of relational thinking buttress notions of research as a social process and the production of knowledge as a partial and political process (Kitchin & Tate, 2000). The idea of an objective, fly-on-the-wall researcher is supplanted by a situated researcher whose identities shape and are being shaped by the research context. Applied to the study of ethics, this translates into the intimate pairing of substantive and professional ethics, particularly in terms of cross-cultural research (Rundstrom & Deur, 1999). Ethical research is more than isolated individual reflection upon a moral conundrum. It involves going to places to engage in the relations and worldviews of the place, and to develop a reciprocal exchange of information as part of long-term research relationships (Rundstrom & Deur, 1999). Willingness to participate, commitment to being open to new possibilities, and adaptability are gateways into this subject-object communion (Bai, 2004).

These tools I packed with me during my first two visits to Baker Lake (or, Qamani'tuaq—"where the river widens"), an inland Inuit community located in the Kivalliq region of Nunavut at the eastern outpouring of the Thelon River (see Figure 2.2). The visits were each approximately three weeks long and occurred in July 2008 and

November 2009. As a researcher, these visits had two primary purposes: first, to acclimatize to the social-cultural-ecological contexts of a possible fieldwork site; and second, to introduce to community members a collaborative research project investigating how responsibility is enacted in the experiences and encounters of Thelon River residents and canoe travelers. These activities follow recommendations for developing research relationships with Inuit communities in Nunavut, and created opportunities for integrating community input into the research design (ITK/NRI, 2007).

Figure 2.2. The Thelon River watershed and neighbouring Nunavut communities.
Source: Retrieved from http://www.chrs.ca/Rivers/Thelon/Thelon-M_e.htm on July 15, 2009

As a canoeist, my intentions were related, but also different. Along its roughly 900-kilometre path, the Thelon River traverses political boundaries and Indigenous

territories, multiple perceptual and experiential divides (e.g., wilderness, homeland, resource, and sacred space), and histories of socio-ecological change (Mackinnon, 1983; Pelly, 1996; Raffan, 1993). Since 1962, when the first documented recreational canoe trip descended the Thelon (Morse, 1987), the river has been celebrated by canoeists as one of the longest and most remote stretches of wilderness in North America (Hall, 2003; McCreadie, 1995). The history of the river as a canoe travel destination (Hodgins & Hoyle, 1994; NoAuthor, 1997) was central to its designation as a Canadian Heritage River in 1990. This lineage as a canoescape, combined with my association with an outdoors subculture (Mullins, 2009), has spurred my desire to travel amid the Thelon's currents. However, as attuned readers will identify in the discussions presented earlier, I am wary of the ways recreational canoe travel frames nature and, so, for my first encounters with the Thelon River I sought something different. Like Mullins and Maher (2007), I strive to take account of the traces I inscribe within a landscape.

In Baker Lake, I have learned to introduce myself to community members as a researcher-canoeist interested in working with residents on a project that documents and shares knowledge concerning Kangirjuaq (the Thelon River), a special place for Inuit and recreational canoe travelers. The cultural memory of Inuit spans generations (Kulchyski & Tester, 2007; Mannick, 1998) and those who reside in Baker Lake are accustomed to researchers and canoeists arriving in town. The idea of collaboration-oriented research is hardly new in Baker Lake (Fox, 2002; Raffan, 1993; Stewart, Keith, & Scottie, 2004), but reverberations from episodes of southern "experts" making decisions concerning Inuit territory seem to raise suspicion about the intentions of research-related activities. As a

researcher-canoeist seeking partnerships, I sense that I am a familiar presence to Baker Lake residents, but one presenting them with new opportunities.

In this paper's final section, I flesh out the abstractions of moral terrains discussed above using narratives drawn from my encounters within the Thelon. Although it is likely that I enact attributes of many different identities in the riverscape (e.g., friend, male, southern Canadian, Euro-descendent, son), I attend most closely to my co-dependent identities of (social science) researcher-canoeist. These reflexive accounts are derivatives of field notes and photographs taken during the community familiarization and consultation visits. At the time of writing, I have received ethics clearance from my host university and a research license from the Nunavut Research Institute. Reports from my first visits to Baker Lake, and a summary of this paper, have been shared with community representatives and partners.

2.5.1 Leaving Traces, Building Relations

There is an empty sardine tin hidden beneath a rock on the river left shoreline of the Thelon River. I left it there.

In July 2008, I traveled with an Inuk guide and his adult son in their 150 horsepower motorboat from Baker Lake up the Thelon River approximately 65 kilometres. Intent to return to town solo and in different style, I brought along a canoe, a paddle, some basic camping equipment, a bit of food, and my research notebook. The Inuit men brought their fishing rods; reminding me of Buckley's (2005) observations of Inuit guides doubling-up on economic gains by using the opportunity to transport tourists to harvest country foods. We stopped our ascent of the river at a point just southeast of Schultz Lake where a small river channel converges with the main flows of the Thelon.

To get us to this point on the river, the guide wove his motorboat among the contours and currents of the river. With son scouting or at the helm, and me sitting comfortably in passenger position, shallow sections of the riverbed were avoided and rapids attained by snaking the boat across the width of the river, carefully positioning it within upstream eddy currents, and accelerating through swift downstream waters. Precision, skill, and awareness characterize to me this guide's river-place knowledge and mobility.

From the shore, I picked out a gentle wave for "front surfing" in the canoe and set about placing my first paddle strokes in the river. The Inuit men identified prime fishing spots and cast their lines.

The three of us later regrouped upon the shoreline to share food, which included staples from our respective customary diets on the land. From my hosts, dried caribou meat and a thermos of tea; from me, some trail mix and sardines. As we snacked, we conversed. Our discussions, unsurprisingly, circulated around our encounters and practices that day on the river: the fishing and canoeing, the river's current and obstacles, the musk-ox we spotted downstream, and the benefits of the guide's new motorboat for shuttling river travelers.

When we finished eating, we packed up our leftovers. The sardines had been devoured and so I gingerly began to deposit the oily tin into a plastic bag. I was rehearsing etiquette familiar to me as environmentally responsible—"pack it in, pack it out" or "leave only footprints"—given our immersion within a riverscape identified as one of the purest remaining wildernesses on the planet (Hall, 2003; Mackinnon, 1983; Pelly, 1997). The Inuk guide, seemingly suspicious of my behaviour, recommended that I

not bother to bring the tin back with me, but instead to leave it under the rock lying on the ground next to me. At first I was surprised by this suggestion. Then dissonance pulsed within me. Ought I adhere to the customary Leave No Trace ethics of wilderness travelers (LNT, 2009; Priest & Gass, 1997) or follow the counsel of the river-place resident who recommends otherwise? By leaving the tin would I deface the nature of the Thelon River? By packing it out, would I re-write, in this rather mundane circumstance, ethnocentric practices of wilderness and impede my ability to learn about the guide's relationships, narratives, and history with the land that underlie his advice (Mullins, 2009)? Would I perform as a passive ethical subject and consumer of wilderness, or could I appeal to my agency and positionality as researcher-canoeist to propose something different (Ryan, 2002; Simon & Alagona, 2009)?

As I mentioned, I left the sardine tin under the rock. At the time, I did so without formulating a rationale. Amid discursive pressures and allegiances to pristine nature constituted by and through my role within an outdoor subculture, I opted to follow instead the counsel of an Other before me; one whose knowledge, skill, and commitment within this river-place I trust. Perhaps in that moment, like Mullins and Maher (2007), I understood that we all leave "traces" and that through my participation on the Thelon I desired to leave a responsible trace. I am skeptical that my act of leaving the sardine tin resulted in an improved relationship with the land, and I am uncertain as to whether connections with the guide or his son were enhanced. The event has certainly helped motivate me to build trusting and reciprocal relationships within the landscape; with the guide, his family, this river, or, perhaps, *for* these geographically distant Others.

To be sure, I am also *for* that stuff we tend to call nature. But, as Simon and Alagona (2009) and Cronon (1995b) insist, the challenge is to connect such respect and responsibility with broader socio-ecological concerns. Unlike Buckley (2005), who too quickly prioritizes nature-values above human-values, or those that reverse these priorities, as in the case of those pointed to in criticisms of environmental justice campaigns (Figueroa & Waite, 2008), I suspect there are alternatives to nature first or society first mentalities. As a starting point, Heidegger's (1966) idea of meditative thinking is instructive in its assertion that we strive to illuminate and discover the meanings of our actions and behaviours, rather than restricting the process of thinking to only the consideration of calculable outcomes (Fennell & Malloy, 2007). In this way, the relationship between "thinking" and "doing" is iterative, conjoined, and contextualized.

While I have yet to learn from the guide about any foundations for his practices and counsel on the river that day, this opportunity may present itself as our relationship continues. There is much wisdom among Inuit and their relations to the land. Along the way, I hope to share the reasoning that frames LNT ethics and associated ideas of wilderness, if only so that the guide might be further informed about tourist preferences and wilderness etiquette, characteristics that resonate broadly among southern living North Americans and who continue to exert various pressures upon his homeland.

2.5.2 Leaving Traces, Negating and Adapting Relations

There are few inexpensive options for canoeing the Thelon River. The remoteness of the river and the travel preferences of canoeists are key factors in a journey costing between \$5000.00 and \$10,000.00. Most canoeists favour trips that fit within their two-week annual holiday (Hodgins, 1988) and so, when combined with the Thelon's

remoteness, canoeists tend to hire chartered flights in and out of various points along the river. Most flights depart from Yellowknife or Fort Smith, NWT, or northern Saskatchewan communities, covering up to 500 air miles and costing close to \$4000.00 round-trip.

In many cases, canoeists fly out at Beverly Lake to avoid paddling a lengthy and often windy lake section. Some travelers arrange motorboat transport with an outfitter to take them to Baker Lake, while others with the time and fortitude will canoe the lakes and directly into Baker Lake. Those canoeists arriving in town are faced with a subsequent expense: the cost of returning their canoes to the south.

As Baker Lake is an isolated inland community with no road access, cargo in and out of town is transported by airplane or barge (via Chesterfield Inlet). Unless canoeists travel with folding, portable “Pakboats,” those wishing to return canoes home face a logistical burden, and an expenditure not far from the price tag of a new canoe. The practical and economic obstacles involved in arranging transport for a canoe from Baker Lake to the south seems justification enough for canoeists to abandon canoes in the community.

I perceived this trend during one of my first walks around town in July 2008. Along the shore of Baker Lake—where town site meets water—canoes lie all over. Some are quality designs and in excellent repair, stored in a way that they appear cared for. Others are busted up and scattered among debris, odds and ends.

The initial surprise of my discovery quickly turned to disgust. Without precise intention, I snatched my camera and marched around town taking pictures of all the canoes that I could find. In a two-hour stroll, I located dozens of canoes (see Figures 2.3,

2.4, and 2.5). My aversion to these sightings was aimed significantly inward, at my participation in the nationalistic and colonial ideology of uninhabited, pristine wilderness—one maintained, so it seemed, only until it is no longer convenient.

Figure 2.3. A fleet of canoes on the shore of Baker Lake. Source: Author.

Figure 2.4. A canoe in storage. Source: Author.

Figure 2.5. Abandoned canoe with a cracked hull. Source: Author.

During my photographic tour, I sensed that romantic views of pristine wilderness, the Great Outdoors (Martin, 2004), or the “barrenlands” of Keewatin (Pelly, 1996), are quickly transformed into events that designate the Arctic as “wasteland” (Amagoalik, 2001). For canoeists that complete their wilderness journey in Baker Lake, the act of abandoning canoes resonates with other practices that become constrained at the end of an operation. For example, the remnants of former mining operations or Cold War era early-warning radar systems left significant traces upon the Arctic landscapes as funding ran out or priorities shifted (Bone, 2009). Of course, abandoned canoes do not have the same negative implications for human and ecosystem health as the others. But that is not my point. Rather, what seems clear is that both wilderness and wasteland discourses project imaginations of people-less landscapes, marking invisible the traditional and contemporary livelihoods bound to these places. How we conceptualize nature has

implications for how we behave towards those things we consider natural (Castree, 2005). Photographing the abandoned canoes was one way to inscribe into my memory these conceptions and discourses, and to begin sharing my observations with others.

Yet, to be fair, the act of leaving a canoe in Baker Lake may also imply alternatives to discourses of Arctic as human-less landscape. For example, canoes may be part of a business transaction whereby local outfitters increase capital by relieving canoeists of their transport-constraining vessels. Also, outfitters based in the south have been known to winter their canoes in Baker Lake for programs occurring in subsequent summers. Canoeists may even consider leaving their canoe as a gift to the community, though this would be embedded with a seemingly misconstrued understanding of Inuit leisure behaviours and skills, and overlook Inuit preferences for the utility of *qajaqs* and, more commonly now, motorboats.

But for me, during my photographic stroll, the most stirring example of resistance to wilderness-wasteland ideology was an encounter with a canoe tied upon a *qamutik* (Figure 2.6). According to one resident, some hunters pull canoes behind their snowmobiles during spring thaw. At this time of year, the lake ice is thick enough to travel upon by snowmobile, but becomes broken up at places along the shoreline. Hunters use the canoe to travel across these small openings in the ice to get to their cabin, or hunting or fishing spot on the land. In such cases, the canoe marks the capacity of Inuit to adapt to social and environmental change by making use of the available tools and technologies that help maintain their cultural livelihoods. It seems that the canoe depicted in Figure 2.6 carries with it much less ideology than I have often packed between the gunnels.

Figure 2.6. A canoe tied down to a *qamutiik*. Source: Author.

2.6 Conclusion

This chapter considers the multiplicity of natures enacted through recreational canoe travel, which include a range of potential associations: for example, sociobiological affiliations with biophysical nature; discursive natures underwritten by colonial narratives and social hierarchies; place-based attachments that may be realized through cognitive, emotional, and embodied activity within a landscape; or, relationships between land and personal and cultural identities. Instead of granting preference to any one of these natures, the chapter maps an approach rooted in geographical studies of ethics for envisioning enhanced responsibility within the moral terrains of recreational canoeing. Illustrative examples of these deliberations are presented using narratives drawn from my early encounters and performances as researcher-canoeist within an Arctic riverscape. These reflexive and conceptual considerations should make clear my attempts to avoid the asymmetrical power relationships that frequent cross-cultural

encounters in the Canadian North (Doubleday, 2007). For me, the North is neither a place to be crossed nor to permanently reside (Saul, 2008); it is instead a place that beckons my participation. This involves recognizing Others, listening and learning with them, and working towards reciprocal partnerships.

The thread running through all this is the consideration of recreational canoeing—and by extension outdoor leisure—as a moral space. Of course, this presents a vexing situation for those who identify with leisure in terms of perceived freedom, flow, or workplace inversion, for morality and ethics is often considered in terms of restraint (though certainly not always, as I have tried to illustrate). Nevertheless, for spaces of leisure to hold persuasion in debates relating to social change, normative and prescriptive concerns, like those found within the domains of ethics, must be deliberated and formulated into leisure program applications. While this chapter is limited in its empirical scope and its applied effects may reside in future reflections on negotiating the diverse natures of river experiences, my primary intention has been to set the stage for further consideration of leisure spaces from the fruitful perspectives found within geographical studies of ethics.

Consequently, the issue of scale is one area that demands careful reflection and consideration. In this chapter, I have adopted an approach that mobilizes ethics in everyday and embodied encounters, following the work of other geographers concerned with the universal and rationalistic tendencies in moral philosophy. Scale also comes into play in terms of locating natures and ethics within the canoe and a particular riverscape. But beyond that, scale becomes an essential point of discussion in determining the extent to which leisure spaces are always sites of social change (positive or negative), and for

whom and in what ways. It should be clear from the substance of this essay that the oft-celebrated spaces of recreational canoe travel are ripe for this kind of elaborate inspection.

CHAPTER THREE

SOCIAL SCIENCE ONTOLOGY OF ENVIRONMENT: CHALLENGES TO HUMAN EXCEPTIONALISM⁶

3.1 Introduction

The social science ontology of environment is one point of incision into the heart of theorizing society and environment relations. Ontology refers to the branch of metaphysics concerned with the study and description of *being*, the general conditions of existence, or the substance of reality. The tendency among social scientists to be concerned with ontology merely because it establishes disciplinary objects, relations, or concepts has, in recent years, been complemented by an ontological “turn” that entails incisive probing of everyday and disciplinary assumptions (Escobar, 2010; Gregory et al., 2009). Such a project has been advanced by critical scholars concerned with environment, and especially those simultaneously burdened and ardent to illustrate the deceptions of dualistic takes on reality. On the one hand, non-dualistic work is reactionary; it opens crucial space for social theory to dissent from excesses of determinism, reductionism, quantification, and meta-narratives. On the other hand, there are inventive and interdisciplinary intentions at play that articulate environmental realities of inclusion, responsibility, and emergence.

Philosophical resistance to human exceptionalism encapsulates these anxious albeit creative tensions. Following Haraway (2008), human exceptionalism refers to the fantasy that humanity alone is different from and superior to all other entities existing on

⁶ This chapter has been accepted for publication as: Grimwood, B. S. R. (in press). The social science ontology of environment: Challenges to human exceptionalism. In Holden, A., & Fennell, D. (eds.), *Handbook of tourism and environment*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Earth. It is manifest when we treat the world solely as a resource bounty for human well-being, or through “save the world” campaigns that advocate humanity’s return to an Eden-like nature. Human exceptionalism is also showcased in debates that emphasize objective or subjective extremes, as in naïve realism or strong versions of social construction. The uniting bond here is an ideology of human autonomy rooted in binary logic and an absolute distinction between human society and non-human nature (Haraway, 2008).

The objective of this chapter is to explain and analyze seminal constructs and paradigms in the social science ontology of environment. To distill this dense, nuanced, but relevant theme, the chapter reviews four theoretical “moments” that, in different ways, challenge the binary visions associated with human exceptionalism. Emulating Braun (2004), these moments should not be read as a linear evolution of academic thought, but instead, as interwoven intellectual threads that intersect, reinforce, run parallel, and diverge. The moments contained herein include critical realism, phenomenology of perception, social nature, and ontological multiplicity. The chapter begins with a case study from the central Canadian Arctic, which is subsequently used to ground discussions of the ontological moments with research possibilities for nature-based tourism.

Two notes are warranted before proceeding. First, given the interdisciplinary intentions of this text, I have opted to lean heavily upon literatures from outside tourism studies. My objective is to participate in the encouragement of tourism research that explores beyond the field. Second, any author developing a critical synopsis has the challenge of balancing sufficient breadth and depth. The preparation of this chapter has

been no exception. In addition to the literature reviewed and representational choices made for each ontological moment, readers will identify certain omissions, including substantial discussion of how complex systems, sociobiological, Marxist, feminist, or Aboriginal thinkers have toiled with ontological questions. However, if only because of this chapter's relational emphasis, which has emerged as a prevalent orientation in social science, readers should recognize my attempts to be adequately inclusive and comprehensive.

3.2 Case Study Background

The Thelon River is one of 41 rivers celebrated in Canada as a Heritage River for its natural, cultural, and recreational values. With headwaters in the Northwest Territories, just east of the height of land that separates the Hudson Bay and Arctic Ocean watersheds, the Thelon stretches 900 kilometres eastward across the central Canadian sub-Arctic and into Nunavut, before draining into Baker Lake west of Hudson Bay. As the river traverses Canadian jurisdictional boundaries, it also meanders among Dene First Nation, Métis, and Inuit territories. The recognition of historical and contemporary human activity within the watershed has not altered the Thelon's appeal as northern wilderness. Such accolades are attributable to the watershed's remoteness from human settlements, unique combination of boreal and tundra ecosystems, and abundant habitat for large mammals (wolves, grizzly bear, moose, caribou, and muskoxen).

Cultural and recreational values associated with the Thelon are intimately tied to wildlife. For generations, Aboriginal hunters and their families have relied on barren-ground caribou as a primary source of food, clothing, shelter, and tools. Hunting and trapping of muskoxen, Arctic fox, wolf, and grizzly bear have also enabled local

Aboriginal Peoples to participate in wage economies. Euro-American travel and exploration within the Thelon basin was not prevalent until early in the 20th century. Since 1962, recreational canoeists have accessed the Thelon by chartered airplane, and have traveled the length of the river in self-supported, multi-day expeditions (Morse, 1987). Commercial tourism along the Thelon was first established in 1974 (Hall 2003), and a handful of companies currently guide and outfit Thelon expeditions as one component in their overall operation. Independent and commercial canoe, kayak, and raft trips along northern Canadian rivers are an important sector in territorial economies. Often it is the lure of the northern wild, and especially the wildlife, that provides impetus for the scores of nature-based tourists visiting the Thelon and surrounding river systems each summer.

However, recent wildlife population estimates, field observations, and local knowledge holders indicate drastic reductions to the size of barren-ground caribou herds, and shifting habitats of the other large mammals (BQCMB, 2010; Hall, 2003). These wildlife dynamics are supported by reports from Thelon canoeists who, in qualitative interviews, indicate that wildlife encounters are much fewer than anticipated based on their reading and research of the area. The wildlife spectacle along the Thelon River is, so it seems, no longer guaranteed, which is likely to have some bearing on tourism satisfaction rates and changing tourist demands.

Figure 3.1 is a photograph taken along one of the Thelon's tributaries in June 2009. It shows a group of guided canoeists gazing upon the landscape, taking photographs, or searching for wildlife through binoculars. This image functions as a

prompt for each of the forthcoming sections to bridge the ontological moments with suggestions for nature-based tourism research.

Figure 3.1. Encounters within the Thelon River watershed. Source: J. Stuart, male canoeist.

3.3 Critical Realism

Critical realism is a philosophical position associated with the work of philosopher of science Roy Bhaskar (1978). Its influence in the social sciences has been profound among scholars in Europe, and clear attempts have been made to encourage its use among North American researchers (Frauley & Pearce, 2007a).

Applications of critical realism include subtle and sizeable differences (Cruickshank, 2004, Frauley & Pearce, 2007b). However, its qualifying factor is a prescribed union of ontological realism and epistemological relativism. In other words, critical realists argue that independent reality exists beyond of scope of our knowledge, perceptions, or actions, and that while our categories and concepts reflect some aspect of material referents, this knowledge never corresponds exactly to what exists. Knowledge is considered a fallible interpretation of reality and always open to criticism, refinement, and further testing (Carolan, 2005a; Frauley & Pearce, 2007b). Thus, critical realism is

set apart from other philosophies of science by the premise that establishes the primacy of ontology over epistemology. Bhaskar (1978) reasons, “it is not the character of science that imposes a determinate pattern or order on the world; but the order of the world that, under certain determinate conditions, makes possible the cluster of activities we call ‘science’” (p. 30). For the activities and accomplishments of science to exist as they do, an independent reality of a certain structure must also exist. Epistemology is therefore distinguishable from matters of ontology, and conflating the two—that is, reducing ontology to epistemology, or transposing questions about being into questions about knowing—warrants the charge of an *epistemic fallacy*, which Bhaskar (1978, p. 36-38) attributes to his empiricist and conventionalist predecessors.

From a critical realist perspective, material and social reality is understood as stratified, rooted, and emergent (Sayer, 1992; Carolan, 2005a; Carolan, 2005b; Bhaskar, 1978). Social scientists concerned with “environment,” and its vernacular cousin “nature,” have found these concepts helpful for navigating debates between naïve realism and strong social constructivism (Carolan, 2005a; Proctor, 1998a; Dunlap, 2010; Soper, 1995). For example, stratification implies hierarchical differentiation between domains of existence, or ontological depth (Pearce, 2007), meaning that inorganic nature provides the basis for organic nature, which, in turn, provides the basis for human society (Day, 2007). However, because the boundaries between strata are permeable, reality constitutes an open system characterized not by reduction and one-way causality, but by *rootedness* and *emergence* (Carolan, 2005b). As these terms suggest, distinct socio-cultural and biophysical realms exert influences on one another (Carolan, 2005b). The purpose of

research then, is to highlight and understand the tendencies and contingent relations in a given circumstance, rather than determine causality (Gregory et al, 2009).

Applied to the case study, tourism researchers could use critical realism to position an investigation of the ecological impacts of tourist behaviour (wildlife photography and viewing), with the aim of identifying and understanding prevalent patterns and tendencies over time. One can imagine the extent to which the visual practices of Thelon tourists (i.e., observing, photographing, or the ability to “zoom in on”), and associated behaviours (e.g., establishing trails on the tundra to quality vantage points, approaching wildlife, distributing photographs), emerge from and exert influence on other domains. For example, how are viewing behaviours enabled or constrained by the habits and shifting habitats of wildlife? How is wildlife disturbance proliferated by touristic viewing, and can such impacts be offset by any increases to wilderness ambassadorship associated with tourism (Maher, 2003)? Attending to the specificity of individual species, tourism demographics or motivations, or the influence of local management policies and strategies would help flesh out the contingencies in these tourist – wildlife relationships.

In terms of methodology, critical realism is impartial and thus compatible with a range of strategies, including both quantitative and qualitative methods. Researchers could, therefore, incorporate a mixed methods approach to understand the relations between the picturing practices of tourists and wildlife. Such an approach would carry much relevance in managerial, operator, or decision-making contexts.

Yet for all the promise of critical realism as a means for negotiating human exceptionalism, particularly in terms of how it softens the extremes of naïve realism and

strong social construction, it seems limited on at least two fronts. First, critical realism tends to rely on analytical abstractions that implicitly detach subjects from embodied encounters that enable dwelling within the world (Ingold, 2000). Second, underlining critical realism is the temptation of a unifying, metatheory to traverse disciplines and encompass the diversity of knowledge claims. These two issues are crucial in the moments discussed next.

3.4 Phenomenology of Perception

Phenomenology is a Western philosophical tradition that prioritizes descriptions of the *life-world*, the always-present world that precedes thoughts and knowledge, and is perceived through everyday actions, movements, and encounters with meaningful things (Merleau-Ponty, 1962, p. vii). Early thinkers such as Husserl, Heidegger, Sartre, and Merleau-Ponty, were concerned with how the “objective facts” of science overshadowed the value of everyday, direct, and spontaneous experience. They insisted that the activities of science be grounded in the understanding that all aspects of life happen only through our engagements of the world in which we dwell (Heidegger, 2008). In short, our experience in and of the world is the *homeland* to our thoughts (Merleau-Ponty, 1962, p. 24).

By calling attention to the life-world, phenomenology presents a direct and forceful challenge to the ontological assumptions lodged within Western systems of value by the influential philosophical work of Rene Descartes (Dillon, 1988; Wylie, 2007). Cartesian assumptions, which are closely associated with human exceptionalism, include the separation of reality into the human subject and the observable object, or the rational individual and the empirical world. Such assumptions translate into categories that order

our lives—distinctions, for example, between mind/body, thought/reality, culture/nature, or human/environment. Phenomenology intervenes in these dichotomies. It suggests that ontological tensions between phenomena as independently real (i.e., reality transcends human perspective) and as dependent upon human experience (i.e., reality is equivalent to human cognition) can be negotiated, and indeed supplanted, by examining themes of subjectivity, knowledge, and perception (Ingold, 2000; Wylie, 2007).

To refine my scope here, I will stay close to the work of Maurice Merleau-Ponty for whom the life-world was understood as indelibly corporeal, a point that distinguishes his phenomenology of perception from Husserl and others. Merleau-Ponty's specific challenge to Cartesian distinctions occurs by placing mind, body, and world in a state of perpetual consciousness. Bodies are not perceived as containers of consciousness, but rather bodies *are* consciousness (Carolan, 2008). In Merleau-Ponty's (1962) words, "I am consciousness of my body *via* the world...and I am consciousness of the world through the medium of my body" (p. 82). Thus, the crux of Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology is a shift from a separation of body and soul, of material object and subjective mind (both of which, he argues, distort the reality given to us in experience), to one of corporeal embodiment as the very basis of the perceptual world (Marshall, 2008). The *body-subject*, as described by Merleau-Ponty, functions as the conduit of this worldly perception and knowledge (Abram, 1996; Merleau-Ponty, 2004). As an active, open, and indeterminate form, the body-subject is in constant relation with other things and terrains of the world—exchanging, shifting, adapting, improvising, and reciprocating. Space, or what we might refer to as environment, is configured through these situated encounters of things, terrains, and bodies (Ingold, 2000). This animate dance of receptivity and

creativity in and of the world constitutes *perception* (Abram, 1996), and is “revealed to us by our senses and in everyday life” (Merleau-Ponty, 2004, p. 31).

Shifting back to the Thelon River case study, phenomenology orients the researcher to a much different set of questions than the critical realist. For example, instead of trying to understand the interrelationships and contingencies among impacts and tourist behaviour, with phenomenology we would be interested in understanding the meaning or essence of wildlife viewing and landscape photography for this group of travellers. Keeping with Merleau-Ponty’s notion of perception, we might seek to describe that which is essential about the intersubjective process of gazing, how tourists interpret their viewing experience, or how different bodies or entities perform as tourists interact with the world in this way. Moreover, immersion within the riverscape stimulates the senses in certain ways: skin is pricked by black flies, cooled by winds, or hardened by the sun; walking up a hill to a lookout provides reprieve from the monotony of paddling, thus stretching the legs but also one’s experience within, and awareness of, the landscape. Accordingly, we might also seek to understand the role that these sensations play in the meanings tourists’ attribute to their lived-experience.

Given that the subject matter of phenomenology is what people experience and how they interpret the world, the most suitable methodologies are those that enable researchers to experience the phenomenon as directly as possible (Patton, 2002). Qualitative research methods such as participant observation and in-depth interviewing are particularly appropriate and frequently employed. The rich and descriptive data gathered are often analyzed and reported using thematic and narrative approaches (Ingold, 2000; van Manen, 2002).

3.5 Social Nature

A third moment that contributes arguments against human exceptionalism includes a suite of orientations broadly referred to as the “social construction of nature,” or in geography circles as “social nature” (Castree & Braun, 2001; Demeritt, 2002). For consistency, I use the latter term, and begin with general comments before moving to a refined focus on “discourse.”

According to Castree (2001), social nature constitutes a critical approach to society-nature relations that asserts nature to be inescapably social. The argument here is that rather than an external or self-evident reality “what counts as nature cannot preexist its construction; when we take nature to be self-evident, we simply mistake our discursive practices for the things they seek to describe” (Braun, 2002, p. 17). In other words, nature is always an outcome of the conceptual and material activities of different societies.

The volume edited by Cronon (1995a) has been influential to this line of thinking. Cronon’s (1995b) essay, for example, has engendered extensive debate because of its assertion that wilderness, the archetype of an ontologically pure non-social environment, is a profound creation of particular human cultures at particular moments in time. Critics fear that Cronon’s reasoning grants humans an unruly capacity to transform nature, undermining preservation and conservation efforts (Soulé & Lease, 1995). In contrast, supporters identify the analytical and political possibilities for a radical environmentalism. They find social nature useful because it implies that humans have the capacity to improve current environmental circumstances by understanding, producing, and practicing nature in more responsible and socially just ways (Castree & Braun, 2001; Cronon, 1995a).

As a general rule, adherents of social nature distance themselves from phenomenology's reification of human emotion, perception, and embodiment. According to Marxist, feminist, and poststructuralist thinkers, phenomenology ignores the ways in which the notion of the free, autonomous individual is shaped by social, economic, historical, and political contexts (Wylie, 2007). The humanistic hue of phenomenology is criticized by social nature theorists for holding out for an unmediated and essential experience of the world, one that implicitly values pre-modern environmental practices and relationships, and too easily conflates contemporary non-Western cultures with romanticized views of the past (Wylie, 2007).

Social nature theorists are also united by an apprehension with universal categories and absolute distinctions, such as the one made by critical realists between ontology and epistemology. Braun (2002) asserts that nature and environment are as much epistemological conditions as they are ontological. Where critical realists allege an epistemic fallacy, social nature alleges "our images and ideas of nature do not simply reflect a preexisting reality, but, in important ways, constitute that reality for us" (Braun 2002, p. 14). Indeed, poststructuralism tends to treat language not as a reflection of reality, but as constitutive of it. In other words, the ontology of environment is viewed as an *effect* of culture. Accordingly, the nature of nature-based tourism along the Thelon River is (re)produced through various cultural texts (e.g., books, travel guides, websites containing canoe travel journals, territorial guiding license regulations) and culturally informed practices (e.g., proper canoe paddling techniques, manufacturing and marketing of outdoor equipment, airplane charter industry).

Much of the work in social nature is indebted to Michel Foucault and, in particular, his theoretical articulation of discourse (Foucault, 1972, 1980). Although Foucault and others use the term in multiple and interchangeable ways (see e.g., Castree 2005, p. 135–153), it is helpful here to understand discourse as “a specific, collective series of representations, practices, and performances through which meanings give the world its particular shapes—their forms and norms. This implies that discourse is inherently productive, generative, and ‘object-constituting’” (Gregory, 2001, p. 86). Discourses have rules and protocols about what is properly regarded as knowledge. They circulate through texts and are inscribed and naturalized through networks of individuals and institutions (Gregory, 2001). Discourses are powerful precisely because they are productive: they produce subject-positions, bodies, and objects. Here, it is important to recognize that, for Foucault, power is more than a repressive, hierarchical force possessed by a State, class, or individual. Rather, in Foucault’s (1980) words, power “produces effects...at the level of knowledge. Far from preventing knowledge, power produces it” (p. 59). Power is thus positive in that it influences and enables the formation of identities (Darier, 1999).

So, unlike phenomenologists or critical realists who resort to some pre-given or essential reality (i.e., the body or an independent, external reality), Foucault and his followers argue that knowledge and truth are constituted by multiple, overlapping, and conflicting discourses. And while Foucault’s attention to environmental concerns was scant, others, such as Darier (1999), Braun (2002), and Haraway (1991), have extended his work into this sphere.

Social nature compels us to question the variety of self-evident categories we use to understand the world (e.g., “tourism” or “environment”). One way to do this is by investigating how power operates through discourse to normalize such categories. For example, in the Thelon River case we could explore how commercial discourses of wilderness tourism, which rely upon touristic desires for untouched nature, contribute to the creation of the Arctic as a last remaining wilderness. Individuals, businesses, and government agencies make money by selling the Thelon as wilderness, so to what extent is the practice of wildlife and landscape photography an effect produced by these wider political economies of tourism? A social nature approach might also consider how nature is framed in certain ways by tourists, which could relate to a desire to consume and collect the spaces represented elsewhere, or be intended to showcase to different audiences upon the return home (Jenkins, 2003). What becomes normalized through touristic photographs and what would be considered out-of-place? Important then from a social nature perspective is to expose how the touristic framing of nature silences, or makes absent, certain other ideas, practices, or histories within the landscape (Rose, 2007).

Given the breadth of social nature, a variety of methodological approaches are possible and appropriate. These include various qualitative methods oriented by semiotics, historical materialism, discourse analysis, or actor-network theory (Castree & Braun, 2001). However, an important feature distinguishing social nature research, especially from phenomenology, is its attention to the historical, cultural, and political conditions that enable objects (e.g., the Thelon River) or identities (e.g., a canoeist) to attain legibility (Braun, 2002). To reveal these kinds of conditions researchers will often

rely on textual analyses of archival and policy documents, photographs, popular magazines, or travel brochures, postcards, and field guides (Waitt, 2005).

3.6 Ontological Multiplicity

Positive outcomes may result from ignoring social nature's theoretical challenge and insisting on the immutability of nature or environment, but as Quigley (1999) observes, these would be achieved through the use of authority rather than sound argument. This final section touches upon ontological multiplicity, a perspective that draws on features of social nature to return to a more sophisticated realism. This relational understanding of ontology is gaining acceptance in a variety of intellectual spheres including the sociology of science, human geography, anthropology, political ecology, and tourism studies (Braun, 2009; Carolan, 2004; Escobar, 2010; Jóhannesson, 2005).

A point of departure for thinking in terms of multiplicity is the notion that the world is constantly being made and remade. Although reality might seem to precede our occupation, Clark, Massey, and Sarre (2008) remind us that the actions and inactions of individuals, cultures, nation states, multinational institutions, and non-human entities are always influencing the way the world is. Like it or not, we are all implicated in socio-material relations of the world, with all activities causing greater or lesser degrees of real-world effects (Clark et al., 2008). Certainly this is not meant to suggest that the world is a "blank-slate" that imposes no demands upon us. Rather, as a multiplicity of space, reality is created through the co-existence of historical, changing, and moving objects, stories, or other socio-material phenomena (Massey, 2005).

A principal concern for people thinking through multiplicity, such as those positioned around the theme of ontological politics, is to bring the materiality and agency of things back into consideration (Hinchliffe, 2007; Law, 2004; Mol, 1999). The reasoning here builds on the seminal work of Latour (1993), who argued that research and theory prioritizing discourse remains entrenched in the “modern constitution” by presuming pure distinctions between nature and culture. This is inaccurate according to Latour because it leaves the “things” of the world passive and mute, and to exist ultimately as epistemological terms (Hinchliffe, 2007; Whatmore, 2002). As such, ontological multiplicity relies on metaphors like intervention, performance, and enactment, which speak to the many realities of an object crafted by various tools and practices that co-exist in the present (Mol, 1999). To quote Mol at length:

reality does not precede the mundane practices in which we interact with it, but is rather shaped within these practices. So the term *politics* works to underline this active mode, this process of shaping, and the fact that its character is both open and contested. (p. 75)

There are then options between multiple versions of reality, and the grounds for enacting a certain version of an object are debatable (Law, 2004). Thus, as one derivative of multiplicity, ontological politics is concerned with understanding which options of a particular phenomenon are to be performed, where options are situated, and what is at stake when a decision between alternative options is made (Mol, 1999).

In terms of environment, an object like the Thelon River can be understood as simultaneously enacted through different material, conceptual, or discursive practices. Such practices vary in time and space but overlap in many ways, so the reality of the river

is open to negotiation. When it comes to the politics of the Thelon, the argument is that there is not just one reality to secure or protect against all other possible versions (Hinchliffe, 2007). Instead, there are many possible rivers that may be enacted differently and with different implications. Brief illustrations based on circumstances related to human-wildlife interactions within the Thelon River basin offer some grounding to these discussions.

The nature-based tourists in Figure 3.1 attempt to make wildlife present through practices associated with photography and gazing. Prior to the journey, these travellers would have studied the natural and human history of the area, purchased cameras and binoculars, and rehearsed how to use these technologies. On location, the travellers beached their canoes, climbed a hill to access a certain vantage point, and spread out for unobstructed views. The wildlife images they captured were brought home as symbols of their journey. It is the collection of these kinds of practices that perform the Thelon as a wilderness space and enact tourist identities.

Among the Inuit living in Baker Lake, Nunavut, shifting cultural practices have enabled hunters to make wildlife (particularly caribou) present to sustain livelihoods. Oral traditions and place names are passed between generations and used as navigational aids; Elders share skills and knowledge about harvesting techniques, food preparation, or the making of tools and clothing; technological changes, such as the use of snowmobiles, are accommodated when practical. These kinds of practices enable some Inuit to maintain subsistence lifestyles while shifting towards a wage economy. They perform the Thelon as cultural space, or homeland, and contribute to the enactment of Inuit identity.

The additional claim of multiplicity—that these different practices overlap in unpredictable ways and interfere with reality (Law, 2004)—is equally apparent. For example, the canoe guide/outfitter has supported his livelihood by traveling within the watershed for over 35 years. His guiding practices have made the Thelon into what can be referred to as his own “backyard” (Hall, 2003). Moreover, a summer-long canoe expedition in 1999 involved Inuit, Dene First Nations, and Germans traveling the length of the Thelon (Gleeson, 1999). The event emphasized cross-cultural learning, wilderness travel, and living off the land, and was recorded in a feature length documentary. The celebratory journey further troubles the distinction between wilderness and homeland. And as a third example, many authors suggest that during an Inuit hunt, the animal offers its presence to a skilled hunter for his or her taking (Bennett & Rowley 2004; Mannik, 1998). The agency of prey implies that human livelihoods and identities are crafted in part through the practices of another species.

An implication of ontological multiplicity is that what counts as environment can be a kind of active experimentation (Braun, 2009) where bodily senses and affective registers are prioritized, what counts as a research subject is extended, and knowledge and expertise is redistributed beyond the academy (Whatmore, 2006). Accordingly, the options for tourism research methodology might best be left unbound, but also open to debate so that their effectiveness and positive contributions to the making of our world might be evaluated (Law, 2004).

3.7 Conclusion

In a volume that considers new visions of nature, Proctor (2009) argues that persistent environmental problems result, in part, because we have not yet taken the risk

to think deeply. When we do, it becomes clear that the notion of environment is astray, as are many of the sources of authority used to justify environmental concerns. Proctor speaks to the relevance of the social science ontology of environment. This chapter has provided another cut into this rich terrain. Specifically, I have drawn attention to various ontological positions that present possible alternatives to human exceptionalism and, through this, attempted to identify possibilities for applying different ontological perspectives in tourism research. A case study from a Canadian Arctic riverscape provided grounding for these discussions.

Three implications merit final comment. First, taking into account the issue of ontology might compel tourism and environment researchers towards consistency and precision in their methodological choices. Certainly some research methods are better suited for critical realists than for phenomenologists. However, given the potential messiness of environmental ontologies, methods must also be engaged playfully, speculatively, and reflexively so that innovative and interdisciplinary approaches in tourism studies can thrive.

Second, tourism and environmental managers are tasked with making decisions in contexts of different, negotiable, and fluid ideas about realities. Clarity and precision can be achieved by basing decisions in philosophical understandings of ontology, though care must be taken to avoid surrendering open philosophical discussion to uncompromising philosophical rigidity. The promises of adaptive co-management seem ripe for addressing these kinds of challenges (Armitage, Berkes, & Doubleday, 2007).

Finally, the social science ontology of environment and attempts to displace human exceptionalism call attention to ethics, a theme not lost on tourism researchers

(Fennell, 2006; Holden, 2003; Smith & Duffy, 2003). What we consider real and true about environment relates to how we act towards those things we consider part of the environment. Thus, different ontologies of environment provide different foundations for ethical consideration. For instance, when the self-evident category of nature is punctured from a social nature perspective, notions of intrinsic value which laden environmental ethics become tricky business (Proctor, 1998b). Moreover, the metaphors of enactment and intervention that characterize multiplicity demands an ethics—towards environment, humans or non-humans, in research, or in tourism—that recoils from teleology (Haraway, 2008; Latour, 2004). When reality is understood as multiple, so too must ethics. The political and environmental possibilities that result from this observation demand our best theoretical reflection and research practice.

PORTAGE ONE

In the preliminary wake of this journey, one will read that the canoe is much more than a river vessel without a deck. The reader will also perceive in my tracks laid thus far that recreational canoeing is viewed as something more than an environmentally benign form of leisure travel. Indeed, I have situated canoeing within hegemonic discourses of nature, pointing to ways that the nature of canoeing can silence certain voices and living histories within a landscape. But more important for the aspirations of the present journey, my initial conceptual strokes have demonstrated that both nature and the nature of canoeing are far from essential and homogenous categories. These environmental ontologies are in fact quite diverse. Thinking through the theoretical matrix of nature's ontology provides resources for envisioning and enacting canoe-natures differently; for example, in ways that might satisfy Baldwin's (2004) call for an environmental ethics of connection and contingency, and that would recognize the heterogeneous social-natures of environmental space. Thus, as I have indicated, the natures of canoeing are not eternally enmeshed in current social hierarchies. Rather, interventions can be and are being made to enact natures differently (Hinchliffe, 2007).

Research is one mechanism through which the ontology of nature can be (re)figured. We know that research is a social process that is constitutive of both the researcher and research participants (Kitchen & Tate, 2000; Rose, 1997), and that the production of knowledge has real world real world effects associated with certain systems of value (Braun, 2002; Foucault, 1972; Said, 1978). Scholars associated with science and technology studies have even explained how reality can be crafted using the methods and instruments employed in the social and natural sciences (Latour, 1993; Law, 2004; Mol,

1999; Whatmore, 2006). Action-oriented researchers have positioned their methodologies within similar frames of reference (Doubleday, 2010; Kobayashi, 2002). However, according to Law (2004), social science methods lag behind such understanding. He argues that the prescriptive and procedural norms of method are conducive only to enacting certain relations that reinforce dominant regimes of influence, knowledge, and truth. New methodological metaphors are needed to reflect the vitality, chance, and oscillation that characterize the intermingled relations of social science research (Law, 2004).

The impending chapter develops one such methodological metaphor. The chapter names “engaged acclimatization” as a methodological vision for establishing and nurturing research relationships with Inuit communities in Nunavut. The premise here is that the emergent ontological must be crafted through partnerships characterized by trust, reciprocity, and respect. At the same time, the process of engaged acclimatization fosters methods that are malleable, expressive, and comfortable with ambiguity (Pink, 2007). Here, the nexus between theory and method is understood as fluid—each domain contributing to the constitution of the other. Engaged acclimatization thus signifies a methodological innovation for enacting relationally responsible research partnerships and relationally responsible worlds.

ENACTING METHODOLOGICAL RELATIONS

CHAPTER FOUR

ENGAGED ACCLIMATIZATION: TOWARD RESPONSIBLE COMMUNITY-BASED RESEARCH IN NUNAVUT⁷

4.1 Introduction

Encouraged by complementary aspects of different knowledge systems, communities of Indigenous and non-Indigenous researchers have worked together to develop shared understandings and address common sources of concern. In the Canadian Arctic⁸, substantive hubs of knowledge-sharing partnerships between Inuit and non-Inuit (Qablunaat⁹) include: climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies (Krupnik & Jolly 2002; Pearce et al., 2009); the health implications of environmental and social change (Doubleday, 2007; Furgal & Seguin, 2006); documentation of toponyms, travel routes, and sea ice terminology (Aporta, 2009; Laidler & Elee, 2008; Stewart et al., 2004); wildlife and resource co-management (Berkes et al., 2005; Freeman & Wenzel, 2006; Kendrick & Manseau, 2008); and aboriginal ecotourism and tourism development (Dowsley, 2009; Stewart & Draper, 2007, 2009). Articles in a recent issue of *The Canadian Geographer* demonstrate that such knowledge-sharing partnerships are being sustained over time and the course of multiple projects (Aporta, 2011; Gearheard et al., 2011; Laidler et al., 2011).

⁷ This chapter has been accepted for publication as: Grimwood, B. S. R., Doubleday, N. C., Ljubicic, G. J., Donaldson, S. G., & Blangy, S. (in press). Engaged acclimatization: Towards responsible community-based research in Nunavut. *The Canadian Geographer*. Please refer to the Co-Author Statement in the preface.

⁸ Confusion arises when “the Arctic,” “northern Canada,” “the North,” or “circumpolar region” are used interchangeably (Stewart et al. 2005), and when perceptual, geophysical, and political delineations are taken into account (Bone 2009). For the purposes of this thesis, the Canadian Arctic is defined as a northern region distinguished by tundra vegetation or polar desert and the traditional homeland of Inuit (Bone 2009).

⁹ *Qablunaat* is an Inuktitut word for non-Inuit people often used by residents of Nunavut’s Kivalliq region (west of Hudson Bay). An individual non-Inuk is *qablunaaq*.

Yet while productive and lasting partnerships are important to Canadian Arctic research, the processes for initiating and nurturing research relationships between Inuit and Qablunaat, and Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities more generally, require careful, critical, and consistent consideration. This is particularly relevant for researchers situated within institutions of power and influence (such as universities based in the Canadian south) as we become more alert to the politics of academic knowledge production and relate further to Smith's (1999) persuasive call to decolonize research. Inevitably, certain imperialisms escort the naturalization of prescriptive and procedural standards in social science method (Law, 2004). If we are to heed Smith's (1999) counsel that researchers first centre their own concerns and worldviews and then come "to know and understand theory and research from our own perspectives and for our own purposes" (p. 39), how might a non-Inuk working within a Canadian university begin to engage in responsible research *for* and *with* an Inuit community? When starting from the position of an "outsider" (Mohammad, 2001), how can we bring into being research relationships characterized by equitable power sharing, justice, and collaboration? If indeed "there is no formula for responsibility...[and] responsible learning is a multiplicity of spatiotemporal registers that do not cohere into a straightforward 'project'" (Jazeel & McFarlane, 2010, p. 121-122), what recommendations or strategies can be extended to those starting out in community-based participatory research?

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce and explain "engaged acclimatization," a neologism referring to embodied and relational methodological processes that can foster responsible research relationships necessary for community-based participatory research. In conceptualizing engaged acclimatization, we are cautious not to prescribe

“right” or “wrong” ways of *doing* responsible research. We are also cognizant of its situated nature; engaged acclimatization emerged as the lead author negotiated the meaning of responsible research during initial exposure to community-based research in Nunavut. In other words, the genesis of engaged acclimatization is experiential and contextual. Accordingly, the discussion herein is based on our perspective as researchers, and does not claim to speak for the Inuit communities informing and sharing in our practices¹⁰.

In this chapter we discuss engaged acclimatization by weaving together supporting literatures, reflexive engagement with the research process, and illustrative moments from research experiences in Nunavut. This approach resonates with various theoretical perspectives (e.g., feminism, critical theory, constructivism) that create space for situated and positioned styles of inquiry to counterbalance research traditions stressing “objectivity,” “detachment,” and “universality” and often resulting in the marginalization of certain voices and/or histories (see e.g., Foucault, 1997; Haraway, 1991; Simpson 2001; Wilson 2008). We begin by clarifying what is engaged acclimatization, and then locate it within related academic literature and an overview of research programs contributing to its enactment. The article then illustrates four fundamental aspects of engaged acclimatization: crafting relations, learning, immersion, and activism. Respectively, these are mapped conceptually as an intention, approach, practice, and effect of engaged acclimatization. Here we integrate specific insights derived from field notes, observations, photographs, critical reflections, and literature that

¹⁰ Co-authorship between academic researchers and community partners is one strategy that can help lessen the risks in representing the Inuit communities discussed in this chapter. In fact, ideas presented in this article were initially discussed with a key community partner with the intention of writing in an Inuk’s perspective. However, this individual chose not to contribute as an author for various reasons, including the preference for a greater degree of anonymity among the growing number of Arctic researchers.

have brought us to this understanding. In conclusion, we identify potential barriers to engaged acclimatization.

The value of this chapter will ultimately lie in the extent to which it encourages readers to situate engaged acclimatization, or something like it, in their own research and further develop it as a process. The four aspects will provide conceptual or methodological tools for readers to adapt in diverse research contexts. They might also inform guidelines for research partnerships with other Inuit, Arctic, or Aboriginal communities. In any event, we encourage readers—graduate students, faculty, research ethics and licensing agencies, funding organizations, Arctic and Indigenous communities—to explore the positive possibilities of engaged acclimatization for *becoming* responsible and practicing responsibility through research.

4.2 What is Engaged Acclimatization?

Like other constructs, engaged acclimatization has the potential to take on multiple levels of meaning and value. Our particular use of the term is intended to complement the relational dimensions of community-based participatory research (discussed further below). As a starting point, engaged acclimatization names a methodological approach for initiating the kinds of partnerships necessary for effective and responsible research with Arctic and Aboriginal communities. It requires that researchers visit communities and communicate transparently (Markey et al., 2010), and it arises through cooperation, mutual trust, and shared learning (Rundstrom & Deur, 1999). As such, engaged acclimatization encourages endogenous constructions of knowledge (Desbiens, 2010) and infuses axiology (the study of value systems, morals,

and beliefs) within the research process (Lincoln & Guba, 2000; Wilson, 2008), derivatives that will be illustrated later in the article.

However, as Indigenous scholars indicate, we are *always* accountable to our relations (Louis, 2007; Wilson, 2008). Thus, responsible research relationships are those that are (re)established and nurtured over time; they do not simply terminate at the conclusion of a fieldwork season. Enacting responsible relationships means that some traditional aspects of a researcher's identity, such as authority, control, and certainty (Desbiens, 2010), must be exchanged with "the concept of respect as part of a relational ethic includ[ing] the idea of reciprocity, listening, and a continuous re-visiting and re-evaluation of our relationships as researchers with others" (Caine et al., 2009, 507). Engaged acclimatization continuously orients researchers to these relational goals through all stages of community-based research, those that Stewart and Draper (2009) have described as "getting there," "getting in," "getting along," and "getting out." While this chapter is mainly derived from experiences in the early stages of community-based projects, our vision of engaged acclimatization as a process should be interpreted as one extending across multiple stages, and beyond the scope of individual projects.

We credit our evolving practices and discussions of engaged acclimatization to shared background in environmental and experiential education. When taking on Bryan as a doctoral student, Nancy committed to prefacing his course of study with fieldwork in Nunavut. Activities included community familiarization, consultations, and research workshops as part of International Polar Year (IPY) projects. These early experiences in Nunavut communities parallel in many ways Van Matre's (1979, 1990) inspired use of "acclimatization" as the initial banner for Earth Education programs, which aim to

familiarize children with the natural world through multi-sensory encounters. In community-based research and Earth Education contexts, acclimatization means gradually growing accustomed to unfamiliar surroundings through immersive experience.

Combining acclimatization with “engaged” reflects the action-oriented and critically charged positions of engaged and committed scholarship (Kobayashi, 2002). These research orientations assume ethical and political dimensions that help align research purpose, design, and procedures with the interests, issues, and priorities of community partners (Cameron & Gibson, 2005). In Nunavut, such approaches hold promise for social change determined in relation to the capacities and identities comprising Inuit communities (Doubleday, 2003).

In sum, engaged acclimatization is a synthesis of research ideas and practices that refers to a process of embodied and reflexive knowledge production occurring through immersive encounters with the material, political, cultural, and perceptual ecologies of Arctic communities. Exploration, reflection, care, creativity, and interaction characterize these encounters, thereby challenging assumptions that research methods, like some styles of participant observation, are best performed by those who bracket their experiences to stand apart from the messiness of context (Stevenson, 2006). Engaged acclimatization can help researchers develop a relational perception and intuition that informs preliminary research objectives, design, and procedures, how research is actually carried out, and later stages of analysis, writing, reporting, and future project identification (Caine et al., 2009).

4.3 Locating Engaged Acclimatization

The projects underpinning this article have been enriched by particular expectations, opportunities, and capacities for research partnerships located within different Nunavut communities. In addition, our understanding of engaged acclimatization is informed by literature concerning Indigenous research and methodology, community-based participatory research, research ethics, and relational geography. Each of these synergistic threads is introduced in this section to help situate our discussion.

4.3.1 Indigenous Research and Methodology

Indigenous communities worldwide express interest in academic research despite its difficult history and colonial legacies (Caine et al., 2009; Smith, 1999). Recent efforts across disciplines include work done *with* and *by* Indigenous peoples, perhaps as a response to historical injustices associated with modernist research and identified by Indigenous communities and scholars (Cole, 2002; Johnson & Murton, 2007; Panelli, 2008; Smith, 1999). This shift has been a source of enrichment for Indigenous communities: they take ownership of research agendas, enable projects that follow local codes of conduct, and honour Indigenous knowledge and worldviews (Simpson, 2001; Weber-Pillwax, 2001; Wilson, 2008). Moreover, articulations of Indigenous methodologies—characterized by Louis (2007) to include relational accountability, respectful representation, reciprocal appropriation, and endorsement of Indigenous rights and regulations—emphasize cyclical and dynamic research styles with the central intent of performing sympathetic, respectful, and ethical research from an Indigenous perspective (Smith, 1999; Wilson, 2008). The politics of Indigenous methodologies

include instilling axiology in human geography and other disciplines (Cole, 2002; Panelli, 2008; Watson & Huntington, 2008), which challenges objectivity, universal abstractions, and generalized understandings. It advocates styles of knowing and approaches to producing knowledge that are responsive to place (Johnson, 2010).

4.3.2 Community-based Participatory Research

Community-based research is understood as a general framework for research conducted by, for, or with the participation of a community (Markey et al., 2010). The practice of community-based research enacts a range of action-oriented intentions, participation, and collaborative partnerships (Markey et al., 2010; Stewart & Draper, 2009). These goals have ushered awareness among researchers and community members of community capacity derived from local knowledge systems, helping substitute paternalistic and condescending practices of research *on* communities (Gibson-Graham, 2003; Battiste, 2008). Accordingly, community-based participatory research aims to: a) balance research power relations by sharing control of research processes and outcomes; b) foster trust through transparent, reciprocal, and interactive relationships; and c) support community ownership of research priorities, decision-making, and knowledge generation (Castleden et al., 2008).

Caine et al. (2009) explain that researchers working in northern Canada, regardless of discipline, have been encouraged to modify their research priorities and methods to respond to the interests and agendas of Aboriginal communities and their cultural traditions. Researchers will “often discover that communities are neither uninterested nor ignorant of the potential for research to benefit their communities and address deteriorating environmental conditions” (Caine et al., 2009, p. 490). Across

Nunavut, Inuit are well acquainted with research and with the practices of visiting researchers. This has fueled expectations for greater participation in all stages of research, including defining research priorities and methods, collecting data, and analyzing and disseminating results (Gearheard & Shirley, 2007; ITK/NRI, 2007). Researchers listening to such requests have welcomed opportunities for community-based participatory research so that locally driven projects can benefit the quality of local and regional life and address local interests, priorities, and knowledge (Doubleday et al., 2008; Gearheard et al., 2011; ITK/NRI, 2007; Laidler & Elee, 2008; Stewart & Draper, 2009). These goals represent a high degree of research involvement desired and performed by Nunavut communities.

To be sure, the social processes of community-based participatory research have temporal and spatial dimensions. They have a starting point, require development through interpersonal interactions, and are understood as a continuum of experience or relationship, rather than something that can be definitively realized (ITK/NRI, 2007). It is important then for both researchers and communities to reflect on how relationships are initiated and nurtured, and the extent to which these contribute to the aims of community-based participatory research. Engaged acclimatization, we argue, provides one approach for meeting these objectives.

4.3.3 Research Ethics

As academic research becomes increasingly responsive to diverse knowledge systems through approaches like community-based participatory research, some researchers have weighed in on processes that engender inclusiveness, courtesy, and respect, and avoid cultural appropriation (Wenzel, 1999). The boundaries of research

ethics have received critical consideration (Battiste, 2008; Dyer & Demeritt, 2009; Rundstrom & Deur, 1999). The challenge, according to Battiste (2008), is not so much about the research community being receptive to ethical research, but about exposing systematic oppressions. For example, in some cases, systems of research ethics governance are said to obscure and burden ethics in practice (Dyer & Demeritt, 2009), or function as a sort of cognitive imperialism that positions some groups in power and others to be exploited (Battiste, 2008).

However, research ethics has progressed in recent years. Castellano (2004) proposed a set of principles for ethical research in Aboriginal communities rooted in local cultural worldviews and struggles for self-determination. In Nunavut, all research must be reviewed and licensed by the Nunavut Research Institute (CIHR et al. 2010; ITK/NRI, 2007). Moreover, recent revisions to the Canadian Tri-Council research ethics policy provide greater flexibility and guidance for university review boards, researchers, and Aboriginal communities working closely together (CIHR et al., 2010). Acts of naming research participants, for example, are no longer strictly prohibited (Wilson, 2008). More support exists for the Indigenous protocol of granting participants the choice of being named in the research, which signals special knowledge-sharing relationships and the participants' custodial ownership of that knowledge (Battiste, 2008; Wilson, 2008). Clearly, initiatives among Aboriginal communities, granting councils, and institutions demonstrate that research ethics is becoming a much more consultative process with workable and illustrative processes taking place (Castellano, 2004).

Yet even with such improvements, what constitutes ethical research cannot be fully captured in the policy documents of funding agencies and universities. Several

authors remind us that research with Aboriginal communities is performed as a set of ethical relationships (Desbiens, 2010; Watson & Huntington, 2008; Wilson 2008); it entails responsible human interaction and interpersonal experience, which are not guaranteed when a researcher receives ethics clearance from the host university. With engaged acclimatization, we prompt further consideration of research ethics issues, and offer suggestions for enacting research ethics as embodied, affective, social, and everyday performances (Haraway, 2008).

4.3.4 *Relational Geography*

Engaged acclimatization is informed by the “relational turn” in geography, and related perspectives that engage with perforated boundaries and non-dualistic metaphors such as fluidity, complexity, and hybridity (Braun, 2008; Hinchliffe 2007; Massey et al., 1999; Whatmore, 2002). We draw two elements from these works. The first is a hesitation with either/or constructions, where mixtures of purified forms are accounted for and reduced in various ways, for example between “nature” and “society” (Latour, 1993). The second is the promise of the “relation” as the finest scale of analysis and the fundamental basis of reality and knowledge (Haraway, 2008; Wilson, 2008).

Tester and Irniq (2008) link such perspectives in a discussion of Inuit knowledge, or *Inuit Qaujimajatuqangit* (IQ)¹¹. As a variant to holistic metaphors of Indigenous knowledge, IQ is a “seamless” unity with no discernable parts and where “everything is related to everything else in such a way that...nothing can stand alone, even in the interest of gaining an appreciation of the whole” (Tester & Irniq, 2008, p. 49). For Tester

¹¹ The Government of Nunavut defined IQ as “the Inuit way of doing things: the past, present and future knowledge, experience and values of Inuit society” (Inuit Qaujimajatuqanginnut Task Force 2002: 4). To perceive IQ as the traditional knowledge of Inuit would be to overlook the adaptive and complex matrix of Inuit experience, values, customs, and knowledge.

and Irniq, IQ is fundamentally about relationships: for example, between factual knowledge and uses of the environment; culturally informed values, norms, and behaviours; and culturally based cosmology founded upon the explanations and guidance derived from observation, experience, and instruction. The definition and application of IQ in Nunavut government and Land Claim contexts demonstrates its adaptability and fluidity (Tester & Irniq, 2008).

Consistent with relational thinking is the understanding that conventional divisions between substantive and procedural dimensions of a research project are blurred. We are often reminded that in research the process is the product—how research is performed is just as important as “results” or “findings” (e.g., Caine et al., 2009; Desbiens, 2010; Hodge & Lester, 2006; Nakamura, 2010). Yet relational thinking takes this a step further by articulating ontology (the nature of reality or being), epistemology (the nature of knowledge), and methodology as mutually constitutive. For example, Law (2004) aspires to methods in social science that help us learn not just about reality, but how to participate in the *making* of those realities. Thinking about method in this way involves considering how everyday acts of living contribute towards the kind of world we want to inhabit. Method is about ways of being and becoming (Law, 2004). Accordingly, engaged acclimatization for fostering responsible research relationships is also about the making of responsible realities. For a researcher *to know* responsibility, she or he must *become* responsible by thinking, feeling, doing, or sensing responsibility (Wilson, 2008).

A uniting theme in the threads discussed above is that they represent steps towards the creation of safe social spaces for sharing knowledge across cultures. Tester and Irniq (2008, 59) argue that both Inuit and non-Inuit play a part in creating a

kappiananngittuq (a safe, non-scary place). Such a space is important to share understanding, acknowledge different historical, cultural, and political contexts, and work together on global scale challenges. Engaged acclimatization, upon which we elaborate shortly, is an approach for respectfully participating in the construction of these kinds of spaces.

4.3.5 Project Overviews

While the intention of this chapter is not to review or prescribe specific community-based research methods, brief discussion is warranted about the different projects that have led to our understanding of engaged acclimatization. Table 4.1 summarizes the five projects underpinning this chapter. These projects are related in at least three ways. First, they share a commitment to collaborating with Nunavut communities within a framework of community-based participatory research. The locations of participating communities are identified in Figure 4.1. Second, for each project, all necessary institutional permissions were obtained, including university ethics clearance and a research license issued by the Nunavut Research Institute. Third, the projects are related by virtue of the lead author's participation in their fieldwork components. Between June 2007 and November 2011, Bryan participated in ten community visits to support or facilitate various aspects of these projects. The first trip was to Cape Dorset, and encouraged Bryan's participation in subsequent community-based research and the direction of his PhD thesis. While the meaning and impact of these visits evolve and shift with the field-based and analytical contexts of ongoing research, they are the stage upon which the process of engaged acclimatization discussed in this article was performed.

Table 4.1 A Summary of community-based projects in Nunavut that have informed the development of engaged acclimatization

Project	Dates	Principal Investigator(s)	Participating Communities	Primary Funding Sources
Photographs and plants through time	2007 – 2011	N. Doubleday S. Donaldson	Kinngait (Cape Dorset) Sanikiluaq Qamani'tuaq (Baker Lake)	International Polar Year (PPS Arctic) SSHRC IPY Education and Outreach
Access to healthy foods: Understanding gendered dynamics among culture, economic and environmental factors	2007 - 2010	S. Donaldson N. Doubleday	Kinngait (Cape Dorset) Iqaluit Kimmirut	International Polar Year (PPS Arctic)
ECOTRAD: Aboriginal ecotourism, traditional knowledge, and livelihoods in the context of environmental change	2008 - 2010	S. Blangy	Qamani'tuaq (Baker Lake)	Institut de Recherche Polaire Paul Emile Victor (IPEV) International Polar Year (PPS Arctic)
Qanuittumik takuvik? (what do you see?)	2009 - 2010	G. Ljubicic (formerly Laidler)	Kangiqliniq (Rankin Inlet) Uqsuqtuuq (Gjoa Haven)	SSHRC Research Development Initiative
Picturing the Thelon : Natures, ethics, and travel within an Arctic riverscape	2009 - ongoing	B. Grimwood	Qamani'tuaq (Baker Lake)	SSHRC Canadian Graduate Scholarship AANDC Northern Scientific Training Program

Taken as a whole, the projects encompass a range of collaborative partnerships between Inuit and Qablunaat researchers. IPY projects “Photographs and Plants Through Time” (PPTT) and “Access to Healthy Foods” (AHF) emerged from Nancy and Shawn’s enduring partnerships with people in Cape Dorset (Donaldson, 2007; Doubleday et al., 2004), but have since expanded to involve other regional partners, local participants, and graduate students (Doubleday et al., 2008, 2010; Ip et al., 2010). PPTT mobilized teams

of academic, student, government, museum, and community researchers from Cape Dorset and Sanikiluaq in the collection of local plants and participant photographs, and integrated these into workshop settings and on-the-land camps. The emphasis was on plant and photograph interpretation as “social observations” of environmental change and well-being (Doubleday et al., 2008; Ip et al., 2008; Vlasova, 2006). In AHF research, partnerships were established in Cape Dorset, Iqaluit, and Kimmirut. Qualitative interviews with community members were used to examine the relationships among gender, country food, and dietary choice (Ip et al., 2010).

Figure 4.1. The locations of participating Nunavut communities. Source: This map was created using Atlas of Canada Basemaps (1:7.5 million scale, Clarke 1866, Lambert Conformal Conic), from GeoGratis, Natural Resources Canada. March, 2011.

The collaborative aims of “ECOTRAD” included understanding how Aboriginal tourism can contribute to well-being in Baker Lake, preserve and enhance traditional culture, sustain natural resources, and help people face the challenges of climate change and economic dependency. The project’s community-based approach supported the development of new project ideas directed by community residents, as well as international research and Indigenous partnerships (Blangy, 2010). In contrast, the “Qanuittumik Takuvik?” project entailed research-planning workshops to identify community research priorities and research best practices (Laidler, 2009; Laidler & Grimwood, 2010). Following up on invitations from community Elders, Gita worked in cooperation with representatives in Rankin Inlet and Gjoa Haven to design and facilitate these project meetings. An outcome of this project was the additional research funding secured for a community-led caribou study in Gjoa Haven.

Finally, in regards to “Picturing the Thelon,” the participatory and visual methods used in PPTT were adapted and combined with experiential river trips so that knowledge from nature-based tourists and Baker Lake residents could be documented and used to consider the moral terrains of an Arctic riverscape. The participatory photography approach enabled participants to take photos during their riverscape experiences, or to select photos from their personal collections as reflections of their experience. Images were then used to direct interviews and workshops where the emphasis was on understanding social meanings related to a special and changing place. In the literature, similar processes have been identified as photo-elicitation (Beilin, 2005; Harper, 2002), photo-voice (Castleden et al., 2008; Wang & Redwood-Jones, 2001), and volunteer- or visitor-employed photography (Garrod, 2007; MacKay & Couldwell, 2004).

4.4 Crafting Relations: An Intention of Engaged Acclimatization

We know that the production of knowledge has real world effects associated with particular value systems (Braun, 2002; Haraway, 1991; Said, 1978) and that reality is always being made and remade through methods and instruments employed in social and natural science (Latour, 1993; Mol, 1999; Whatmore, 2006). Hence methodology and ontology are closely linked in the impact that the social and material practices of research have on the world. The participatory research and Indigenous methodology literatures accommodate such perspectives (Castleden et al., 2008; Kemmis & McTaggart, 2000; Kobayashi, 2002; Wilson, 2008). In light of the related nature of ontology and methodology, and Law's (2004) repudiation of prescriptive norms of method that authorize a powerful but exclusive vision of reality, what advice might be offered to researchers for discovering appropriate methods for community-based participatory projects?

In this section, we describe encountering and/or enacting relations as an intention of engaged acclimatization. In Bryan's training as a community-based researcher, an initial grasp of this aspect was achieved through direct fieldwork experience. Research assistantships in the projects led by the co-authors (Table 4.1) provided opportunities to visit several Nunavut communities. The first of these occurred in June 2007; familiarization and IPY consultation visits to Cape Dorset and Iqaluit. At the time, Bryan's relationship to the Arctic was largely disciplined by an imagination of the "far north"—he had not been to Nunavut before. Therefore, as research supervisor, Nancy offered straightforward instructions: attend and observe meetings between academic researchers and community representatives, make introductions to people in the

communities, walk around town and on the land, take photographs, and record reflections in field notes. The intention was not about collecting what is typically referred to as “data,” but setting in motion personal relationships with the social, cultural, and ecological fabrics of Nunavut.

One morning in Cape Dorset, for example, Bryan and another research assistant toured the town site with a local research associate.

We wandered around with Elee, who pointed out various buildings of interest (e.g., the Co-op, RCMP and Hamlet office, residences of carvers, Northern Store, etc.). We also spent moments gazing out on the bay and exploring the ice and rock shoreline on the north point of the hamlet. On our way back into town, Elee introduced us to a carver who was working on a white marble piece. He discussed with us how the rock is retrieved from a distant quarry. (B. Grimwood field notes, June 05, 2007)

Concurrent with this orientation to environmental and economic features within the landscape was a nascent awareness of local expressions of Inuit community, culture, and identity, and how these have adapted to settlement life. Bryan’s participation at a meeting of the Cape Dorset Healing Team (mostly female Elders) was a case in point. In addition to learning about IPY research, this “grassroots” group was discussing the possibility of a new cultural centre, which they envisioned as a space for gathering, practicing cultural skills, sharing knowledge, and promoting well-being. But more than a functional space, the building would improve the Healing Team’s visibility in the community, thereby increasing local participation and involvement. Constraints included the high costs of construction, limited local access to building supplies, and insufficient technical expertise; thus the group had recruited outside support in the form of an architecture graduate student, who was also in attendance (Ip, 2009). At this meeting, Bryan

perceived the convergence of complex relations, some that were local and distant in reach, and some that reflected environmental, cultural, and economic conditions.

Indeed, engaged acclimatization is about creating circumstances for relationships to emerge or to be formulated. It is about a researcher crafting relations with others, ideas, cultures, identities, places, and materials in new and personal ways; a process that can orient a researcher's interactions within a community such that these are more conducive to the goals of community-based participatory research. Unlike methodologies that require adherence to certain data collection techniques, engaged acclimatization prioritizes the notion that research *is* a relationship-forming process. Appropriate "methods," like the familiarization encounters in Cape Dorset, are those that construct relations and help situate the researcher within wider ecologies.

A moment from a June 2008 research workshop in Cape Dorset illustrates how more tangible methods encourage this relational awareness. Figure 4.2 is a photograph taken in 1969, and was contributed by Annie Pitseolak to PPTT as part the protocols integrating photo interpretation and focus group workshops (Ip et al., 2008). Like many other PPTT contributors, Annie selected the photograph from her personal collection to use as a focal point in a research interview and to display and discuss in workshop settings along with a series of other contributed photographs. The image became the point of conversation between an Inuk man and Bryan, details of which were recorded in field notes, edited as follows:

The Elder identified himself as one of the marching young men, and explained that the boys had been preparing for a visit from either Queen Elizabeth or Prime Minister Trudeau. With no airstrip at the time, planes could land only on open water or solid ice. The spring thaw arrived late in 1969, and broken ice slabs littered the sea, making landing impossible. The visit of the esteemed guest had to be cancelled. (B. Grimwood, field notes, June 10, 2008)

The photograph and the Elder's associated narrative expressed a matrix of historical, political, cultural, and ecological circumstances. Local observations of environmental change were communicated, as were past moments of Inuit transition into settlements, the order marshaled by colonial regimes, or evolutions of Arctic aviation (Cape Dorset now has an airport and land-based airstrip). These were revealed as the memory of one participant conveyed in relation to a photograph contributed by another participant. Additionally, the circumstances were revisited only because local research participants directed the study content and interacted through the medium of the photograph (Doubleday et al., 2008).

Figure 4.2. Boy Scouts marching near Cape Dorset, NU in July 1969. Source: Photograph contributed by Cape Dorset resident Annie Pitseolak.

4.5 Learning: An Approach for Engaged Acclimatization

In cross-cultural research contexts, we must be alert to the ways a researcher's gaze, acquisition of knowledge, and representations might contribute to colonial narratives and power imbalances. Since Foucault's (1980) articulation of the productive

fields of power, claims to knowledge and truth have been associated with discourse and understood as always partial, situated, constructed, and mobilized in various ways (Haraway, 1991; Johnson & Murton, 2007). Indigenous scholars, including Smith (1999), have found these analytics useful for resisting colonial and other so-called “Western” epistemologies with “counter-stories”; in other words, demonstrating the constructed trajectories of knowledge to reveal authoritative knowledge systems as particular rather than universal in nature. This understanding has contributed to opening institutional spaces (e.g., university settings) to the influences and contemporary relevance of Indigenous knowledge understood as a relationship with all creation (Battiste, 2008; Louis, 2007; Wilson, 2008).

In recognition of the partiality of knowledge, and in an attempt to balance power relationships between different knowledge systems, engaged acclimatization approaches the field with a learning perspective (Jazeel & McFarlane, 2010; Nakamura, 2010). Assuming the mantle of a learner facilitates the shift from research driven by expertise, certainty, and efficiency to humility, ambiguity, and a willingness to deal with flux in the processes, practices, peoples, and places that constitute research (Desbiens, 2010). Any aversions to adapting methods in the field—for instance, to letting the community research contexts influence the procedures of “data collection” or “data analysis”—must be set aside so that the researcher can openly listen to and accept project-related content, etiquette, actions, meanings, or priorities shared by community participants. To borrow from Cruikshank (2005), research is not only about listening to stories, but also listening *for* stories. Learning thus becomes indirect, embodied, emotional, and imprecise (Jazeel & McFarlane, 2010; Law, 2004; Nakamura, 2010). The skill is in being alert to how

knowledge changes with circumstances, and the potential opportunities created by and through this volatility (Jazeel & McFarlane, 2010). In other words, community-based research practices must remain open to circumstances of spontaneity and serendipity.

Two moments from research in Baker Lake help us ground the learning approach in practice. The first occasion took place in July 2010 during a photo-elicitation interview with a young adult Inuk. Evening set in as the conversation turned to the participant's experiences at a nearby archeological site, a series of tent rings that mark a former camp at the mouth the Thelon River.

She asked if I wanted to join her on an ATV ride out to Blueberry Hill where [this] archeological site can be found...I welcomed the short excursion. The evening light illuminated the tundra, the airport, and industrial site located nearby. As we explored the tent rings, we talked casually about the diversity within the landscape (e.g., industrial and traditional) and respecting this place of heritage (e.g., should we walk through the tent rings?; visiting the area with friends to have bonfires; showing concern and care by picking up litter and preventing damage at the site). (B. Grimwood field notes, July 29, 2010)

The event not only deviated from the photographic interview, it made more tangible the meanings and experiences that the participant inscribed within place. These were sensed and felt by Bryan, and made possible by a style of research that remains oriented to the directions and invitations of participants.

The second illustration occurred when Anautalik's¹² mother-in-law expressed her desire to go ice fishing; creating a change in plans for working on the Thelon River project. As the primary research contact in Baker Lake, Anautalik had initially agreed to spend the day working with Bryan. However, Anautalik's mother-in-law required transportation and desired companionship. To be Inuk means to listen to and obey the guidance and requests of Elders. On this day, formal Thelon work would wait.

¹² To repeat a note made earlier in the dissertation, "Anautalik" is the self-selected pseudonym of a research partner in Baker Lake who requested that her name not be identified.

After Anautalik had driven her mother-in-law by snow machine to the ice and helped auger out a fishing hole, she returned to invite Bryan to come along. Similar events of spontaneity had been encountered during Bryan's fieldwork, many of which had led to clarifying moments of learning, new interactions with people and places, and a broader understanding of the cultural landscape. For example, he had learned on his first snowmobile journey how to orient travel using two distant and faint ridges on the horizon. "You go there," Anautalik had instructed.

While fishing, the northwest wind hurried dusts of snow across the frozen Baker Lake, and pierced Bryan's multiple insulating layers, which included caribou skin *kamiks* and three layers beneath down-filled jacket and overalls.

The fishing was cold...you stand or sit. Movement is minimal—a flex of the bicep pulls the lure line up quickly and regularly (intervals of a few seconds)—so staying warm by being mobile is not really an option. (B. Grimwood field notes, November 20, 2010)

The elements and local harvesting practices were corporally encountered. This learning facilitated a greater appreciation of Inuit capacity to adapt and thrive in cold regions, and the celebration that comes with a successful harvest:

Anautalik constructed a wind block by pulling her qamutiik [a sled towed behind the snowmobile] near her fishing hole and flipping it on its side. This seemed to give her good fortune as she pulled in a medium-sized lake trout soon after. (B. Grimwood field notes, November 20, 2010)

The catch would nourish Anautalik's mother-in-law for a couple of days. In Bryan's case, the events supplanted intentions of formal research work with embodied and experientially derived understanding of certain aspects of Inuit identity and culture.

Many important lessons for community-based participatory research occur spontaneously and/or serendipitously (Blangy et al., 2010; Caine et al., 2009). While

formal research consultations, meetings, and procedures can be planned and implemented with varying degrees of success, elusive and powerful lessons are also derived from unforeseen opportunities to interact with community research participants in town and on the land. Informal conversations and serendipitous moments are opportunities for place-based learning and relationship development that add depth and meaning to the formal project components. Researchers must be cautious to avoid rigid schedules or research protocols during community visits. Patience, flexibility, and a willingness to adapt and deal with uncertainty are traits of a respectful researcher and help convert the research field into a teacher.

4.6 Immersion: A Practice of Engaged Acclimatization

“Knowing things requires one first of all to place oneself between them. Not only in front in order to see them, but in the midst of their mixture, on the paths that unite them” (Serres, 2009, p. 80).

The third fundamental of engaged acclimatization, immersion, is a central practice in our community-based research in Nunavut. Immersion refers to the generation of knowledge in ways alluded to by Serres (2009); that is, through local experiential and corporeal encounters with the things, peoples, communities, or relations with which we seek to learn and work. It is about engaging with “place specific ways of knowing that place and that community” (Johnson, 2010, p. 7). To reiterate the recommendation of Markey and colleagues (2010), researchers need to visit communities as part of the research process. Indeed, time spent in communities helps build reciprocal learning relationships and a sense of how the nuances of place relate to more generalized processes (Markey et al., 2010). But, as we illustrate below, it is through immersive experiences that researchers develop an understanding of local knowledge and an

enhanced capacity to translate knowledge across cultural groups. We explain and exemplify through an episode derived from the Thelon River project.

As southern-based researchers working with Nunavummiut (the people of Nunavut), immersion has facilitated our encounters with the seamless and relational qualities of IQ (Tester & Irniq, 2008), and shown how these are expressed in different community contexts. In our collection of projects, immersion has transpired through multiple visits to participating communities, regular project consultations with local and regional representatives, participation at community events and celebrations (when invited), and importantly, experiential trips with Inuit guides and research participants on land, sea, ice, and river. Significant understanding derived from these experiences is corporeal and difficult to describe. We know that without immersion we could not feel or sense, for example, the bitter rip of a northwest wind, the laughter and relaxed shoulders at a cabin on the land, the hum of snowmobiles piercing a spring evening soundscape, or the subtleties in a specific Inuktitut dialect that resonates with place. These sensations provide valuable shared and lived experience with Inuit, adding a certain depth to our participation as northern researchers.

Figure 4.3 depicts Bryan during his first personal encounter with the Thelon River. The photograph was taken in July 2008 along the river's shoreline and during a weekend outing spent with an Inuit family at their cabin northwest of Baker Lake. The masses of ice littering the shore are wintry remnants from upriver and inland lakes that accumulate near the river's outpouring and linger well into July. As the ice jarred Bryan's expectation of an ice-free river, it also provoked closer attention in the project to seasonal variations within the riverscape; how Inuit hunting and traveling practices, for example,

adapt to fluctuating river levels, freeze and thaw cycles, caribou migration patterns, or hours of daylight. Conversations with Inuit about these river dynamics were stirred, and demonstrated social-cultural-ecological relations as fundamental to Inuit knowledge (Doubleday, 2007; Tester & Irniq, 2008).

Figure 4.3. On the shores of the Thelon River. Source: Author.

Understanding of local knowledge derived from immersion is necessary for researchers to contribute to the translation of knowledge across groups (e.g., from community contexts to academic contexts and vice versa). Equally, if not more important to knowledge translation, is the introspective and critical self-awareness in relation to others and place that is encouraged through immersion. Experiential encounters with difference (e.g., culture) prompt personal reflection and epistemological reflexivity; they can encourage researchers to reflect on the ways that their own values, beliefs, attitudes, or identities shape the field experience, or how power relations and broader discourses structure the production of knowledge (Mohammad, 2001; Patton, 2002). Reflexive researchers learn to question their assumptions and positionality as agents of influence, and reveal how these have real-world effects. When balanced with a learning perspective

and the intention of crafting relations, this reflexive and critical questioning allows researchers to gauge their representations to remain accountable to and for their relations.

To illustrate, we return to the encounter reflected in Figure 4.3. Upon reflection, Bryan determined that his misplaced expectation of an ice-free Thelon was connected to his affiliations with outdoors and canoeing subcultures (Mullins, 2009; Raffan, 1999), which were in part constituted by various texts (Hodgson & Hobbs, 1987; Pelly, 1996), and marked the riverscape as a *summer* canoe destination. In Canada, canoeing is associated with hegemonic discourses of nationalism, wilderness, masculinity, and leisure class, and in many ironic and unfortunate circumstances, has led to marginalizing Aboriginal canoe designers and users (Baker, 2002; Baldwin, 2009; Erickson, 2008; Haun-Moss, 2002; Newbery, 2003). The seasonal “nature of canoeing” (Grimwood, 2011) had structured Bryan’s imagination with summerscape assumptions about the river environment. The ice exposed these very clearly. It also entrenched in Bryan the persistent question of how other aspects of the riverscape are made visible or invisible and in certain ways by broader networks of influence and power relations.

If endogenous research is a goal of community-based participatory research, then immersion is a foundational practice for an outside researcher working with communities. In relation to the Thelon River project, the moment of immersion described above led to two central objectives. First, community-based participatory research was employed to juxtapose the values and practices of both Thelon canoe travellers and Baker Lake residents. In agreement with supporting Baker Lake representatives, the tourist and Inuit dimensions would be an effective way to document and share knowledge about the multiple ways that the Thelon is a special and changing place. Second, immersive

experiences in different seasons were determined to be important for more complete understanding of the riverscape, and to facilitate more trusting and respectful relationships with the Baker Lake residents that use and know the Thelon throughout the year. Fieldwork was therefore organized as multiple community visits in different seasons (early spring, mid-summer, and early winter).

4.7 Activism: An Effect of Engaged Acclimatization

We believe that certain forms of activism are derived from community-based participatory research and Indigenous methodologies, particularly in terms of advocating and creating social change, balancing the power relations and ownership of research, and committing to ethical positions within the production of knowledge (Castleden et al., 2008; Johnson, 2010; Kobayashi, 2002; Markey et al., 2010). Indeed, we see these research practices making inroads into institutional frameworks of research agencies, governments, and Aboriginal communities (Castellano, 2004; CIHR et al., 2010; ITK/NRI, 2007; McDonald, 2004). Subsequent sections show the role of engaged acclimatization in realizing some of these tangible effects. In this final section, we turn our attention to two more subtle modes of activism; one that emerged through engaged acclimatization, and one expressed through it. We begin with some instructive grounding.

A primary goal of research planning workshops in Baker Lake (July 2008), Rankin Inlet (December 2009), and Gjoa Haven (February 2010) was for community representatives and researchers to work together to identify local issues that might benefit from research and how potential research might best be structured. This research planning approach followed a collaborative model advocating community participation at all stages of the research process, including the project design phase (ITK/NRI, 2007;

Stewart & Draper, 2009). While the meetings were engaging and the attendees responsive, brainstorming sessions leaned toward discussions of problems, challenges, and deficiencies rather than hope or capacity within the community, suggesting that these components in the collaboration process may be detrimental to well-being. Bravo (2009) described a related and edifying concern with climate change crisis narratives that position northern communities as “at risk” or “vulnerable.” According to Bravo, these narratives marshal scientific expertise and physical causation but mask the voices and knowledge of northern citizens while impeding civic participation in policy opportunities. The related question for those invested in community-based participatory research is to what extent do our practices, such as research-planning exercises, rewrite narratives that position communities at authentic margins shaped by perceptions of deficiency and vulnerability?

The activism emerging through engaged acclimatization was conceptualizing how community-based participatory research might be oriented toward positive possibilities and capacities. We have found helpful here the work of Gibson-Graham (2003), who identified the potential for research to create places for the “ethical practice of self-formation” by understanding and cultivating local capabilities, responsibilities, and potentialities to become something other than what we have hitherto chosen to be (Gibson-Graham, 2003; see also Doubleday et al., 2004). Following Gibson-Graham’s notion of “community,” the methodology used in PPTT, for example, was to awaken practices and feelings “of appreciation, generosity, desire to *do* and *be* with others, connecting with strangers (no matter who), encountering and transforming oneself through that experience” (p. 68-69). As we noted above, the methods included:

participatory landscape photography; local plant identification, collection, and specimen preservation; and interactive workshops with Elders, students, and visiting researchers in community settings and at on-the-land camps (Doubleday et al., 2010). The project resulted in locally derived baseline information for monitoring and evaluating environmental change, including tools for establishing a community herbarium.

As a research assistant, Bryan worked with Inuit researchers and participants as they directed research content through the application, documentation, and discussion of knowledge and skills related to the contexts in which they live. Although unsubstantiated with the views from community members themselves, the research seemed to function as a ceremony bringing people together (Wilson, 2008). Observations of environmental and social vulnerabilities still emerged during the project, but these were embedded within a framework prioritizing culture, learning, and community, keys to Inuit resilience and autonomy (Doubleday, 2007). In this way, local and university-based researchers have been revisiting meta-narratives of Inuit vulnerability with visions of community capacity, self-efficacy, and expressions of identity. This spirit of methodological practice has been replicated in the Thelon River project, and represents activism emerging through engaged acclimatization.

Attempting to revisit meta-narratives is an activist endeavour as it provides a basis from which we can rethink our positionality in relation to other oppressive projects (Johnson & Murton, 2007). Here we find a thread that connects to the activism expressed through engaged acclimatization; specifically, that it fosters the decolonizing of research methods. As we have alluded to throughout the article, prescriptive and procedural research protocols can dictate how reality ought to be viewed and designate the field as

uniform space to be observed by the knowing expert (Law, 2004; Serres, 2009). In contrast, engaged acclimatization becomes manifest with the recognition that uncertainty, variation, and creativity pervade the methods, places, and peoples involved in research. It therefore encourages methods given meaning less by external standards and protocols than by circumstances found within a community, and the relationships crafted between researchers and those communities.

To exemplify briefly, in the Thelon River project, a daylong motorboat trip with an Inuit hunter and his family journeyed up the neighbouring Kazan River rather than the Thelon proper. This raised the methodological question of whether or not the event would qualify in the case study of the Thelon River, and led to modifying the project focus from “river corridor” to “riverscape.” The latter term better reflects the network of river, land, and ice trails that Baker Lake Inuit travel to hunt, fish, and recreate with family. The former is tied to colonial narratives of crossing the North (Saul, 2008).

By centering methodologies on respectful relationships and circumstances within participating communities, researchers depart from prescriptive norms of social science method. Such endeavours resist research narratives characterized by exogenous benefit, decision-making, ownership, and control; the kinds of research that are likely to aggravate Aboriginal communities (Smith, 1999; Wilson, 2008). Engaged acclimatization facilitates both the emergence and expression of this action for change.

4.8 Conclusion

Drawing from our experiences of community-based participatory research in several Nunavut communities, we have introduced and developed engaged acclimatization, an embodied, responsible, and reflexive approach to knowledge

production occurring through immersive encounters in the field. As a complement to community-based participatory research, engaged acclimatization facilitates endogenous research by embodying research ethics as a lived and relational experience, initiating and nurturing research relationships as a central outcome of research, and centering methods on relationships for and with participating communities. Specific attention in this chapter focused on four interrelated aspects—crafting relations, learning, immersion, and activism—that have come into being primarily through our field experience. But upon critical reflection, subsequent reviews of literature, and writing, we identify with engaged acclimatization as a methodological process that jars against methods prescribing objectivity, detachment, and universality. We envision engaged acclimatization as an ingredient of responsible community-based research.

Engaged acclimatization does not come without barriers and we believe three that relate well to research in Canadian northern contexts deserve brief comment. Physical barriers include spatial and temporal obstacles, such as community remoteness, seasonal climatic patterns, and commercial shipping supply schedules, which make northern research time-consuming and expensive. Normative barriers refer to dogmatic and authoritative approaches to knowledge production that hold fast to certain procedures, objectives, and expected products. The prescriptive and procedural norms of method that may be imposed by research supervisors, evaluation committees, or the peer review process are a case in point (Law, 2004). Finally, attitudinal barriers to people and place limit relationship building, learning, immersion, and activism. Indeed, as readers will recognize, engaged acclimatization is intimately connected to overcoming this final obstacle. To overcome the first two barriers, however, more attention must be directed at

changing institutional mechanisms that govern funding priorities and distribution, determine project timelines, and evaluate research.

In this chapter we have suggested ways to augment relational geographies and responsible community-based research, while attempting to avoid prescribing ways of being responsible or doing responsible research. In Bryan's case, engaged acclimatization has helped develop research relationships within Baker Lake. These relationships helped to structure a project that: is adaptive to circumstances of spontaneous learning and uncertainty; documents knowledge to share within and between cultural groups; advances through immersive experiences in different seasons; and invites the capacities of community representatives and participants. An important next step is to better understand the extent to which engaged acclimatization resonates with Inuit perspectives on responsible research, as well as their experiences cultivating research relationships with Qablunaat. We also encourage other researchers using community-based participatory research to critically examine how engaged acclimatization is or could be expressed in their own practices, and how the process might contribute to their own enactments of responsible research.

PORTAGE TWO

Portaging can take a lot of effort. Although I would prefer to enjoy slower movements along the trail, sometimes, when packs are heavy or the mosquitoes and black flies are plentiful, I find it best to flip the canoe and other gear onto my shoulders and get on with covering the required distance. Completing the portage can easily overshadow the walk itself.

One of the risks of a paper style dissertation is that theoretical and methodological content gets overly abbreviated so that more attention can be paid to research results and outcomes. This is not an outcome I wish to achieve. My intention throughout the thesis has been to strike an effective and appropriate balance. In the preceding chapters, I have tried to knit my research within a theoretical-methodological fabric that sufficiently enables the enactment of a relational ethics for and within the Thelon River watershed. This theoretical-methodological attention will continue as I move forward into the terrain of empirical and interpretive relations. Furthermore, it is important to stress the persistent centrality of engaged acclimatization. While in Chapter Four the four aspects of engaged acclimatization were located within the initial phases of developing community-based research relationships, these aspects have continued to be relevant throughout all stages of the dissertation, including the selection and application of research methods, how research contributions (i.e., “data”) were interpreted and reported, and the content emphasized in and through my writing. Chapter Five and Chapter Six thus represent substantive products of engaged acclimatization.

The balance of this portage is devoted to touching down on aspects of the research design employed in *Picturing the Thelon*. While the increased word counts of Chapter

Five and Chapter Six (i.e., relative to the preceding three chapters) reflect the inclusion of significant methodological substance, it is inevitable that important details will remain under-emphasized or left out completely. The following preamble is, therefore, meant to fill some of these gaps.

Community-based case-study research

Picturing the Thelon was designed as an embedded single case study emphasizing community-based participatory research methods. Yin (2009) considers case study research as a form of empirical inquiry that investigates contemporary phenomenon within real-life contexts using multiple sources of evidence, data triangulation, and guiding theoretical propositions. It is an especially effective strategy when the boundaries between the phenomenon under investigation and its context are not clearly discernable. An embedded single case study examines one case in depth through the lens of more than one subunit of analysis, and is an approach best suited for fleshing out a case with extensive analytic opportunities and insights (Yin, 2009).

The case in question, the Thelon River watershed, meets Yin's (2009) criteria for a single case study. It is arguably an "extreme" or "unique" case because of its popular status as one of the most remote and wild places remaining in North America (Hall, 2003; Pelly, 1996; Taylor, 2006). In addition, the Thelon also functions as a "representative" or "typical" case in the sense that it is an archetype of a special and changing place, layered to be sure with the normative, embodied, and political-ethical happenings that constitute it as a moral terrain. The primary subunits of analysis are Thelon River canoe travellers and residents of the Inuit settlement of Baker Lake, Nunavut. Details about these groups are discussed extensively in the subsequent chapters.

Research Modules

Referring to Figure P2.1 (recall that this a component of the conceptual synthesis presented in Chapter One), this community-based case study has consisted of three data collection modules that have overlapped in temporal duration. These modules—experiential river trips, photographic interviews, and community workshops—are described at various points within the dissertation. The experiential river trips, which were documented and interpreted from the perspectives of mobile ethnography, are described extensively in Chapter Five. The brief sketches of photographic interviews and community workshops contained in Chapter Six are supplemented with a number of appendices. Moreover, in the overview of projects discussed in Chapter Four (in particular section 4.3.5, but also section 4.4), I explain the evolution of these visual and workshop approaches and point to certain features of their implementation. Tables P2.1 and P2.2 present a timeline and general overview of project activities occurring in partnership with Thelon River inhabitants and canoeists.

Figure P2.1. The empirical research design of Picturing the Thelon.

Table P2.1 Research activities that occurred in Baker Lake, Nunavut

Intention of Community Visit	Dates	Research Related Activities
Familiarization	July 02 – 17, 2008	Informal project planning meetings Piloted experiential river journeys (motorboat, ATV x 3)
Consultation	October 27 – November 09, 2009	Formal and informal consultations with community representatives and organizations Project planning workshops Acquisition of letters of support Research document translation
Research visit 1	May 03 – 21, 2010	7 photographic interviews, 88 photographs contributed Experiential river journeys (snowmobile, walking) Community research assistant recruitment
Research visit 2	July 23 – August 01, 2010	2 photographic interviews, 23 photographs contributed Experiential river journeys (motorboat, ATV x 2)
Research visit 3	November 17 – December 03, 2010	1 photographic interview, 9 photographs contributed Experiential river journey (snowmobile) 2 research workshops, 19 participants
Research visit 4	October 17 – 25, 2011	Research workshops Research reporting

Table P2.2 Research activities that occurred with Thelon River canoeists

Project Activity	Date	Details
Community consultation	October 2009 – April 2010	Ongoing consultation, project planning, and communication with Canoe Arctic Inc.
Photographic interviews	February – March 2010	9 participants, 119 photographs contributed All clients of Canoe Arctic Inc.
Qualitative questionnaires	February – April 2010	13 participants, 168 photographs contributed 12 clients of Canoe Arctic Inc., 1 independent canoeist
Experiential river journey	July 10 – 20, 2010	11 days, 270 kilometres Traversed Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary 1 guide, 8 other clients of Canoe Arctic Inc.
Photographic interviews	September – October 2010	6 participants, 70 photographs contributed 3 clients of Canoe Arctic Inc., 3 independent canoeists
Research workshop	September 25, 2010	19 participants, all outdoor educators and canoeists from Ontario

Collaborative Research

While Chapter Four positions this case study within the contexts of community-based participatory research with Aboriginal communities, some supplementary points about collaborative research are warranted. The guidelines for negotiating research relationships with Inuit communities in Nunavut recognize that collaboration exists as a continuum of community involvement in the research (ITK/NRI, 2007). In the framework adapted by Stewart and Draper (2009), community involvement ranges from minimal to maximal, and applies to various stages of research including “project design,” “fieldwork,” and “data analysis/interpretation.” According to this framework, *Picturing the Thelon* represents a mid-range level of community involvement or collaboration among Thelon canoeists and Inuit inhabitants. In terms of project design, involvement was relatively low as community¹³ input was achieved but not to the extent of defining project objectives. Collaboration in fieldwork and data analysis/interpretation, however, has been high. Regarding the former, both canoeists and inhabitants assisted in collecting research materials. Also in Baker Lake, Anautalik provided considerable input and insight as a research assistant. Data analysis and interpretation, which is ongoing through the process of community workshops, integrates the innovative approaches of *Photographs and Plants Through Time* (PPTT) to invite public engagement (Doubleday et al., 2010). Like PPTT, *Picturing the Thelon* is committed to balancing out the power relations associated with the interpretation of research.

Other specific features of the mid-range collaboration achieved include:

¹³ When referring here to “community”, I mean the residents and representatives of Baker Lake, Nunavut, and the canoeists whose participation was invited with the assistance of *Canoe Arctic Inc.* I discuss these communities further in Chapter Five and Chapter Six.

- Separate visits were made to Baker Lake for the purposes of community familiarization and community consultation. These visits, in parallel with the experiences in other Nunavut communities described in Chapter Four, were important to the development of the applied intrinsic purpose and the research design.
- Data collections methods were participatory and accommodating of participant input and feedback. To a significant degree, they also provided opportunities for participants to determine the content of research materials collected.
- Local and regional research protocols were followed to the best of my ability. In Baker Lake, this included offering research participants an honorarium, hiring local research assistants and local guides, translating documents into the local Inuktitut dialect, and ensuring that research materials stayed within the community (e.g., photographs contributed by participants) or were returned in due course (e.g., interview transcripts).
- Knowing that *Picturing the Thelon* project objectives were largely my creation, and in the spirit of reciprocity, consistent effort has been made to communicate to Baker Lake participants and representatives my willingness to support and contribute to a subsequent project that addresses an issue, problem, or question identified directly by residents.

ENACTING EMPIRICAL AND INTERPRETIVE RELATIONS

CHAPTER FIVE
ON THE TRAILS OF RIVERSCAPE PRACTICES AND VALUES: MOBILITIES
AND MORAL TERRAINS OF ARCTIC TOURISM AND INUIT
INHABITATION¹⁴

5.1 Introduction

This chapter engages community-based case study research of the Thelon River in Arctic Canada to contribute interdisciplinary and intercultural understandings of Arctic travel and tourism, a complex social-ecological system and emerging sub-field within tourism studies (Dawson, Maher, & Slocombe, 2007; Hall & Johnston, 1995; Maher, 2007; Snyder & Stonehouse, 2007; Stewart, Draper, & Johnston, 2005). My objective is to encourage respectful acknowledgement of the contemporary living realities of the Arctic's Indigenous inhabitants, the focus here being the Caribou Inuit. For Arctic tourists, as well as tourism operators, managers, and advertisers, this means orienting ourselves to northern spaces as “a homeland” rather than “an unpeopled wilderness” (Kulchyski & Tester, 2007, p. 278). For Arctic tourism researchers, it means continuing our work with communities, but not limiting the scope of local participation and understanding to roles in and perspectives of tourism development and impacts (Stewart & Draper, 2007, 2009).

Drawing on research with Thelon River canoe travellers and residents of Baker Lake, Nunavut (*Qamani'tuaq*, or “where the river widens”), an Inuit settlement of roughly 2000 people located at the Thelon's eastern terminus, the chapter illuminates the

¹⁴ This chapter is based on a sole authored journal paper currently in preparation. At the time of submission, the material had not been published or presented elsewhere. Some minor overlap exists with the themes discussed in: Dunkin, J., & Grimwood, B. S. R. (under review). *Mobile habitations in canoescares*. In Duncan, T., Cohen, S., & Thulemark, M. (eds.). *Lifestyle mobilities and corporealities*. London: Ashgate.

productive tensions and diversity of cultural practices within the riverscape with the purpose of expounding accessible and inclusive value-based metaphors to shape and inform Arctic travel and tourism. Taking as points of departure relational geographies of ethics and mobility, and mobile ethnographies of several Thelon riverscape journeys, I tease out suggestive narratives that depict cultural practices as the expression of certain nature-culture values. These values, which are named *emplacement*, *wayfaring*, and *gathering*, are put forward as categories of becoming; that is, in their fluidity and indeterminacy they refuse expressions of value that are universal and totalizing. Locating these values is designed to help to create more equitable spaces for tourism actors to work together in thinking through and responding to the cultural, ecological, and social changes occurring in the Arctic (Bone, 2009). Indeed, these values are also categories of connection and participation.

The chapter begins with background information related to the Thelon River and Arctic tourism. This information leads into a description of the relational moments of departure where theoretical and methodological approaches are explained. Next, details of the documented river journeys are presented. The balance of the chapter integrates instructive resources from the literature and qualitative empirical material to sketch out the practices that express emplacement, wayfaring, and gathering.

5.2 Background

5.2.1 The Thelon River: A Special and Changing Place

The Thelon River is a main artery in the Hudson Bay watershed. From its headwaters in the Northwest Territories (NWT) east of Great Slave Lake, the Thelon flows roughly 900 km in a general north and eastward direction, out of the boreal biome

into the tundra and into Nunavut. As Raffan (1993) observed, the Thelon is “a place of edges,” an area of cultural and biological transition with a “compelling combination of wildlife, wild water, history, scenery, and sense of isolation” (p. 46). Along its path, the river traverses expansive tracts of largely undisturbed terrain and shelters anomalous stands of spruce that extend far north of the commonly mapped tree line. This is ideal habitat for large charismatic mammals (e.g., caribou, muskoxen, moose, grizzly bear, and wolf) and smaller, albeit extraordinary species, such as the Harris’s Sparrow, that thrive in the mosaic of tree and tundra vegetation (Norment, 2008). The Thelon also traverses the homelands of the Dene, to the south and west, and the Caribou Inuit, to the north and east¹⁵. For generations, these Aboriginal societies have relied on the Thelon as a gateway to hunting, fishing, and gathering locations, and as an obstacle that concentrates migrating herds of barrenland caribou for efficient harvest at various water crossing sites (Gordon, 1975). Near these caribou crossings, material traces like tent rings, inuksuit, stone tools, and former meat caches inscribe the riverscape with cultural meaning, as do oral histories, stories, place names, and contemporary subsistence practices (Stewart, Friesen, Keith, & Henderson, 2000; Stewart, Keith, & Scottie, 2004). This heritage is supplemented by the significance of the Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary, a protected area established in 1927 and one of Canada’s earliest and largest projects in conservation (Pelly, 1996). Notwithstanding its contentious history, which includes state prohibition of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal hunting and the ill-fated starvation of John Hornby and companions (Sandlos, 2007; Taylor, 2006), the Sanctuary holds currency as a remote,

¹⁵ Although discernable, much less attention has been paid to the historical and contemporary presence of Métis People within the Thelon River watershed (Freeman, 2010).

intact, and sublime wilderness, especially among certain types of nature-based tourists (Hall, 2003; Pelly, 1997).

As a place of edges, the Thelon's designation by governmental agencies as a special place of high natural and cultural value is clearly warranted (CHRS, 2000). In addition, however, the Thelon must also be recognized as place embedded in contexts of rapid social-ecological-cultural change. Unpredictable snow and ice conditions, changing wildlife habitat and endangered species, mega resource extraction projects, cultural adaptation and vulnerability, country food contaminants, water and energy security—these are some of the global scale issues concentrated within the riverscape and experienced by its inhabitants. Similar to Inuit in other Nunavut communities, the people of Baker Lake straddle engagement within a wage economy and their semi-nomadic traditions as hunter-gathers (Doubleday, 2003; Leduc, 2006). The transition from life on the land and into the settlement has been swift, taking place only since the 1950s. It has also involved a great deal of injustice, particularly in the form of colonial policies of assimilation, residential schooling, and economic and social service disparities relative to communities in the Canadian south (Bone, 2009). Stevenson (2006) attributes such unnecessary suffering as the result of seeing the Arctic not through Inuit eyes, but through Inuit bodies. Still, within these difficult contexts of change, Inuit have demonstrated their capacity to adapt and be resilient (Doubleday, 2007; Kulchyski & Tester, 2007).

5.2.2 Arctic Tourism

Adapting a definition of polar tourism presented by Hall and Johnston (1995, p. 8), Arctic tourism refers to all travel for pleasure or adventure within the Arctic,

exclusive of travel for primarily governmental, commercial, subsistence, military, and scientific purposes. The span of activities includes large-scale commercial cruise tourism, park and protected area visitation, wildlife viewing, community-based Aboriginal ecotourism products, and independent or expedition-type adventures, such as Arctic trekking (Dowsley, 2009; Gyimothy & Mykletun, 2004; Lemelin & Johnston, 2009; Lück, Maher, & Stewart, 2010; Stonehouse & Snyder, 2010). Similar to other Arctic regions, tourism in Nunavut is often considered a tool for sustainable regional development (Grenier & Müller, 2011). In other words, with proper planning and policy in place, tourism is perceived to be compatible with the “triple bottom line”—economic stimulation, cultural preservation, and ecological protection. Although some sectors in some regions reflect patterns of decline, the general impression among researchers is that Arctic tourism is in a state of growth (Stewart, Tivy, Howell, Dawson, & Draper, 2010; Stonehouse & Snyder, 2010).

It is a concoction of desires and representations that constructs the Arctic as an exotic place to visit, and that motivates tourists to experience and consume landscapes perceived as wild and fragile (Grenier, 2004; Hall, Müller, & Saarinen, 2009; Lemelin, Dawson, Stewart, Maher, & Lück, 2010; Stewart et al., 2005). As we anticipate, for example, the challenges and opportunities of an ice-free Northwest Passage, or become more aware of, and alarmed by, the vulnerabilities of Arctic systems as noted above, the prominence in Arctic and polar tourism research of issues related to planning, governance, impacts, sustainability, and visitor management is well deserved (Maher, Stewart, & Lück, 2011). Such issues are effectively summarized in the four primary polar tourism research clusters identified by Stewart et al. (2005): tourism patterns, tourism

impacts, tourism policy and management issues, and tourism development. These authors also recommended that new clusters emphasize understanding tourist experience and the implications of global change and other large-scale influences (e.g., terrorism or mega-development projects).

In general, however, the trends in Arctic tourism research seem to remain tethered to industry or policy driven priorities, a characteristic that Franklin and Crang (2001) critically observed was common to the broader field of tourism. The degree to which Arctic tourism researchers have engaged with tourism ethics is a case in point. Research has chiefly centered on the design, compliance, and regulation of codes of ethics and conduct, with the aim of tailoring and/or modifying the behaviours of individual operators and visitors to reduce environmental or cultural impacts (Mason, 1997, 2005). Employing ethics as a philosophical or descriptive lens through which to negotiate the meanings of touristic practices, or to reflect on the expression of moral values, has seldom been achieved (Fennell, 2006; Grimwood & Fennell, 2011).

A dearth of information also exists in relation to Arctic tourism as a fundamental aspect of human experience; that is, as a mechanism for discovering meaning and pleasure, refashioning identities, sensing objects and landscapes, and interacting with the social and geographic fabrics of the world (Pons, 2003; Williams, 2009). With few notable exceptions, it seems that Alneng's (2002) criticism holds true in the case of the Arctic: that the authority of tourism research helps perpetuate ideas and images of who is and is not a tourist. Learning from Hannam (2008), to situate Arctic tourism within wider contexts of social theory can help to break this impeding conceptual frame that prioritizes certain modes of mobility over others (see again the definition of Arctic tourism noted

above). Tourism researchers might therefore relate to the travel practices of Arctic inhabitants, for example, as significant sources of understanding, and to the capacity in these mobile livelihoods and knowledge systems to effect or respond to change at multiple scales.

5.3 Relational Moments of Departure

This chapter infuses into Arctic tourism research two relational moments in contemporary Anglophone geography, both of which resonate more broadly within the social sciences and have been instructive to other tourism researchers. The first is the geographic metaphor of *moral terrain*, which is used to orient my theoretical perspectives and to continue fleshing out tourism ethics with place-based descriptive ethics. The second construct, *mobility* or *mobilities*, also informs the theoretical scope of the paper, but relates directly to the methodological approach discussed in this paper.

5.3.1 Moral Terrains

The notion of moral terrains has proven to be a helpful tool for researchers thinking across nature/culture dichotomies and describing ethics as an everyday, corporeal, and lived experience (Figueroa & Waitt, 2008; Grimwood, 2011; Proctor, 1995; Waitt, Figueroa, & McGee, 2007). Applications of the relational metaphor offset abstract and normative tendencies in ethical theory (Smith, 2000). Conceived by Figueroa and Waitt (2008), moral terrains represent

the web of values layered over places through discourses that establish normative practices and socio-environmental belonging. At the same time, moral terrains are inscribed onto bodies through affective responses to touring...Bodily affects are understood as living, performative emotions that enable people to come to know

and build or negate relationships with other human body-selves as well as non-human entities. (p. 328)

Previously, moral terrains proved a useful construct for shedding light on the multiple moral layers perceived and enacted during my preliminary research visits to Baker Lake (see Chapter Two). In this paper, I employ the metaphor to situate the expression and embodiment of values observed in and through the cultural practices of Thelon River canoeists and inhabitants. Three additional points are important to the understanding and application of moral terrains in this paper.

First, it is important to stress moral terrains are lived-spaces. Using this metaphor to approach the Thelon is intended to resist Cartesian traditions that value mind over body and which, for better or worse, infiltrate the majority of moral philosophy (Merleau-Ponty, 1962). The approach to engaging with ethics advocated here is place-based, or entangled in multiple material, social-cultural, and embodied relations (Figueroa & Waitt, 2008; see also Massey, 2005). The experience of these relations is lived and felt in everyday encounters; for example, along trails and paths, those lines crafted and perceived by visitors and inhabitants as they navigate within a landscape (Ingold, 2007). According to Turnbull (2007), such trails are inherently performative; they bring into existence cognitive connections, social interactions, and relationships, which are likewise marked by the trails and movements and actions along them. The river trails performed by travellers are thus important sites for observing, understanding, or “reading” the moral terrains.

Second, clarification is necessary about what is meant by values, a concept that assumes different meanings in a range of contexts (e.g., economic, environmental,

political, or moral). In general terms, values refer to the principles and standards that inform the ideas and beliefs of an individual or group (Matless, 2009). The notion of instrumental values in environmental discourses, for example, structures opinions about the utility of natural resources (Fox, 1990). However, values are also associated with behaviour and action, a point that is captured succinctly in Rand's fundamental definition: "that which one acts to gain and/or keep" (cited by Fennell, 2006, p. 57). Unless we adhere to strong versions of social construction whereby existence is solely conceived as the inscription of mental constructs (Demeritt, 2002), values remain tethered to the activities and practices of moving human bodies. Values are not simply in and of the mind but are inscribed upon and brought-into-being by bodies.

Kulchyski (2006) writes specifically about the embodiment of values in Nunavut, and it is aspects of his view that I want to borrow specifically. Deviating from traditional anthropological attention to culture as exotic other, or to cultural difference for its own sake, Kulchyski explains culture as "the expression and embodiment of values" (p. 158). It is through cultural practices, he argues, that values are circulated and become observable. Egalitarianism, trust, and community are values traced in the gestures of Inuit inhabitants of Pangnirtung and signal resistance to totalizing social forms. Maintaining Kulchyski's view that values are expressed in and through cultural practices, but slipping from his emancipatory objective, my empirical interest has been to document and share understanding of Thelon practices, and particularly those that are associated with a relational understanding of riverscape responsibility. Whereas Kulchyski relies on dialectical resistance to totalizing systems of value, my approach is to jar such systems with indeterminate, permeable, and adaptable alternatives.

Finally, because it may appear that taking into account values as expressed in and through cultural practices will reproduce the nature/culture binary jettisoned by relationality, I should explain where the environs fit into the equation. While Kulchyski (2006) provides little in the way of assistance here, we can appropriate from Haldrup (2004) the expression “spinning relations” (p. 444). For Haldrup, spinning relations reflect peoples’ engagement with various landscape features, objects, and subjects in the transformation of an environment into a home. “Nature,” like “culture,” is therefore not viewed as an object in the world, but as a set of relations created through practices or events of human action (Stevenson, 2006). Similarly, in the case of the Thelon, I want to suggest that the values expressed and embodied in the riverscape practices of canoeists and inhabitants are brought into being through spinning relations. In other words, values (again, as expressed through practices) are not derived strictly from within an individual or a society, but are performed in relation to the more-than-human world.

5.3.2 Mobilities

The second relational moment of departure echoes the efforts of scholars that employ mobilities as a lens through which to understand travel and tourism (Hall, 2005; Hannam, 2008, 2009). According to Büscher and Urry (2009), mobilities refer to the “broad project of establishing a ‘movement-driven’ social science in which movement, potential movement and blocked movement, as well as voluntary/temporary immobilities, practices of dwelling and ‘nomadic’ place-making are all conceptualized as constitutive of economic, social and political relations” (p. 100). The orientation or paradigm of mobilities positions movement as an essential aspect of life (Adey, 2010; Urry, 2007). Attention is paid to the fundamental role of mobility in the structure and function of the

material world (e.g., think of the movement of matter and energy within an organism, or the movements that constitute a high-rise building) and in the composition of societies (e.g., think of how images and information move through online social networks) (Urry, 2007). Thinking of travel and tourism in these terms situates the field within broader contexts and relations (Hannam, 2009).

Adey (2010) stressed the importance of understanding mobilities relationally. He explains that mobilities and immobilities exist only in relation to something or somebody. A canoe, for example, moves across a body of water. More specifically, Adey describes mobility as the *effect of relations*, an outcome or accomplishment that always involves some other kind of mobility. Thus, mobility is not independent or singular, but “is really about being mobile-with” (Adey, 2010, p. 18). In the case of canoeing, the pull of a paddle through water results in the canoe’s movement and transpires in relation to the musculoskeletal movements of the canoeist. With experience, the canoeist’s bodily movements grow accustomed to working in tandem with a paddling partner and with the river current to a desired effect. It has been argued that these kinds of interrelated modes of movement are closely associated with how people perceive and confer meaning to places and landscapes (Haldrup, 2004). In other words, practices of mobility are constitutive of space and identity (Adey, 2010; D’Andrea, 2006).

5.3.2.1 *Mobile ethnography*

The empirical material discussed in this chapter was derived mainly from the mobile ethnography of seven experiential Thelon River journeys. Supplementary qualitative “data” is pulled from photographic interviews and community workshops. According to Watts and Urry (2008), mobile ethnography “involves traveling *with* people

and things, participating in their continual shift through time, place, and relations with others” (p. 867). These authors suggest that, while movement between locations is central to other styles of ethnography, only in recent years has movement become the ethnographic “field site.” In other words, whereas conventional ethnography fleshes out important understandings of people and things at spatially located sites or points of passage, mobile ethnography involves the movement of the researcher with those people and things (Watts, 2008; Watts & Urry, 2008). The field site is, therefore, configured as the researcher *lives* the shifting relations, events, and encounters that construct a place on-the-move (Cresswell, 2006).

Mobile ethnography has gained recent traction because it “draws researchers into a multitude of mobile, material, embodied practices of making distinctions, relations and places” (Büscher & Urry, 2009, p. 105). One advantage of this approach, particularly in relation to community-based research contexts, is that it is fundamentally collaborative (Büscher & Urry, 2009). This was sensed and felt in the majority of experiential river journeys in which *travelling with* research participants meant *working with* them to accomplish mundane but necessary travelling tasks. Power relations were balanced out, for example, when a research associate/participant, Anautalik, instructed me on how to tie down materials on a *qamutiik*, or when dense summer heat and bugs crippled our enthusiasm as canoeists. The intimacy of “being on the trail” with others facilitated knowledge sharing partnerships characterized not by intensive, episodic, and fabricated one-off discussions (e.g., interviews), but rather by diverse, fluid, and organic relations between researcher and participants. These relations commenced prior to the experiential river journey (for example, through email communications with canoeists or visits to the

Baker Lake Co-op with Anautalik to buy spare spark plugs), and persist beyond the duration of the physical journey in the form of shared experiences, memories, and material objects (e.g., photographs). As Indigenous scholars explain, responsible research is about *always* being accountable to these kinds of relations (Wilson, 2008).

It is because of my entanglement in, and accountability to, these social-material relations that the methods employed in the mobile ethnographies reflect Kulchyski's (2006) "ethics of reading" as a substitute for participant observation. As Stevenson (2006) explains it, the conventional assumption in participant observation is that beliefs and truth-claims will make sense, or can be explained, under the cultural logic of the society being examined. This requires that the researcher bracket his/her presuppositions in order to observe and present the unbiased final word (Stevenson, 2006). In contrast, Kulchyski's critical and situated ethics of reading tethers contemporary social theory with community-based research practice to "give a sense" of cultural alternatives to the logics of totalization. It is about using research and writing to draw attention to cultural expressions of value that present positive possibilities for the communities we work with. As such, the suggestive and impressionistic narratives presented below illuminate three nature-culture values expressed in and through riverscape practices that, so I argue, are conducive to cultivating enhanced responsibility to, for, and within the Thelon. These thematic narratives are the product of iterative readings of experiential river journeys taken with Baker Lake residents and canoeists. Before describing these river-research experiences, some background information regarding the Thelon River journeys is presented.

5.5 Documenting and Representing River Trails

Table 5.1 describes the experiential river journeys completed during the course of this project. Four piloted research journeys occurred during a community familiarization visit in July 2008. While field notes and photographs taken during these journeys served as helpful resources for securing university ethics clearance (Appendix A) and a Nunavut Research License (Appendix B), these are not integrated as empirical sources for this article. Seven experiential river journeys were documented using mobile ethnography. Qualitative sources derived from these journeys include audio-recorded memos, field notes, and photographs. Anautalik also took photographs during the Halfway Hills and Lower Kazan River journeys, which she discussed in a follow-up interview. GPS data was recorded on a hand-held device in order to represent the journeys using digital mapping software, such as Google Earth. Transcribed memos, field notes, interviews, and photographs were entered into N'Vivo 8.0 qualitative analysis software, which was subsequently used for initial coding, for thematic and patterned grouping, and to look within and across sources for alternative explanations (Creswell, 1998; Jackson, 2001).

Six of the seven experiential river journeys departed from Baker Lake (see Figure 5.1) and included travel by snowmobile and *qamutiik*, motorboat, all-terrain vehicle (ATV), and foot. Travel distances ranged accordingly. The cost of each journey also ranged. No fees were attached to the solo-walking journey, and the price of gasoline was the only expense for the Prince River ATV trip. Expenses incurred in the four journeys guided by Anautalik included the cost of food and gasoline, as well as research assistance and guiding fees. The most expensive of these journeys was the motorboat trip, which came in at roughly \$500.00. Anautalik, in collaboration with her husband, determined

Table 5.1 Descriptive Details of the Experiential River Journeys

Research Type	Date(s)	Mode of Transportation	Locations	Distance (~ km)	Guide & Participants
Piloted Research Journeys	July 04 – 05, 2008	All-terrain vehicle	Anautalik's Cabin	24	<i>Anautalik</i> 1 Qablunaq
	July 09, 2008	All-terrain vehicle	Archeological sites	20	<i>Anautalik</i> 2 Qablunaat
	July 11, 2008	Motorboat	Lower Thelon River	80	2 Inuit hunters
	July 15, 2008	All-terrain vehicle	Prince River	33	N/A
Formal Research Journeys	May 08, 2010	Snowmobile	Halfway Hills	73	<i>Anautalik</i>
	May 16, 2010	Walking	Blueberry Hill	7	N/A
	July 10 – 20, 2010	Canoe	Middle Thelon River Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary	270	<i>Alex Hall</i> 8 clients
	July 24, 2010	Motorboat	Lower Kazan River	183	<i>Anautalik</i> <i>Anautalik's husband</i> 3 family members
	July 25, 2010	All-terrain vehicle	Prince River	33	3 Qablunaat
	July 27, 2010	All-terrain vehicle	Anautalik's Cabin	24	<i>Anautalik</i> 1 Qablunaat
	November 27, 2010	Snowmobile	Anautalik's Cabin	20	<i>Anautalik</i> 3 Inuit

travel routes based on their interpretation of the Thelon River project focus. It is important to recall here that as riverscape inhabitants, the travel practices of Anautalik and her husband are tethered to a social-ecological field of vision that differs from Qablunaat canoeists. Whereas Thelon canoeists tend to order their trajectories according

to summertime downstream currents, Inuit travel patterns are related to seasonally diverse factors, for example: ice and water levels of the Thelon and neighbouring waterways; the migration patterns of different caribou herds; and the camp locations of family and friends. As such, the Lower Kazan River journey was not considered to fall outside the scope of this project. Rather, the decision made by Anautalik and her husband to go to the Kazan provides an important illustration of how the Thelon is envisioned and performed by inhabitants as part of a broader network of human and non-human trails (Aporta, 2009).

Figure 5.1. Google Earth map showing the trails of experiential river journeys that departed from Baker Lake, Nunavut.

The 11-day, 270-kilometre canoe journey traversed the heart of the Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary (see Figure 5.2), and was outfitted and guided by Alex Hall's *Canoe Arctic Inc.*, a commercial operation based in Ft. Smith, NWT (Hall, 2003). Since its establishment in 1974 Canoe Arctic has provided affluent North American and European

tourists with wilderness canoe expedition experiences on remote Arctic rivers. It is currently the only guiding company licensed to travel the entire stretch of the Thelon. All trips are organized, advertised, and guided by Alex, which marks another reason his single-staffed business is an anomaly amongst expedition-based outfitters in the Canadian Arctic. Typical of Alex's trips, the July 2010 journey included nine clients¹⁶ who convened as a group in Ft. Smith a day or two prior to boarding a chartered aircraft to the "put-in." Our descent of the Thelon through the Sanctuary involved paddling approximately seven hours each day in tandem canoes, carrying all of our equipment and food, constructing new campsites each night, and taking meals prepared by Alex at 8:05 am, noon, and 7:00 pm (Dunkin & Grimwood, under review). According to Alex, however, our journey was atypical in a number of ways. The clientele was on average older and more capable than most others (see Table 5.2), and thick summer heat and moderate wind intensified the presence of the tundra's legendary mosquitoes and black flies. Moreover, while Alex has observed recent declines of caribou, wolf, muskoxen, and grizzly bear within the Wildlife Sanctuary (Hall, 2010), our encounters with these charismatic mammals were said to be particularly slight.

Clearly, these documented river journeys do not provide a comprehensive picture of travel patterns and behaviour within the Thelon. Arguably, however, the journeys are reflective of common routes taken both by canoeists and residents of Baker Lake. Moderate current with few portages, heritage attractions (e.g., Warden's Grove or the Hornby cabin), and possible encounters with wildlife draw the majority of independent and commercially guided canoeists to the river corridor that passes through the Sanctuary

¹⁶ I include myself in this category as I incurred the same guiding, outfitting, and charter airfare expenses as the research participants.

to Beverly Lake. It is also a route that, given the financial means, can be completed during a customary two-week annual holiday (Hodgins, 1988). For some Baker Lake residents, including Anautalik and her husband, river trails extend much longer distances than those documented, or include multiple days at remote cabins. Most inhabitants, however, participate regularly in day outings to hunt and/or fish at more proximate sites, practices that are conducive to engaging in a wage economy.

Figure 5.2. Google Earth screen shot showing the experiential river journey taken by canoe in July 2010.

Rich and organic as they were, the experiential river journeys should not be misconstrued as authentic Inuit or canoeist experiences/encounters within a landscape. As implied above, my presence alone affixed to the journeys the status of a moving field site (Watts, 2008). Although I explained to participants that the research should not disrupt the intentions or style of travel, their behaviours and actions were clearly tailored to my presence. This recognition came about full force a dozen kilometers into the first journey

to Halfway Hills when Anautalik stopped the snowmobile, turned to me on the *qamutiik*, and asked, “How do I know when you want to take pictures?” For Anautalik, the journey was not so much about hunting as it was about showing a researcher around. Her question marshaled further awareness that certain Inuit spaces—including the majority of those communicated in *Inuktitut*—would remain absent from my view.

Table 5.2 Descriptive details for the July 10 – 20, 2011 canoe trip participants

#	Gender	Age	Place of Residence	Related Travel Experience
1	Male	52	Toronto, ON	Intermediate canoeist Moderate white-water experience Backpacks and snowshoes regularly
2	Female	60	Vancouver, BC	Intermediate canoeist Previous canoe experience on Arctic rivers Certified flat-water canoe instructor
3	Female	61	Toronto, ON	Extensive white-water canoe experience Hikes and snowshoes regularly
4	Female	64	Vancouver, BC	Intermediate canoeist Previous canoe experience on Arctic rivers Hikes regularly
5	Female	69	Toronto, ON	Intermediate canoeist Moderate white-water experience Backpacks and snowshoes regularly
6	Male	71	Vancouver, BC	Intermediate canoeist Previous canoe experience on Arctic Rivers Hikes regularly
7	Female	73	Toronto, ON	Intermediate canoeist Previous canoe experience on Arctic Rivers Trip leading experience Hikes regularly
8	Female	75	Toronto, ON	Intermediate canoeist Hikes, skis, and snowshoes regularly

Source: Hall (2010)

In the case of travelling with canoeists, participant reactivity—that is, the extent to which the presence of an observer affects participant behaviours (Patton, 2002)—was

tempered as the 11-day journey progressed. For example, some participants were initially very keen to express their care for nature, but this seemed to fade after the first two days. Still, participants recognized the effect of my presence. A positive indication of this occurred on our final evening when two women expressed gratitude for having learned through their participation in the research.

The mobile ethnographies were constrained in other ways too. I note two examples in the following audio memos that, despite being described in relation to the canoe journey, extend also to the journeys with Inuit.

A big part of [the canoe journey] is hanging out in tents, and something I can't really get at is what people's experiences are like within their own personal tents. So that's a limitation because that is a significant place. Especially like when today we got into the campsite shortly after 3pm. Tents were up by four, and thereafter everyone sort of disappeared. (B. Grimwood audio memos, July 14, 2010)

Similarly, because I paddled everyday in the lead canoe with Alex, I could not effectively observe the experience of participants canoeing. Moreover, in terms of practicing mobile ethnography

Things become repetitive, and maybe it becomes harder to pick out the nuances of things. Or the nuances that you're trying to look for. And I don't know if there's an alternative to it or not...I need to make sure that I'm thinking through that. Or thinking about that and trying to stay focused or stay attuned to the certain things that are happening here...Anyways, yea, stay on track. But it is hard. I'm getting tired. And the bugs are certainly a drain. Paddling is a drain. The heat today was a drain. Always paying attention is a drain, while trying also to enjoy the trip, and take in the landscape I guess, or be part of the landscape. (B. Grimwood audio memos, July 14, 2010)

These reflections reveal that my readings, including those contained in the following narratives, are always from a partial perspective.

5.5 Riverscape Practices and Values

The remainder of this chapter is devoted to sketching out three nature-culture values expressed in and through the riverscape practices of canoeists and inhabitants. These values are referred to as *emplacement*, *wayfaring*, and *gathering*. To preface the discussion of each, I want to recapitulate some key propositions and note a few points about difference.

First, the propositions being made include:

- Riverscape practices are culturally diverse. This article attends specifically to those of Thelon River canoeists and residents of Baker Lake, Nunavut.
- Riverscape practices spin relations with social-ecological-cultural surroundings, thus they are not strictly cultural or natural.
- Riverscape practices express and embody values, thus values are not strictly cultural or natural, nor are they singular (i.e., different practices will enact values differently).
- Values may or may not be perceived by the individual or groups that express or embody them.
- Reading (interpreting) riverscape practices contributes to the understanding of values and moral terrains.
- I am interested in reading riverscape practices in order to locate resources (in this case, related to values) for cultivating enhanced responsibility to and for the riverscape. Some expressions of value are not conducive to this mission. If responsibility is an “infinition” whereby we can always become more responsible

(Levinas, 1998), than discourses of closure (e.g., totalizing/universal values) are unacceptable.

- Drawing on mobile ethnographies of experiential river trips, I suggest that emplacement, wayfaring, and gathering are nature-culture values expressed and embodied in and through riverscape practices. How these values are expressed and/or embodied vary between and within groups.

Picking up on the final bullet, it is important to recognize that heterogeneity exists across and within the two cultural groups used to structure this article and research. Both canoeists and inhabitants are enmeshed in complex and overlapping systems of value, knowledge, and beliefs. Thus, suggestions that Inuit culture is untethered to totalizing systems of value are just as misplaced as expectations that all southerner visitors to the Thelon are completely enveloped within totalizing projects (Kulchyski & Tester, 2007). Moreover, lines of social differentiation are constructed amongst canoeists and Inuit in relation to gender, age, and lived-experience along river trails. The extent to which I was able to perceive such social demarcations varied. Some lines of difference, such as those existing among inhabitants based on their ancestral homeland, were imperceptible given my negligible abilities with Inuktitut. Others, such as gender, were more apparent. In choosing to frame things in terms of tourists and inhabitants, I recognize that I risk concealing other social dimensions and histories, and/or re-inscribing relations of power that have functioned against the self-determination of Inuit.

5.5.1 Emplacement

While the Thelon might be envisioned or represented as a spatial abstraction, such as “wilderness” or “frontier,” where acts of human inhabitation are anachronized and/or

deemed out-of-place according to certain social and cultural norms (Cresswell, 2006), the riverscape practices of canoeists and Baker Lake residents reflect the value *in* and *of* emplacement. This nature-culture value refers to conditions of being in place, encountering place, or becoming emplaced. Here, place is not conceptualized as an authentic site of human experience (Relph, 1976; Tuan, 1977), nor as a political site of resistance against global capitalistic forces (Harvey, 1996). Rather than essential, bound, or impermeable, place is volatile and contingent (Massey, 1992); made and remade, for example, through various travel practices (Cloke & Perkins, 2005; Crang, 2004).

Following Massey's (2005) instructive insights, place is an event of "throwntogetherness" where distinct, multiple, and performative trajectories are encountered and negotiated in the "here-and-now." People, things, ideas, meanings, histories, and landscapes converge to enact places via strategically planned and/or spontaneous encounters (Bærenholdt & Granås, 2008). Within the Thelon, emplacement is expressed as practices of imagination/representation, practices of the body, and practices of return.

5.5.1.1 Practices of imagination/representation

Emplacement within the riverscape is not confined to what tourism researchers often define as the "site experience." Rather, emplacement is expressed in persistent practices of imagination and representation, which extend into everyday lives. In the case of the canoe journey, canoeists began to construct place in various ways throughout the preceding year. Information circulars distributed by the guide in the winter incited canoeists' imaginations with logistical details and route information, equipment lists, descriptions of natural history including flora and fauna, and a recommended reading list.

People organized their travel arrangements from the south; read up on the journals of early Euro-Canadian explorers and trappers in the area; participated in canoe instruction courses or seminars offered by local clubs and associations; and ensured they had the appropriate clothing and personal equipment, including extra batteries and memory cards for digital cameras. These preparations activated certain knowledges and skills that fueled canoeists' minds and bodies with anticipation. This continued to build when we convened at Alex's base in Fort Smith, NWT and bodies were outfitted with appropriately sized paddles and individual packs to carry our personal effects. While Alex packed the group equipment, first aid supplies, tents, and food, clients visited local sites of interest including the Fort Smith Museum, Pelican Rapids on the Slave River, and Wood Buffalo National Park. Imaginations of, and anticipation for, travel peaked as we boarded the chartered airplanes taking us to river. Latching her seat belt, one canoeist exclaimed, "Now I'm really excited!" (B. Grimwood field notes, July 10, 2010).

Pagnatit—or "getting ready"—in Baker Lake seemed more concentrated and immediate. Decisions to go out on the land are made only days, if not hours, before departure. Nevertheless, social and material relations mobilize anticipation for, and imaginations of, travel. Inside Anautalik's house, tea, store-bought snacks, dried meat, and toilet paper make their way into a utility bag before sweaters, parkas, and caribou skin pants and *kamiks*, pulled from hooks hanging in uninsulated vestibules, are donned to protect us from a crisp summer breeze or bitter winter wind. Transitioning outside, we ensure that vehicles and extra jerry cans are filled with fuel, and hunting rifles loaded. When travelling by snow machine, passengers follow on *qamutiiks*, sitting upon skins and accompanied by the extra fuel, supplies and materials for cabins on route, and the

day's equipment, all of which must be lashed down using a tarp, rope, and a series of slipknots. Boat travel involves taking fishing rods and additional safety equipment (personal flotation devices, insulated emergency cover-alls, and spare paddles) out of the storage shed located on the shore, and re-ordering these within the boat. The immediacy of preparation and anticipation for travel is a function of inhabiting the riverscape, and marks a distinction from temporally extended anticipation of canoeists. It is clear, however, that the pace of preparation is a derivative of practices rehearsed throughout the year, a commonality Inuit share with canoeists. For example, the caribou clothing used for winter and spring travel is prepared with the skins of the autumn harvest. As the skins of cows and calves transition for winter, they become malleable and durable materials to hand sew warm winter wear. Likewise, the hoods of store-bought or machine sewn parkas are lined with skins of wolf, wolverine, or fox harvested at certain times of the year. This outerwear is regularly stored in the vestibule to keep the skins from rotting.

Emplacement also extends into everyday lives through representational practices, or memory making. Some of these practices are textual, while others are inscribed corporeally and affectively. Many canoeists documented their journeys in personal journals, a text that, when returned to "at home," can evoke feelings associated with events encountered on route (Raffan & Barrett, 1989). Likewise, canoeists used photography to enframe certain aspects of their journeys and to document their participation within the riverscape. Cameras came out most often to zoom in on wildlife or their tracks, arrowheads revealed under rocks and sand by Alex, or the celebrated sites of "Lookout Point" or Hornby's legendary demise (see Figure 5.3). A fair presumption is that photographers' motives were tinged within consuming the spaces and sites (or sights)

that, in association with other representations of the Thelon, they constructed as meaningful and would use to report their adventures to their respective social groups, therefore weaving the river further into a touristic “circle of representation” (Jenkins, 2003).

Photography is also a common practice among inhabitants, as demonstrated both by Anautalik during the experiential river journeys and the contributions made by other inhabitants in the photographic interview project component (see Chapter 6). Like canoeists, photographs are one way that inhabitants document travel. For example, during an interview on July 28, 2010, Anautalik explained how one photograph she took draws out memories of social encounters and knowledge sharing:

Anautalik: Well I always need pictures. I like, when I’m with somebody, just thinking that you might need a picture with somebody that you went [on the land] with, or like you met them [there].

Bryan: What does that picture tell you now when you look at it?

Anautalik: That you were there. Like learning the way the Inuit lives. How to skin the caribou. How to cook it. How to prepare it...And like you’re here for the river... What you do at the river.

Figure 5.3. Archaeological finds, like arrowheads and other stone tools, were the focal point of many photographs taken by canoeists. Source: Author.

Aside from photographs, other material mementos were also collected. Canoeists gathered bald eagle feathers or interesting rocks from the shoreline, while inhabitants

returned with their hunting and fishing harvest. In addition, the bodies of canoeists carried temporary symbols of travel, including tired and/or strengthened backs and arms, and sun bronzed hands and faces. Most noticeable, perhaps, were the scores of residual scratches and sores around wrists, ankles, and necks caused by biting insects. Corporeal markings of travel were less pronounced among inhabitants.

5.5.1.2 Practices of the body

Embodied practice constitutes the second way that canoeists and inhabitants express the nature-culture value of emplacement. My understanding of “embodied practice” reflects what Parr (2010) describes as corporeal embodiment. It refers generally to all those sensuous acts of smelling, tasting, touching, hearing, and seeing that connect us with the world (Merleau-Ponty, 1962). Corresponding with current thinking in tourism geography, embodied practice is understood as integral to the construction space and place (Williams, 2009).

Travel within the Thelon riverscape involves a diversity of such embodied practices. The turbulence of riding a *qamutiik* or ATV reverberates in bones and muscles, the grip of hands easing with experience. Crisp summer swims cool the sting of tundra heat and bug bites, much like the chill that accompanies speeding in a motorboat across Baker Lake. Sips of sweetened tea linger with conversation. Within the expansiveness of the tundra, one’s depth perception grows accustomed to spotting subtle movements within landscape. The utility of these and other embodied practices is likewise diverse. They can create a range of pleasant and unpleasant sensations, both physical and affective. They enable social and material interactions in and of the world, some of which become habitual and some that support subsistence (e.g., locating prey). Safe navigation

is facilitated, as is an awareness of varying degrees of environmental change. Embodied practices also elicit memories, and mobilize knowledge and subsequent reflection.

However, thinking with Massey's (2005) conception of place, it is apparent that emplacement was expressed by canoeists and inhabitants as they used their bodies to sense both the "here and now" as well as "then and there." To be in place or to become emplaced was about feeling the present and sensing the past. For example, as one canoeist explained in a follow-up communication:

When out walking the tundra, or when paddling when no conversation was occurring, I felt very acutely the sense of "living in the moment", unencumbered by any past memories, and unconcerned with any future potential problems or situations. My mind was able to completely focus on a paddle stroke, or where exactly I should put my foot down (will I bother the lichen or a spiderweb, or crush a berry?). My mind was empty of all else and for me that constitutes a holiday...I was content, in a profound sense. (Canoe participant, August 08, 2010)

For this canoeist, repetitive movements of the body, like walking and paddling long distances, evacuated remote burdens from the mind and anchored attention to immediate interactions. His movements facilitate a positive sense of being-in-place, in the present. In contrast, he found conversing with others a cognitive distraction.

Sensing the past occurred through the investigation of various historical and/or archaeological sites. Each of Baker Lake's four "Trails into the Past" (Kabloona et al., No date) was visited during the course of the research, while our canoe group explored numerous encampments of Dene and Inuit ancestors, which were marked by the rocky remnants of tent rings, kayak stands, meat caches, and lithic chipping sites (locations where hunters and their families prepared stone or bone blades, projectile points, scrapers, and other small tools) (Friesen, 2004; Gordon, 1975). To be sure, these encounters with the past elicited cognitive acts of imagination and nostalgia, especially in

terms of what life was like on the land prior to settlement. However, understanding these sites of heritage and the meaning imparted upon them was also an embodied performance. For example, going beyond the consumptive gaze of touristic photography, canoeists would run their fingers along the sharp edges of stone blades or arrowheads, or use the length of their bodies as reference points to size-up impressive stone food caches or distinguish a fox trap from a gravesite. Kinesthetic appreciation was obtained when canoeists tried their own hands at knapping stones (see Figure 5.4). Such embodied practice has the effect of drawing past trajectories into the contemporary and experiential manifolds of place.

Figure 5.4. A canoeist knapped stones to get a “sense” of the historical tool-making practices used within the Thelon River valley. Source: Author.

Another way that heritage is lived and embodied was made clear in an event recalled by Anautalik. Figure 5.5 was taken more than a decade ago during one of Anautalik’s first visits to her family’s camp near Beverly Lake. Anautalik is pointing up with the stands of black spruce, smiling not for the sake of the camera, but because she was immersed in sensations of her family’s heritage.

I was really happy, so happy to see the trees. Smell the trees, the plants...It made me feel like at home where I came from with my parents. And when we burned the wood, I told my husband and my mother-in-law "come and smell the trees!"..."smell the smoke!"...Oh that was home! Like way back from where I came from...My goodness I was a little girl again...It was good to be back home. In this picture I'm old. In my heart I was young. (Anautalik, May 11, 2010)

Anautalik encountered her family heritage in the smells of spruce and campfire smoke. In a similar fashion, Inuit cultural heritage becomes embodied along river trails each time: a kidney from a freshly harvested caribou is tasted; a young hunter piles stones for his first cache; or a motorboat follows the deep water channel to the opposite shoreline as the driver's body responds to his identification and reading of an *inuksuit*.

Figure 5.5. Embodying family heritage near Beverly Lake. Source: Anautalik

5.5.1.3 Practices of return

Midway through the canoe journey I recorded the following observation:

Each canoe has designated packs that are colour coded with electrical tape...In the canoe Alex and I paddle, each pack and piece of gear has its place. E.g., the green wannigan [i.e., a wooden equipment box] faces the bow and sits in front of the middle thwart. Behind the mid thwart are three packs; one labeled "General Equipment", my personal gear pack, and the pack containing the satellite phone. This packing routine doesn't change, with exception of food packs becoming lighter. (B. Grimwood field notes, July 15, 2010)

Similar to this order of packing equipment, each canoeist established and rehearsed a personal system of emplacement within the canoe. Individual daypacks containing pocketknives, journals, sunscreen, bug repellent, rain gear, and extra layers were initially stowed under the seat or at the feet for easy access. As contents were removed for use throughout each day, they tended to be re-stored in pockets, on packs, or in the bottom of the canoe. Unworn life jackets and spare paddles rested behind each bow seat, while cameras were secured at the hip or in cases lying at foot. My camera case seconded as a coffee table for morning instant brews, and the thwarts and packs became effective clotheslines for my wet socks.

This placing of packs and personal objects within the canoe was not haphazard, but a reflection of the third set of practices expressing the value in and of emplacement. As derivatives of past events (of place), practices of return are accumulated sets of place-making knowledge and skill that add texture to emplacement. Thinking again with the aid of Massey (2005), although the enactment of place occurs in the here and now, histories are built upon “the succession of meetings, the accumulation of weavings and encounters” (p. 139). Every return to a location (i.e., performed by humans or non-humans) adds to these accumulating and affecting layers of intersection, weaving what Massey calls “a process of space-time” (p. 139). So even as returns “are always to a place that has moved on” (p. 139), the sites of here and now remain entangled with spatial histories. Inevitably, when we make our returns, these spatial histories inform our practices.

The positioning of objects in a canoe can, thus, be interpreted as routines fostered by prior related events. Indeed, it was because of the hours and days spent acclimatizing

to the canoe that these patterns were established. Likewise, the guiding routines that Alex maintained, which went well beyond how a canoe was loaded (e.g., the camp kitchen set up, campsite selection, menu plan, trip entry and egress points), reflects the knowledge he has accumulated from travelling within the riverscape for almost four decades.

Anautalik's generous but assertive instructions on how to properly lash materials onto a *qamutiik* are another case in point. She knows the system of lines and slipknots that most effectively secure equipment to the sled and can be efficiently released in bitter temperatures by mittened hands. Suggestions that these routines affirm Alex or Anautalik's river-place authority, or restrict an individual client's freedom-to-choose, may be accurate. However, the routines do offer the promise of safe travel, which travellers to remote areas value, as well as security, in terms of Alex and Anautalik maintaining their distinctive livelihoods. Routines thus function as "moorings" (Adey, 2010) that, in addition to efficiency, make safety, security, and livelihoods possible along Thelon river-trails.

Practices of return were also conveyed as a cultivated ecological awareness. Like routines, authority over ecological knowledge was assumed by, and an expectation of, the river guides. With direct riverscape experience far surpassing that of any of their river-trail companions, this authority was arguably warranted and certainly respected.

Canoeists would go to Alex, a university-trained biologist, to settle debates concerning animal track identification. Down river and in another season, Anautalik stopped her snowmobile to point out the fresh wolf tracks leading to the river, a path we crossed at over 30 kilometres per hour. Both Alex and Anautalik would observe and identify environmental changes, such as recent shoreline erosion or sections of open water on

typically frozen stretches of river. Daily and seasonal oscillations could be explained; the migratory movements of caribou and the suitability of bulls for spring harvests, or the twelve-hour window between 7:00 am and 7:00 pm when mosquitoes and black flies were least active. In both cases, such awareness facilitated safe travel. But its utility also differed—particularly in terms of direct implications for subsistence—and was more seasonally specific with Alex, a result, no doubt, of my having only travelled with him in the summer months.

Finally, it is likely that the most contextually and temporally sophisticated practices of return are those expressed in Inuit place names and stories. Along the corridor of the Thelon, for example, multiple place names transmit different meanings and histories. Near Anautalik's cabin, the river's outpouring into Baker Lake is called *kangijuaq*, a place of turbulent water moving in different directions. A few kilometres upriver is *Aniktalik*, a place that refers to muskoxen droppings. An Elder explained during a community research workshop that these "tracks" were first found at this location when he was a young man, indicating to him an eastward shift in muskoxen habitat. To be sure, the river journeys included several other encounters with Inuit place names and stories. While their relevance was noted, it was not my intention to understand the specific cultural knowledge and meanings that they transmit between generations. Significant ethnographic and oral history work, however, has contributed to these ends (Aporta, 2009; Pelly, 2005; Stewart et al., 2000; Stewart et al., 2004). A future area of research might engage with this literature to better flesh out place names and stories as practices of return.

5.5.2 *Wayfaring*

I just took a picture—it's day four sorry, day four campsite—just took a picture. I guess I'm downstream of our campsite. I guess this direction is going to be northwest. So I'm probably southeast of the campsite. Well, maybe directly east of the campsite at this point. East of the campsite. Anyways, it's looking back at the campsite. (B. Grimwood audio memo, July 13, 2010)

My fixation on documenting locations and directions during the experiential river journeys was, in many ways, a fixation on method. Technological applications, like audio recording voice memos, entering GPS waypoints, and layering topographical maps with penciled marks and notes, were used to sketch these journeys through space. These representations were informed by, and intended to satisfy, the calculative and economic mindsets of rationalist culture. “Method,” according to the French philosopher Michel Serres (2009), traces a path of efficiency from point of departure to final destination. “Running between both these situations,” Serres (2009, p. 261) explains, “the methodical line passes through the middle and is defined, and of course constrained, in terms of these extremes.” Such methodical lines characterize what Ingold (2007) defines as “transport;” a modality of travel linked to projects of colonial occupation whereby networks of connections between points of interest are established across a surface, and the “in-between” holds little meaning or value. These lines and networks of transport prolong perceptions of the Canadian North, for example, as a place to *pass through* rather than *inhabit* (Saul, 2008). They are detectable within various riverscape practices beyond those discussed directly in my research. For example, resource extraction projects near Baker Lake, which promise finite economic returns, temporary roads, and environmental restoration, depend on lines of transport to carry supplies and human resources to and from the mining site.

In this section, however, the storied lines of interest are those in-between the peripheral waypoints of method; mobile practices associated with an “exodus” that deviates from point-to-point routes and/or submits to the complexities and fluctuations of lived space (Serres, 2009). Specifically, I want to describe the moving practices of canoeists and inhabitants that express the riverscape value of *wayfaring*. Appropriating this travel metaphor from Ingold (2007) and Fox and McAvoy (1998) wayfaring occurs when motion and perception are coupled; that is, the paths and pace of travel are responsive to sensuous and corporeal encounters with features of the surrounding environment. As such, a wayfarer is a body in motion—“he is his movement” (Ingold, 2007, p. 75)—and perceptually monitors and materially engages with the countryside as it opens up along his or her path. The wayfarer *knows as he goes* (Ingold, 2000). Passengers, in contrast, do not move themselves, but are moved from place to place (Ingold, 2007), their movement detached from perception. If Ingold (2007) is correct in describing the lines of British sailors as transport across a surface, it is reasonable to equate “first” (e.g., first contact) with ownership and or prestige or knowledge. A wayfarer, in contrast, equates knowledge and ownership with experience.

Informed by these observations, but taking a slightly different angle, I argue that wayfaring is a second nature-culture value expressed in and through the practices of Thelon River canoeists and inhabitants and, therefore, constitutive of the riverscape’s moral terrain. Either consciously or unconsciously, canoeists and inhabitants perform as wayfarers. I explain by highlighting aspects paddling practices, motorized practices, and walking practices.

5.5.2.1 Paddling practices

Many circumstances designate canoeing as a practice of methodical lines, more so than a mode of wayfaring. Despite the fact bodily exertions are required to propel downriver, river trails are often constructed in relation to epochal methods of transport, such as airplanes and automobiles, which shuttle canoeists to and from the physical riverscape. Even on river, the tendency is to craft efficient lines from campsite to campsite.

Paddling and efficiency result in positive attitudes [amongst the canoeists]. People want to feel like they are moving...Movement—distance travelled over time—relates to positive feelings. Because it translates into being on time? An early arrival at a campsite? Accomplishment? Are these all distractions from attuning to the feel of being in a canoe? (B. Grimwood field notes, July 12, 2010)

Desires for efficiency, and the resultant affect, factor into the general tendency among canoe groups to avoid the series of lakes from Beverly to Schultz where exposure to winds can result in days without paddling. Even those with the leisure time to travel all the way to Baker Lake are likely to echo the Morse (1987) practice of racing across the lakes when the winds are mellow.

To think, then, of paddling as an expression of the nature-culture value of wayfaring requires a shift in focus to mundane practices. In other words, while the macro-trajectory of canoe travel flows with the downstream current, it is the commonplace micro-trajectories or fluctuations that express wayfaring. For instance, using paddles as extensions of their arms, canoeists work their bodies in tandem to position their canoe relative to the current or wind for a desired effect. When head winds pick up or river obstacles are presented, bodies shift into position for more calculated and concentrated strokes. We sit tall to survey ahead, or tuck our legs under the seat or

against the side of the canoe to brace and balance. At the Thelon Bluffs, where the river constricts and bends, we beached our canoes to scout the current's concentration along the river left shore. Standing waves, capable of swamping a canoe, were definite. Back upon the water, arms and paddles synchronized to angle canoes to the river right eddy and propel forward. Crossing into the eddy's upstream current, we shifted our weight to tilt the canoe slightly to the right and to apply a few quick "draw" and "pry" strokes to help turn and stabilize the vessel. Waves were avoided and we carried on down river.

5.5.2.2 Motorized practices

Following Ingold (2007), wayfaring does not exclude movements that employ mechanical means. Much like the practices of canoeing down rapids, inhabitants demonstrate a union of watercraft-body movement and environmental perception while driving motorboats. These are used during the summer months to access caribou crossings or encampments, which often involves driving against river currents and attaining powerful rapids. While safe routes up rapids are inscribed into local knowledge systems, their everyday navigation demands an ability to read the river for deep-water channels, obstacles, and slower moving micro-currents, and to maneuver the motorboat in response to river features encountered. At the helm, the pilot tends to stand to scout the river, scan the shoreline for guidance in the form of inuksuits, or watch the happenings of other vessels. It is a subtle but well-rehearsed skill of manipulating the steering wheel and/or applying the appropriate amount of throttle that enables effective and safe navigation (see Figure 5.6). As I observed in Chapter Two, precision, skill, and awareness characterize this river-place knowledge and mobility.

Figure 5.6. An Inuk hunter keeps a hand on the motorboat's throttle while attaining river rapids. Source: Author

Wayfaring was also expressed in other motorized practices. Figure 5.7 depicts an exodus that transpired during the ATV journey to the Prince River in July 2010. Two travel companions, both Qablunaat and botanists, were enthusiastic about the emerging tundra wildflowers and berries. Persuaded by their sense of exploration and plant identification skills, we steered the ATVs to a trail with high plant density and, upon arriving, dismounted in order to wander, snap photographs, and crouch for close inspection. Thus, in addition to fusing perception and motion, some forms of motorized transportation are conducive to experiencing the deviations and fluctuations encountered on trail.

Figure 5.7. An “exodus” to inspect tundra vegetation during an ATV journey. Source: Author.

5.5.2.3 Walking practices

Practices of walking also express wayfaring. Whilst the Thelon’s current determined the macro-trajectory of the canoe journey, canoeists engaged daily in purposeful and aimless wanderings on foot. For example, time and space enabled us to ramble the landscape unguided. Oriented by the river corridor and snaking eskers, and unfettered by the extended hours of Arctic summer daylight, we would walk the environs surrounding our campsite, individually or in small groups, and curious about some animal tracks sketched upon the beach or a glacial deposit standing incongruously upon a hill. Such micro-journeys, which typically occurred before breakfast or in the evenings as Alex prepared or tidied up dinner, helped to loosen backs and stretch legs, cramped by hours of paddling or a night’s slumber upon a sleeping pad. Alex also guided hikes during the day, retracing his discoveries from previous years to wolf and fox dens, waterfalls, points of elevation, or historic sites, like Dene chipping sites, former Inuit encampments, or the dilapidated cabins constructed by trappers and game wardens. The

apparent order of these guided walks did not deny our bodies the physicality or sensations enfolded in our walking. Cautious and steadied steps negotiated the patchiness of muskeg. Amplified winds were encountered when we crested a ridge, sweeping away the bugs and gifting moments to remove our bug hoods and breathe deeply. The fragrances of wildflowers were perceived, as I noted on this occasion:

Noticed the sweet smell of the tundra today on occasions walking from gravel/rock shore up hillside and onto tundra. Arctic lupin perhaps? (B. Grimwood field notes, July 15/2010)

Our walking bodies merged further with the landscape as they were contorted in relation to different features encountered, an observation communicated in Figure 5.8.

Figure 5.8. “Tourists sneaking up on muskox made a humorous sight”. Source: B. Cumming, male canoeist.

Walking is also an important practice in the river trails lived by Baker Lake Inuit, but more so in the summer than in the winter. With snow and ice, hunters are able to approach and retrieve their prey on snowmobile or with dog-team (which was more common in the past). From July through to September, however, when motorboats are used as the primary mode of travel, hunters often approach caribou on foot. Adapting traditional practices of hunting at caribou water crossings using *qajait* (kayaks) (Bennett & Rowley, 2004, pp. 63-67), Inuit scout migrating herds from, or along route to, land

camps, and move within rifle range on foot. A caribou harvested during the July 2010 motorboat journey was spotted east of a hunter's camp. Tracking the animal's movements, the hunter walked to a slightly elevated position with a good line of sight. A small group of us tramped through buggy muskeg to the kill site, and hauled meat and skins back to camp. Figure 5.9 shows some of weight that burdened the walk back.

Figure 5.9. A hunter and his son (background) carried the harvested caribou meat back to camp. Source: Author.

On our way back to town that day we encountered a small herd grazing a few hundred metres from the river right shore. After the motorboat was securely beached, we crept quietly towards the herd, over shoreline boulders, through the scratches of willow, and onto the uneven tundra. With a wave of his hand, the hunter motioned for me to keep my body low. While I was struck by the symphony of grunts echoing from the animals, the hunter noted the late evening light and that the bulls, which are the preferred harvest of *qaaratut* (northward migrating herd), were on the far side of the herd. A successful hunt would require a long roundtrip walk. Legs and bodies, tired from the day's journey, urged us back to the boat.

Lastly, it is important to note that wayfaring was also expressed through walking practices that I performed in order to immerse myself in the community and cultural contexts of research in Baker Lake. As my primary source of transportation in town, walking facilitated certain interactions with residents. Other walkers would ask me about my presence in town or would provide directions upon request. People driving by in cars/trucks or on ATV would gesture acknowledgment with a nod. Walking also encouraged an awareness of avenues across town that offered more or less shelter from the elements, and opportunities to easily deviate from my route to make new introductions or re-acquaint with representatives at community offices.

5.5.3 Gathering, or Crafting Community

Gathering names the third nature-culture value expressed in and through the riverscape practices of canoeists and inhabitants. Borrowing from Law (2004), gathering connotes a process of bundling, bringing together, picking, meeting, or flowing together. It is a metaphor that reflects a building up or an accumulation, much like a gathering storm or picking a bunch of flowers. It thus refers to relations that might not satisfy the logics of (in)coherence and (in)consistency (Law, 2004).

In this section, gathering is employed as an alternative to prevalent travel and outdoor recreation narratives that emphasize liberal projects of self-development. Fox and McAvoy (1998) observed that the personal resources and autonomy involved in outdoor recreation and cogent styles of travel are limited to certain social classes. Lozanski (2010) has implicated related independent pursuits in the structural inequalities that characterize colonialism. Shifting attention to the riverscape practices of canoeists and inhabitants, however, demonstrates that such narratives are not the exclusive desire

of travellers, nor are they comprehensive of the outdoor travel experience. Riverscape travel practices also comprise processes of social becoming, the coming together or *gathering* of certain social bonds. This is, so-to-speak, a crafting of community, where community stands not for the accumulation of autonomous individuals organized by shared patterns of consumption (Kulchyski, 2006), but for the “awakening of a communal subjectivity” that emerges “from practices and feelings—of appreciation, generosity, desire to *do* and *be* with others, connecting with strangers (no matter who), encountering and transforming oneself through that experience” (Gibson-Graham, 2003, pp. 68-69). Gathering is thus a relational endeavour that factors into the making of social-material spaces as well as intra and/or inter-cultural spaces. I illustrate the expression of this nature-culture value using three practices observed during the experiential river trips.

5.5.3.1 *Invitations*

Gathering is often first expressed through an *invitation*. To invite is to encourage someone to go somewhere or do something, often by making a friendly request.

Invitations related to the mobile ethnographies ranged in style and substance. Some were formal, like my invitations to research participants, which included explanations of project details and informed consent (Appendix C). Others were informal. Some were expressed verbally and others non-verbally. They were put forward by different actors with the intent of gathering others in a journey or activity.

It was a subtle invitation that facilitated a web of inter-generational and inter-cultural knowledge sharing during a snowmobile journey to Anautalik’s cabin. As Anautalik and I readied two snowmobiles and a *qamutiik*, two young neighbours emerged from their house to offer their assistance.

Anautalik quickly saw this as an opportunity to get youth on the land; or maybe she is just an inviting woman? In any case, Anautalik asked the youth to join us, and then invited one of their mothers to come along. (B. Grimwood field notes, November 27, 2010)

The mother and youth agreed. Short on the necessary warm layers, one of the youth was outfitted by Anautalik with parka, caribou skin pants, and *kamiks*. Once at the cabin, Anautalik showed us where a fox and wolverine had been gnawing through a wooden shed in attempt to get at her stored frozen meat. The animals' tracks identified them as the culprits. Anautalik proceeded to set a trap, demonstrating how to effectively rig the metal snare and camouflage it with a thin block of snow carved with a long bladed knife.

The point here is that the spontaneous invitation brought a group of us together to learn from Anautalik about fox, wolverine, snow, traps, food security...so you have environmental-cultural-social learning emerging from the spontaneous event of invitation. (B. Grimwood field notes, November 27, 2010)

Similar informal and spontaneous invitations occurred during the canoe journey.

The evening walks in pairs or small groups, described in the previous section, would come about by one canoeist asking others to tag along. Other invitations were non-verbal. Our calling to dinner each night, for example, was the sweet scent of freshly baked bannock drifting from the kitchen. Our senses invited us to gather for nourishment. On occasion, peoples' actions would function as the invitation.

Today's lunch spot was this gravel bed/boulder shoreline...And it was really hot with little wind...intense and no shade...I took off my rubber boots, bug jacket, and waded into the water...The swim was awesome and people shortly followed suit. Most people got in...so people were really refreshed by that...They were saying that this was the best lunch yet, partly because of the swim. (B. Grimwood audio memos, July 15, 2010)

Figure 5.10 shows one participant cherishing the fully clothed swim.

Figure 5.10. Canoeists found reprieve from the heat and bugs by swimming in the river.
Source: Author.

Clearly, as the above examples imply, the significance of an invitation is tied to how it is received. Meaning and substance is contained not only in the practice of invitation, but also in the response that it elicits. In the contexts of gathering, practices of invitation and reception are co-constitutive.

5.5.3.2 Constructing camp

Along their respective river trails, canoeists and inhabitants create encampments to fulfill basic survival needs. Food and drink are prepared and consumed, and shelters are erected to provide protection from the wind, cold, bugs, or darkness. However, as a form of place-making that draws people together, constructing camp is also a practice that expresses gathering.

In the case of our canoe journey, the daily re-establishment of camp at different locations resulted in consistent showings of teamwork and cooperation amongst our entire group. Upon arrival at camp, and no longer tethered to our tandem canoe pairings, people would share the weight of unloading each canoe of heavy packs and equipment, or carrying canoes up the shore to lash and secure to boulders or willows. As a group, we

explored the tundra for flat surfaces to erect our seven single- or two-person nylon tents, calling out to others to share a potentially suitable location that was passed up for one reason or another. Our personal abodes, never too far removed from each other, structured a temporary village and served as a basis from which other activities transpired. Following these tasks, people would bathe in the river or go for exploratory walks along the shoreline, along eskers, or onto the tundra. A network of paths linking kitchen and tents, and extending into the river and open terrain, would quickly become established and familiar. On the days with little wind, a mesh tent was assembled so that we could enjoy our meals in relative bug-free comfort (see Figure 5.11). The bug tent had the parallel effect of enclosing our group within a confined space, the comfort of which was reflected in the ease that informal conversation transpired. The significance of these kinds events was noted in the field:

These are all different kinds of events that go into enacting or creating a place, or allowing this place to emerge as one of [certain] meaning and as one of significance. (B. Grimwood audio memo, July 12, 2010)

Figure 5.11. Canoeists erected a mesh tent to escape biting insects. Source: Author.

In contrast to the ephemeral nature of the canoe camps, Inuit encampments have a greater degree of permanency, both in terms of their physical construction and as sites of experience. Wood cabins or durable canvas tents are established at sites that are used by extended families across generations and in multiple seasons for a matter of hours or days on end. Resonating with the practices of their ancestors, Inuit continue to situate these encampments close to good hunting or fishing areas. Camps thus function as nodes of activity and stability in relation to various intersecting human, non-human, and ancestral trails (Aporta, 2009). They are also the locus of social activity, hospitality, and rest. For example, during the motorboat journey, much the afternoon was spent at the camp of Anautalik's sister-in-law, sipping tea, snacking, relaxing, and casually conversing. Other travellers on the river that day, clearly identified the encampment as a place to convene:

Since we arrived here, three other motorboats came in and people stopped for tea. It was a very social atmosphere and people seemed to feel like they were welcome to come into camp and chat and share food and drink and stories. (B. Grimwood audio memo, July 27, 2010)

As explained in the next section, these practices of sharing also express gathering.

5.5.3.3 Sharing food

The mobile ethnographies of experiential river trips suggest that gathering is most clearly expressed through practices of sharing food (Collings, 2011). These practices include the preparation, consumption, and/or exchange of food between two or more individuals. As an expression of gathering, sharing food is much more than a material practice that provides physical nourishment. It is also about establishing or affirming social bonds, and creating spaces for cultural understanding.

During the canoe journey, the preparation of food was strictly Alex's undertaking. It represented a feature of his guiding service and a strategy for managing client nutrition

and well-being. Our three daily meals were served at exactly 8:05 am, noon, and 7:00 pm. These were single menu spreads, save for lunch where we had the choice of different cracker toppings and snacks. Thus, the preparation of food did little to draw canoeists together, save for the fact that it harmonized our diets during the journey.

Eating meals, however, was a consistent incentive to convene as a group. At breakfast, people would “check-in” after a night in the tents, often to compare strategies for dealing with the hordes of black flies, and discuss the day’s route ahead. Likewise, our evening meal provided an opportunity to reflect together on the day’s events and encounters, to continue learning from Alex about the histories of the Thelon, and to converse about broader contemporary issues.

Conversations at dinner tonight ranged from health issues related to environment, such as asthma and allergies, as well as learning disabilities...As a collective it seems, few conclusions or little consensus is achieved. Also at dinner, discussions focused on iconic individuals, like Farley Mowat and John Hornby, and the derelict canoes left on the hill across the river. (B. Grimwood field notes, July 17, 2010)

While meals were the most gregarious moments of each day, I also sensed that these were safe collective spaces for telling life stories and learning about our travel companions. For instance, as two female canoeists became more acquainted, they discovered that they held in common a close mutual friend. One participant’s best friend at university was another participant’s childhood neighbour in Ireland.

Comparable social dimensions accompanied the eating of food along the river trails of inhabitants. People congregated and conversed around hot tea, fresh and/or dried caribou meat, bannock, and store-bought snacks. On the journey to Halfway Hills, for example, lunch involved much more than eating:

Over lunch was a time for storytelling. Anautalik spoke about stories in between Schultz Lake and Baker Lake...[e.g.,] The story of an older man who adopted an eight-year old boy and followed Anautalik and her husband out to the land one summer. On the way back, that man died just across from Halfway Hills, and the eight-year old boy ended up walking back to town on his own. (B. Grimwood audio notes, May 08, 2010)

Anautalik also explained the meaning of two nearby *inuksuit*, and we explored the hillside for archaeological remains. Affixed to the experience of eating food were lessons in place-based cultural histories.

In contrast to canoeists, however, whose food sharing was structured by the guide's solitary preparations and recurrent meal times with non-autochthonous fare, inhabitants demonstrated more consistent and collective approaches to preparing, consuming, and exchanging food. Indeed, the gathering *of* and *for* food remains the principal intention of riverscape travel among inhabitants. These are also constant practices where Inuit identity and culture is played out. The vitality of food sharing networks, for example, was revealed during the motorboat journey when Anautalik's brother-in-law harvested a bull caribou. This was a time for adult hunters to instruct youth (and the visiting researcher) on skinning and butchering techniques, and on how to transport the harvest from the kill site back to camp. As a gesture of encouragement, the hunters presented both the youth and I with the first cuts of kidney, a delicacy among the harvesting traditions of Caribou Inuit. To taste, Anautalik latter mentioned, was to express our willingness to learn and our gratitude for the knowledge shared. Upon leaving the camp to return to Baker Lake, Anautalik and her husband loaded the full harvest into their motorboat; the food given to them by Anautalik's brother-in-law who was staying at camp another couple of days.

5.6 Conclusion

This article has drawn on the mobile ethnography of several experiential journeys with Thelon River inhabitants and canoeists to explicate the relational nature-culture values of emplacement, wayfaring, and gathering. These values are expressed in and through the culturally diverse riverscape practices of research participants. They are also positioned as fluid, ambiguous categories of becoming, connection, and participation, which, I argue, jars against ontologies of totalization and division.

Accordingly, this chapter is about much more than the juxtaposition of canoeist and inhabitant practices and values. While these empirical products contribute importantly to our understanding of the various human uses of and relationships to the Thelon River, and by extension to river systems and special places more generally, it is the reading and/or interpretation across the multiple Arctic mobilities of a moral terrain that affords greater significance for Arctic tourism and tourism researchers. First, for example, it locates Arctic tourism within broader spheres of human experience and social theory. Tourism is thus unmasked as an exotic enterprise of escape and re-positioned as an everyday performance of relations with other actors and mobile activities (Larsen, 2008). In effect, the Arctic is demystified as an authentic wilderness. Second, as situated and partial perspectives, these readings affirm the centrality of partnerships in the production of knowledge. It is through partnerships that innovative, reciprocal, and trusted knowledge is configured and realities of shared responsibility crafted. If tourism research is committed to understanding and improving tourism as a place-making or world-making agent (Crang, 2004; Hollinshead, 2007), then prioritizing the synergies and complementary aspects of different knowledge systems—in the case reported here those

of Arctic inhabitants, tourists, and researchers—is fundamentally important. Third, such readings engender new metaphors that, for the purposes of this chapter, avoid the oppositional hierarchies of nature/culture and related dichotomies (Haraway, 1991; Latour, 1993). These metaphors invite an ethics that relies less on essential identities and more on a spatiality of care, connection, and positive possibility that exists at the edge, or interface, of transformation. As I discuss further in Chapter Six, ethics therefore enables us to question present circumstances and to responsibly exercise our agency in the creation of better personal and social futures.

Clearly, more research is needed to flesh out the nature-culture values of emplacement, wayfaring, and gathering, and to identify/construct other relational value-based metaphors for Arctic travel and tourism. Expounding these metaphors will enrich our understanding of human travel experiences, such as those observed within the Thelon River watershed, and may also prove useful for mobilizing the participation and capacities of inhabitants and tourists in responding to rapid social-ecological-cultural change. This latter possibility would necessitate educational, outreach, management, and policy interventions informed by future applied research grounded in the kinds of value-based metaphors proposed here. My hope is that the invitations contained within this chapter will be received with such opportunities in mind.

CHAPTER SIX

“TRACKS AND TRACES”: ENACTMENTS OF RESPONSIBILITY WITHIN AN ARCTIC RIVERSCAPE¹⁷

6.1 Introduction

In their comprehensive critique of the tourism field, Franklin and Crang (2001) argued that both the object of nature and the desire for nature go uncontested all too often in the literature concerning nature-based tourism. In the decade subsequent to this observation, researchers have made significant corrective strides, demonstrating, for instance, that the “nature” of nature-based tourism is not simply an authentic and external backdrop for leisure but rather a product of moral, cultural, historical, political, and embodied relations (Brookes, 2001; Cloke & Perkins, 2005; Gray, 2003; Vespestad & Lindberg, 2010; Waite & Cook, 2007). This literature reflects the tourism field’s increasing engagement with diverse critical, theoretical, and philosophical perspectives, much needed advancements that were also called for by Franklin and Crang, among others (Ateljevic, Pritchard, & Morgan, 2007b; Fennell, 2006; Tribe, 2009).

The focus of this chapter is fueled by these conversations that think deeply about the meanings, values, and practices associated with touristic phenomena. Broadly speaking, my objective is to call attention to relational enactments of responsibility within the contexts of nature-based travel and tourism (Fennell, 2008a; Hall & Boyd, 2005). To do so, I engage community-based case study research of the Thelon River watershed located in Arctic Canada. While tourism within the Thelon is a relatively small

¹⁷ This chapter is based on a journal paper currently in preparation. Some of the chapter’s empirical material was used as the basis of a recent conference presentation: Grimwood, B. S. R., & Doubleday, N. C. (2011). *Tracks and traces: Natures, travel, and practices of responsibility within an Arctic Riverscape*. Paper presentation at the Association of American Geographers Conference, Seattle, WA.

economic player, visiting travellers, such as “wilderness” canoeists, continue to leave their mark upon, and leave marked by, the riverscape. Likewise, travel within the Thelon remains central to the cultural and sustainable livelihoods of local and regional inhabitants, the majority of whom are Aboriginal Peoples, including the Inuit residents of Baker Lake, Nunavut.

The central theme in this article—“tracks and traces”—emerged from participatory photographic interviews with Thelon River canoe travellers (henceforth “canoeists”) and Baker Lake residents (henceforth “inhabitants”). Tracks and traces refer to various material signs within the riverscape of previous human or wildlife presence; they are the markings of lives, events, or activities captured intentionally or unintentionally in the photographer’s viewfinder. The surfacing of tracks and traces marshaled interpretive attention to the meanings of material presences and absences in the lived-space experiences of canoeists and inhabitants. It was from this reading that the specific arguments of this paper were devised: to suggest, first, that the Thelon is made and remade in and through the travel practices of canoeists and inhabitants; and second, that certain practices of (re)making the Thelon function as expressions of responsibility to and for others connected to personal and social-cultural identity. Understanding these thematic similarities within different riverscape practices, I argue, draws us away from the “violences” associated with nature/culture and related dichotomies, and provides resources and positive possibilities for enacting cross-cultural, touristic, and responsible relations in and of place.

The chapter is organized into three parts. I begin by situating responsibility within the recent ethical and critical “turns” in tourism studies. In parallel, both literatures have

awakened the field to theoretical proficiency and engaging responsibility as a core concept. The second part reviews two points of theoretical departure—ontological multiplicity and an understanding of responsibility associated with the philosophy of Emmanuel Levinas. These relational orientations converge at the intersections of tourism ethics and critical tourism scholarship. In part three, attention shifts to the contexts of the Thelon and the case study research. Here I navigate from the manifest content of participant photographs to the latent meanings contained in various qualitative sources to illustrate the linkages between (re)making nature, responsibility and identity. These explanations are meant to be suggestive and purposeful, more so than exhaustive and definitive (Hollinshead, 2009). As such, the chapter concludes with a reflexive summary that pulls into discussion some implications and limitations associated with the particular manifestation of nature-responsibility-identity trident.

Before proceeding, it important to address two issues that readers are bound to perceive. First, I recognize that canoeist/inhabitant maps easily onto tourist/host or Western/Indigenous distinctions that have troubled scholars for some time (Alneng, 2002). To be sure, these somewhat arbitrary categories jar in certain ways with the relational framing employed herein, are associated with power differentials and various historical and contemporary injustices, and tend to conceal other modes of difference. For this paper, although I name canoeist and inhabitant for their utility as categories in research and writing, I do so cautiously and with the understanding that these groups are far from homogeneous, let alone innocent.

Second, that community-based participatory research is meant to be *for* and *with* communities, rather than *on* them, is well rehearsed (Battiste, 2008; L. Smith, 1999), so

readers might be suspicious of the intentions laid out thus far. Indeed, to what extent does this research benefit, or demonstrate my responsible engagement with, those communities involved in the project? This is a question I ask myself routinely. Aside from acting upon my responsibilities to and for the academic community, I am hopeful that this paper complies with Nakamura's (2010) contention that some benefits to participating communities are best distinguished down the road.

6.2 Responsibility, Tourism, and Research

The academic study of tourism has grown exponentially since the 1970s. Pernecky's (2010) observation of tourism academia as a "prolific space" is reflected quantitatively in the increasing number of tourism undergraduate and graduate programs, and the estimated 150 tourism-related academic journals in circulation (Pritchard, Morgan, & Ateljevic, 2011). Despite this growth, pundits have drawn attention to the deficiencies in the quality of tourism scholarship. With priorities driven significantly by tourism industry interests (e.g., applied business and managerialism), tourism researchers have argued that the field lacks mature engagement with the philosophical, theoretical, and paradigmatic debates oscillating within the social sciences and beyond (Fennell, 2006; Hollinshead, Ateljevic, & Ali, 2009; Meethan, 2003; Pritchard & Morgan, 2007; Tribe, 1997). For example, Franklin (2004) indicated that most tourism scholars rely on "flimsy" explanations built around familiar binaries that map everyday and touristic worlds as "here/there," "routine/escape," "ordinary/extraordinary," or "home/away". The result has been a propensity for confirmatory and reproductive research characterized by positivist authority, neoliberal ideologies and values, typologies, and dualistic classifications (Goeldner, 2005; Hollinshead, 2007; Pritchard & Morgan, 2007).

Recent developments in tourism ethics and critical tourism scholarship have been a source of atonement for this dearth in theoretical and philosophical diversity. Both turns have surfaced in parallel during the last two decades, but with orientations and applications that differ in many ways and often in separation. For instance, whereas critical tourism scholarship advocates for responsibility in how we practice tourism research and scholarship, the literature relating tourism and ethics has directed attention to substantive understandings and investigations of responsibility in touristic spaces, places, and environments. It is at the interface of these intellectual spheres that the contributions of this chapter are positioned. Specifically, I intend to illuminate as a point of intersection a relational sense of responsibility, a construct that is later fleshed out in the empirical material reported.

6.2.1 Tourism Ethics

Ethics commonly refers to the branch of philosophy that analyzes the basis and justification of right and wrong, good and bad, better or worse, should and should not, and other value-based distinctions that we make as part of living life (Proctor, 2001). Over the past two decades, ethics has become progressively more visible and relevant within the tourism industry and academic community (Fennell, 2006). Following Hall and Brown (2006), among others (Holden, 2003; Smith & Duffy, 2003), this growing interest can be attributed to at least four factors:

- global social, economic, and political processes that aim to distribute the costs and benefits of tourism more equitably among stakeholders (e.g., ethical consumerism, fair trade policies);

- growing awareness that those whose livelihoods depend on tourism are vulnerable to economic downturns, terrorism, and disease outbreaks;
- increasing ethical concern among travellers, which has apparent effects on travel motivations, destination choice, and purchasing behaviour;
- paradoxical recognition that tourism spoils the natural and cultural resources upon which it is based.

The concept of responsibility fits into these discussions because it “relates to our efforts to be as accountable and ethical as possible in our touristic behaviour” (Fennell, 2006, p. 108). Moreover, as Bramwell et al. (2008) indicate, encouraging a sense of moral responsibility among tourism-related actors affords possibilities for changed behaviours and sustainability.

Debate within the tourism ethics literature has circulated around the nature of responsible tourism. There is reason to consider responsible tourism as a *product* (e.g., on par with ecotourism) that is delivered to a socially, environmentally, and economically conscious market segment (Frey & George, 2010; Goodwin & Francis, 2003; Weeden, 2001). However, most authors concur with Husbands and Harrison (1996) that responsible tourism is best understood as a way of *doing* tourism planning, policy, and development. In such applied contexts, responsible tourism prioritizes equitable distribution of benefits among stakeholders, sustainable resource management, and local community control and planning (Blackstock, White, McCrum, Scott, & Hunter, 2008; Husbands & Harrison, 1996; Mowforth, Charlton, & Munt, 2008; Reid, 2003). The adoption of ethical policies and practices is viewed as a form of corporate social

responsibility that could gain operators a competitive advantage (Frey & George, 2010; Hudson & Miller, 2005).

The approach to responsible tourism taken up in this paper better reflects the renewed interest in the existential aspects of touristic behaviour (Kim & Jamal, 2007; Steiner & Reisinger, 2006). This literature marshals attention to the *meaning* of responsible tourism as a matter of being or becoming. Fennell (2008b), for example, argued that the concept of responsibility must be well grounded in such philosophical frameworks for it to contribute to the promises of alternative tourism. Drawing on aspects of Kierkegaard's philosophy, including the interrelated notions of self-knowledge and selfless acts of love for the other, Fennell illustrates how such an introspective consciousness can structure the move to responsible action on the part of individual tourists and communities of ethically oriented selves.

Ultimately, however, and as Fennell (2008b) implies, attempts to understand the meaning of responsibility will find value only if they are translated by tourism stakeholders into responsible tourism practices. In other words, ontological questions of being (i.e., meaning) must lead to ontologies of becoming (i.e., transformation). Recent research that positions the tourist at the centre of responsible tourism debates may prove to be fundamental to these aims (Puhakka, 2011; Stanford, 2008). Traditionally, the lack of attention to tourists is tied to the contentious perception that they are part of the problem rather than the solution; that tourists are on vacation and, therefore, not concerned with responsibility and/or ethics (Butcher, 2003; Stanford, 2008). Still, the consideration of tourists as a starting point for responsible tourism should not be

overlooked. If tourist identities were constructed in relation to responsibly, then this has the potential to trickle up through the industry (Fennell, 2008b).

6.2.2 *Critical Tourism Scholarship*

The so-called critical turn in tourism studies reflects the convergence of researchers committed to de-centering tourism inquiry through an engagement with various ontological, epistemological, and methodological perspectives (Ateljevic et al., 2007b; Pernecky, 2010). Whereas many orthodox tourism researchers working within a positivist paradigm *mark* differences by thinking in terms of “either/or” distinctions, critical tourism scholars embrace “both/and” thought so as to *make* a difference in the world (Ateljevic, Pritchard, & Morgan, 2007a; Botterill, 2007). This translates into an explicit recognition of multiple worldviews and a commitment to working with a plurality of positions to create positive change (Pritchard & Morgan, 2007). Accordingly, critical tourism scholarship is understood as a *way of being* that fosters social justice, equality, and anti-oppression (Ateljevic et al., 2007a).

Amid the array of ideas and practices comprising critical tourism scholarship, there are three general aspects that resonate most clearly in this article. The first is the awareness that no single intellectual convention or system of knowledge has a universal hold on the nature of reality (i.e., ontology) or our knowledge of that reality (i.e., epistemology). Ontology and epistemology are instead recognized as contested spaces characterized by multiple and situated perspectives (Pritchard & Morgan, 2007). Second, given these contextual underpinnings, critical tourism scholarship seeks to illuminate the voices of those who are, or historically have been, marginalized, oppressed, or unrecognized (Pritchard et al., 2011). These commitments include correcting the

tendencies in tourism research that reproduce hegemonic socio-political practices (e.g., colonialism, patriarchy, neoliberalism) (Ateljevic et al., 2007a). Third, critical tourism scholarship attempts to balance the power relations involved in research by engaging with people in processes of co-transformation and participative reality-making (Pernecky, 2010; Pritchard et al., 2011). It is, therefore, a values-led approach to research that strives for cooperative relations, co-created knowledge through action-oriented and participant-driven methodologies, and the creation of new and hopeful tourism worlds (Hollinshead et al., 2009; Pernecky, 2010; Pritchard et al., 2011).

Clearly, a pillar of stability in critical tourism scholarship is a critically reflexive sense of research responsibility. Researchers recognize that knowledge generation is a social process that authorizes and disciplines certain voices in certain ways and with real-world effects. The vision for researchers is, therefore, to invite others to engage in reciprocal knowledge-sharing partnerships, to always remain accountable to the knowledge relations produced, and to work with these relationships towards positive futures (see Chapter Four). This is not about assuming responsibility for others, but about researchers identifying themselves and others as agents of influence and capacity, and choosing to distribute the expertise, control, and ownership associated with knowledge accordingly. In this way, critical tourism scholarship advocates a vision for *doing* responsible tourism research.

6.2.3 Synergies and Possibilities

The convergence of critical tourism and tourism ethics literatures appears limited to a handful of contributions where relationships are left rather implicit (Feighery, 2011; Figueroa & Waitt, 2008; Smith & Duffy, 2003; Tribe, 2009). At first glance, the lack of

explicit interaction is surprising. After all, both conversations have surfaced in roughly the same time frame and as theoretically rich critiques of tourism inquiry norms.

However, there are conceptual incongruencies between these literatures that scholars likely perceive and that caution direct engagement by researchers. For example, whereas critical theory embraces multiple, interpretative, and emancipatory perspectives, ethics is conventionally viewed in terms of repressive social norms servicing neoliberal intentions and restricting individual freedoms (Smith, 2009). The penchant for universal imperatives in theoretical and applied ethics is likewise inconsistent with critical scholars' affinity for the contextual, heterogeneous, and multiple. Thus, critical tourism scholars might liken ethics to the hegemonic, imperialistic, and colonizing tendencies in much Western philosophical discourse (Smith, 1999).

Yet, in Smith's (2009) sharp critique of Butcher (2003), who insisted that in tourism's hedonistic lure we are absolved from morality, we are reminded that ethics can take on many forms. Drawing on the likes of Freud, Arendt, Bauman, and Levinas, Smith (2009) argues that

ethics are not just socially imposed norms, they are also ways of composing who we are...[Ethics] provides a basis for questioning the way things are, informs how we might relate to others, and is a mode of being in which we exercise our *individual* responsibilities in concert, though not necessarily agreement, with others. (p. 270-271)

So rather than a suite of strict rules, social norms, or infallible codes that constrain individual self-interest, ethics is integral to our subjectivity and exercised as we balance individual capacities and social relations. With this notion of individual responsibility as

its starting place, being ethical is not so much about following prescribed standards and rules as it is about perceiving ourselves as responsible agents and always seeking alternative possibilities that contribute to the betterment of ourselves and others (Smith, 2009).

This is precisely the kind of ethics as relational responsibility that is apparent in critical tourism scholarship, and which complements the three aspects of this literature discussed above. It is also a philosophically sophisticated notion of responsibility that, when enacted, is likely to contribute to the betterment of touristic practices. It is also locatable in an empirical sense. In the following section, two points of theoretical departure are explained that, when taken together, contribute to the intersections of tourism ethics and critical tourism scholarship. These relational moments are also used to orient the subsequently presented case study research.

6.3 Relational Ontology and Responsibility

The theoretical orientations of this article are affiliated with an interdisciplinary engagement with questions of ontology from a relational perspective (Braun, 2008; Escobar, 2010; McKenzie, Hart, Bai, & Jickling, 2009). Echoing the objectives of critical tourism scholarship, relational thinking abandons either/or traditions by envisioning relationships as the primary “unit” of reality (Bai, 2004; Haraway, 2008). It is a marked shift from dualistic to relational ontology; in other words, from a divisive, categorical, and deterministic version of reality to a perspective characterized by configuration, mobilization, hybridity, and impermanent relations (Hinchliffe, 2007). Much of this work has stemmed from the politicization of nature and the rejection of nature/society binaries that are said to fuel various social, cultural, and environmental injustices (Castree &

Braun, 2001; Haraway, 1991; Harvey, 1996; Latour, 1993, 2004; Plumwood, 2002).

Given the ontological fluidity of relational thinking, theoretical efforts have concentrated on the structure of political and ethical responsibilities and the possibilities that result.

Two interrelated points of theoretical departure orient the suggestive analyses of the empirical content presented below. The first, ontological multiplicity, engenders questions about world-making, and specifically about what kind of worldly (i.e., spatial) relations we want to enact. The second concerns responsibility, and here I introduce the philosophy of Emmanuel Levinas as a starting point.

6.3.1 Multiplicity

Multiplicity has become an appealing and familiar construct used by social scientists to represent an alternative to singularity. More often than not, it is used casually in the tourism literature; for example, as a way to describe the variation in tourism typologies (Cohen, 1979) or the plurality of tourist experiences, motivations, and environments (Uriely, 1997). In this paper, multiplicity is used as an ontological metaphor that depicts identities and entities as the product of relations and, therefore, implies the co-existence of realities at a single moment (Mol & Law, 2002). In effect, reality is constantly made and remade (Clark, Massey, & Sarre, 2008).

This understanding of multiplicity is pulled from its use in human geography and science, technology, and society literatures. If we think ontology in spatial terms, engaging Massey's (2005) relational approach provides an instructive starting point. Against conventional spatial imaginations of an abstract void relative to the locality and meaningfulness of place (Cresswell, 2004), Massey argues that space is the product of interrelations, as always under construction, and as "the sphere of the possibility of the

existence of multiplicity” (p. 9). For Massey, multiplicity equates to “contemporaneous plurality,” which implies the co-existence of heterogeneous “trajectories” or “stories.” In other words, multiplicity is the co-existence of historical, changing, and mobile identities/entities that are both constitutive of, and constituted by, space (Massey, 2005). Spaces of nature, for example, are thus neither independent of nor dependent on society. Rather, nature and society are enacted through a series of material, perceptual, discursive, and embodied relations (Hinchliffe, 2007; Latour, 1993).

The shift from perceiving reality (i.e., singularity) to enacting realities (i.e., multiplicity) is facilitated by foregrounding the practices through which identities/entities are manipulated or brought into being. As Mol (2002) explains, “since the object of manipulation [i.e., an identity or entity] tends to differ from one practice to another, reality multiplies” (p. 5). Singularity is achieved only by removing reality from the practices that sustain it. To borrow an example from Hinchliffe (2008), we can think of the different practices shaping an object of conservation (e.g., a rare bird species in Hinchliffe’s case). These might include various technological innovations, human observation or documentation strategies, management or land use plans, and particular species adaptations to local settings. Each of these practices can simultaneously enact the identity/entity in different ways. Hence, “they are different versions, different performances, different realities, that co-exist in the present” (Mol, 1999, p. 79).

However, as Mol (1999, 2002) reveals, multiplicity does not imply an infinite suite of options. Rather, by examining the variations of an identity/entity performed in practices, we can perceive complex interferences. In other words, practices may clash, but they will also overlap in many and unpredictable ways to collaborate and become

mutually dependent (Mol, 1999). Realities may follow, stand in, or include one another; meaning that what is “other” may also be “within.” “Alternative realities don’t simply co-exist side by side, but are also found inside one another” (Mol, 1999, p. 85). Hinchliffe (2007) interprets this to suggest that difference is not only about exclusion. It is also a site for adaptation, accommodation, and learning (Hinchliffe, 2007).

The crucial shift here is that multiplicity suspends the assumption that ontology is singular without resorting to pluralism (Carolan, 2004). This is something of a different order than the epistemological suggestions of perspectivalism and constructivism because the discovery of multiplicity—that “we are living in two or more neighboring worlds, worlds that overlap and coexist” (Mol & Law, 2002, p. 8)—is necessarily a commitment to politics (Mol, 1999). Multiplicity demands that we are always negotiating how the world might be done well, tolerating open-endedness, and living-in-tension (Mol, 1999; 2002). This is the nature of ontological politics; “never forgetting about these performances that go into reality...Never forgetting about the enacting of reality that agents do and have done to them, and how through performance ontology becomes multiple” (Carolan, 2004, p. 512).

6.3.2 Responsibility

The idea that reality is made and remade through practices presents some difficulties for ethics, which tends to anchor claims to fixed properties, or is concerned with establishing universal norms or codes. If indeed, reality is multiple, then it is also political, which provokes questions about how we can engage responsibly in the practices of (re)making realities (Carolan, 2004; Mol, 2002). What does it mean to be responsible in the context of multiplicity? What constitutes a responsible practice? How might we

envision ourselves as responsible world-making agents? If we accept that realities are (re)made, then we cannot escape our individual and collective involvement in producing reality. Yet, as Clark et al (2008) observe, this power to make the world is unequally distributed. It is also unequally engaged with.

We know from Massey (2005) that conventional “Russian-doll” geographies of ethics and care, where responsibility emanates from the local only after it is first secured for those nearest in, is inconsistent with the “increasingly geographically expansive interconnectedness” (p. 187) of global relations. Projecting responsibility across distance can also be problematical. Spivak (1994), for example, reminds us of the patronizing, dominative, and administrative hues that responsibility can assume when it is attached to development. When central bureaucracies have assumed responsibility for the livelihoods of others, questionable assumptions, prejudices, and cultural misunderstandings tend to occur. Such an approach characterized the wildlife management policies and strategies implemented in the Canadian Arctic in the 1950s and 1960s by the Federal Canadian Government. Many of these were designed to conserve stocks of caribou and muskoxen, but had the effect of displacing culturally significant subsistence activities of Inuit (Kulchyski & Tester, 2007).

For thinking through the responsible (re)making of reality, I use as a point of reference an understanding of individual responsibility *to* and *for* others associated with the philosophy of Emmanuel Levinas (1906 - 1995). Concerned by the injustices and violence attributable to ontological totalitarianism (e.g., Heidegger’s *Being*), Levinas’ project was to install an ethical metaphysics that precedes an existential base (Levinas, 1969, 1981). He thus conceived a first philosophy of ethics that avoided the pitfalls of

essentialism, foundationalism, and naturalism, and that departed from mainstream ethical inquiry (Perpich, 2008; Smith, 2001). Whereas the latter tends to understand ethics as moral codes and commands attached to autonomous agents (Campbell, 1999), Levinas articulated ethics as pre-given or transcendent of ontology; “the very node of the subjective is knotted in ethics understood as responsibility” (Levinas, 1985, p. 95). In other words, the very basis of incarnate being (human existence) is already an exercise of responsibility. In the contexts of uncertainty and becoming that come with multiplicity, Levinas provides several resources for engaging with ethics that avoids retreating to cultural relativism.

First, for instance, Levinas teaches us that we are always responsible and exceedingly so. As intimated above, responsibility is not an attribute of subjectivity, as if subjectivity existed before one entered an ethical relation (Levinas, 1985). Rather, responsibility is located in a metaphysical, pre-ontological space, such that “it is as responsible that one is incarnated” (Lingis, 1981, p. xix). Our *being* is, therefore, always in relation with responsibility. Accordingly, we can envision responsibility as an indispensable part of who we are as always and already ethically situated beings (Campbell, 1999). Moreover, as Levinas (1985) expressed, “responsibility is what is incumbent on me exclusively, and what, *humanly*, I cannot refuse” (p. 100, emphasis in original). These demands apply to past and present circumstances in which we find ourselves, and to the processes that go beyond the limits of foresight and intention (Lingis, 1981). In this sense, the bounds of responsibility to and for others have a measure of infinity. We can never relinquish or fulfill responsibility. We can approach, but never reach, this horizon.

Second, Levinas emphasizes the ethical importance of difference, or more specifically, the difference between Self and Other (Smith, 2001). Responsibility is said to be a response to the “face” of an Other. It is a relationship to the Other’s very alterity.

Positively, we will say that since the Other looks at me, I am responsible for him, without even having *taken* on responsibilities in his regard...Usually, one is responsible for what one does oneself. I say...that responsibility is initially a *for the Other*. (Levinas, 1985, p. 96, emphasis in original)

This responsibility to alterity is an ethical relation that refuses to subsume others into the same, that resists assimilating difference, possessing the Other, or accounting for the Other within our own particular desires, expectations, or even language (Smith & Duffy, 2003). To visualize this face-to-face acknowledgement of fundamental difference and separation, it is helpful to recall the grammatical shift that distinguishes Levinas’ thinking from Heidegger. Whereas Heidegger emphasized reciprocally *being with* another, Levinas located the ethical relation as an *in front of* or a *face-to-face* encounter (Shapiro, 1999).

Third, since the “face-to-face” ethical relation is characteristically intimate and personal, Levinas’ responsibility to and for others is most pertinent at the interactional scale of lived-experience (Bærenholdt & Granås, 2008; Harrison, 2007). As Smith and Duffy (2003) point out, “it is, then, an ethic for the individual tourist rather than a means of regulating the tourist industry or tourism development” (p. 113). Levinas’ difference ethics will be recognized, or enacted or expressed, not in the formulation of codes or allocation of rights and duties, but through the embodied actions of tourists and other travellers that reflect an awareness of and response to others on their own terms (Smith &

Duffy, 2003). It is this scale of lived-experience that I have concentrated empirical case study attention and turn to next.

6.4 Case Study Research of an Arctic Riverscape

The empirical material discussed in forthcoming sections is derived from a qualitative case study of the Thelon River watershed in Arctic Canada. The research was carried out for both intrinsic and instrumental reasons (Stake, 2000). In Yin's (2009) terms, the project constitutes an embedded single case study as it examines one principle unit of analysis in depth through the lenses of more than one subunit of analysis. Yin recommends this approach for fleshing out a case with extensive analytical opportunities and insights. This section begins with background information on the Thelon River, which is followed by descriptions of the primary subunits of analysis and the specific research methods employed.

6.4.1 The Thelon River: Wilderness, Homeland, and Change

With headwaters in the Northwest Territories (NWT), just east of the height land that separates the Hudson Bay and Mackenzie River watersheds, the Thelon River first flows north and out of the boreal biome before sweeping east across the tundra of the central Canadian Arctic and into Nunavut (Figure 6.1). The river stretches approximately 900 km across expansive tracts of road-less terrain, ideal habitat for migratory herds of caribou and other large mammals such as muskoxen, grizzly bear, wolf, and moose. Such "remoteness" and high degree of "naturalness" mark the Thelon as an emblematic wilderness destination (Hall and Boyd, 2005), a status that has not been lost among nature-based travellers and writers (Hall, 2003; Morse, 1987; Pelly, 1996, 1997).

Institutional recognition has certainly facilitated this perception. For example, in 1927 the

Canadian federal government demarcated the Thelon Game Sanctuary (now Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary) in order to conserve stocks of muskoxen and caribou (Sandlos, 2007). At its current size of 56,000 km², the Sanctuary represents one of the largest and earliest established protected areas in Canada (Lemelin & Johnston, 2009).

Figure 6.1 The Thelon River is one of many special places in the Territory of Nunavut. Source: Retrieved from <http://www.nunavutparks.ca>.

In addition to its construction as wilderness, the Thelon River is the homeland of distinct pre-historical and historical Aboriginal societies. Along the river's lower section, which flows through the interior barrenlands of the District of Kivalliq in Nunavut (west of Hudson Bay), archaeological records dating back roughly 8000 years suggest that human occupation has always been closely associated with caribou as the main source food, skins for clothing and tents, and bones and antlers for various tools (Gordon, 1975,

1996). The current inhabitants of this region are direct descendants of the historic Caribou Inuit, who moved inland from the Hudson Bay coast after the Chipewyan Dene abandoned the barrenlands late in the eighteenth century (Friesen, 2004). At the time, the Dene permanently relocated to forests in the south and west in order to engage more fully in the fur trade (Gordon, 1996). While the historical hunting practices, mobilities, and encampments of Dene and Inuit are different, the Thelon was a place of concentrated activity for both groups. At caribou water crossings, for example, hunters and their families would drive and/or wait for caribou to cluster and become vulnerable while swimming. These places are marked materially with stone tent rings, lithic scatters from manufacturing or repairing stone tools, inuksuit, meat caches, and kayak stands (Friesen, 2004; Gordon, 1975; Stewart, Friesen, Keith, & Henderson, 2000). Oral histories also reveal the practices inscribed at these sites. For example, Silas Putumiraqtuq, an Inuit Elder from Baker Lake, recalled “as the caribou would swim away we’d chase them, keeping the front of the qayaq [kayak] right close to the caribou, and then spear it” (Mannick, 1998, p. 15). In the present day, the Dene First Nations of Lutsel K’e, NWT, located on the east arm of Great Slave Lake, and Inuit of Baker Lake, Nunavut, located at the eastern terminus of the Thelon, continue to travel within the riverscape to hunt and fish. Although much of the Thelon is too distant to access regularly, contemporary customs, knowledge, and cultural memory remain firmly connected to the river (Pelly, 1996; Raffan, 1992).

Concurrent with its status as a special place (i.e., wilderness and homeland), the Thelon is also a riverscape characterized by rapid change. Global scale processes related to a warming climate have been documented within the river valley, both from the

perspectives of natural science (Norment, Hall, & Hendricks, 1999) and local indigenous knowledge (Fox, 2002; Mannick, 1998). During the course of *Picturing the Thelon*, observations of environmental change reported by Inuit included: consistently lower water levels in the Kazan and Thelon rivers, particularly in the fall season; odd snow and ice patterns, such as later freeze and thaw cycles of nearby lakes; changing migration patterns of caribou; new bird species to the area; and increasing local presence of grizzly bears. Moreover, the resource extraction industry, which for decades has shown consistent interest in the uranium, diamond, and gold deposits within the riverscape, has advanced its agenda significantly in recent years, especially around Baker Lake. The Meadowbank gold mine, located 70 km north of Baker Lake, began production in early 2010, while a proposed uranium mine 80 km to the west of the hamlet and just south of the Thelon is now undergoing an environmental assessment. If the latter operation proceeds, a road from Baker Lake to the mine site will be constructed alongside the lower sections of the Thelon, with the possibility of a bridge having to be built to cross the river. As inhabitants continue to adapt social and cultural practices to life in settlements, a process that has been in effect only since the middle of the twentieth century, the controversies associated with industrialization are certain to remain centre stage in the community.

6.4.2 Thelon Canoeists and Inhabitants

The case study is composed of two primary subunits of analysis: Thelon river canoe travellers and residents of Baker Lake, Nunavut. These two groups were selected for three interrelated reasons. First, together they offered a range of different riverscape practices that could be investigated empirically and reflected upon critically. Second, it

was presumed that the majority of canoeists and inhabitants identify the Thelon as a special place, and that this would translate into diverse expressions of care, concern, and responsibility to and for the river. Third, these contexts of multiplicity seemed ripe for exploring the possibilities and challenges associated with enacting responsibility and/or a relational ethics.

Since 1962, when the first recreational canoe trip ventured down the Thelon River (Morse, 1987), hundreds of independent and commercially guided canoeists have travelled portions of the river on multiple-day expeditions (Pelly, 1997). Arguably, like other nature-based tourists, these canoeists are motivated to encounter sublime and remote landscapes and to (re)construct identities through an experience of difference (Kane & Tucker, 2004; Mehmetoglu, 2007). Many also desire entry into Thelon narratives of Euro-Canadian exploration, which include epic journeys into unmapped territory by the likes of David Hanbury and J.W. Tyrell at the turn of the twentieth century, and the fateful starvation of John Hornby and companions in 1927 (Mackinnon, 1983).

The majority of the canoeists included within this study were clients of *Canoe Arctic, Inc.*, a commercial guiding company in operation since the mid-1970s that caters primarily to an affluent North American market (Hall, 2003). The company averages two or three Thelon trips per year each 11-days long, upwards of 270 km in length, and either on the upper or middle sections of the river. These are fully outfitted and guided excursions that require charter float planes for access and egress. Demands placed upon the canoeists include paying the associated guiding and charter fees, organizing personal clothing and effects, paddling fully load tandem canoes for approximately seven hours

per day, and setting up and sleeping in single or two person tents each night. Canoeists were invited to participate in collaboration with *Canoe Arctic*'s owner who, after reviewing the research objectives and methodology, distributed via email a project information letter to former and current clients. Those canoeists that expressed interest in contributing to the study were then formally invited to participate, which entailed obtaining written informed consent and permissions to reproduce the project materials contributed by participants (e.g., photographs) (see Appendix D).

Baker Lake, or *Qamani'tuaq* ("where the river widens") as it is called in Inuktitut, is an Inuit settlement of approximately 2000 people located at the eastern terminus of the Thelon River. Following a familiar pattern of Canadian "frontier development," the Hudson's Bay Company established a trading post on Baker Lake in 1916, with traders, RCMP, and missionaries close behind. In 1926 the post was relocated to the hamlet's current site on the northwestern shore of Baker Lake. At the time, several Inuit cultural groups occupied the areas around Baker Lake. While Inuit camps moved several times per year within a territory of 100-150 km in diameter, they tended to be concentrated near or along major rivers such as the Kazan, Dubwant, Back, and Thelon (Friesen, 2004). The present Inuit population in Baker Lake (roughly 90 percent) is drawn from these cultural groups, the majority of whom settled in town by the mid-1960s.

The inhabitants that participated in the case study research are all residents of Baker Lake who, at some point in their lifetimes, have had direct experience living and/or travelling within the Thelon. Initial community familiarization (July 2008) and consultation visits (October 2009) provided opportunities to discuss project objectives with community members and representatives to ensure local research protocols and

priorities were met and to identify potential participants and local collaborators or research assistants. Three research visits between 10 and 20 days in duration occurred in 2010 (May, July, November). Participants involved in the project included men and women, Elders and young adults, and bilingual and Inuktitut-only speakers. Only two participants were non-Inuk.

Arguably, for the purposes of this paper, a third lens may be considered the discourse of leave no trace¹⁸. Mobilized through a range of environmental, public, commercial, non-governmental, and academic institutions (Simon & Alagona, 2009), leave no trace structures the meanings, values, and styles associated with Thelon travel in particular ways. The discourse of leave no trace includes the seven fundamental principles for outdoor ethics advance by Leave No Trace (Appendix E), which are effectively summarized in the idiom “take only photographs, leave only footprints.” I work with leave no trace critically here because of its pervasiveness as an educational tool and code of ethics for nature-based recreation and tourism (Mullins & Maher, 2007; Ryan, 2002), and because of my professional and personal experience employing it as a tool for learning and teaching.

6.4.3 Research Methods

The study, which began in January 2009, is oriented by community-based and participatory research and includes three research modules involving research participants. Details of these project components are summarized in Table 6.1. The first module, photographic interviews, was structured as a form of photo-elicitation (Beilin, 2005; Harper, 2002; Loeffler, 2004). Research participants were invited to select up to 12

¹⁸ Throughout the dissertation, I use upper case letters when referring to Leave No Trace as the not-for-profit organization. Lower case letters are used when referring to the broader discourse of no trace or minimum impact camping and travel.

Thelon images from their personal photograph collections that reflected to them themes related to responsibility and nature-based experience (Appendix F and Appendix G). These photographs were subsequently shared with me and used to direct face-to-face conversational interviews concerning the participant's knowledge, stories, meanings, and experiences in and of the Thelon. With participants' informed consent, photographs were copied and saved and interviews audio recorded and later transcribed. Supplementary information was collected from canoeists via qualitative email questionnaires and volunteer-employed photography (Garrod, 2007), the latter of which remains ongoing (Appendix H and Appendix I). The second module involved my participation as a researcher in experiential journeys with Inuit and Qablunaat. This module included seven journeys by various modes of transportation over a range distances, and lasting from half a day to ten days in length. These journeys were documented using ethnographic methods including participant observation, photography, and GPS tracking (Chapter Five). The third research module entails community-based research workshops that emphasize knowledge translation and sharing, and collective learning. More than a focus group, the participants at these workshops are invited to engage with the photographs and information derived from other research modules, and to share in group settings their own knowledge, experiences, and meanings of the Thelon. As such, the workshops function simultaneously as a strategy for reporting results and for community interpretation of research, which weaves additional layers of riverscape knowledge while balancing out the expertise and power relations in doing research. At the time of writing, additional workshops are being planned in Baker Lake and with southern Canadian canoe groups.

Table 6.1 An overview of research modules involving participants

Module	Group/Type	Details
Photographic Interviews (including supplementary approaches)	People of Baker Lake	10 participants 147 photographs contributed
	Canoe tourists	28 individual participants, one family 345 photographs contributed
Experiential River Trips	Snow machine	a) Baker Lake to Halfway Hills 1 day, 73 kms b) Baker Lake to cabin at Kangirjuaq ½ day, 20 kms
	Honda (ATV)	a) Baker Lake to Prince River ½ day, 33 kms b) Baker Lake to cabin at Kangirjuaq ½ day, 24 kms
	Motorboat	Baker Lake to Kazan River 1 day, 182 kms
	Canoe	Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary 10 days, 240 kms
Community Workshops	Ontario outdoor educators	19 participants One 1.5 hour workshop
	Arctic College in Baker Lake	a) NTEP Students 9 participants, One 1.5 hour workshop b) Pre-Apprenticeship Students 5 participants, One 1.5 hour workshop
	Baker Lake Elders	10 participants One 2.5 hour workshop
	Baker Lake Residents	4 participants Two 2-hour workshops

The next section explains tracks and traces as a descriptive theme emerging from research photographs contributed by participants, and then shifts into the interpretive explanation of the nature-responsibility-identity trident. Before proceeding, however, I should acknowledge that certain power relations have permeated and shaped the research process to date, including the representations made in the impending analysis. More often

than not, research functioning within Eurocentric and colonial narratives has displaced Indigenous Peoples from their lands, cultures, and identities (Smith, 1999). Indeed, various circumstances in northern Canada suggest that there has been no lack of such violence (Bone, 2009; Kulchyski & Tester, 2007; Stern & Stevenson, 2006). While I attempt to position and reflect upon my research as a process of working *with* rather than *on* Inuit, canoeist, and other communities, I recognize that I inevitably make decisions (e.g., in my writing) which enact certain privileges and represent people and places in particular ways. Engaging with communities as a co-learner in a research process characterized by trust, transparency, reciprocity, and collaboration is an ongoing challenge that requires consistent critical reflection. Moments of research success are related to the contributions of community partners and research associates and, I would argue, my commitments to multiple community visits and interactions during the course of the project.

6.5 Tracks and Traces

As indicated in table 6.1, a total of 38 photographic interviews were completed with 492 photographs contributed. Of these, 19 interviews (nine with canoeists, ten with inhabitants) and 264 photographs were derived from the photo elicitation process noted above. With the assistance of N'Vivo 8 qualitative analysis software, the content of these photographs was analyzed using manifest content analysis to derive initial descriptive understanding of canoeist and inhabitant experience (Berg, 1998; Rose, 2007). Manifest codes were devised inductively with several sensitizing concepts serving as initial guideposts (Patton, 2002). Once all photographs were exhaustively analyzed and the codes refined to reduce overlap, a second coder was invited to analyze every sixth

photograph. A positive inter-coder correspondence rate of 82.7% was achieved. The complete list of codes is presented in Appendix J.

The theme “tracks and traces” emerged from this photograph analysis. These photographs depict material signs within the landscape of previous human and/or wildlife presence—a material presence of an absence so to speak. Tracks and traces are thus the markings of living realities, events, activities, or trajectories of the past, boundary objects that allow us to *read* something about the river-realities that have come before. They are inscriptions of landscape histories or memories made present in the photographer’s field of vision, and include snowmobile tracks, a trapper’s cabin, stone arrowheads, the shed antlers of a caribou, grizzly paw prints upon an esker, or the wake of a canoe. Clearly, the temporal scale of these tracks and traces range from minutes to decades to centuries, which suggests that humans and wildlife constantly *write* the Thelon. Appropriating from Massey (2005), tracks and traces reveal that the Thelon is a “contemporaneous plurality” (p. 9) of space.

Table 6.2 shows the frequencies of the different codes that make up the human and wildlife tracks and traces themes. I include these here for illustrative purposes and to give context to the progression into interpretive arguments. “Structures that signal,” for example, consist of human made structures that mark a feature, activity, or moment within the landscape. Examples include inuksuit, a cairn, wooden crosses that mark a grave, or stone tent rings of former Inuit encampments. These are contrasted by images coded as “human settlement,” which include structures erected in a fixed location for long-term occupation or shelter. Hunting cabins or buildings fit within this code. Photographs coded as “tracks” include foot prints or paths created on land or water by

humans (including those created by vehicles) or wildlife, including grizzly bear, wolf, caribou, or geese. Another example, “remains,” refers to antlers, eagle feathers, or skulls that linger upon the land.

Table 6.2 Frequencies of human and wildlife traces

	Code/Trace Type	Number of photos containing code	Number of times code assigned
Human Traces	Discarded fuel barrels	10	11
	Human settlement	16	16
	Litter	1	1
	Structures that signal	17	17
	Tools and chipping sites	6	6
	Tracks	30	34
Wildlife Traces	Disturbance	1	1
	Remains	8	10
	Tracks	9	9

In themselves, the frequencies of tracks and traces contribute limited insight into the experiences of Thelon River canoeists and inhabitants, or their practices of responsibility. However, corresponding with the counsel of Rose (2007), this type of analysis was valuable for locating general tendencies to explore in more depth. For the purposes of this paper, it was the surfacing of tracks and traces in the photograph analysis that marshaled interpretive attention to the role of material presences and absences in the lived-space experiences of research participants. Discussion turns to these suggestive and analytical derivatives for the remainder of the paper.

6.6 Making Traces Present and Absent

In addition to the manifest content analysis, which examined the surface structures presented in photographs, latent content analysis was used to interpret various qualitative sources for underlying meanings and symbolism (Berg, 1998). Taking the tracks and traces theme as a point of reference, the transcripts from interviews, email questionnaires, and workshops, partnered with participants' photographs and ethnographic observations from the experiential river trips, were reviewed and analyzed for latent meanings. Knowing the traction of LNT as a backcountry wilderness ethic (Simon & Alagona, 2009), I was specifically interested to explore and tease out relationships between the notion of tracks and traces and research participant expressions of responsibility. Maintaining a commitment to articulating positive possibilities of connection and relation, I illustrate below that the making present and making absent of certain tracks and traces function as expressions of responsibility to and for others connected to personal and/or cultural identity. This explanation is packaged into two parts, with each part explained using two descriptive examples.

6.6.1 Making Traces Absent: Leave No Trace

When asked to identify the meaning of “responsibility”, Thelon River canoeists routinely described ideas and practices that resonate with leave no trace. For example:

- Responsibility includes “all the practices followed by the guide to minimize the human impact to the Thelon” (B. Bailey, male canoeist);
- “Responsible tourism [means] respecting the native animals...canoeing leaves no trace. Camping without leaving a trace” (anonymous female canoeist);
- Responsibility means, “to leave it unchanged, unaltered without garbage” (J. Langdon, female canoeist, March 28, 2010);
- “This land has not been much affected by humanity due to its isolation—and best to leave it that way” (anonymous female canoeist).

Ensnared within these statements is the understanding that: a) the Thelon exists as a pristine space unscathed by human activity, and b) visible human impacts, especially those of present-day canoeists, are unacceptable. Several scholars have criticized such lines of reasoning. They insist that, although environmental impacts related to travel may be minimized, the underlying premise is that humans are an alien species within nature spaces (Mullins & Maher, 2007; Ryan, 2002; Simon & Alagona, 2009). Likewise, learning from Cronon (1995), it is arguable that the canoeists' concern and commitments for the Thelon and other wildernesses obscure the need to practice environmental responsibility in everyday spaces of their home communities. In effect, the discourse of leave no trace reinforces the human-nature dichotomy that many believe constructs nature as "out-there" and is the root cause of contemporary environmental calamity (Haluza-Delay, 2001).

Yet in their consumption of the Thelon as a touristic wilderness, some canoeists recognized that the place is not original, independent, or severed from society. According to one canoeist, "obviously, for a long time, there have been human beings that have been in that area and they obviously have left more lasting legacies of their time there" (A. Cumming, male canoeist, March 01, 2010). This was a clear acknowledgement of the Thelon's Aboriginal inhabitants. The statement is augmented by the words of another canoeist whose background in ecology became apparent: "I wanted to go see the Thelon, but I don't have really grave concerns environmentally on it. It's going to change. Everything changes. Sometimes life systems will adapt and sometimes they'll be displaced" (J. Fischer, male canoeist, February 28, 2010).

Still, the individual and group perception that the experience is an authentic discovery remains a crucial motivating factor and determinant of tourist satisfaction. The following two quotes expose how two canoeists desire such practices of discovery in order to compose their ecological selves.

I felt even then, at the very beginning, a responsibility to take back from this trip as much of an appreciation for the uniqueness of the Thelon as I could, to give myself to the experience rather than trying to make it into something. (B. Fleming, male canoeist)

Responsibility, to me, means coming to a place with curiosity, humility, and openness. To gain knowledge from the experience. I try not to pre-judge and to allow each day to evolve in its own way. (C. Ritchie, female canoeist)

Perhaps then it is more accurate to perceive that, by hiding any lasting material traces, canoeists are not simply attempting to leave the landscape unmarked, but are *re-making* the Thelon so as to secure authentic discovery opportunities for the next fleet of river travellers. This set of relations was expressed clearly by one participant who amended his practice of bringing animal remains found on the land back to the campsite. He explained that the guide

pointed out another caribou skull that clearly he knew was there from last time. I realized, okay, that you could start to get a whole series of camps with these animal bits and it becomes quite a different experience for people...it becomes clear that this is a route that other people have traveled, that have maybe unearthed some of the things you could have the excitement of finding. That instead of it being an unmarked landscape, this one that has clear signs of man [*sic*]. [So there is value] in leaving it without, and leave it for people to discover or not discover. (J. Stuart, male canoeist, March 15, 2010)

6.6.2 Making Traces Absent: Following a Harvest

Inuit knowledge, or *Inuit Qaujimajatuqanginnut* (IQ), has been described as “the Inuit way of doing things: the past, present and future knowledge, experience and values of Inuit society” (Inuit Qaujimajatuqanginnut Task Force, 2002, p. 4). According to

Tester and Irniq (2008), IQ represents a seamless unity of fundamental relationships, a fluid and adaptive entanglement of factual knowledge, land use, values, norms, direct experience, and cosmology. Within Inuit society, Elders are respected as knowledge-holders and interpreters of these seamless relations, and transfer lessons to younger generations.

To be sure, the lifestyles of Inuit inhabitants of the Thelon have transformed significantly in the region during the last century; life on the land has accommodated hamlet life in Baker Lake. However, respect for Elders and their teachings remain prevalent. One young hunter indicated that, “Regardless of what they say, Inuit should do what Elders wish” (anonymous male inhabitant, July 27, 2010). The hunter went on to describe how a very sick Elder had requested some of his cached caribou meat, a fermented delicacy prepared on the land and stored over winter beneath large piles of rocks. The young hunter had learned how to cache meat from his father, and the Elder’s request was a recognition that the hunter’s cached meat was of high quality (i.e., it tasted like meat from the “old days”). Without hesitation, the hunter travelled to one of his caches and retrieved some meat for the Elder. The hunter’s identity is configured in relation to his respect for the teachings and requests of his Elders.

An important lesson that relates to making traces absent emerged during separate meetings with Baker Lake Elders. While discussing the contents of Thelon River photographs contributed during photographic interviews, two Elders described the importance of removing the traces of a harvest. They explained:

If there were lots of bones or skins the animals wouldn’t come to the camp. We would bury the skins or bones. Animals used to run away if they saw skins or bones. The people would always bury stomachs at the kill site and take everything

else back to the camp. Where the caribou was killed was kept clean so that caribou would still follow that path. (Lucy Tuguaq, November 25, 2010)

We used to clean up that area where we butchered the caribou, so the caribou will continue to use that trail. Even just garbage, we used to clean it all up, try to keep the area as tidy as much as possible. Just an example...we keep our house really clean. Back then we weren't living in houses so we used to keep the land clean. Same principles. (Thomas Qaqimat, May 15, 2010)

In the circumstances described above, making traces absent means that caribou will not deviate from customary migration routes. This is a living tradition that helps to ensure food and resource security for communities of families in the form of future harvests. Furthermore, Qaqimat explained that people further south rely on the same animals for food and clothing, so it is up to Inuit to help prevent caribou from altering their travel patterns.

6.6.2 Making Traces Present: Inuksuit

Any success of project components in Baker Lake is attributable to a research partnership with Anautalik. As a bilingual Inuk Elder, Anautalik played a crucial role in clarifying project objectives, organizing and interpreting meetings, translating documents, and guiding experiential river journeys. Moreover, she shared generously her extensive knowledge of life within the Thelon riverscape.

Figure 6.2 shows the spot where Anautalik and I lunched during a snowmobile journey to Halfway Hills in May 2010. Halfway Hills arises roughly 200 metres above sea level and is located about 30 km northwest of Baker Lake, the approximate midway point to Schultz Lake. The image shows an eastern horizon with the Thelon River valley just out of the viewfinder to the right.

Figure 6.2. A place to lunch during the journey to Halfway Hills. Source: Author.

Notice the boulder on the right side of the photo, the presence of which served to block a north wind as we sipped tea and warmed hands over a small fire. Amidst the immensity of the tundra landscape, Anautalik pointed to the smaller rock on top of the boulder, referring to it as a sign left by hunters to orient others to the direction from which caribou travel. It marks the possibility of a good harvest. A subtle compositional change resulted in Figure 6.3 and directs the eye to a valley that has accommodated many migrations. Figure 6.4 shows another rock marking that directed Anautalik to a nearby creek leading into the Thelon. She explained: “That means good fishing over there. To know how to read it, you must be Inuk.”

The oral histories of *inuksuit* contained in the compilation edited by Bennett and Rowley (2004) correspond with Anautalik’s interpretations of landscape. Among the myriad of meanings of *inuksuit*, people with the knowledge to interpret them “could find game, locate caches, travel to regions they had never visited, be made aware of hazardous conditions, know that others had passed that way, and learn the history of the landscape

and the people that dwelt there” (Bennett & Rowley, 2004, p. 255). Inuksuit are a presence made to assist and provide for others, including unknown others traveling within an unfamiliar region. To be Inuk is to know how to read and author inuksuit, lessons transferred between generations and facilitated by shared experience on the land.

Figure 6.3. Inuksuit indicating the direction from which caribou travel. Source: Author.

Figure 6.4. Inuksuit indicating a good location for fishing. Source: Author.

6.6.4 Making Traces Present: The Guide

Canoe travel guides assume many roles while on the job. They organize and repair equipment, maintain safe and healthy campsites, prepare food, provide first aid, navigate routes, teach canoe and camping skills, and interpret landscape features for the benefit of their clients. In his 35 years of operation, the canoe guide involved in this research has acquired a degree of direct experience within the Thelon River valley that is arguably unmatched (Pelly, 1996). He has established firm and time-tested routines in all aspects of canoe travel, including navigation, campsite selection, food preparation, and the packing of equipment, all of which facilitates safe travel experiences for his clients and minimizes impact upon the river. His annual journeys within the riverscape have also led to his discovery of various tracks and traces, and the ability to relocate these on each return trip, to the satisfaction of his clients of course. He presents these traces to clients in a spirit of interpretation.

Figure 6.5, for example, is a photograph taken in July 2010 during the Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary canoe trip and shows the canoe travellers following the guide to one of many wolf dens visited during the 11-day journey. While each of the dens visited were inactive, canoeists were enchanted by the possibility of encounter. Upon approach, voices would be muted, bodies crouched, and cameras readied. The guide, a university trained wolf biologist, had explored this area individually and with groups many times prior, storylines that are etched in the very distinct trail winding through the transitioning vegetation.

The photograph in Figure 6.6 depicts a scene of unearthing stone arrowheads and tools, a sample of which are contained in Figure 6.7. The guide has hidden these

archaeological pieces beneath rocks and sand. Photographic interview participants often referred to these as positive or significant encounters; an “autochthonous technology in the wilderness” (anonymous male canoeist). They spoke about the hidden arrowheads in this way:

[The guide] uncovers them. He’s got them buried there.... We’re not supposed to take stuff out...he is very thoughtful that way. Partly because it is good for his trips, if he leaves them all there, then they are there for every single trip he ever takes back. But I think [of] that as a something that belongs. (Anonymous male canoeist)

So I think he preserved them...I think this is his response to how to ensure they stay up there and available and yet not lying around so that anybody with less respect would just pick them up and walk off with them. So it is kind of his little museum. (J. Stuart, male canoeist, March 15, 2010)

Figure 6.5. Canoeists followed the guide on various hikes to wolf dens or archaeological sites. Source: Author.

Figure 6.6. The guide unearths arrowheads and other stone tools that he has buried at various locations along the Thelon River. Source: Author.

Figure 6.7. A selection of stone tone tools revealed by the guide. Source: Photograph contributed by K. Carter, male canoeist.

One interpretation of these findings is to suggest that the Thelon is a *staged wilderness*, with various props upon the landscape that the guide makes present for the consumption of his clients. However, a more positive spin is that the guide—who perceives himself as caretaker and steward—enables canoeists to relate to the tracks and

traces that enliven this special place. For the guide, this is measure that not only secures the riverscape and his livelihood (i.e., his business), but functions to encourage the independent discovery practices of his clients. A family that has travelled with the guide expressed that their favourite moments during subsequent independent trips were those exploring the land for Inuit tent rings and artifacts, an outcome they said of learning from the practices of the guide.

6.7 Reflexive Summary

This chapter commenced by positioning the theme of responsibility at the convergence of tourism ethics and critical tourism scholarship. To build up the interface of these literatures, I described ontological multiplicity and Levinas' first philosophy of ethics as responsibility, two theoretical reference points that also inform our case study research of the Thelon River in Arctic Canada. From these theoretical and empirical contexts, two specific arguments have been presented. First, that the Thelon riverscape is made and remade through the practices of canoeists and inhabitants (and particularly, practices that make present or make absent certain material tracks and traces). Second, that some of these riverscape practices, or geographies of nature, function as expressions of responsibility to and for others connected to identity. This nature-responsibility-identity trident was derived by interpreting the meanings of tracks and traces in the lived-space experiences of canoeists and inhabitants.

Clearly there is more work to be done. The findings reported here are not comprehensive of all types of tracks and traces, or all riverscape activities. For example, the chapter does not consider the practices of wildlife in depth, nor those involved in other human land uses such as resource extraction. This chapter has also not considered

how the research photographs themselves operate as material traces that enter the circuits of Thelon River knowledge production, or link up with responsibility and identity beyond the sites of the tourist and inhabitant experience. Moreover, just as the Thelon is made and remade, so too are responsibility and identity. In this chapter, we have not explored in depth these lines of analysis. Indeed, we have leaned rather heavily on the utility of a particular difference—that between canoeists and residents—which, as we noted above, jars in some ways against the relational premise of our work.

Still, several implications follow from this chapter that, as we conclude, deserve particular mention because of their relevance to the geographies of tourism, recreation, and leisure. First, connections are made between tourism and other forms of mobility—in this case between practices associated with canoe travel and Inuit subsistence. This approach helps to reveal the complex flows of people, things, ideas, and practices that enact a place.

Second, the suggestive findings are applicable to managers and decision-makers of special places, parks, and protected areas. The making and remaking of the Thelon calls into question claims to authentic nature, which factors into the politics of conservation and preservation. But importantly, it does so by drawing attention to potentially inclusive and adaptive strategies for making decisions. With the understanding that tourist and Inuit actions within the Thelon are associated with how individuals perceive and construct themselves and demonstrate concern for others, decision-makers may be better equipped to enter into or facilitate equitable co-management partnerships and develop effective mechanisms for responding to change.

Finally, the nature-responsibility-identity trident reveals possibilities for enacting healthy, resilient, and meaningful human-environment relationships. It does so not through prescriptive force, but through the capacity of individuals and communities to craft their realities in ways that honour, demonstrate concern for, and relate to others. To be sure, people can learn how to do this—a transformative effect often encountered through leisure and travel

CHAPTER SEVEN

RIPPLES

This final chapter is composed of three sections. The first section is dedicated to summation and synthesis. My challenge here has been to weave together the preceding five chapters, which is accomplished by returning to and explaining the modes/attributes of enacting relational ethics introduced in Section 1.3 and Figure 1.1. Should a single culminating statement be made for this dissertation, the circumstances (re)presented in this concluding synthesis would be it. In the second section, I highlight avenues of ongoing and future research. While some of these trajectories pick up on limitations related to the research presented herein, other anticipated paths are tracked based on the findings, partnerships, and learning that have emerged. A final few reflections are made in the brief third section.

7.1 Thesis Summary and Synthesis

In an October 22, 2011 opinion piece in the *Globe and Mail*, columnist Margaret Wenté expressed her agitation with contemporary human geography. According to Wenté, geographers, like many others in the social sciences and humanities, are caught up in writing “impenetrable academese” that “turn the curriculum into their personal playgrounds”. The crux of Wenté’s disparagement is a recent edited academic text that, in the introduction, integrates previous comments made by Wenté into a critical reading of Canadian canoe culture (Baldwin, Cameron, & Kobayashi, 2011). Wenté had quoted and championed Pierre Berton’s declaration that “making love in a canoe is the most Canadian act that two people can do” (Hodgins, 1988, p. 45). In discovering that her words had been associated with racist undertones, Wenté exclaimed that she “felt like a

black fly being blasted with a bazooka.” No doubt her opinion piece was a rejoinder to receiving a critical spurring.

By drawing reference to Wente’s column, my intentions are not to enter debates about the status of the canoe or Canadian canoe culture in the (re)production of hegemonic social relations. Some of these issues have been reviewed in Chapter Two and mentioned elsewhere in the dissertation. My intentions here are much simpler. First, I want to point out that I can relate to Wente’s feeling of “being blasted.” Having spent many of my childhood, teenage, and adult summers harnessing or advocating the benefits of canoe experiences, I too was shaken when I first encountered critical scholarship that interrogated “nature” and the “nature of canoeing.” However, and second, unlike Wente’s column, which comes across as not much more than a reactionary retort, I have intended to take the time to think carefully about the aforementioned critical geographies and to work with this scholarship to begin formulating positive possibilities for canoeing differently (and, as I stated earlier, to enact nature differently). Whereas Wente perceives the critical work as an attack and justifies brushing it off by belittling an entire suite of values-oriented researchers, my approach has been to engage *with* such critical orientations in mind and in order to identify and negotiate new ways of being.

Indeed, we have learned from theories of social nature and multiplicity that realities are never static. They are, instead, always in the making as ideas, objects, people, practices, stories, representations, discourses, and events converge, diverge, and interrelate. *Picturing the Thelon* thus represents a compilation of moments that have attempted to articulate such an emergent reality whereby canoeing—and other riverscape practices—can always be practiced with greater degrees of responsibility, care, and

respect to, for, and with the people and places encountered. It has been an attempt to draw into relation diverse events, meanings, and systems of knowledge to construct inclusive, adaptive, and contextual understanding about a particular touristic activity and a particular special and changing place.

When taken together, the principal instrumental purpose, the applied intrinsic purpose, and the primary research objectives have marshaled *Picturing the Thelon* towards ends of relationality, becoming, and ethics as an everyday practice of responsibility. These purposes and objectives are recounted in Table 7.1. To pull these all together, an investigation of recursive patterns resonating across the preceding chapters was undertaken. This process resulted in the identification of five interrelated modes and/or attributes that characterize the enactment of relational ethics. I call these “modes” because they reflect the style of relational ethics performed, and “attributes” because they reflect the quality. Presented in Figure 7.1 (recall that this is derived from Figure 1.1), these modes/attributes of enacting relational ethics constitute the higher order outcomes of this thesis. That is, they provide a response to the primary instrumental purpose of this dissertation. In the following subsections, each mode/attribute is described and reference is given to the locations within the dissertation where each is most palpable. Table 7.2 also conveys simplistic but helpful chapter summaries that identify these locations.

7.1.1 Place

The enactment of relational ethics is a fundamentally contextual process. It is an ethics performed in, and derived from, place. Accordingly, to enact relational ethics for and within the Thelon required that I directly experience it as a river-place. Throughout the course of this dissertation, a total of seven research-related visits to the Thelon were

made. Six of these, spanning a total of 12 weeks, were centred in Baker Lake, which served as a base for multiple experiential river journeys (as well as other community-based research activities). One visit was made to the middle section of the river to experience 270 km by canoe over the span of 11 days.

Table 7.1. Summary of Purposes and Objectives

Primary instrumental purpose	To enact relational ethics for and within the Thelon River watershed
Applied intrinsic purpose	To work with Thelon River canoeists and inhabitants to document and create knowledge, and to share this knowledge within and between groups in order to cultivate place-based understanding and enhanced social-ecological responsibility.
Research objectives	<p>To envision enhanced responsibility amid the multiple natures of recreational canoe travel</p> <p>To challenge binary visions associated with human exceptionalism</p> <p>To foster responsible community-based research relationships with Nunavut communities</p> <p>To develop accessible and inclusive value-based metaphors to shape and inform Arctic travel and tourism</p> <p>To demonstrate how different travel practices (re)make the Thelon and express responsibility to and for others connected to personal and socio-cultural identity</p> <p>To develop resources and positive possibilities for enacting cross-cultural, touristic, and responsible research relations in and of place</p>

Figure 7.1. The five modes/attributes of enacting relational ethics.

Table 7.2 Descriptive Summaries of Chapters Two through Five

Chapter Title	Description of Content	Mode/Attribute of Relational Ethics
CH 2 “Thinking Outside the Gunnel’s”: Considering Natures and the Moral Terrains of Recreational Canoe Travel	Literature review Conceptual Theoretical Reflexive	Perception Place Philosophy
CH 3 The Social Science Ontology of Environment: Challenges to Human Exceptionalism	Theoretical Literature review Methodological	Philosophy
CH 4 Engaged Acclimatization: Towards Responsible Community-based Research in Nunavut	Methodological Research ethics Reflexive Literature review Conceptual	Partnership Perception
CH 5 Riverscape Practices and Nature-Culture Values: Touristic and Inuit Mobilities of the Thelon River in Arctic Canada	Empirical Conceptual Interpretive Literature review	Practice Place Partnership
CH 6 “Tracks and Trace”: Enactments of Responsibility within an Arctic Riverscape	Empirical Theoretical Interpretive Literature review	Practice Philosophy Perception

However, by thinking with Massey’s (2005) conception of place as an *event*, direct experience within the Thelon’s physical locale was deemed to be insufficient on its own. The event of place, according to Massey, occurs at the intersection of multiple and performative trajectories (e.g., stories, histories, and materialities). Places occur, or come into being, through an encounter, which result in new configurations of space (Massey, 2005). Therefore, to enact relational ethics required immersion into multiple dynamic sites of experience: the memories or histories, for example, that surface when people look at photographs and reflect on their meaning. Moreover, when place is perceived not as bound, closed, or impermeable space, but rather as tentative and anti-closural (Thrift, 1999), possibilities are encouraged for positive transformations. Birkeland (2008) has

used this observation to make the case for enacting places in terms of a persistent potential for respecting and caring for difference, creating reciprocal and sustainable relations between individuals, societies, and natures, and making visible our ecological connectivity. It was with such spirit in mind that my encounters within the contexts of the Thelon transpired.

In the foregoing chapters, the mode/attribute of place emerged most clearly in Chapter Two and Chapter Five. Both chapters engaged Figueroa and Waitt's (2008) notion of *moral terrains*, a derivative of the moral geography literature where thick, descriptive, and place-based ethical inquiry is prioritized. Chapter Five, however, also drew directly on Massey (2005) to flesh out the event of place with descriptions of Thelon Riverscape practices that expressed the nature-culture value of *emplacement*.

7.1.2 Perception

In Chapter Three, I described the phenomenological *life-world* as the always-present world that is perceived in and through everyday experience and encounters. Perception is identified as body-subject processes of receptivity and creativity in, of, and with the life-world (Merleau-Ponty, 2004). Here, as a second mode/attribute of enacting relational ethics, perception reflects the living awareness or sense of self in relation to others and to place. Inevitably, this self-other-place interface has many permutations, which are contingent upon the actors and contexts involved.

In reading across chapters and reflecting on different project components, four aspects of perception associated with the enactment of relational ethics were discerned. First, perception of the life-world may or may not be relational. Conceivably, an individual may identify him/herself as entirely autonomous or relationally disconnected.

In such a circumstance, relational ethics holds little currency. However, and second, perception is malleable. It changes, adapts, and develops. As such, a relational perception is something that can be cultivated. The two narratives in Chapter Two provide good examples of a relational perception developed during my initial encounters in Baker Lake. They also demonstrate how responsibility and relational perception are intertwined; for instance, in the case of my commitments to making repeat research visits to Baker Lake. Agency, a third aspect, is especially important to fostering this relational sense, both in terms of recognizing the capacity within self and within others to be agents of change. The narratives in Chapter Two are again revealing as they depict personal and conscious acts to change relational circumstances. Unequivocally, Chapter Four is about learning to recognize the agency in others (in this case the various Nunavut communities participating in different research projects), and how the capacity of others to change circumstances has direct bearing on my own perception of the life-world. The chapter demonstrates how relational perception is fostered through continued encounters in Nunavut. Finally, perception, and the cultivation of a relational perception, is tied to material realities. The most explicit examples of this are contained the narratives of the sardine can and photographic mission in Chapter Two, and the “tracks and traces” theme that frames Chapter Six. In these cases, encounters and events with objects helped to re-inscribe certain realities or to bring forth ideas and opportunities for engaging with new emergent ontologies.

7.1.3 Partnership

As implied in Chapter Three, an intention of enacting relational ethics (and by extension, a relational ontology) is the displacement of divisive and deterministic

ontology that renders certain contemporary living realities invisible or out-of-place. We saw signals of such anachronism and anachorism in the *Canoeroots* magazine excerpts in Section 1.1. Accordingly, enacting relational ethics to and for the Thelon is, fundamentally, an effect of inviting and nurturing partnerships with the multiple stakeholders and voices that enliven a place. As a figure of co-existence, or a shared vision of responsibility and care, relational ethics must be co-created in contexts of mutual trust and respect, balanced power relations, and reciprocity. Echoing a principal pillar of community-based research, relational ethics are enacted *with* others, rather than imposed *on* them.

This theme of partnership emerged unmistakably in Chapter Four where I discussed methodological processes for initiating and nurturing responsible relationships for community-based research in Nunavut. In this chapter, I critically analyzed and reflected on research practices in order to identify strategies that, in effect, construct research as midwife to partnership and co-creation among Inuit and Qablunaat. The four identified aspects of engaged acclimatization (crafting relations, learning, immersion, and activism) are the stage upon which the subsequently described participatory research methods were set.

There is, of course, an enormously practical dimension to partnerships as well. We have learned as researchers that the production of knowledge is always partial, that our views are situated (Haraway, 1991) and, thus, borrowing from Chapter Six, characterized by certain absences. It is through partnerships that these absences may be more fully revealed, that our knowledge, as shared understanding, becomes enriched, more inclusive, and trusted. The final two chapters, which integrate empirical material

derived from different participatory research components, are manifestations of this kind of enhanced and co-produced understanding, or gathering.

7.1.4 *Philosophy*

Philosophy emerged as a fourth mode/attribute characterizing the enactment of relational ethics. In this context, philosophy refers not so much to the systematic study of fundamental questions about the world, knowledge, or how to live a good life (Fennell, 2006), but to a subtle and generous disposition that remains adaptable to the emergent possibilities in, of, and through difference, impurity, and uncertainty (Whatmore, 2002). It is a disposition that resonates in questions raised by Foucault (1985):

But, then, what is philosophy today—philosophical activity, I mean—if it is not the critical work that thought brings to bear on itself? In what does it consist, if not the endeavor to know how and to what extent it might be possible to think differently, instead of legitimating what is already known? [Philosophical activity] is entitled to explore what might be changed, in its own thought, through the practice of a knowledge that is foreign to it. (p. 8-9).

As signaled in this excerpt from Foucault, this disposition to *that which could be otherwise* functions in close association with the modes/attributes of perception and partnership.

Each of the previous chapters is steeped in research practices that express this spirit of philosophy. Throughout the text, issues of ontology, epistemological, and methodological were broached with inventive and relational intentions. This comes through clearly in Chapter Three where I reviewed and appraised resources for articulating new environmental realities of inclusion, responsibility, and emergence.

Likewise, in Chapter Six, my engagement with multiplicity and Levinas' metaphysics of responsibility (i.e., ethics as a first philosophy) orients a hopeful union that envisions interconnections among (re)making the Thelon, responsibility to and for others, and personal and cultural identity. The narratives contained in Chapter Two and Chapter Four, which described my encounters in Nunavut community contexts, exposed more tangible examples of the philosophical disposition at work. Missing from the scope of this thesis, however, is an understanding of the extent to which such a philosophical disposition is expressed by the research participants. Understanding the relevance of such a philosophical social disposition to enacting a relational ethics for and within the Thelon would be an interesting area for future research.

7.1.5 Practice

The final mode/attribute of enacting relational ethics is practice, which in a general sense can be understood as the everyday tactics, actions, or performances of living carried out by an individual or social group (de Certeau, 1984). Practice emerged most clearly in the dissertation as the scope of empirical content presented. It figured prominently in Chapter Five and Chapter Six. In the former, the riverscape practices of research participants were "read" as the expression of nature-culture values (Kulchyski, 2006). In the latter, they were conceived as an agent molding ontological multiplicity. Objects, things, and ideas, such as the Thelon River, are practiced in multiple ways; hence reality is multiple (Hinchliffe, 2007; Mol, 2002). Critical reflections on my practices as a researcher are also integrated throughout the text, most notably in Chapters Two and Four. Future autoethnographic and reflexive investigations might further probe the affective dimensions of my practices as a white, male, and well-educated researcher.

Such attention to the fields of practice is a mainstay for enacting relational ethics. In contrast to many theoretical and applied ethical debates that rely on abstract ideas, universal norms, or contextually vacant codes, relational ethics are situated, affective, and corporeal negotiations of events and encounters that facilitate new ways of being (Popke, 2009). In addition to this practicality, relational ethics are also implicated in and with the material happenings of the world. They transpire in association with objects and things and bodies (e.g., the sardine can, photographs, wildlife). As I explained above, this approach to ethics is perceived as an everyday activity that is immensely geographic (Jickling, 2005; Proctor, 1998b; Smith, 2000). In other words, relational ethics is, fundamentally, something that occurs in the lived spaces of experience. To be sure, these are spaces where practices can be perceived, developed, and adapted.

7.2 Ongoing and Future Research

Each of the preceding chapters included some mention, if not discussion, of potential and necessary future research related to the issues, themes, and outcomes presented. Rather than recapitulate these verbatim and chapter-by-chapter, I have opted instead for synthesis. The discussion contains two parts: a) extensions of *Picturing the Thelon* that are ongoing or currently underdevelopment, and b) innovative prospective projects that will commence in the next two to five years. Each of these project extensions and innovations will be strengthened by partnerships with communities and other researchers. As such, I invite interested readers to contact me about the possibilities of working together.

7.2.1 Project Extensions

This dissertation represents a moment within a larger project vision. At present, the continuation of *Picturing the Thelon* consists of four components, some of which address limitations of this dissertation.

1. The volunteer-employed photography (VEP) (Garrod, 2007) process described briefly in Chapter Six has achieved moderate success as a research method for working with Thelon River canoeists, and very limited success as an approach for working with inhabitants. As such, ongoing research continues to explore the meanings of responsibility expressed by canoeists through their VEP contributions, and to critically reflect on strategies for adapting the VEP process for application in Arctic and Inuit community contexts.
2. Community-based research workshops will continue in Baker Lake (e.g., during an October 2011 research reporting visit) and southern Canadian contexts (e.g., the Wilderness Canoe Symposium in February 2012). The focus of these workshops remains on mobilizing public participation in the interpretation of project photographs, creating safe social spaces for sharing stories and knowledge about the Thelon River, and exploring how these contexts may (or may not) cultivate enhanced responsibility to and for the riverscape. These workshops will continue to be modeled after those used in *Photographs and Plants Through Time* (Doubleday et al., 2008, 2010; Grimwood et al., in press), and will serve as the empirical basis for an upcoming presentation at the 2012 IPY conference in Montreal, QC (see Appendix K). This forthcoming paper will emphasize the applied area of study depicted in Figure 1.1 (i.e., mobilizing Arctic riverscape relations) and be used to better situate

the project within the rich Thelon River histories and assemblages of inhabitant, touristic, and research relations (see e.g., Birket-Smith, 1929; Norment, 2008; Raffan, 1992, 1993; Rasmussen, 1930; Tyrrell, 1908).

3. Given the community-based orientation of my doctoral research, it is important that the knowledge documented and shared is translated into meaningful and usable resources for residents of Baker Lake, Thelon River canoeists, or organizations such as the Baker Lake Hunters and Trappers Organization, Nunavut Tourism, Nunavut Parks, or the Canadian Heritage Rivers System. Part of this process entails communicating research procedures and findings to various stakeholder groups. To some degree this has already been achieved: for example, through research workshops that blend reporting results with participant interpretation; the distribution of research reports to Baker Lake residents and representatives following each community visit (see Appendix L – N); and informal public presentations at schools or the community centre. Additionally, as requested by a few Baker Lake research participants, hard copies of all photograph contributions, interview transcripts, and audio recordings with Elders will be delivered to, and stored at, local agencies, including the local Arctic College building and the Itsarnitaqarvik Inuit Heritage Centre. Still, more concerted attention to knowledge translation is necessary, especially if *Picturing the Thelon* and its central themes of relationality, ontological multiplicity, and ethics/responsibility are to marshal institutional appeal or have any policy relevance. This is a work in progress. To these ends, however, I suspect further engagement with the resiliency and social learning literatures will yield promising connections to tease out.

4. In its present form, *Picturing the Thelon* is limited by the absence of Dene and Métis participation. Although both groups have long living histories within the Thelon, I have thus far focused strictly on Inuit inhabitation in order concentrate my northern research training and engagement within the cultural codes and protocols of a single Arctic and Indigenous community, and within a region where my research supervisors have acquired expertise. However, starting February 2012, I will initiate communications with representatives of the Lutsel K'e Dene First Nation and the Northwest Territory Métis Nation. My intentions will be to invite research partnerships with these communities by adapting the model of community-based and collaborative research development implemented by Ljubicic (formerly Laidler; see e.g., Laidler, 2009; Laidler & Grimwood, 2010) and following the methodological processes of engaged acclimatization. With community support and approval, research workshops will be held in Lutsel K'e and Fort Smith, NWT and follow the structure of the reporting and interpretation workshops noted above. Photographic contributions from Inuit and canoeists will be shared and discussed, and used as a way to introduce my approach to doing research with Indigenous communities. Should either Dene and/or Métis communities reciprocate an interest in working together on a related project, I will seek out various channels for obtaining research funding (e.g., SSHRC's Insight Development program emphasizing Aboriginal Research and Northern Communities as strategic priorities).

7.2.2 Prospective Projects

In addition to anticipated project extensions of *Picturing the Thelon*, I envision several future research initiatives stemming from this dissertation. Four are highlighted.

1. One of the key shortcomings of *Picturing the Thelon* is that the project focus and objectives in Baker Lake were largely determined from an outsider's perspective. While community familiarization and consultation visits were effective means for obtaining and integrating community input and recruiting local research assistance, the research agenda was predominantly mine to steer. This stands against other examples where Indigenous communities have called upon the expertise of outside researchers and assumed a greater degree of ownership throughout the research process (e.g., Castleden et al., 2008; Laidler, 2009). But as implied in Chapter Four, collaborative research partnerships are established and nurtured over time and over the course of multiple projects. At some point in time and space then, responsible research relations between Inuit and Qablunaat, for example, must be initiated. This dissertation functions as one such point of instigation. As my doctoral studies come to a close, my commitment to participating communities is to assist, with the best of my abilities, in new research projects that address endogenously derived topics of concern. This is clearly most applicable to the inhabitants of the Thelon River. Accordingly, during the three most recent research visits to Baker Lake, I have indicated to various community representatives and other researchers my willingness to explore and participate in new locally derived project ideas. In July 2010, Anautalik responded by requesting my assistance to locate funding that would support the re-development of a cultural skills and programming centre. In addition, I have recently been invited to join an international group of researchers from Baker Lake, a Sami community in northern Sweden, and various academic institutions to

develop a series of projects to address local priorities associated with the social, ecological, and cultural implications of mining (Blangy & Pulsifer, forthcoming).

2. As implied in Sections 5.5 and 6.1, another significant limitation of this dissertation is that my attention to social differentiation is structured exclusively around the categories of “canoeist” and “inhabitant.” This runs the risk of: a) obscuring instances when these categories are blurred, b) concealing other categories important to the enactment of relational ontologies and ethics, and c) re-mapping the historic power differentials existing between Qablunaat and Inuit. To be sure, other forms of difference were noted during my fieldwork (e.g., how gender and age are played out in the contexts of riverscape travel). However, in itself, this recognition is not enough. Future research and writing should return to, or elaborate upon, the qualitative and visual material collected during this thesis to explore more fully how categories such as male/female, Elder/youth, hunter/non-hunter, and human/non-human are “done” and “re-done”, and how these make and remake the Thelon River in particular ways.
3. Another area of future research relates to the role of the more-than-human world in enacting a relational ethics. Related research suggests that a relational (environmental) ethics must take into consideration different types of moral agency based on the different contributions or creative capacities of non-human agents in relational networks or assemblages (Cloe & Jones, 2003; Figueroa & Waitt, 2008). According to Cloe and Jones (2003), this agency is based not on some level of intentionality or sentience exhibited by non-human actors, but rather in the willingness of humans to recognize in non-humans the potential for intention. Despite my initial project objectives, which included an exploration of how canoeists and

inhabitants expressed this kind of ethical mindfulness (Plumwood, 2002), my research has yet to focus sufficiently on this subject. This is unfortunate because it would likely have helped to forge connections between spirituality and relationality. My sense is that this relational understanding would be greatly enhanced by continuing work with Inuit and other hunting societies whose traditional teachings often refer to prey as giving themselves willingly to respectful hunters (Bennett & Rowley, 2004; Gombay, 2005; Watson & Huntington, 2008).

4. Various possible thematic offshoots emerge from this thesis. The issue of scale, for example, might be invoked to expand research into multiple Arctic riverscapes or multiple touristic activities. In what ways are the nature-culture values of emplacement, wayfaring, and gathering expressed in other riverscape regions or through other riverscape practices? These lines of research would lend themselves well to cross-case comparisons (Yin, 2009) and to situating the particularities of place within more expansive moral geographies (Smith, 2000). Memory is another theme that has surfaced within this dissertation, but which has been granted little direct analytical attention. An interesting line of inquiry related to Chapter Six would be to explore the relevance of tracks and traces from a relational perspective that configures ontology and memory as inseparable. For example, how does photography of tracks and traces function as a practice of memory making that constructs place-based realities for self and others? What role do the memories invoked by such photographs play in constructing what is real, true, or responsible?

7.3 A “Take Out”

To bring closure to my 2005 Masters of Arts thesis, I described how my research resembled the act of throwing a stone into a pool of calm water, creating a series of concentric ripples expanding out across and through a textured surface. The hope I expressed was that others might take notice of the resultant ripples and follow their paths to the shoreline. Although I had no doubt that this allegory had achieved the status of cliché, I could not resist its utility. Attempting now to locate some sense of closure for the present doctoral dissertation, I find myself drawn again to thinking about these ripples in still water.

The relational journey represented in the foregoing pages can be viewed as the navigation, or riding out, of one such ripple. To enact a relational ethics for and within the Thelon River watershed transpires as an event in motion. It occurs at the ripple's edge, in the instant where the swell meets the imminent surface of the water. It is about engaging at such a brink of transformation with awareness, a spirit of creativity and capacity, and a responsibility for crafting the betterment of the world with others. The surface ahead, of course, is never actually still, settled, or free from obstruction. Others have tossed their own stones, which yield additional ripples, and an associated assemblage of travellers, to be perceived, encountered, and negotiated. As ripples meet, they may converge or inflict turbulence; thus, a ripple is never singular. Consequently, the trajectory that one is to follow is difficult to predict. To some extent, the route ahead may be anticipated, planned for, and achieved with strategic maneuvering. Some paths, however, will always remain indeterminate, presenting themselves in moments of spontaneity. Hazards must be negotiated. Opportunities will arise. Assistance must be

invited. Traces will remain. Relational ethics is about our capacities to engage with, and respond to, these fluctuations. This is a persistent process. To reiterate a statement made at the beginning of this dissertation, thinking relationally about such a journey means that the point of departure becomes the destination, that the journey's end becomes a beginning.

REFERENCES

- Abram, D. (1996). *The spell of the sensuous: Perception and language in a more-than-human world*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Adey, P. (2010). *Mobility*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Alneng, V. (2002). The modern does not cater for natives: Travel ethnography and the conventions of form. *Tourist Studies*, 2, 119-142.
- Amagoalik, J. (2001). Wasteland of nobodies. In J. Dahl, J. Hicks & P. Jull (Eds.), *Inuit regain control of their lands and their lives* (pp. 138-141). Copenhagen, Denmark: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.
- Aporta, C. (2009). The trail as home: Inuit and their pan-Arctic network of routes. *Human Ecology*, 37(2), 131-146.
- Aporta, C. (2011). Shifting perspectives on shifting ice: Documenting and representing Inuit use of the sea ice. *The Canadian Geographer*, 55(1), 6-19.
- Armitage, D., Berkes, F., & Doubleday, N. C. (2007). *Adaptive co-management: Collaboration, learning, and multi-level governance*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- Ateljevic, I., Pritchard, A., & Morgan, N. (2007a). Editors' introduction: Promoting an academy of hope in tourism enquiry. In I. Ateljevic, A. Pritchard & N. Morgan (Eds.), *The critical turn in tourism studies: Innovative research methodologies* (pp. 1-11). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Ateljevic, I., Pritchard, A., & Morgan, N. (Eds.). (2007b). *The critical turn in tourism studies*. New York, NY: Elsevier.
- Bærenholdt, J. O., & Granås, B. (Eds.). (2008). *Mobility and place: Enacting Northern European peripheries*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing.

- Bai, H. (2004). The three I's for ethics as an everyday activity: Integration, intrinsic valuing, and intersubjectivity. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, 9, 51-63.
- Baker, J. (2002). Production and consumption of wilderness in Algonquin Park. *Space and Culture*, 5(3), 198-210.
- Baldwin, A. (2004). An ethics of connection: Social-nature in Canada's Boreal Forest. *Ethics, Place & Environment*, 7(3), 185-194.
- Baldwin, A. (2009). Ethnoscaping Canada's boreal forest: Liberal whiteness and its disaffiliation from colonial space. *The Canadian Geography*, 53(4), 427-443.
- Baldwin, A., Cameron, L., & Kobayashi, A. (eds). (2011). *Rethinking the great white north: Race, nature, and the historical geographies of whiteness in Canada*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- Battiste, M. (2008). Research ethics for protecting Indigenous knowledge and heritage: Institutional and researcher responsibilities. In Denzin, N. K., Lincoln, Y. S., & Smith, L. T. (eds.), *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies* (pp. 497-509). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Beilin, R. (2005). Photo-elicitation and the agricultural landscape: 'Seeing' and 'telling' about farming, community and place. *Visual Studies*, 20(1), 56-68.
- Benidickson, J. (1997). *Idleness, water, and a canoe: Reflections on paddling for pleasure*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Bennett, J., & Rowley, S. (2004). *Uqalurait*. Montreal, QC: McGill-Queen's University Press.

- Berg, B. L. (1998). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Berkes, F., Huebert, R., Fast, H., Manseau, M., & Diduck, A. (2005). *Breaking ice: Renewable resource and ocean management in the Canadian North*. Calgary, AB: University of Calgary Press.
- Bhaskar, R. (1978). *A realist theory of science*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press Inc.
- Birkeland, I. (2008). Sensing places: The ethics of authentic place. In J. O. Bærenholdt & B. Granås (Eds.), *Mobility and place: Enacting Northern European peripheries* (pp. 39-48). Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing.
- Birket-Smith, K. (1929). *The Caribou Eskimos: Material and social life and their cultural position*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
- Blackstock, K. L., White, V., McCrum, G., Scott, A., & Hunter, C. (2008). Measuring responsibility: An appraisal of a Scottish National Park's sustainable tourism indicators. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16(3), 276-297.
- Blangy, S. (2010). *Co-construire le tourisme autochtone par la recherche-action participative et les Technologies de l'Information et de la Communication*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Université Paul Valéry, Montpellier III, France.
- Blangy, S., McGinley, R., & Lemelin, R. H. (2010). Recherche-action participative et collaborative autochtone: Améliorer l'engagement communautaire dans les projets touristiques. *Téoros*, 29(1), 69-80.
- Blangy, S., & Pulsifer, P. L. (forthcoming). Local and scientific knowledge integration workshop (Paris, June 14-16, 2011). *The Polar Journal*.

- Bone, R. M. (2009). *The Canadian North: Issues and challenges* (3rd ed.). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Botterill, D. (2007). A realist critique of the situated voice in tourism studies. In I. Ateljevic, A. Pritchard & N. Morgan (Eds.), *The critical turn in tourism studies: Innovative research methodologies*. (pp. 121-131). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Bramwell, B., Land, B., McCabe, S., Mosedale, J., & Scarles, C. (2008). Editorial: Research perspectives on responsible tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16(3), 253-257.
- Braun, B. (2002). *The intemperate rainforest: Nature, culture, and power on Canada's west coast*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Braun, B. (2004). Nature and culture: On the career of a false problem. In J. S. Duncan, N. C. Johnson, & R. H. Schein (Eds.), *A companion to cultural geography* (pp. 151-179). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Inc.
- Braun, B. (2008). Environmental issues: Inventive life. *Progress in Human Geography*, 32(5), 667-679.
- Braun, B. (2009). Nature. In N. Castree, D. Demeritt, D. Liverman & B. Rhoads (Eds.), *A companion to environmental geography* (pp. 19-36). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Inc.
- Bravo, M. T. (2009). Voices from the sea ice: The reception of climate impact narratives. *Journal of Historical Geography*, 35, 256-278.
- Brookes, A. (2001). Doing the Franklin: Wilderness tourism and the construction of nature. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 26(1), 11-18.

- Buckley, R. (2005). In search of the narwhal: Ethical dilemmas in ecotourism. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 4(2), 129-134.
- Büscher, M., & Urry, J. (2009). Mobile methods and the empirical. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 12(1), 99-116.
- Butcher, J. (2003). *The moralisation of tourism: Sun, sand...and saving the world?* New York, NY: Routledge.
- BQCMB. (2010) *Beverly and Qamanirjuaq Caribou Management Board 28th annual report 2009-2010*. www.arctic-caribou.com.
- Caine, K. J., Davison, C. M., & Stewart, E. J. (2009). Preliminary field-work: Methodological reflections from northern Canadian research. *Qualitative Research*, 9(4), 489-513.
- Cameron, J., & Gibson, K. (2005). Participatory research in a poststructuralist vein. *Geoforum*, 36(3), 315-331.
- Campbell, D. (1999). The deterritorialization of responsibility: Levinas, Derrida, and ethics after the end of philosophy. In D. Campbell & M. J. Shapiro (Eds.), *Moral spaces: Rethinking ethics and world politics* (pp. 29-56). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Carolan, M. S. (2004). Ontological politics: Mapping a complex environmental problem. *Environmental Values*, 13, 497-522.
- Carolan, M. S. (2005a). Realism with reductionism: Toward an ecologically embedded sociology. *Human Ecology Review*, 12(1), 1-19.

- Carolan, M. S. (2005b). Society, biology, and ecology: Bringing nature back into sociology's disciplinary narrative through critical realism. *Organization and Environment*, 18(4), 393-421.
- Carolan, M. S. (2008). More-than-representational knowledge/s of the countryside: How we think as bodies. *Sociologia Ruralis*, 48(4), 408-421.
- Castellano, M. B. (2004). Ethics of Aboriginal research. *Journal of Aboriginal Health*, January, 98-114.
- Castleden, H., Garvin, T., & Huu-ay-aht First Nation. (2008). Modifying photovoice for community-based participatory Indigenous research. *Social Science & Medicine*, 66, 1393 - 1405.
- Castree, N. (2001). Socializing nature: Theory, practice, and politics. In N. Castree & B. Braun (Eds.), *Social Nature: Theory, Practice, and Politics* (pp. 1-21). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Castree, N. (2003a). A post-environmental ethics? *Ethics, Place & Environment*, 6(1), 3-12.
- Castree, N. (2003b). Environmental issues: Relational ontologies and hybrid politics. *Progress in Human Geography*, 27(2), 203-211.
- Castree, N. (2005). *Nature*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Castree, N., & Braun, B. (Eds.). (2001). *Social nature: Theory, practice, and politics*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- CHRS. (2000). *Thelon Heritage River: Ten-year review*. Iqaluit, NU: Department of Sustainable Development, Parks and Tourism Division.

- CIHR, NSERC, & SSHRC. (2010). *Tri-Council policy statement: Ethical conduct for research involving humans*. Available at: www.pre.ethics.gc.ca.
- Clark, N., Massey, D., & Sarre, P. (Eds.). (2008). *Material geographies: A world in the making*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Cloke, P., & Jones, O. (2003). Grounding ethical mindfulness for/in nature: Trees in their places. *Ethics, Place & Environment*, 6(3), 195-214.
- Cloke, P., & Perkins, H. C. (2005). Cetacean performance and tourism in Kaikoura, New Zealand. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 23, 903-924.
- CPAWS/MEC. (2009). Retrieved June 27, 2009, from www.thebigwild.org
- Cohen, E. (1979). Rethinking the sociology of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, Jan/March, 18-35.
- Cole, P. (2002). Aboriginalizing methodology: Considering the canoe. *Qualitative studies in education*, 15(4), 447 - 459.
- Collings, P. (2011). Economic strategies, community, and food networks in Ulukhaktok, Northwest Territories, Canada. *Arctic*, 64(2), 207-219.
- Crang, M. (2004). Cultural geographies of tourism. In A. A. Lew, C. M. Hall & A. M. Williams (Eds.), *A companion to tourism* (pp. 74-84). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Cresswell, T. (2004). *Place: A short introduction*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Cresswell, T. (2006). *On the move: Mobility in the modern western world*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Cronon, W. (1995a). The trouble with wilderness; or, getting back to the wrong nature. In W. Cronon (Ed.), *Uncommon ground: Rethinking the place in nature* (pp. 69-90). New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Cronon, W. (Ed.). (1995b). *Uncommon ground: Toward reinventing nature* (1st ed.). New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Cruikshank, J. (2004). A tale of two ontologies: An immanent critique of critical realism. *The Sociological Review*, 52, 567-585.
- Cruikshank, J. (2005). *Do glaciers listen? Local knowledge, colonial encounters, and social imagination*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- D'Andrea, A. (2006). Neo-nomadism: A theory of post-identitarian mobility in the global age. *Mobilities*, 1(1), 95-119.
- Darier, É. (Ed.). (1999). *Discourses of the environment*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Dawson, J., Maher, P. T., & Slocombe, S. D. (2007). Climate change, marine tourism, and sustainability in the Canadian Arctic: Contributions from systems and complexity approaches. *Tourism and Marine Environments*, 4(2-3), 69-83.
- Day, R. (2007). More than straw figures in straw houses: Toward a revaluation of critical realism's conception of post-structuralist theory. In J. Frauley & F. Pearce (Eds.), *Critical realism and the social sciences: Heterodox elaborations* (pp. 117-141). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- de Certeau, M. (1984). *The practice of everyday life*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Demeritt, D. (2002). What is the 'social construction of nature'? A typology and

- sympathetic critique. *Progress in Human Geography*, 26(6), 767-790.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2000). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 1 - 28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Desbiens, C. (2010). Step lightly, then move forward: Exploring feminist directions for northern research. *The Canadian Geographer*, 54(4), 410-416.
- Dillon, M. C. (1988). *Merleau-Ponty's ontology*. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Donaldson, S. G. 2007. *The role of local renewable resources in the health and well-being of women and men living in Cape Dorset, Nunavut, Canada*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. Carleton University, Ottawa, ON.
- Doubleday, N. C. (2003). The nexus of identity, Inuit autonomy and Arctic sustainability: Learning from Nunavut, community and culture. *British Journal of Canadian Studies*, 16(2), 297-308.
- Doubleday, N. C. (2007). Culturing adaptive co-management: Finding “keys” to resilience in asymmetries of power. In Armitage, D., Berkes, F., & Doubleday, N. C. (eds.), *Adaptive co-management: Collaboration, learning, and multi-level governance* (pp. 228-246). Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- Doubleday, N. C., Mackenzie, F. A. D., & Dalby, S. (2004). Reimagining sustainable cultures: Constitutions, land and art. *The Canadian Geographer*, 48(4), 389-402.
- Doubleday, N. C., Donaldson, S. G., Vlasova, T., Kushwaha, A., & Ip, M. (2008).

- Human experience of cryospheric change in Nunavut, Canada. *Ninth International Conferences on Permafrost: Extended abstracts* (pp. 65-66). Fairbanks, AK: University of Alaska Fairbanks.
- Doubleday, N. C., Donaldson, S. G., Ip, M., Grimwood, B. S. R., Charette, D., Van Oostdam, J. (2010). Photos and plants through time and food choice research: Collaborative community research. Paper presented at the *International Polar Year Oslo Science Conference*, Oslo, Norway.
- Dowsley, M. (2009). Inuit-organised polar bear sport hunting in Nuavut territory, Canada. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 8(2), 161-175.
- Dunlap, R. E. (2010). The maturation and diversification of environmental sociology: From constructivism and realism to agnosticism and pragmatism. In M. R. Redclift & G. Woodgate (Eds.), *The international handbook of environmental sociology* (2nd ed., pp. 15-32). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Dyer, S., & Demeritt, D. (2009). Un-ethical review? Why it is wrong to apply the medical model of research governance to human geography. *Progress in Human Geography*, 33(1), 46 - 64.
- Erickson, B. (2008). Canoe Nation: Canoes and the shifting production of space through white Canadian masculinities. *Antipode*, 40(1), 182-184.
- Erickson, B. (2009). *Canoe nation: Race and gender in the making of a national icon*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, York University, York, ON.
- Escobar, A. (2010). Postconstructivist political ecologies. In M. R. Redclift & G. Woodgate (Eds.), *The international handbook of environmental sociology* (2nd ed., pp. 91-105). Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Evernden, N. (1992). *The social creation of nature*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Feighery, W. G. (2011). Consulting ethics. *Annals of Tourism Research*, doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2011.1001.1016.
- Fennell, D. A. (2006). *Tourism ethics*. Toronto, ON: Channel View Publications.
- Fennell, D. A. (2008a). *Ecotourism* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge Publishing.
- Fennell, D. A. (2008b). Responsible tourism: A Kierkegaardian interpretation. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 33(1), 3-12.
- Fennell, D. A., & Malloy, D. C. (2007). *Codes of ethics in tourism: Practice, theory, synthesis*. Toronto, ON: Channel View Publications.
- Figueroa, R. M., & Waitt, G. (2008). Cracks in the mirror: (Un)covering the moral terrains of environmental justice at Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park. *Ethics, Place and Environment*, 11(3), 327-349.
- Finklestein, M. (2007). Go North -- The five Arctic rivers you have to do before you die: The Thelon River, Northwest Territories and Nunavut. *Canoeroots, Fall Issue*, 23.
- Foster, A., & Linney, G. (2007). *Reconnecting children through outdoor education: A research summary*. Toronto, ON: Council of Outdoor Educators of Ontario. (Document Number)
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. New York, NY: Harper Colophon.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings 1972 - 1977*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

- Foucault, M. (1985). *The use of pleasure: Volume 2 of the history of sexuality*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1997). *The politics of truth*. New York, NY: Sexiote(x).
- Fox, K. M., & McAvoy, L. H. (1998). Wayfaring metaphors and environmental ethics. In A. E. Watson, G. H. Aplet & J. C. Hendee (Eds.), *Personal, societal, and ecological values of wilderness: Sixth World Wilderness Congress proceedings on research, management, and allocation* (pp. 73-78). RMRS-P-4 Ogden, UT: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station.
- Fox, S. (2002). These are things that are really happening. In I. Krupnik & D. Jolly (Eds.), *The Earth is faster now: Indigenous observations of arctic environmental change* (pp. 12-53). Fairbanks, Alaska: Arctic Research Consortium of the United States.
- Fox, W. (1990). The most widely recognized approaches in ecophilosophy. In *Toward a transpersonal ecology: Developing new foundations for environmentalism* (pp. 149-196). Boston, MA: Shambhala Publications, Inc.
- Franklin, A. (2004). Tourism as an ordering: Towards a new ontology of tourism. *Tourist Studies*, 4(2), 277-301.
- Franklin, A., & Crang, M. A. (2001). The trouble with tourism and travel theory? *Tourist Studies*, 1, 5-22.
- Frauley, J., & Pearce, F. (2007a). Critical realism and the social sciences: Methodological and epistemological preliminaries. In J. Frauley & F. Pearce (Eds.), *Critical realism and the social sciences: Heterodox elaborations* (pp. 3-29). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

- Frauley, J., & Pearce, F. (Eds.). (2007b). *Critical realism and the social sciences: Heterodox elaboration*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Freeman, M. M. R., & Wenzel, G. W. (2006). The nature and significance of polar bear conservation hunting in the Canadian Arctic. *Arctic*, 59(1), 21-30.
- Freeman, R. (2010). The Beaulieu clan: "Unlettered People". In M. Asfeldt & B. Henderson (Eds.), *Pike's portage: Stories of a distinguished place* (pp. 149-157). Toronto, ON: Dundurn Press.
- Frey, N., & George, R. (2010). Responsible tourism management: The missing link between business owners' attitudes and behaviour in the Cape Town tourism industry. *Tourism Management*, 31, 621-628.
- Friesen, T. M. (2004). A tale of two settlement patterns: Environmental and cultural determinants of Inuit and Dene site distributions. In G. M. Crothers (Ed.), *Hunters and gatherers in theory and archaeology*. Center for Archaeological Investigations, Occasional Paper No. 31: Southern Illinois University.
- Furgal, C., & Seguin, J. (2006). Climate change, health, and vulnerability in Canadian northern Aboriginal communities. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 114(12), 1964-1970.
- Garrod, B. (2007). A snapshot into the past: The utility of volunteer-employed photography in planning and managing heritage tourism. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 2(1), 14-35.
- Gearheard, S., & Shirley, J. (2007). Challenges in community-research relationships: Learning from natural science in Nunavut. *Arctic*, 60(1), 62-74.

- Gearheard, S., Aporta, C., Aipellee, G., & O'Keefe, K. (2011). The Igliniit project: Inuit hunters document life on the trail to map and monitor arctic change. *The Canadian Geographer*, 55(1), 42-55.
- Gibson-Graham, J. K. (2003). An ethics of the local. *Rethinking Marxism*, 15(1), 49 - 74.
- Gillet, D. P., Thomas, G. P., Skok, R. L., & McLaughlin, T. F. (1991). The effects of wilderness camping and hiking on the self-concept and the environmental attitudes and knowledge of twelfth graders. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 22(3), 33-44.
- Glacken, C. (1967). *Traces on a Rhodian shore: Nature and culture in western thought from ancient times to the end of the eighteenth century*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Gleeson, R. (1999). Canoeing across cultures: Eight-week canoe trip brings Germans, Dene and Inuit together. *Northern News Services*, June 14, 1999. Accessed online at: http://www.nnsl.com/frames/newspapers/1999-06/jun14_99canoe.html.
- Goeldner, C. R. (2005). Reflections on the historic role of journals in shaping tourism knowledge. *The Journal of Tourism Studies*, 16(2), 44-51.
- Gombay, N. (2005). Shifting identities in a shifting world: Food, place, community, and the politics of scale in an Inuit settlement. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 23, 415-433.
- Goodwin, H., & Francis, J. (2003). Ethical and responsible tourism: Consumer trends in the UK. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 9(3), 271-284.
- Gordon, B. H. C. (1975). *Of men and herds in barrenland prehistory*. Ottawa, ON: National Museums of Canada.

- Gordon, B. H. C. (1996). *People of sunlight, people of starlight: Barrenland archaeology in the Northwest Territories of Canada*. Hull, QC: Canadian Museum of Civilization.
- Gray, N. (2003). Unpacking the baggage of ecotourism: Nature, science, and local participation. *The Great Lakes Geographer*, 9(2), 113-123.
- Gregory, D. (2001). (Post)colonialism and the production of nature. In N. Castree & B. Braun (Eds.), *Social nature: Theory, practice, and politics* (pp. 84-111). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Gregory, D., Johnston, R., Pratt, G., Watts, M. J., & Whatmore, S. (Eds.). (2009). *The dictionary of human geography*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Grenier, A. A. (2004). *The nature of nature tourism*. Lapland, Finland: University of Lapland Press.
- Grenier, A. A., & Müller, D. (Eds.). (2011). *Polar tourism: A tool for regional development*. Québec, QC: UQAM Press.
- Grimwood, B. S. R. (2005). *The nature experiences of wilderness recreation leaders: Throwing a stone*. Unpublished Master of Arts thesis, Brock University, St. Catharines, ON.
- Grimwood, B. S. R. (2011). "Thinking outside the gunnells": Considering natures and the moral terrains of recreational canoe travel. *Leisure/Loisir*, 35(1), 49-69.
- Grimwood, B. S. R., & Fennell, D. A. (2011). Meditative thinking for polar tourism codes of ethics. In A. A. Grenier & D. Müller (Eds.), *Polar tourism: A tool for regional development*. Québec, QC: UQAM Press.

- Grimwood, B. S. R., Doubleday, N. C., Laidler, G. J., Donaldson, S. G., & Blangy, S. (in press). Engaged acclimatization: Towards responsible community-based research in Nunavut. *The Canadian Geographer*.
- Gyimothy, S., & Mykletun, R. J. (2004). Play in adventure tourism: The case of Arctic trekking. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(4), 855-878.
- Haldrup, M. (2004). Laid-back mobilities: Second home holidays in time and space. *Tourism Geographies*, 6(4), 434-454.
- Hall, A. M. (2003). *Discovering Eden: A lifetime of paddling Arctic rivers*. Toronto, ON: Key Porter Books.
- Hall, A. M. (2010). Canoe Arctic Inc. information brochure. Distributed November 23, 2009.
- Hall, C. M. (2005). *Tourism: Rethinking the social science of mobility*. London, UK: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Hall, C. M., & Boyd, S. (Eds.). (2005). *Nature-based tourism in peripheral areas: Development or disaster?* Toronto, ON: Channel View Publications.
- Hall, C. M., & Johnston, M. E. (Eds.). (1995). *Polar tourism: Tourism in the Arctic and Antarctic regions*. Toronto, ON: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hall, C. M., Müller, D. K., & Saarinen, J. (2009). *Nordic tourism: Issues and cases*. Toronto, ON: Channel View Publications.
- Hall, C. M., & Page, S. J. (2006). *The geography of tourism and recreation: Environment, place and space* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hall, D., & Brown, F. (2006). *Tourism and welfare: Ethics, responsibility and sustained well-being*. Cambridge, MA: CABI

- Haluzá-Delay, R. (2001). Nothing here care about: Participant constructions of nature following a 12-day wilderness program. *The Journal of Experiential Education*, 32(4), 43-48.
- Hanna, G. (1995). Wilderness-related environmental outcomes of adventure and ecology education programming. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 27(1), 21-32.
- Hannam, K. (2008). Tourism geographies, tourist studies and the turn towards mobilities. *Geography Compass*, 2(1), 127-139.
- Hannam, K. (2009). The end of tourism? Nomadology and the mobilities paradigm. In J. Tribe (Ed.), *Philosophical issues in tourism* (pp. 101-113). Toronto, ON: Channel View Publications.
- Haraway, D. J. (1991). *Simians, cyborgs, and women: The reinvention of nature*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Haraway, D. J. (2008). *When species meet*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Harper, D. (2002). Talking about pictures: A case for photo elicitation. *Visual Studies*, 17(1), 13-26.
- Harrison, D. (2007). Towards developing a framework for analysing tourism phenomena: A discussion. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 10(1), 61 - 86.
- Harvey, D. (1996). *Justice, nature, and the geography of difference*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Haun-Moss, B. (2002). Layered hegemonies: The origins of recreational canoeing desire in the Province of Ontario. *Topia: Canadian Journal of Cultural Studies*, 7, 39-55.

- Heidegger, M. (1966). *Discourse on thinking*. New York, NY: Harper Torchbooks.
- Heidegger, M. (2008). Building dwelling thinking. In D. F. Krell (Ed.), *Basic writings from Being and time (1927) and The task of thinking (1964)* (pp. 343-363). Toronto, ON: Harper Perennial.
- Hinchliffe, S. (2007). *Geographies of nature: Societies, environments, ecologies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hinchliffe, S. (2008). Reconstituting nature conservation: Towards a careful political ecology. *Geoforum*, 39, 88-97.
- Hodge, P., & Lester, J. (2006). Indigenous research: Whose priority? Journeys and possibilities of cross-cultural research in geography. *Geographical Research*, 44(1), 41-51.
- Hodgins, B. (1988). Canoe irony: Symbol and harbinger. In J. Raffan & B. Horwood (Eds.), *Canexus: The canoe in Canadian culture* (pp. 45-57). Toronto, ON: Betelguese Books.
- Hodgins, B., & Hobbs, M. (Eds.). (1985). *Nastawgan: The Canadian north by canoe and snowshoe*. Weston, ON: Betelgeuse Books.
- Hodgins, B., & Hoyle, G. (1994). Rivers of the barrens: Thelon and its tributaries. In B. Hodgins & G. Hoyle (Eds.), *Canoeing north into the unknown: A record of river travel: 1874 - 1974* (pp. 99-107). Toronto, ON: Natural Heritage.
- Hogan, R. A. (1992). The natural environment in wilderness programmes: Playing field or sacred space? *The Journal of Adventure Education and Outdoor Leadership*, 9(1), 25-31.

- Holden, A. (2003). In need of new environmental ethics for tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 30*, 94-108.
- Hollinshead, K. (2007). 'Worldmaking' and the transformation of place and culture. In I. Ateljevic, A. Pritchard & N. Morgan (Eds.), *The critical turn in tourism studies: Innovative research methodologies* (pp. 165-193). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Hollinshead, K., Ateljevic, I., & Ali, N. (2009). Worldmaking agency--worldmaking authority: The sovereign constitutive role of tourism. *Tourism Geographies, 11*(4), 427-443.
- Horwood, B. (1988). Canoe trips: Doors to the primitive. In J. Raffan & B. Horwood (Eds.), *Canexus: The canoe in Canadian culture* (pp. 123-134). Toronto, ON: Betelgeuse Books.
- Hudson, S., & Miller, G. A. (2005). The responsible marketing of tourism: The case of Canadian Mountain Holidays. *Tourism Management, 26*, 133-142.
- Husbands, W., & Harrison, L. C. (1996). Practicing responsible tourism: Understanding tourism today to prepare for tomorrow. In L. C. Harrison & W. Husbands (Eds.), *Practicing responsible tourism: International case studies in tourism, planning, policy, and development* (pp. 1-15). Toronto, ON: John Wiley & Sons, INC.
- Hvenegaard, G., & Asfeldt, M. (2007). Embracing friluftsliv's joys: Teaching the Canadian North through the Canadian wilderness travel experience. In B. Henderson & N. Vikander (Eds.), *Nature first: Outdoor life the friluftsliv way* (pp. 168-178). Toronto, ON: Natural Heritage Books.
- Ingold, T. (2000). *The perception of the environment: Essays in livelihood, dwelling and skill*. New York, NY: Routledge.

- Ingold, T. (2007). *Lines: A brief history*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ingold, T. (2011). *The perception of the environment: Essays on livelihood, dwelling and skill* (reissue). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Inuit Qaujimajatuqanginnut Task Force. (2002). *The first annual report of the Inuit Qaujimajatuqanginnut Task Force*, in Iqaluit, Government of Nunavut, August 2002.
- Ip, M. (2009). *Architecture and healing: Culturally appropriate design in the Canadian Arctic*. Unpublished MArch Thesis, Carleton University, Ottawa, ON.
- Ip, M., Grimwood, B. S. R., Kushwaha, A., Doubleday, N. C., & Donaldson, S. G. (2008). Photos and plants through time: Monitoring environmental change in the Canadian Arctic with implications for outdoor education. *Pathways: The Ontario Journal of Outdoor Education*, 21(1), 14-18.
- Ip, M., Donaldson, S. G., Doubleday, N. C., Haines, D., Charette, D., Nancarrow, T., Grimwood, B. S. R., Manning, A., Leech, T. Adlard, B., & Van Oostdam, J. (2010). A comparative analysis of the gender specific determinants of diet choice in three communities in Nunavut, Canada. Paper presentation at the *ArcticNet Annual Scientific Meeting*, Ottawa, ON.
- ITK/NRI. (2007). Negotiating research relationships with Inuit communities: A guide for researchers. In S. Nickels, J. Shirley & G. Laidler (Eds.). Ottawa and Iqaluit: Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami and Nunavut Research Institute.
- Jackson, P. (2001). Making sense of qualitative data. In M. Limb & C. Dwyer (Eds.), *Qualitative methodologies for geographers* (pp. 199-214). London: Arnold.

- Jazeel, T., & McFarlane, C. (2010). The limits of responsibility: A postcolonial politics of academic knowledge production. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 35, 109-124.
- Jenkins, O. H. (2003). Photography and travel brochures: The circle of representation. *Tourism Geographies* 5, 305-328.
- Jickling, B. (2005). Ethics research in environmental education. *South African Journal of Environmental Education*, 22, 20-34.
- Jóhannesson, G. T. (2005). Tourism translations: Actor-network theory and tourism research. *Tourist Studies* 5, 133-150.
- Johnson, J. T. (2010). Place-based learning and knowing: Critical pedagogies grounded in Indigeneity. *Geojournal*., DOI: 10.1007/s10708-010-9379-1.
- Johnson, J. T., & Murton, B. (2007). Re/placing native science: Indigenous voices in contemporary constructions of nature. *Geographical Research*, 45(2), 121-129.
- Johnston, R. J., & Sidway, J. D. (2004). *Geography and geographers: Anglo-American human geography since 1945* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kabloona, C., Anautalik, E., Kreelak, M., Ikuutaq, S., McGregor, J., & Bielawski, E. (No date). *Baker Lake's trails into the past*. Baker Lake, Nunavut: Inuit Heritage Centre.
- Kane, M. J., & Tucker, H. (2004). Adventure tourism: The freedom to play with reality. *Tourist Studies*, 4, 217-234.
- Kellert, S. (2005). *Building for life: Designing and understanding the human-nature connection*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.

- Kellert, S., & Wilson, E. O. (Eds.). (1993). *The biophilia hypothesis*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.
- Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (2000). Participatory action research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed., pp. 567-606). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Kendrick, A., & Manseau, M. (2008). Representing traditional knowledge: Resource management and Inuit knowledge of barren-ground caribou. *Society and Natural Resources*, 21(5), 404-418.
- Kim, H., & Jamal, T. (2007). Touristic quest for existential authenticity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(1), 181-201.
- Kitchin, R., & Tate, N. J. (2000). *Conducting research in human geography: Theory, methodology and practice*. New York, NY: Prentice Hall.
- Kobayashi, A. (2002). Negotiating the personal and the political in critical qualitative research. In M. Limb & C. Dwyer (Eds.), *Qualitative methodologies for geographers* (pp. 55-70.). London: Arnold.
- Kobayashi, A., & Proctor, J. D. (2004). How far have we cared? Recent developments in the geography of values, justice and ethics. In G. Gaile & C. Willmott (Eds.), *Geography in America* (pp. 723-731). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Krupnik, I., & Jolly, D. (Eds.). (2002). *The Earth is faster now: Indigenous observations of arctic environmental change*. Fairbanks, AK: Arctic Research Consortium of the United States.

- kulchyski, p. (2006). six gestures. In P. Stern & L. Stevenson (Eds.), *Critical Inuit studies: An anthology of contemporary Arctic ethnography* (pp. 155-167). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Kulchyski, P., & Tester, F. J. (2007). *Kiumajut (talking back): Game management and Inuit rights, 1900-70*. Toronto, ON: UBC Press.
- Laidler, G. J. 2009. *Qanuittumik takuvit? Report on the results of a research planning workshop in Rankin Inlet*, December 9-10, 2009. Available at: www.straightupnorth.ca/Sikuliriji/RK-SummReports.html
- Laidler, G. J., & Elee, P. (2008). Human geographies of sea ice: Freeze/thaw processes around Cape Dorset, Nunavut, Canada. *Polar Record*, 44(228), 51-76.
- Laidler, G. J., & Grimwood, B. S. R. (2010). *Qanuittumik takuvit? Report on the results of a research planning workshop in Gjoa Haven*, February 17-19, 2010. Available at: <http://www.straightupnorth.ca/Sikuliriji/GH-SummReports.html>
- Laidler, G. J., Hirose, T., Kapfer, M., Ikummaq, T., Joamie, E., Elee, P. (2011). Evaluating the Floe Edge Service: How well can SAR imagery address Inuit community concerns around sea ice change and travel safety? *The Canadian Geographer*, 55(1), 91-107.
- Larsen, J. (2008). De-exoticizing tourist travel: Everyday life and sociality on the move. *Leisure Studies*, 27(1), 21-34.
- Latour, B. (1993). *We have never been modern*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Latour, B. (2004). *Politics of nature: How to bring the sciences into democracy*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Law, J. (2004). *After method: Mess in social science research*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Leduc, T. B. (2006). Inuit economic adaptations for a changing global climate. *Ecological Economics*, 60, 27-35.
- Lemelin, R. H., Dawson, J., Stewart, E. J., Maher, P. T., & Lück, M. (2010). Last-chance tourism: The boom, doom, and gloom of visiting vanishing destinations. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 13(5), 477-493.
- Lemelin, R. H., & Johnston, M. E. (2009). Northern parks and protected areas. In P. Dearden & R. Rollins (Eds.), *Parks and protected areas in Canada: Planning and management* (3rd ed., pp. 294-312). Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Levinas, E. (1969). *Totality and infinity*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.
- Levinas, E. (1981). *Otherwise than Being or beyond essence* (A. Lingis, Trans.). Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.
- Levinas, E. (1985). *Ethics and infinity: Conversations with Philippe Nemo* (R. A. Cohen, Trans.). Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.
- Light, A., & Smith, J. M. (Eds.). (1997). *Philosophy and geography I: Space, place, and environmental ethics*. New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2000). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed., pp. 163-188). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Lingis, A. (1981). Translator's introduction. In E. Levinas (Ed.), *Otherwise than being, or beyond essence*. Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press.

- LNT. (2009). Retrieved June 27, 2009, from www.leavenotrace.ca/programs/index.html
- Loeffler, T. A. (2004). A photo elicitation study of the meanings of outdoor adventure experiences. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 36(6), 536 - 556.
- Louis, R. P. (2007). Can you hear us now? Voices from the margin: Using indigenous methodologies in geographic research. *Geographical Research*, 45(2), 130-139.
- Louv, R. (2005). *Last child in the woods: Saving our children from nature-deficit disorder*. Chapel Hill, NC: Algonquin Books of Chapel Hill.
- Lowan, G. E. (2008). *Outward Bound Giwaykiwin: Wilderness-based Indigenous education*. Unpublished Master of Education thesis, Lakehead University, Thunderbay, ON.
- Lowan, G. E. (2009). Exploring place from an aboriginal perspective: Considerations for outdoor and environmental education. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, 14(1), 42-58.
- Lozanski, K. (2010). Independent travel: Colonialism, liberalism and the self. *Critical sociology*, 1-18.
- Lück, M., Maher, P. T., & Stewart, E. J. (Eds.). (2010). *Cruise tourism in polar regions: Promoting environmental and social sustainability?* London, UK: Earthscan.
- MacKay, K. J., & Couldwell, C. M. (2004). Using visitor-employed photography to investigate destination image. *Journal of Travel Research*, 42, 390-396.
- Mackinnon, C. S. (1983). A history of the Thelon Game Sanctuary. *Musk-Ox*, 32, 44-61.
- Maher, P. T. (2007). Arctic tourism: A complex system of visitors, communities, and environments. *Polar Geography*, 30(1), 1-5.

- Maher, P. T., Steel, G., & McIntosh, A. (2003). Antarctica: Tourism, wilderness, and "ambassadorship". In A. Watson, & J. Sproull (Eds.). *Science and stewardship to protect and sustain wilderness values: Seventh World Wilderness Congress symposium* (pp. 204-209). Ogden, UT: USDA Forest Service.
- Maher, P. T., Stewart, E. J., & Lück, M. (Eds.). (2011). *Polar tourism: Human, environmental and governance dimensions*. Putnam Valley, NY: Cognizant Communication Corporation.
- Mannick, H. (Ed.). (1998). *Inuit Nunamiut: Inland Inuit*. Altona, Manitoba: Friesen Corporation.
- Markey, S., Halseth, G., & Mason, D. (2010). Capacity, scale and place: Pragmatic lessons for doing community-based research in the rural setting. *The Canadian Geographer*, 54(2), 158-176.
- Marshall, G. J. (2008). *A guide to Merleau-Ponty's "Phenomenology of Perception"*. Milwaukee, WI: Marquette University Press.
- Martin, D. C. (2004). Apartheid in the great outdoors: American advertising and the reproduction of a racialized outdoor leisure identity. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 36(4), 513-535.
- Mason, B. (1988). *Song of the paddle*. Toronto, ON: Key Porter Books Ltd.
- Mason, P. (1997). Tourism codes of conduct in the Arctic and sub-Arctic region. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 5(2), 151-165.
- Mason, P. (2005). Visitor management in protected areas of the periphery: Polar perspectives. *Tourism and Hospitality Planning and Development*, 2(3), 171-190.
- Massey, D. (1992). A place called home? *New Formations*, 17, 3-15.

- Massey, D. (2005). *For space*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Massey, D., Allen, J., & Sarre, P. (Eds.). (1999). *Human geography today*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Massey, D., & collective. (1999). Issues and debates. In D. Massey, J. Allen & P. Sarre (Eds.), *Human geography today* (pp. 3-21). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Matless, D. (1994). Moral geography in Broadlands. *Ecumene*, 1(2), 127-155.
- Matless, D. (2009a). Moral geographies. In D. Gregory, R. Johnston, G. Pratt, M. J. Watts & S. Whatmore (Eds.), *The dictionary of human geography* (5th ed., pp. 478-479). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Matless, D. (2009b). Moral landscapes. In D. Gregory, R. Johnston, G. Pratt, M. J. Watts & S. Whatmore (Eds.), *The dictionary of human geography* (5th ed., pp. 479-480). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Matless, D. (2009). Values. In D. Gregory, R. Johnston, G. Pratt, M. J. Watts & S. Whatmore (Eds.), *The dictionary of human geography* (5th ed., pp. 797). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- McClintock, A. (1995). *Imperial leather: Race, gender and sexuality in the colonial contest*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- McCreadie, M. (1995). *Canoeing Canada's Northwest Territories: A paddler's guide*. Hyde Park, ON: Canadian Recreational Canoe Association.
- McDermott, L. (2004). Exploring intersections of physicality and female-only canoeing experiences. *Leisure Studies*, 23(3), 283-301.

- McDonald, J. A. (2004). The Tsimshian protocols: Locating and empowering community-based research. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 28(1/2), 80-91.
- McKenzie, M., Hart, P., Bai, H., & Jickling, B. (2009). *Fields of green: Restorying culture, environment, and education*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.
- McKibben, R. (1989). *The end of nature*. New York, NY: Vintage.
- Meethan, K. (2003). Mobile cultures? Hybridity, tourism and cultural change. *Tourism and Cultural Change*, 1(1), 11-28.
- Mehmetoglu, M. (2007). Nature-based tourism: A contrast to everyday life. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 6(2), 111-126.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (1962). *Phenomenology of perception*. London, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (2004). *The world of perception*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Mitten, D. (2009). *The healing power of nature: The need for nature for human health, development, and wellbeing*. Paper presented at the Henrik Ibsen and The Birth of "Friluftsliv": A 150 Year International Dialogue, Conference, Jubilee, Celebration, Trondelag University College, Norway.
- Mohammad, R. (2001). "Insiders" and/or "outsiders": Positionality, theory and praxis. In M. Limb & C. Dwyer (Eds.), *Qualitative methodologies for geographers* (pp. 101-117). London: Arnold.
- Mol, A. (1999). Ontological politics. A word and some questions. In J. Law & J. Hassard (Eds.), *Actor-network theory and after* (pp. 74 - 89). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

- Mol, A. (2002). *The body multiple: Ontology in medical practice*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Mol, A., & Law, J. (2002). Complexities: An introduction. In J. Law & A. Mol (Eds.), *Complexities: Social studies of knowledge practices* (pp. 1-22). Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Morse, E. W. (1987). *Freshwater saga: Memoirs of a lifetime of wilderness canoeing in Canada*. Ashland, Wisconsin: NorthWord Inc.
- Mowforth, M., Charlton, C., & Munt, I. (2008). *Tourism and responsibility: Perspectives from Latin America and the Caribbean*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Mullins, P. M. (2009). Living stories of the landscape: Perception of place through canoeing in Canada's North. *Tourism Geographies*, 11(2), 233-255.
- Mullins, P. M., & Maher, P. T. (2007). *Paddling the Big Sky: Reflections on place-based education and experience*. Paper presented at the Science and stewardship to protect and sustain wilderness values: Eighth World Wilderness Congress symposium, Anchorage, AK.
- Nakamura, N. (2010). Indigenous methodologies: Suggestions for junior researchers. *Geographical Research*, 48(1), 97-103.
- Newbery, L. (2003). Will any/body carry that canoe? A geography of the body, ability, and gender. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, 8, 204-216.
- No author. (2011). Way up North -- Five northern rivers you can do: Thelon River, Northwest Territories/Nunavut. *Canoe roots, Early Summer Issue*, 18.
- Norment, C. (2008). *Return to Warden's Grove: Science, desire, and the lives of sparrows*. Iowa City, IA: University of Iowa Press.

- Norment, C. J., Hall, A. M., & Hendricks, P. (1999). Important bird and mammal records in the Thelon River valley, Northwest Territories: Range expansions and possible causes. *The Canadian Field-Naturalist*, 113(3), 375-385.
- Palmberg, I. E., & Kuru, J. (2000). Outdoor activities as a basis for environmental responsibility. *The Journal of Experiential Education*, 31(4), 32-36.
- Panelli, R. (2008). Social geographies: Encounters with Indigenous and more-than-White/Anglo geographies. *Progress in Human Geography*, 32, 1-11.
- Parr, J. (2010). *Sensing changes: Technologies, environments, and the everyday, 1953-2003*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- Patterson, M. E., Watson, A. E., Williams, D. R., & Roggenbuck, J. R. (1998). An hermeneutic approach to studying the nature of wilderness experiences. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 30(4), 423-452.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pearce, F. (2007). Bhaskar's critical realism: An appreciative introduction and a friendly critique. In J. Frauley & F. Pearce (Eds.), *Critical realism and the social sciences: Heterodox elaborations* (pp. 30-63). Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- Pearce, T. D., Ford, J. D., Laidler, G. J., Smit, B., Duerden, F., Allarut, M., Andrachuk, M., Baryluk, S., Aialla, A., Elee, P., Goose, A., Ikummaq, T., Joamie, E., Kataoyak, F., Loring, E., Meakin, S., Nickels, S., Shappa, K., Shirley, J., & Wandel, J. (2009). Community collaboration and climate change research in the Canadian Arctic. *Polar Research*, 28(1), 10-27.

- Pelly, D. F. (1996). *Thelon: A river sanctuary*. Hyde Park, ON: Canadian Recreational Canoeing Association.
- Pelly, D. F. (1997). *Arctic cairn notes: Canoeists' reflections on the Hanbury-Thelon & Kazan Rivers*. Toronto, ON: Betelgeuse Books.
- Pelly, D. F. (2005). *A synthesis of the Hanningajuq Project*. Baker Lake, NU: Baker Lake Hunters & Trappers Organization.
- Pernecky, T. (2010). The being of tourism. *The Journal of Tourism and Peace Research*, 1(1), 1-15.
- Perpich, D. (2008). *The ethics of Emmanuel Levinas*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Plummer, R. (2009). *Outdoor recreation: An introduction*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Plumwood, V. (2002). *Environmental culture: The ecological crisis of reason*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Pohl, S. (2006). Technology and the wilderness experience. *Environmental Ethics*, 28(2), 147-163.
- Pons, P. O. (2003). Living on display: Tourist dwelling, bodies and place. *Tourist Studies*, 3(1), 47-66.
- Popke, J. (2009). Geography and ethics: Non-representational encounters, collective responsibility and economic difference. *Progress in Human Geography*, 33(1), 81 - 90.
- Priest, S., & Gass, M. A. (1997). *Effective leadership in adventure programming*. Windsor, ON: Human Kinetics.

- Pritchard, A., & Morgan, N. (2007). De-centring tourism's intellectual universe, or traversing the dialogue between change and tradition. In I. Ateljevic, A. Pritchard & N. Morgan (Eds.), *The critical turn in tourism studies: Innovative research methodologies* (pp. 11-28). New York, NY: Elsevier.
- Pritchard, A., Morgan, N., & Ateljevic, I. (2011). Hopeful tourism: A new transformative perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, doi: 10.1016/j.annals.2011.1001.1004.
- Proctor, J. D. (1995). Whose nature? The contested moral terrain of ancient forests. In W. Cronon (Ed.), *Uncommon ground: Rethinking the human place in nature* (pp. 269-297). New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Proctor, J. D. (1998a). The social construction of nature: Relativist accusations, pragmatist and critical realist responses. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 88(3), 352-376.
- Proctor, J. D. (1998b). Ethics in geography: Giving moral form to the geographical imagination. *Area*, 30(1), 8-18.
- Proctor, J. D. (1999). Introduction: Overlapping terrains. In J. D. Proctor & D. M. Smith (Eds.), *Geography and ethics: Journeys in a moral terrain* (pp. 1-16). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Proctor, J. D. (2001). Solid rock and shifting sands: The moral paradox of saving a socially constructed nature. In N. Castree & B. Braun (Eds.), *Social nature: Theory, practice, and politics* (pp. 225-239). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

- Proctor, J. D. (2009). Environment after nature: Time for a new vision. In J. D. Proctor (Ed.), *Envisioning nature, science, and religion*. (pp. 1-14). West Coughohocken, PA: Templeton Foundation Press.
- Puhakka, R. (2011). Environmental concern and responsibility among nature tourists in Oulanka PAN Park, Finland. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 11(1), 76-96.
- Quigley, P. (1999). Nature as dangerous space. In É. Darier (Ed.), *Discourses of the environment* (pp. 181-202). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Raffan, J. (1988). Probing canoe trips for persistent meaning. In J. Raffan & B. Horwood (Eds.), *Canexus: The canoe in Canadian culture* (pp. 171-186). Toronto, ON: Betelgeuse Books.
- Raffan, J. (1992). *Frontier, homeland and sacred space: A collaborative investigation into cross-cultural perceptions of place*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Queen's University, Kingston, ON.
- Raffan, J. (1993). The experience of place: Exploring land as teacher. *The Journal of Experiential Education*, 16(1), 39-45.
- Raffan, J. (1993). Where God began. *Equinox*, 12, 44-57.
- Raffan, J. (1999). *Bark, skin and cedar: Exploring the canoe in Canadian experience*. Toronto, ON: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Raffan, J. (Ed.). (2004). *Rendezvous with the wild: The Boreal Forest*. Erin, ON: Bost Mills Press.
- Raffan, J., & Barrett, M. J. (1989). Sharing the path: Reflections on journals from an expedition. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 12(2), 29-36.

- Rasmussen, K. (1930). *Observations on the intellectual culture of the Caribou Eskimos*.
Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
- Reid, D. (2003). *Tourism, globalization and development: Responsible tourism planning*.
London, UK: Pluto Press.
- Relph, E. (1976). *Place and placelessness*. London, UK: Pion Limited.
- Rose, G. (2007). *Visual methodologies: An introduction to the interpretation of visual materials* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rundstrom, R., & Deur, D. (1999). Reciprocal appropriation: Toward an ethics of cross-cultural research. In J. D. Proctor & D. M. Smith (Eds.), *Geography and ethics: Journeys in a moral terrain* (pp. 237-250). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ryan, S. (2002). Cyborgs in the woods. *Leisure studies*, 21, 265-284.
- Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Sandlos, J. (2007). *Hunters at the margin: Native people and wildlife conservation in the Northwest Territories*. Vancouver, BC: UBC Press.
- Saul, J. R. (2008). *A fair country: Telling truths about Canada*. Toronto, ON: Viking Canada.
- Sauer, C. O. (1925). The morphology of landscape. *University of California Publications in Geography*, 2, 19-54.
- Sayer, A. (1992). *Method in social science: A realist approach*. London, UK: Hutchinson.
- Sayer, A., & Storper, M. (1997). Ethics unbound: For a normative turn in social theory. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 15, 1-17.

- Schein, R. H. (2004). Cultural traditions. In J. S. Duncan, N. C. Johnson & R. H. Schein (Eds.), *A companion to cultural geography* (pp. 11-23). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Setten, G. (2004). The habitus, the rule and the moral landscape. *cultural geographies*, 11, 389-415.
- Serres, M. (2009). *The five senses: A philosophy of mingled bodies* (M. Sankey & P. Cowley, Trans.). New York, NY: Continuum.
- Shapiro, M. J. (1999). The ethics of encounter: Unreading, unmapping the imperium. In D. Campbell & M. J. Shapiro (Eds.), *Moral spaces: Rethinking ethics and world politics* (pp. 57-91). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Shields, R. (1991). *Places on the margins: Alternative geographies of modernity*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Simpson, L. (2001). Aboriginal peoples and knowledge: Decolonizing our processes. *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies*, 21(1), 137-148.
- Simon, G. L., & Alagona, P. S. (2009). Beyond Leave No Trace. *Ethics, Place and Environment*, 12(1), 17-34.
- Smale, B. (2006). Critical perspectives on place in leisure research. *Leisure/Loisir*, 30(2), 369 - 382.
- Smith, D. M. (1997). Geography and ethics: A moral turn? *Progress in Human Geography*, 21(4), 583-590.
- Smith, D. M. (2000). *Moral geographies: Ethics in a world of difference*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Smith, L. (1999). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*.

London, UK: Zed Books.

Smith, M. (2001). The face of nature: Environmental ethics and the boundaries of contemporary social theory. *Current Sociology*, 49(1), 49-65.

Smith, M. (2009). Development and its discontents: Ego-tripping without ethics or idea(l)s? In J. Tribe (Ed.), *Philosophical issues in tourism* (pp. 261-277). Toronto, ON: Channel View Publications.

Smith, M., & Duffy, R. (2003). *The ethics of tourism development*, New York, NY, Routledge.

Snyder, J. M., & Stonehouse, B. (Eds.). (2007). *Prospects for polar tourism*. London, UK: CAB International.

Soulé, M., & Lease, G. (Eds.). (1995). *Reinventing nature? Responses to postmodern deconstruction*. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Spivak, G. C. (1994). Responsibility. *boundary 2*, 21(3), 19-64.

Stake, R. E. (2000). Case studies. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 435 - 454). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stanford, D. (2008). 'Exceptional visitors': Dimensions of tourist responsibility in the context of New Zealand. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 16(3), 258-275.

Steiner, C. J., & Reisinger, Y. (2006). Understanding existential authenticity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(2), 299-318.

Stern, P., & Stevenson, L. (Eds.). (2006). *Critical Inuit studies: An anthology of contemporary Arctic ethnography*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

- Stevenson, L. (2006). Introduction. In Stern, P., & Stevenson, L. (eds.), *Critical Inuit studies: An anthology of contemporary arctic ethnography* (pp. 1-22). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Stewart, A. (2004a). Canoeing the Murray River (Australia) as environmental education: A tale of two rivers. *Canadian Journal of Environmental Education*, 9, 136-147.
- Stewart, A. (2004b). Decolonising encounters with the Murray River: Building place responsive outdoor education. *Australian Journal of Outdoor Education*, 8(2), 46-55.
- Stewart, A. M., Friesen, T. M., Keith, D., & Henderson, L. (2000). Archaeology and oral history of Inuit Land Use on the Kazan River, Nunavut: A feature-based approach. *Arctic*, 53(3), 260-278.
- Stewart, A. M., Keith, D., & Scottie, J. (2004). Caribou crossings and cultural meanings: Placing traditional knowledge and archaeology in context in an Inuit landscape. *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, 11(2), 183-211.
- Stewart, E. J., & Draper, D. (2007). A collaborative approach to understanding local stakeholder perceptions of tourism in Churchill, Manitoba (Canada). *Polar Geography*, 30(1), 7-35.
- Stewart, E. J., & Draper, D. (2009). Reporting back research findings: A case study of community based tourism research in northern Canada. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 8(2), 128-143.
- Stewart, E. J., Draper, D., & Johnston, M. E. (2005). A review of tourism research in the polar regions. *Arctic* 58, (4), 383-394.

- Stewart, E. J., Tivy, A., Howell, S. E. L., Dawson, J., & Draper, D. (2010). Cruise tourism and sea ice in Canada's Hudson Bay region. *Arctic*, 63(1), 57-66.
- Stonehouse, B., & Snyder, J. M. (2010). *Polar tourism: An environmental perspective*. Toronto, ON: Channel View Publications.
- Taylor, M. (2006). *Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary*. Government of Nunavut, Department of Environment, Final Wildlife Report: 10: Iqaluit, NU.
- Tester, F. J., & Irniq, P. (2008). *Inuit Qaujimagatuqangit: Social history, politics and the practice of resistance*. *Arctic*, 61(1), 48 - 61.
- Thrift, N. (1999). Steps to an ecology of place. In D. Massey, J. Allen & P. Sarre (Eds.), *Human geography today* (pp. 295 - 322). Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Tribe, J. (1997). The indiscipline of tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(3), 638-657.
- Tribe, J. (Ed.). (2009). *Philosophical issues in tourism*. Toronto, ON: Channel View Publications.
- Tuan, Y.-F. (1974). *Topophilia: A study of environmental perception, attitude and values*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Tuan, Y.-F. (1977). *Space and place*. London, UK: Edward Arnold.
- Turnbull, D. (2007). Maps, narratives, and trails: Performativity, hodology and distributed knowledges in complex adaptive systems -- an approach to emergent mapping. *Geographical Research*, 45(2), 140 - 149.
- Tyrrell, J. W. (1908). *Across the sub-Arctics of Canada*. Toronto, ON: William Briggs.
- Uriely, N. (1997). Theories of modern and postmodern tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(4), 982-984.

- Urry, J. (2007). *Mobilities*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Van Manen, M. (2002). *Phenomenology online*. Accessed at:
www.phenomenologyonline.com.
- Van Matre, S. (1979). *Sunship Earth: An acclimatization program for outdoor learning*.
Martinsville, IN: American Camping Association.
- Van Matre, S. (1990). *Earth education: A new beginning*. Greenville, WV: Institute for
Earth Education.
- Vespestad, M. K., & Lindberg, F. (2010). Understanding nature-based tourist
experiences: An ontological analysis. *Current Issues in Tourism, iFirst article*, 1-
18.
- Vlasova, T. (2006). Arctic residents' observations and human impact assessments in
understanding environmental change in boreal forests: Russian experience and
circumpolar perspectives. *Mitigation and Adaptation Strategies for Global
Change, 11*, 897-909.
- Waite, G. (2005). Doing discourse analysis. In I. Hay (Ed.), *Qualitative research methods
in human geography* (pp. 163 - 191). Victoria: Oxford University Press.
- Waite, G., & Cook, L. (2007). Leaving nothing but ripples on the water: Performing
ecotourism natures. *Social and Cultural Geography, 8*(4), 535-550.
- Waite, G., Figueroa, R., & McGee, L. (2007). Fissures in the rock: Rethinking pride and
shame in the moral terrains of Uluru. *Transactions of the Institute of British
Geographers, 32*, 248-263.
- Wang, C. C., & Redwood-Jones, Y. A. (2001). Photovoice ethics: Perspectives from Flint
Photovoice. *Health Education and Behaviour, 28*(5), 560-572.

- Watson, A., & Huntington, O. H. (2008). They're here - I can feel them: The epistemic spaces of Indigenous and Western knowledges. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 9(3), 257-280.
- Watts, L. (2008). The art and craft of train travel. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 9(6), 711 - 726.
- Watts, L., & Urry, J. (2008). Moving methods, travelling times. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 26, 860 - 874.
- Weber-Pillwax, C. (2001). What is Indigenous research? *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, 25(2), 166-174.
- Weeden, C. (2001). Ethical tourism: An opportunity for competitive advantage? *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 8(2), 141-154.
- Wenzel, G. W. (1999). Traditional ecological knowledge and Inuit: Reflections on TEK research and ethics. *Arctic*, 52(2), 113-124.
- Whatmore, S. (1997). Dissecting the automomous self: Hybrid cartographies for a relational ethics. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 15(1), 37-53.
- Whatmore, S. (2002). *Hybrid geographies: Natures, cultures, spaces*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Whatmore, S. (2006). Materialist returns: Practising cultural geography in and for a more-than-human world. *Cultural Geographies*, 13, 600-609.
- Williams, S. (2009). *Tourism geography: A new synthesis* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Wilson, S. (2008). *Research is ceremony: Indigenous research methods*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood Publishing.

Wylie, J. (2007). *Landscape*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Inc.

APPENDIX A

Carleton University Ethics Clearance Form

Carleton University Research Office
5th Floor Tory Building
1125 Colonel By Drive
Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6 Canada
Tel: (613) 520-2516
Fax: (613) 520-2521
www.carleton.ca/cu/research/curo/

Ethics Clearance Form

This is to certify that the Carleton University Research Ethics Board has examined the application for ethical clearance. The REB found the research project to meet appropriate ethical standards as outlined in the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans* and, the *Carleton University Policies and Procedures for the Ethical Conduct of Research*.

☒ New clearance

☐ Renewal of original clearance

Original date of clearance:

Date of clearance	16 October 2009
Researcher	Bryan Grimwood
Status	Ph.D. student
Department	Department of Geography and Environmental Studies
Supervisor	Professor Nancy Doubleday, McMaster University & Professor Claudio Aporta
Title of project	Picturing River-Place Responsibility: Natures, Ethics, and the Encounters of Residents and Canoe Travelers along the Thelon River, Nunavut

Ethics approval expires on: 31 May 2010

All researchers are governed by the following conditions:

Annual Status Report: You are required to submit an Annual Status Report to either renew clearance or close the file. Failure to submit the Annual Status Report will result in the immediate suspension of the project. Funded projects will have accounts suspended until the report is submitted and approved.

Changes to the project: Any changes to the project must be submitted to the Carleton University Research Ethics Committee for approval. All changes must be approved prior to the continuance of the research.

Adverse events: Should any participant suffer adversely from their participation in the project you are required to report the matter to the Carleton University Research Ethics Committee. You must submit a written record of the event and indicate what steps you have taken to resolve the situation.

Suspension or termination of clearance: Failure to conduct the research in accordance with the principles of the *Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans* and the *Carleton University Policies and Procedures for the Ethical Conduct of Research* may result in the suspension or termination of the research project.

Leslie J. MacDonald-Hicks
Research Ethics Board Coordinator
For the Chair of the Carleton University Research Ethics Board
Prof. Antonio Gualtieri

APPENDIX B

Nunavut Research Institute

Nunavummi Qaujisaqullirijikkut / Nunavut Research Institute

Box 1720, Iqaluit, NU X0A 0H0 phone: (867) 970-7270 fax: (867) 970-7100 e-mail: info@nri.ca
nri.ca

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH LICENSE

LICENSE # 03 026 10N-M

ISSUED TO: Bryan Greenwood
Department of Geography & Environmental Studies
Carleton University
1125 Colonel By Drive
Ottawa, Ontario
K1S 5B6 Canada
613 520 1407 ext 1407

TEAM MEMBERS: B. Greenwood, N. Doubleday, C. Aporta, O. Laidlaw

AFFILIATION: Carleton University

TITLE: Picturing Responsibility on the Thelon River, Nunavut

OBJECTIVES OF RESEARCH:

The Thelon River is a source of natural and cultural value for Inuit residents of Baker Lake and nature-based tourists from the south. It is also a place with changing social-ecological relationships, complex knowledge systems, and diverse political structures. The purpose of this PhD research is to explore how personal and group responsibility functions within this complexity, and to use this information to cultivate enhanced social and environmental responsibility along the Thelon River.

The central objectives of this research are to: 1) describe how nature and culture are bound together along the Thelon; 2) illustrate the interconnected layers of values associated with the Thelon; and 3) consider the extent to which knowledge-sharing encounters facilitate expressions of responsibility along the Thelon. Of central concern is that the research engages Thelon River canoe travelers and residents, particularly the Inuit living in Qummi'tung, through knowledge-sharing workshops about land-based practices, environmental and social responsibility, and meaningful places.

TERMS & CONDITIONS:

DATA COLLECTION IN NU:

DATES: January 01, 2010-June 30, 2011

LOCATION: Baker lake

Scientific Research License 03 026 10N-M expires on December 31, 2010
Issued at Iqaluit, NU on February 10, 2010

Mary Ellen Thomas
Science Advisor

Nunavut Research Institute / Nunavut Research Institute

Box 1728, Iqaluit, NU A6A 0P0 phone: (867) 979-7279 fax: (867) 979-7100 e-mail: info@nri.ca

© 2008 Nunavut Research Institute Ltd.

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH LICENSE

LICENSE # 03 066 11R-M-Amended

ISSUED TO:

Bryan Greenwood
Department of Geography & Environmental Studies
Carleton University
1125 Colonel By Drive
Ottawa, Ontario
K1S 5B6 Canada
613 520 1407 ext 1407

TEAM MEMBERS:

B. Greenwood, N. Doubilet, C. Apata, G. Leifler

AFFILIATION:

Carleton University

TITLE: Picturing Responsibility on the Thelon River, Nunavut

OBJECTIVES OF RESEARCH:

The Thelon River is a source of natural and cultural value for local residents of Baker Lake and nature-based tourists from the south. It is also a place with changing social-ecological relationships, complex knowledge systems, and diverse political structures. The purpose of this PhD research is to explore how personal and group responsibility functions within this complexity, and to use this information to cultivate enhanced social and environmental responsibility along the Thelon River. The central objectives of this research are to: 1) describe how nature and culture are bound together along the Thelon; 2) illustrate the interconnected layers of values associated with the Thelon; and 3) consider the extent to which knowledge-sharing encounters facilitate expressions of responsibility along the Thelon. Of central concern is that the research engages Thelon River canoe travelers and residents, particularly the Inuit living in Qaumiq'tung, through knowledge-sharing workshops about land-based practices, environmental and social responsibility, and meaningful places.

TERMS & CONDITIONS:

DATA COLLECTION IN NU:

DATES: October 18, 2011 - October 25, 2011

LOCATION: Baker Lake

Scientific Research License 03 066 11R-M-Amended expires on December 31, 2011

Issued at Iqaluit, NU on September 09, 2011

Mary Ellen Thomas
Science Advisor

APPENDIX C

Sample Informed Consent Form Used In Baker Lake¹⁹

I, _____, have been read the letter of information and understand that I am being invited to participate in the research project *Picturing River-Place Responsibility: Natures, Ethics, and the Encounters of Residents and Canoe Travelers along the Thelon River, Nunavut*.

- I understand that the research investigates social and environmental responsibility in the contexts of the Thelon River, Nunavut. The study will a) describe how social and environmental responsibility is performed during the experiences and encounters of Thelon River canoe travelers and residents, and b) work collaboratively with Thelon River canoe travelers and residents to understand and cultivate river-place responsibility.
- I understand that my participation in this study involves taking part in a **photographic interview**. I am being asked to take pictures with a single-use camera OR select photographs from my personal collection related to research themes. I may complete a photograph logbook to assist with these steps. The principal researcher will provide the research materials and will cover associated photograph development expenses. I will discuss my photographs with the principal researcher in a face-to-face interview and with others in a group interview, both of which that will last between 30 – 60 minutes.
- I understand that the interviews will be audio recorded and transcribed.
- I understand that I remain the owner of the information and opinions I have contributed. With my consent the principal researcher will copy and save my photographs, and reproduce these and my interview responses in a PhD thesis, journal publications, conference presentations, and multi-media outreach presentations (e.g., community-based workshops, reports, or Internet applications). Original photographs and logbooks will be returned to me.
- As an acknowledgement of my contributions I will receive an honorarium of \$50.00 CAN, which will be distributed at the completion of the face-to-face interview.
- I understand that my participation will contribute to cross-cultural, place-based, and collaborative learning. Opportunities for enlarging personal and group responsibility towards human and nonhuman others are likely.
- I understand that my participation will involve only minimal risks or inconveniences, and that these risks and inconveniences have been explained to me.
- I understand that I may ask questions about the research at any point during the project.
- I understand that I am under no obligation to answer any of the interview questions. I also understand that I am under no obligation to share my photographs or other information.
- I understand that the principal researcher will take measures to enhance my anonymity and the confidentiality of the information that I provide. However, I will have an opportunity to indicate whether or not I want to be credited for my contributions in any research publications, reports, presentations, or other media (e.g., on the Internet).
- The principal researcher will securely store all data, including audio recordings and photographs, and may incorporate this information in research activities that extend beyond the time lines of this particularly study.
- I understand that the principal researcher, any research assistants, and the research supervisors will have access to the data. I also understand that a translator will be involved during different stages of the study. The translator and any research assistants will sign a confidentiality agreement.
- I understand that study results will be shared at various stages during and after the project and in various formats (e.g., written reports, community presentations and workshops, radio announcements, Internet applications) with research participants and broader communities of Thelon River residents and travelers. **A summary of results will be available to me by June 30, 2011.**

¹⁹ All forms, documents, and reports used or distributed in Baker Lake were translated into Inuktitut.

I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary and that I may change my level of consent or withdraw from the study at any time for any reason without repercussion. Should I withdraw, I may decide at that time whether the information I have provided can continue to be used for the research or if the information is to be destroyed.

Participant Consent:

I consent to participate in:

- ☐ Volunteer employed photography & interview
- ☐ Volunteer photography collection & interview
- ☐ Group interview (i.e., community workshop)

I consent to the reproduction of my photographs for all research and outreach activities: ☐ Yes
☐ No

In the publication of study results and sharing this information with others:

- ☐ I want to be credited by name for the contributions that I have made (information will be attributed to me).
- ☐ I DO NOT want to be credited by name, but general acknowledgment can be provided (e.g., "Anonymous resident of Qamani'tuaq (Baker Lake), Nunavut).

Participant's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Verbal consent, check here: ☐

Name of parent (guardian) if under 16: _____

Parent (guardian) signature: _____ Date: _____

Principal Researcher Consent:

I have fully explained the procedures of the study to the above participant and will respect the terms of this consent form.

Researcher's Signature: _____ Date: _____

This study has been reviewed and approved by the Carleton University Research Ethics Committee.
If you have any questions or concerns about your participation in the study, you may contact:

<p>Bryan Grimwood (principal researcher) Dept. of Geography and Environmental Studies Carleton University, 1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6 Tel: 613 520-1407 x. 1407 Email: bgrimwoo@connect.carleton.ca</p>	<p>Nancy C. Doubleday and Gita J. Laidler (research supervisors) Dept. of Geography and Environmental Studies Carleton University, 1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6 Tel: 613 520-2600 x. 8370 or x. 2566 Email: Nancy_Doubleday@carleton.ca or Gita_Laidler@carleton.ca</p> <p>Antonio Gualtieri, Chair Carleton University Research Ethics Committee Office of Research Services Carleton University, 1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6 Tel: 613 520-2517 Email: ethics@carleton.ca</p>
---	--

Thank you for your help! Please take one copy of this form for your future reference.

APPENDIX D

Sample Informed Consent Form For Canoeists

I, _____, have been read the letter of information and understand that I am being invited to participate in the research project *Picturing River-Place Responsibility: Natures, Ethics, and the Encounters of Residents and Canoe Travelers along the Thelon River, Nunavut*.

- I understand that the research investigates social and environmental responsibility in the contexts of the Thelon River, Nunavut. The study will a) describe how social and environmental responsibility is performed during the experiences and encounters of Thelon River canoe travelers and residents, and b) work collaboratively with Thelon River canoe travelers and residents to understand and cultivate river-place responsibility.
- I understand that my participation in this study involves having the principal researcher accompany me on a multi-day canoe trip along the Thelon River. On this river trip, the principal researcher will record his experiences and observations, including my behaviours and practices, in detailed field notes, with photographs, and using a GPS. This recorded information will be compiled with other data collected in other research procedures and be used in various research activities.
- Should a commercial outfitter organize or guide my trip, I understand that the principal researcher will obtain the support and informed consent of this commercial operation.
- I understand that I remain the owner of any information and opinions I contribute. With my consent the principal researcher may reproduce his recorded observations from the canoe trip in the preparation of a PhD thesis, journal publications, conference presentations, and multi-media outreach presentations (e.g., community-based workshops, reports, or Internet applications).
- I understand that the principal researcher will NOT cover any expenses associated with the canoe trip. As an acknowledgement of my participation, I will receive a small gift (approximate value of \$15.00) and copies of the photographs taken by the principal researcher during trip.
- I understand that my participation will contribute to cross-cultural, place-based, and collaborative learning. Opportunities for enlarging personal and group responsibility towards human and nonhuman others are likely.
- I understand that my participation will involve only minimal risks or inconveniences, and that these risks and inconveniences have been explained to me.
- I understand that I may ask questions about the research at any point during the project.
- I understand that I am under no obligation to answer any questions. I also understand that I am under no obligation to act as guide/companion for the experiential river trip or share any information.
- I understand that the principal researcher will take measures to enhance my anonymity and the confidentiality of the information that I provide. However, I will have an opportunity to indicate whether or not I want to be credited for my contributions in any research publications, reports, presentations, or other media (e.g., on the Internet).
- The principal researcher will securely store all data, including photographs taken of me, and may incorporate this information in research activities that extend beyond the time lines of this particularly study.
- I understand that the principal researcher, any research assistants, and the research supervisors will have access to the data. I also understand that a translator will be involved during different stages of the study. The translator and any research assistants will sign a confidentiality agreement.
- I understand that study results will be shared at various stages during and after the project and in various formats (e.g., written reports, community presentations and workshops, radio announcements, Internet applications) with research participants and broader communities of Thelon River residents and canoeists. A summary of results will be available to me by June 30, 2011.

I understand that my participation in this study is voluntary and that I may change my level of consent or withdraw from the study at any time for any reason without repercussion. Should I withdraw, I may decide at that time whether the information I have provided can continue to be used for the research or if the information is to be destroyed.

Participant Consent:

I consent to participate as a river guide/companion for an experiential river trip: ☐ Yes ☐ No

I consent to having my photograph taken and reproduced for research purposes: ☐ Yes ☐ No

In the publication of study results and sharing this information with others:

☐ I want to be credited by name for the contributions that I have made (information will be attributed to me).

☐ I DO NOT want to be credited by name, but general acknowledgment can be provided (e.g., "Anonymous resident of Qamani'tuaq (Baker Lake), Nunavut).

Participant's Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name of parent (guardian) if under 16: _____

Parent (guardian) signature: _____ Date: _____

Outfitter/Guiding Company Consent (if necessary):

The purpose and procedures of the study have been fully explained to our organization. We consent to the research and will respect the terms of this consent form.

Organization: _____ Date: _____

Employee Signature: _____ Name: _____

Principal Researcher Consent:

I have fully explained the procedures of the study to the above participant and will respect the terms of this consent form.

Researcher's Signature: _____ Date: _____

The Carleton University Research Ethics Committee (INSERT File number) approved this research.
If you have questions or concerns about your participation in the study, you may contact:

<p>Bryan Grimwood (principal researcher) Dept. of Geography and Environmental Studies Carleton University, 1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6 Tel: 613 520-1407 x. 1407 Email: bgrimwoo@connect.carleton.ca</p>	<p>Nancy C. Doubleday and Gita J. Laidler (research supervisors) Dept. of Geography and Environmental Studies Carleton University, 1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6 Tel: 613 520-2600 x. 8370 or x. 2566 Email: Nancy_Doubleday@carleton.ca or Gita_Laidler@carleton.ca</p> <p>Antonio Gualtieri, Chair Carleton University Research Ethics Committee Office of Research Services Carleton University, 1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6 Tel: 613 520-2517 Email: ethics@carleton.ca</p>
---	--

Thank you for your help! Please take one copy of this form for your future reference.

APPENDIX E

The Principles of Leave No Trace

**Leave No Trace
River Corridor
Ethics**

www.leavenotrace.ca

Plan Ahead and Prepare

- Learn about the waterway you plan to visit, including specific issues, regulations and permits.
- Use a map or guidebook to plan your trip.
- Schedule your trip so that you encounter appropriate water conditions for your group's ability. Prepare for extreme weather, hazards and emergencies. Schedule your trip to avoid times of high use.
- Repackage food to minimize waste.

Travel and Camp on Durable Surfaces

- Durable surfaces include established trails, campsites, rock, gravel and sand.
- Protect the riparian area by camping at least 70 meters from the river's edge.
- Good campsites are found not made. Altering a site is not necessary.
- Select a campsite large enough for your group.
- In popular areas
- Concentrate use on existing trails, campsites and launching/landing areas.
- Focus activity where vegetation is absent.
- When portaging or hiking, walk single file in the middle of the trail, even when muddy.
- In pristine areas
- Disperse use to prevent the creation of new launching/landing sites, campsites and trails.
- Avoid places where impacts are just beginning.

Dispose of Waste Properly

- Pack it in, pack it out. Inspect your campsite and rest areas for trash or spilled food. Pack out all trash, leftover food and litter.
- Use the washroom facilities provided by the manager.
- If facilities are not available use a portable, reusable toilet system to pack out solid human waste.
- Otherwise deposit solid human waste in a cat hole dug 15-20 cm deep and at least 70 meters from water, camp and trails. Pack out all toilet paper and other sanitary products. Check local regulations.
- To wash yourself or your dishes, carry water 70 meters away from the water's edge and use small amounts of biodegradable soaps. Scatter strained grey water.

Leave What You Find

- Appreciate ancient structures, artifacts, rock art and other natural objects, but leave them undisturbed.
- Leave rocks, plants and other natural objects as you found them. Avoid building structures, furniture or digging trenches. Avoid introducing non-native species, including live bait, by cleaning equipment between trips.

Minimize Campfire Impacts

- Minimize campfire impacts by using stoves for cooking and candle lanterns for light.
- Minimize trampling in the riparian area by keeping fires 70 metres from the water's edge.
- Where fires are permitted, use designated fire rings, fire pans, or mound fires. Keep fires small. Only use sticks from the ground that can be broken by hand.
- Consider bringing your own firewood or charcoal.
- Burn all wood and coals to ash, put out campfires completely, then pack out or scatter the cool ashes.

Respect Wildlife

- Observe wildlife from a distance. Following or approaching them can harm them and can be dangerous.
- Feeding wildlife damages their health, alters natural behaviours and exposes them to predators and other dangers.
- Protect wildlife by storing food and trash securely.
- Control pets at all times or leave them at home.
- Avoid wildlife during sensitive times: mating, nesting, raising young or when food is scarce.

Be Considerate of Others

- Respect other visitors and protect the quality of their experience.
- Respect industrial/commercial users of the area by avoiding work sites.
- Leave larger camps for larger groups.
- When possible, avoid camping or eating near major rapids where scouting and portaging take place.
- Non-motorized crafts usually have right-of-way over powerboats; slower boats should keep to the right.
- Noise travels exceptionally well over water, let nature's sounds prevail.

Source: www.leavenotrace.ca

APPENDIX F

Sample Information Script For Canoeists

Dear Sir or Madame,

My name is Bryan Grimwood and I am a PhD candidate in the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies at Carleton University in Ottawa, Ontario. I am the principal researcher of a project titled "Picturing River-Place Responsibility: Natures, Ethics, and the Encounters of Residents and Canoe Travelers along the Thelon River, Nunavut". The purpose of this research is to explore both social and environmental responsibility in the contexts of the Thelon River. More specifically, the study will a) describe how social and environmental responsibility is performed during the experiences and encounters of Thelon River canoe travelers and residents, and b) work collaboratively with Thelon River canoe travelers and residents to understand and cultivate river-place responsibility. Professors Nancy Doubleday and Gita Laidler (both of the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies, Carleton University) are the supervisors of this study.

I would like to invite you to contribute to this study as a collaborator and research participant. Specifically, I am requesting your participation in one of two different **photographic interview** processes. The first is called volunteer employed photography (VEP), and involves participants using a single-use camera to take 12 pictures related to the themes of the research while engaging in a Thelon River canoe trip. Participants may use a photo logbook (provided) to record information about the picture taken. Instructions and all materials (including a camera, logbook, pen, waterproof dry bag, and reply-paid envelop) will be provided to participants, who will be asked to mail their camera and logbook to me in the reply-paid envelop shortly after the completion of their canoe trip. Once the pictures are returned to me, I will pay for two sets of the film to be developed. One set will be returned to the participant and the other set I will keep and use, as well a photocopy of the logbook, for the purposes of this research and for sharing research findings and information with various audiences. Participants will be asked to discuss their images with me in a subsequent 30 – 60 minute semi-structured interview that is face-to-face, over the telephone, or computer assisted (e.g., Skype). Group interviews are also planned and participants will have opportunities to contribute in these community workshop formats. These interviews will be audio recorded so that they can be later transcribed.

The second photographic interview process available for your participation is called volunteer photography collection (VPC). For this activity, participants who have traveled the Thelon River by canoe in previous years will be asked to select up to 12 photographs from their personal collections that reflect the themes of the research and then share these images with me in a 30 – 60 minute face-to-face and semi-structured interview that is audio recorded. The photographs that participants select may be digital or printed and will be copied and saved onto my personal computer. The original photographs will be returned to the participant and the copied images will be kept and used in the same procedures described in the VEP process.

I anticipate minimal inconvenience or risk to the participants of these photographic interviews. The content focuses on participants' Thelon River experiences, perceptions, and encounters and is not expected to elicit emotionally or psychologically sensitive material. Physical and economic risks beyond those encountered in day-to-day activities are also unlikely. Part of the project does involve exhibiting and discussing participants' photograph contributions in community-based workshops with Qamani'tuaq (Baker Lake) residents and Thelon River canoeists. The principal investigator and any research assistants will be responsible for facilitating exploratory dialogues at these workshops so as to protect the participants and to avoid inter-personal or inter-cultural judgment or conflict. Participants that remain uneasy about their

photographs being shared with a wider social audience may indicate that their photographs are not be used in the workshops.

Participants may also request that their responses and photographs not be shared with wider audiences to protect anonymity and confidentiality. Challenges to securing participant anonymity include:

- a) Some basic personal information will be recorded for each participant (gender, approximate age, the year(s) in which the Thelon River was traveled and the sections of the river that were traveled); and
- b) Interviews will be audio recorded.

Limits on the confidentiality of participant data and responses include:

- a) The project investigates the Thelon River specifically, which the principal investigator will indicate in all written publications, reports, and presentations; and
- b) The audience members of workshops may recognize photographs and/or be able to identify the photographer.

I will take measures to enhance the anonymity of participants and the confidentiality of the data and responses they provide. All personal information collected, audio recordings, and other data will be securely stored on my personal password-protected computer or in a locked drawer in my research office. Although I expect to retain these materials indefinitely and incorporate them into research activities that extend beyond the time lines of this particularly study, the materials collected from a particular participant will be immediately destroyed (permanently deleted, shredded or burned) upon a his or her request. A confidentiality agreement has been prepared for and will be signed any research assistants. Upon participants' requests, pseudonyms may be used when referring to them in any reports. At any time, participants may withdraw from the study and without consequence. Should a participant withdraw he or she may decide at that time if I may continue to use the information provided or if it is to be destroyed.

Canoe travelers that participate in this research will contribute to a cross-cultural and a place-based collaborative investigation concerning responsibility towards humans and non-humans. Opportunities for learning together and enlarging personal and group responsibility concerning the Thelon River are likely. Other benefits of participation include: a) photographic interview participants will receive a small waterproof dry bag valued at approximately \$15.00; and b) VEP participants will receive at no cost developed copies of the pictures they took.

Research findings will be shared with participants at various stages during and after the project. Participants will be invited to review and comment on written research reports prepared in English and Inuktitut and made available to them via email or regular post. Community presentations and Baker Lake radio announcements will highlight key research findings. The community workshops will also integrate the sharing of research findings. All research activities for this study should be complete by June 30, 2011, by which time a research summary will be distributed to individual research participants.

This project was reviewed and received ethics clearance by the Carleton University Research Ethics Committee (INSERT review code/number). Concerns or questions about your involvement in this study may be directed to those individuals identified on your Informed Consent Form.

Thank you for considering your participation in this research project. I look forward to the opportunity to work, learn, and collaborate with you.

Sincerely,

Bryan Grimwood, PhD Candidate
Department of Geography & Environmental Studies
Carleton University

APPENDIX G

Instructions Distributed to Canoeists for Volunteer Photography Collection

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study, which involves an investigation of social and ecological responsibility during the experiences of Thelon River canoe travelers. At this point, the principal researcher (Bryan Grimwood) should have distributed to you:

- ☐ An information form or flyer ☐ Two copies of an informed consent form

If you have not already done so, please sign and return to Bryan one copy of the informed consent form (ICF). The ICF may be returned by regular mail to Bryan at the address noted on the ICF; or if convenient, you may scan and send it to Bryan as an email attachment. **Please keep the second signed copy of the ICF for your records.**

Once you have returned the ICF to Bryan, he will contact you by telephone to arrange an interview time. These interviews will be based on the Thelon River photographs that you select from your own collection.

Please follow and complete the next steps before the interview:

1. From the photographs you took while canoeing the Thelon River, please choose 12 pictures related to any one or more of the following 'themes'. You may choose any photograph from your Thelon River trip, but please ensure that each theme is represented at least once. The themes are:
 - a. A **positive** and/or **negative** event (i.e., meeting, encounter, or interaction) on the river
 - b. Something that was **good** and/or **bad** about your experience on the river
 - c. Something that seemed **fair** or **unfair** during your experience of the river
 - d. Something that **belongs** or **doesn't belong** on the river
 - e. A **change** caused by **humans**
 - f. A **change** that **just happens**
 - g. Something **significant** about the river
 - h. Something that tells you what to do or **how you should behave**.
2. For each photograph, record any information that you think might be relevant. This will help you during the interview process. Also, please obtain the consent of any third party (see **Third Party Consent Form**).
3. Once you have selected 12 pictures, send copies of these to Bryan via email. If photographs are not digital and cannot be sent electronically, please inform Bryan so that he may organize with you an alternative method for sharing these images.
4. Once Bryan receives the photographs, the interview can take place. We have arranged for this interview to be (please complete when able):

☐ face-to-face ☐ by telephone ☐ computer assisted (Skype)

Time: _____ Date: _____

Location: _____

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Bryan Grimwood at: bgrimwoo@connect.carleton.ca

APPENDIX H

Instructions Distributed to Canoeists for Volunteer-Employed Photography

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study, which investigates responsibility along the Thelon River. The project involves documenting the stories, encounters, and events experienced by Thelon River canoeists and your contributions will be helpful to these ends.

At this point, the principal researcher (Bryan Grimwood) has sent to you the following items:

- ☐ An information flyer and informed consent form (which you have signed and returned)
- ☐ A photo logbook (enclosed)
- ☐ A reply-paid envelope (enclosed)

You have also indicated to Bryan that you will be using your own digital camera during the trip, so no camera will be provided for you. If this is incorrect, please contact Bryan as he will be happy to provide you with a *single-used camera* for the purposes of the project.

Please follow and complete the next steps during your canoe trip along the Thelon River:

5. Take 10 - 12 photographs related to any one or more 'themes' concerning your experience canoeing the Thelon River. You may choose what to photograph but please ensure that each theme is represented at least once. The themes are:
 - a. A **positive** and/or **negative** encounter on the river
 - b. Something that is **good** and/or **bad** about your river experience
 - c. Something that you experience as **fair** or is **unfair** during your trip
 - d. Something that **belongs** or **doesn't belong** on the river
 - e. A **change** caused by **humans**
 - f. A **change** that **just happens**
 - g. Something **significant** about your river experience
 - h. Something that tells you what to do or **how you should behave**.
6. For each photograph, try to record the applicable information on one page in the photo logbook. Keep this logbook in a secure and dry location (e.g., dry bag, pelican case).
7. Once you have returned from your trip, please send Bryan an email () with the 10 – 12 photographs included as separate attachments. The logbook must also be sent to Bryan using the enclosed reply paid envelope. The mailing address is already on the envelope.
8. Once Bryan receives your photos and logbook, he will contact you about a follow-up interview. This interview may be face-to-face, over the telephone, or by computer and, ideally, will take place in August. Following this interview, Bryan will provide you with a small gift (approximate value: \$15.00) as an acknowledgement of your contributions.
9. Please enjoy your trip!

If you have any questions or concerns before or after the VEP process, please contact:

Bryan Grimwood (principal researcher)
 Tel Ottawa:
 Email:

APPENDIX I

Log Book Distributed to Volunteer Employed Photography Participants

Carleton
UNIVERSITY
Canada's Capital University

To ask questions or comment please contact:

Bryan Grimwood, PhD Candidate
Department of Geography & Environmental Studies
Carleton University
1125 Colonel By Drive
Ottawa, ON K1S 5B6
(613) 520-2800 x1407
bgmwood@connect.carleton.ca

**Picturing Thelon River-Place Responsibility
Photograph Logbook**

This book belongs to: _____
(participant name)

If found, please deliver to: _____

(contact information)

Photograph Logbook

Photo #: _____ Date: _____

Location: _____

Photo subject(s): _____

Did the photo include a human subject (please check one)?
☐ Yes ☐ No
 If "Yes", please record the following:
 Subject name: _____
 Contact information: _____

Photograph Theme (check all that apply):

☐ Something positive on river ☐ Something good about the river ☐ Something that seems fair ☐ Something that belongs ☐ A change caused by humans ☐ A change that just happens	☐ Something negative on river ☐ Something bad about the river ☐ Something that seems unfair ☐ Something that doesn't belong ☐ Something that tells me how I should behave ☐ Something significant
---	--

Notes: _____

Photograph Logbook

Photo #: _____ Date: _____

Location: _____

Photo subject(s): _____

Did the photo include a human subject (please check one)?
☐ Yes ☐ No
 If "Yes", please record the following:
 Subject name: _____
 Contact information: _____

Photograph Theme (check all that apply):

☐ Something positive on river ☐ Something good about the river ☐ Something that seems fair ☐ Something that belongs ☐ A change caused by humans ☐ A change that just happens	☐ Something negative on river ☐ Something bad about the river ☐ Something that seems unfair ☐ Something that doesn't belong ☐ Something that tells me how I should behave ☐ Something significant
---	--

Notes: _____

APPENDIX J

Codes Derived from Content Analysis of Inhabitant and Canoeist Photographs

Trunk	Branch	Sub-branch	Explanation
Populated photographs	Fauna		Photographs that contain at least one human subject, or living or harvested animal subject
			Photographs that depict living or recently harvested fauna (e.g., birds, fish, large or small mammals)
		Living	Photographs that depict living fauna
		Harvested	Photographs that depict harvested fauna
	Inuit		Photographs that depict at least one Inuk
		Inuit on water	Photographs that depict Inuit in a vessel on the water
		Inuit on land	Photographs that depict Inuit on land
	Qablunaat		Photographs that depict at least one Qablunaq
		Qablunaat on water	Photographs that depict Qablunaat in a vessel on the water
		Qablunaat on land	Photographs that depict Qablunaat on the land
Unpopulated photographs			Photographs that contain no human subjects, and no living or harvested animal subjects
Human-fauna encounters	Fauna type		Photographs that depict an encounter between humans and fauna (living or harvested)
			The type of fauna (living or harvested) depicted in the photograph.
		Dogs	Photographs that contain domesticated or sled dogs as a primary subject
		Fish	Photographs depicting fish as a primary subject
		Small mammals	Photographs that depict small, undomesticated mammals (e.g., wolverine, squirrel, fox) as a primary subject
		Large mammals	Photographs that depict large, undomesticated mammals (e.g., moose, caribou, wolf, bear, muskoxen) as a primary subject

	Birds	Photographs that depict birds as a primary subject
	Gazing interactions	Photographs that depict “gazing” or “looking” interactions between humans and fauna, but with no other corporeal encounter
	Corporeal interactions	Photographs that depict corporeal interactions between humans and fauna (e.g., holding, touching, approaching, skinning)
<hr/>		
Traces		Photographs that include signs and traces of past human and/or animal presence.
	Signs of animal presence	Photographs that include signs and traces of animal activity or presence
	Animal disturbance	Photographs that depict disturbance caused by animals (e.g., cabin damage)
	Animal tracks	Photographs that depict the tracks, paths, or trails of animals (e.g., foot prints, water trails)
	Animal remains	Photographs that depict animal remains (e.g., bones, antlers, skulls) that are distinct from active harvesting sites.
	Signs of human presence	Photographs that include signs and traces of human activity and presence
	Litter	Photographs depict abandoned garbage/litter
	Tools and chipping sites	Photographs that depict ancient stone or wood tools (e.g., arrowheads) or the chipping sites where these tools were often crafted
	Fuel Drums	Photographs that depict fuel barrels that may or may not appear to be abandoned
	Human habitation	Photographs that depict structures designed for long-term human habitation (e.g., cabins, hunt camps, townscapes)
	Structures that signal	Photographs that depict human made structures that mark/signal a landscape feature, event, activity, or moment (e.g., Inuksuit, caches, traps, tent rings, grave sites)
	Human tracks	Photographs that depict the tracks of humans (e.g., humans(e.g., foot prints, vehicle tread tracks, water trails/wakes)

Technology	Mode of transportation	Photographs that depict a mode of transportation
	Helicopter	Photographs that include a helicopter
	Airplane	Photographs that include an airplane
	ATV	Photographs that include an ATV
	Qamutiik	Photographs that include a qamutik
	Snowmobile	Photographs that include a snowmobile
	Motorboat	Photographs that include a motorboat
	Canoe	Photographs that include a canoe
	Specialized equipment	Photographs that depict specialized equipment
	Camping equipment	Photographs that depict equipment that supports camping (e.g., tents, tarps, stoves, canvas packs, outdoor kitchen supplies)
	Specialized clothing	Photographs that depict specialized clothing for safe and comfortable outdoor living/camping (e.g., bug jackets, boots, synthetics, Tilley hats, rain jackets, PFD's, parkas)
	Small tools and equipment	Photographs that depict small tools or equipment being used by humans, or in the presence of humans
	Walking stick	Photographs that depict a walking or hiking stick/staff
	Gas cans	Photographs that depict a gas can (i.e., not jet fuel barrel, but used for smaller vessels)
	Knife	Photographs that depict a knife
	Camera	Photographs that depict a camera
	Binoculars	Photographs that depict a pair of binoculars
	Fishing equipment	Photographs that depict fishing equipment
	Paddles	Photographs that depict canoe paddles, kayak paddles, or other forms of paddles
	Firearms	Photographs that depict firearms
	Cordage	Photographs that depict cordage

Human activity		Photographs that depict humans engaged in current and identifiable activity
	Physical activity	Photographs that depict humans engaged in identifiable physical activity
	Passenger	Photographs that depict humans as passengers of a vehicle
	Canoeing	Photographs that depict humans paddling a canoe
	Walking	Photographs that depict humans walking
	Subsistence activity	Photographs that depict humans engaged in identifiable subsistence activity
	Hunting	Photographs that depict humans hunting
	Fishing	Photographs that depict humans fishing
	Harvesting practices	Photographs that depict humans working with or recently working with, harvested fauna (e.g., transporting harvest, skinning, storing skins, preparing meat, posing with harvest)
	Eating and cooking	Photographs that depict humans eating/cooking
	Drinking	Photographs that depict humans drinking, or sources of and containers used for drinking
	Picking berries	Photographs that depict humans picking berries
	Studying the landscape	Photographs that depict humans studying some aspect of the surrounding landscape (e.g., scouting a rapid, searching for wildlife; Note that this code must not include fauna, but only the search for fauna)
	Social interactions	Photographs that depict human social interactions, broadly defined as two or more humans in close proximity to one another
Non-Human Landscape		Photographs that depict features of the non-human landscape
	Ecozone	Photographs that depict characteristics of a distinct or transitioning ecosystem
	Forest	Photographs that depict the boreal forest as a predominant feature of the landscape
	Transition	Photograph that depict a transition between forest and tundra ecosystems

	Tundra	Photographs that depict tundra as a predominant feature of the landscape
Water-scapes		Photographs that depict bodies of water or distinct water features
	River corridor	Photographs that depict the river as a corridor through the landscape (i.e., both opposite shores are visible in the photograph)
	Flat water	Photographs that depict flat water, including lakes, low current, and calm waters
	Moving water	Photographs that depict moving water, current, or white water rapids
	River or lake ice	Photographs that depict ice or snow on, or along the shorelines of, bodies of water
Vegetation		Photographs that depict certain elements of vegetation as a primary subject, or distinct feature
	Low lying vegetation	Photographs that depict low lying vegetation (e.g., lichen, moss, dwarf willow, berries, wild flowers) as the primary subject or distinct feature of a photograph
	Decay and driftwood	Photographs that depict decaying plant life (e.g., decaying tree trunks) or driftwood
Snow-scapes		Photographs that depict land-based snow cover, which might include images from fall, winter, or spring seasons
Summer-scapes		Photographs that depict a predominately snow-free landscape, which might include spring, summer, or fall seasons
Forest fires		Photographs that depict forest fires or forest fire scars
Rain		Photographs that depict rain
Wind action		Photographs that depict action created by wind
Sky-scapes		Photographs that depict certain patterns or features in the sky
	Clear	Photographs that depict sky that is mostly clear and with no clouds
	Mixed clear and cloud	Photographs that depict a mixed sky that is clear and clouded

Overcast	Photographs that depict overcast or cloud cover (that is not storm cloud)
Storm clouds	Photographs that depict storm clouds
Sun	Photographs that depict the sun or sunshine as a distinct feature (sunrises or sunsets)
Low light	Photographs that depict low light settings (e.g., sunrise, sunset, or night time)

APPENDIX K

Abstract Submitting for Oral Presentation at the 2012 IPY Conference

Mobilizing Arctic Knowledge for Capacity and Care Through Community-based, Participatory, and Visual Research Methodologies

B. S. R. Grimwood¹, N. C. Doubleday², S. G. Donaldson¹, M. Ip¹

¹*Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada;* ²*McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada*

This presentation draws on IPY research, education, and outreach activities in Nunavut, Canada to critically reflect on community-based, participatory, and visual methodologies as processes for mobilizing Arctic knowledge at local and inter-regional scales. Specific emphasis is placed on reporting methods that foster public engagement and community research relationships characterized by reciprocal and trusting partnerships, co-constructed realities and memories, and a sense of responsibility to and for Arctic places.

Adapting methodologies developed for *Photos and Plants Through Time* ("PPTT" is a part of the IPY Core project *PPS Arctic – Impacts of a Changing Treeline*), collaborative visual methods and research workshops were used to document and interpret Inuit and tourist knowledge of the Thelon River, a trans-regional river in the central Canadian Subarctic and Arctic. The project entailed working with residents of Baker Lake, Nunavut and wilderness tourists (i.e., canoeists) to document river experiences, events, and stories using participant derived photographs. Subsequently, these photographs were used to direct focus group research workshops in Baker Lake and in southern Canada. Here, the intentions were to a) disseminate diverse knowledge of an Arctic riverscape, b) encourage public participation in the interpretation of research photographs, and c) cultivate enhanced responsibility to and for the Thelon River as a special and changing place, both among local inhabitants and visitors.

The methodologies developed from PPTT for the Thelon project were effective mechanisms for collaborative and social learning. In particular, using participant derived photographs as the basis of community workshops facilitated intra and inter-cultural understanding of the multiple layers of knowledge, experience, and value connected to specific Arctic places. A photograph depicting a meaningful encounter for a young Inuk participant, for example, could be transported to an audience of Elders (or tourists) for translation and interpretation. Research "analysis" was therefore extended beyond the partial vision of a single researcher. Moreover, these workshops proved to be safe spaces where Inuit and non-Inuit could discuss observations of change, explain culturally informed practices, express concerns and identify with difference, and articulate the significance of Arctic places to individual and cultural constructions of identity.

In the contexts of Arctic social-ecological-cultural vulnerability and change, expressions of optimism, meaning, capacity, and care can easily become lost. These expressions, however, can be illuminated and shared to encourage perceptions and partnerships for co-creating the Arctic as a geography of positive possibility. We argue that the methodologies discussed in this presentation can contribute to such hopeful futures.

APPENDIX L

Community Consultation Visit Report

ᑭᓚᓂᓪᓰᓰᓰ ᓰᓇᓴᓴᓰ ᓰᓴᓴᓰᓂᓰᓰᓰ
ᓰᓴᓰᓂᓰᓰᓰ 2009-ᓰᓰ ᑭᓚᓂᓪᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰ

**Picturing Responsibility Along Kangirjuaq (the Thelon River,
Nunavut): Community Visit Report, December 2009**

ᑭᓚᓂᓪᓰᓰᓰᓰ ᓰᓰᓰᓂᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰ
ᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰ ᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰ ᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰ
ᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰ ᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰ
ᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰ ᓰᓰᓰᓰ ᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰ ᓰᓰᓰᓰᓰ

Prepared for Residents and Agencies of
Qamanituaq (Baker Lake), Nunavut

by Bryan S. R. Grimwood, Department of
Geography & Environmental Studies,
Carleton University, Ottawa, ON

During Bryan's visit, he met with many residents and community representatives, and discussed the research objectives. For example, Bryan received many comments, questions, and ideas about the study from teacher training and office administration students at the Arctic College. This meeting helped to clarify the steps in the research process. Also, an open-to-the-public meeting was held on November 05 at the Thomas Tapscot Community Library. Announcements on the radio were used to promote this event. Only a few people attended the meeting, but Bryan learned many lessons from them and will use this information to plan for future community workshops. Bryan learned other lessons about working and consulting with

• 4750 "CDL" 20' 6L 5' 4"

Kangirjuaq 4

- ᐱᓄᓐ ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ
- ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ ᐱᓄᓐ ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ
- ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ
- ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ
- ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ
- ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ
- ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ

- Traveling to and documenting important places along the Thelon River with hunters and fishers;
- Working with residents to document meaningful Thelon River experiences and encounters.

Bryan would like to thank the residents and representatives of Qamani'tuaq for their hospitality during his 2009 visit, and for sharing with him their questions, concerns, and ideas about the project. Bryan looks forward to continuing and building his research relationships within Qamani'tuaq.

ᐱᓄᓐ ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ (ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ)
 ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ 2009-ᐱᓄᓐ.
 ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ.
 ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ.
 ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ ᐱᓄᓐᐱᓄᓐ.

Carleton
 UNIVERSITY

Canada's Capital University

APPENDIX M

Report from Research Visit #1

"Picturing the Thelon River" — Report for Baker Lake Residents and Representatives

May 04 – 19, 2010

Introduction

Bryan Grimwood, a PhD student in geography at Carleton University in Ottawa, visited Qamani'tuaq from May 04 – 19, 2010. This was Bryan's third visit to the community. His previous visits occurred in July 2008 and October/November 2009. The purpose of Bryan's visit in May was to begin community-based research activities. These activities

are important components of Bryan's PhD study about the Thelon River. The Nunavut Research Institute licensed this project in February 2010 (License # 03

026 10N-M). The project involves working with Qamani'tuaq residents and Thelon River tourists to document and create knowledge about the Thelon River using photographs, and to use these photographs to share knowledge about responsibility within the Thelon River watershed. This is important because the Thelon is a special place for Inuit and Qallunaat, and for many different reasons. The river is also a changing place. For example: the population of caribou and other country food sources along the river fluctuate; resource development initiatives, such as gold and uranium mining, create new social and environmental challenges and opportunities; river water levels are observed to be decreasing; although technological advances make river travel more accessible, the

increasing cost of taking these journeys inhibits many people.

Before the May 2010 visit, Bryan had communicated with 21 Qallunaat who had travelled the river by canoe in previous summer seasons. These people contributed approximately 300 photographs from the Thelon, some of which were taken as long ago as 1967! Many photographs were from river sections in the Northwest Territories, while many others were from within Nunavut.

Objectives of Community Visit #3

There were three objectives for Bryan's visit in May:

1. To continue building research relationships within the community;
2. To initiate 'data collection';
3. To plan and prepare the next stages of the project.

Building Research Relationships

Bryan has been fortunate to observe and participate in effective research relationships between other Nunavut communities and university researchers. In Qamani'tuaq, Bryan is trying to follow these models and to build similar partnerships with the hope that a safe space might be created for sharing knowledge and diverse perspectives about the Thelon River. Bryan anticipates that Qamani'tuaq residents, tourists, and researchers can learn from one another, and share in the celebration of and caring for this special place. Of course, this process requires trusting relationships that develop over time.

During the visit, Bryan spoke with community and regional representatives at the Hamlet Office, HTO, KIA office, the Arctic College, and Itsamitaaqviik Inuit Heritage Centre. Many individuals working at these places provided helpful suggestions, thoughtful ideas, instructive feedback, and comfortable meeting spaces. These contributions helped Bryan clarify further the project goals, and complemented the letters of support provided by many of these groups months earlier.

Two community members, Vera Avaala and Kiah Hachey, have agreed to be part of the research team by taking on community research assistant roles. Both Vera and Kiah are involved with the communication of project goals to Qamani'tuaq residents, identifying potential participants and inviting their contributions, and distributing and collecting research materials and information. These connections are important starts to developing long term and mutually beneficial research relationships.

Initiating 'Data Collection'

In May, Bryan began the data collection phase of the project in Qamani'tuaq. He carried out a series of photographic interviews and participated in an experiential river journey (but that was actually on the land).

In total, seven photographic interviews were performed with Qamani'tuaq residents and 88 photographs were collected. The contributors were asked to select photographs from their personal collections and that depicted something significant about their experiences along the Thelon River. These photographs were shared and discussed with Bryan in a conversational interview that was audio recorded. Two residents did not contribute photographs but shared stories about the Thelon based on the photographs contributed by others. When necessary, a translator was hired to help with any communication barriers.

On Saturday, May 08, Vera Avaala guided Bryan on a snow machine and qammutik journey to Halfway Hills. Both Vera and Bryan took photographs to document the journey. Bryan also used an audio voice recorder to make 'notes' and a GPS to record the travel route. While having lunch at the base of Half Hills Vera pointed out to Bryan two examples where Inuit had placed small rocks upon larger

boulders that pointed to good fishing or hunting locations. This intrigued Bryan because it is a subtle suggestion of ways in which Inuit might view the land; that is, as a place providing people with sustenance and livelihoods. In contrast, the majority of Thelon River tourists try very hard to hide the presence of people (including their own) by covering up their 'traces'.

Planning and Preparing the Next Stages

Research activities will continue throughout 2010 and the analysis of materials collected will occur over the next year. Research findings will be reported in Qamani'tuaq in the summer of 2011. During Bryan's visit, it was important to speak with community representatives about upcoming research activities so that the community is informed about the research process and their input can be integrated. Research assistants, Kiah Hachey and Vera Avasala, have been helpful in this regard. So have the staff at the Itamaritqarvik Inuit Heritage Centre, the teacher training students at the Arctic College, and the KIA community liaison representative.

Future community-based activities are planned for July 2010 and November 2010. In July, Bryan will be travelling with canoeists along a section of the Thelon River and documenting the journey with photographs, field notes, and GPS. Following this canoe trip, he will be returning to Qamani'tuaq from July 23 – August 01, 2010, during which more photographic interviews will be carried out. Bryan also plans to participate in river journeys by motorboat and Honda/ATV, and facilitate one community workshop. The dates of the November visit to

Qamani'tuaq have not been confirmed. However, activities will involve two or three community workshops in which the photographs collected over the course of the project will be displayed and discussed. Participants at these workshops will be invited to share their own stories, ideas, and experiences related to the Thelon River, and that are triggered by the displayed photographs.

Acknowledgments

Bryan was fortunate to visit Qamani'tuaq during the annual Hamlet Days celebration. Sincere thanks are extended to all those residents who helped Bryan feel welcome, whether that was during the jiggling contest, playing games on the lake, or chatting in the arena. Special thanks to Thomas Qadimat, Joedee Joedee, Vivian Joedee, Alexander and Patsy Attungala, John Avasala, Ray Didiham, David Ford, Kiah Hachey, Gabriel Joedee, Ivk Lund, Susan MacIsaac, Tammy Mansbridge, Andy Parker, Valene Pudrak, Elizabeth Qunangnaq, Robert Senteenak, and those residents who prefer to remain unidentified. Vera Avasala has been exceptionally generous with assistance, skill, and knowledge contributions.

The Social Science and Humanities Research Council, Carleton University, and First Air provided financial support for the May 2010 visit. The inspiring support of Bryan's research supervisor, Dr. Nancy Doubleday, and the guidance provided by Dr. Gita Laidler and other committee members, never goes unnoticed. This report was prepared by Bryan Grimwood. Some photographs were contributed by Vera Avasala, Joedee Joedee, and Jim Fischer.

APPENDIX N

Report from Research Visit #3

PICTURING KANGIRJUAQ (THE THELON)

Natures, ethics, and travel within an Arctic Riverscape

2010 RESEARCH SUMMARY FOR COMMUNITY RESEARCH PARTICIPANTS

BRYAN S. R. GRIMWOOD

Department of Geography & Environmental Studies
Carleton University

**Inuktitut text to follow*

1125 Colonel By Drive, Ottawa, ON K1S 5S6 • TEL: 613.520-1407 ext. 1407 •
bgrimwoo@connect.carleton.ca

2010 Research Summary

Bryan Grimwood is a PhD student in the Department of Geography and Environmental Studies at Carleton University in Ottawa, Ontario. Throughout 2010, Bryan has worked on a research project about the Thelon River. The research involves working with wilderness tourists (canoe travellers) and local Inuit (Qamani'tuaq residents) to document stories and experiences about the Thelon using photographs contributed by research participants. This information is then shared in community research workshops to cultivate understanding and enhanced social and ecological responsibility concerning this special and changing place. The research is important because Inuit and non-Inuit (Qablunaat) participate in documenting different knowledge of, and values associated with, the Thelon, which is then shared between and within cultural groups. This participation and exchange of information is designed to enable inclusive and respectful understanding.

As of December 01, 2010 most of the research was complete. Bryan visited Qamani'tuaq three times: once in May for three weeks; once in July for one and a half weeks; and once again in November for two weeks. Throughout the year, Bryan also worked in Ottawa and Toronto to meet with people who have canoed along Thelon River in different summer seasons. Table 1 summarizes the research fieldwork involving research participants.

Table 1: Number of research participants for different components of the project

Project Component	Group/Type	Details
Photographic Interviews	People of Qamani'tuaq	10 participants, 120 photographs contributed
	Canoe tourists	27 participants, 340 photographs contributed
Experiential River Trips	Snow machine	a) Qamani'tuaq to Halfway Hills b) Qamani'tuaq to cabin at Kangiryuaq
	Honda (ATV)	a) Qamani'tuaq to Prince River b) Qamani'tuaq to cabin at Kangiryuaq
	Motorboat	Qamani'tuaq to Kazan River
	Canoe	Thelon Wildlife Sanctuary
Community Workshops	Outdoor educators from Ontario	19 participants in 1.5 hour workshop
	Arctic College NTEP Students in Qamani'tuaq	9 participants, 1.5 hour workshop
	Qamani'tuaq Elders	10 participants, 2.5 hour workshop

The project includes photographic interviews with ten Qamani'tuaq residents. These participants contributed to the project their own Thelon River photographs and used these to tell the stories that they felt important to share. Thirteen similar interviews were done with Thelon tourists, which were supplemented by another 14 Qablunaat participants that submitted photographs and knowledge through an email questionnaire. In total, more than 450 photographs from the Thelon River have been contributed.

Near Halfway Hills, May 2000

Canoeing along the Thelon River, July 2010

Canoeists near Beverly Lake, July 2010

Another part of the research involves experiential river trips, both with Inuit and Qablunaat users of the Thelon. During his three research visits to Qamani'tuaq, Bryan used notes, photographs, and a GPS to document five river trips. One trip was by motorboat, two were by snow machine, and two were by ATV (Honda). Each of these were a half or full day in length. In July, Bryan used the same methods of documentation on a professionally guided 10-day canoe journey with Qablunaat tourists, a trip that finished near Beverly Lake.

Community workshops are the third component of the project involving research participants. In September, Bryan met with a group of 19 outdoor educators who live and work in Ontario, but who are familiar with the Thelon River. Sixty-nine photographs contributed by interview and questionnaire participants, and identified either as "meaningful," "significant," or representative of "responsibility" were displayed. The contents of the photographs were discussed in smaller groups, and workshop participants were invited to identify the photographs that most closely reflected their ideas of "nature" and/or "responsibility." Two similar workshops were held in Qamani'tuaq during Bryan's November visit. The first was with nine members of the Nunavut Teacher's Education Program at the Arctic College. The second was with ten Elders who have lifelong connections to the Thelon. The same 69 photographs were shared at each workshop, and resulted in the exchange of many different stories about the Thelon River.

Over the next number of months, Bryan will be sorting through and organizing all the photographs and knowledge contributed to the project. Key contacts in Qamani'tuaq will be

Following a Nov. 2010 workshop with Elders

NTEP student workshop, Nov. 2010

Bryan at a cabin near Kangiassag, Nov. 2010

invited to assist with this research analysis. Copies of the research material will be delivered to the Arctic College and the Itarmitaqarvik Inuit Heritage Centre during Bryan's next visit to Qamani'tuaq, which is anticipated for the spring or fall of 2011. Bryan will also be using the project information to prepare a PhD dissertation, which he expects to submit next summer. A full copy of the dissertation will be available at the Heritage Centre in Qamani'tuaq, and a summary of research findings will be distributed to all individual participants, as well as supporting community organizations, including: the Hamlet of Baker Lake; the Qamani'tuaq Hunter's and Trapper's Association; the Nunavut Research Institute; and the Canadian Canoe Museum.

Caribou near Mushuery Hill, May 2010

Acknowledgements: Thank you to all of the Qamani'tuaq residents and Thelon River canoe travellers who have shared their knowledge, and to the community organizations that have supported the project. Special thanks to Aneutalik and Alex Hall for their guidance and contributions. Carleton University, SSJIRC, NSTP (INAC), and Tourism Cares provided research funding, and First Air and the Canadian Canoe Museum provided generous in-kind support.

“በጋላኛው ስር ለሚኖሩ ህጻናት ምርመራ ይደረጋል።”

ᑕᓂᓐᓂᓐᓂᓐ ᓂᓐᓂᓐᓂᓐ (THE THELON: ᓂᓐᓂᓐ, ᓂᓐᓂᓐᓂᓐ, ᓂᓐ ᓂᓐᓂᓐᓂᓐ
ᓂᓐᓂᓐᓂᓐ ᓂᓐᓂᓐ ᓂᓐᓂᓐ)

SECRET JUL 9 1968, 0-200000C C C C C C C C C C

ଉତ୍ତର ଶାଖା ଓ ଉତ୍ତର ଶାଖା

67C ΔC-σΔA-4V, 1125 Colonel By Drive, 434, 4-7-68 K15 586

ᐃᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ: (613) 520-1407 ᐃᑦᑲᑦᑲᑦ 1407

ᐃᓕᓂᐅᓂᓴ: bgrimwoo@connect.carleton.ca

[illegible][illegible][illegible][illegible]

[illegible]