

# Arctic Nation

---

HESTER BLUM

*Abstract* This provocation considers the relationship between the United States and the Arctic. America might be understood as an Arctic nation not just because of its political and resource claims in the polar region but because the nation has become both environmentally and politically inhospitable to human life. The polar regions are no longer climate outliers on the planet, remote regions exceptionally hostile to human life. The United States could do more to recognize forms of geopolitical organization that do not presume continental supremacy; that loose the “territory” from “territorial seas”; that understand the cryosphere as a model for new forms of relation and collaboration; that turn to Indigenous knowledge and traditional ecological knowledge for guidance.

*Keywords* Arctic, Anthropocene, polar, America, climate change

The elemental fluidity of the seas is both a hydrophysical fact and the first principle for a model of hydro-criticism.<sup>1</sup> Although modern academic disciplines have generally organized themselves around units of analysis such as time periods, nations, data sets, or human societies, an oceanic orientation urges researchers instead to embrace the undulating, nonhuman, nonplanar depths of the sea as a model for critical expansiveness.<sup>2</sup> Oceanic forms of relation do not accede to the signposts or lines of demarcation presumed by territorial spaces; marine, lacustrine, or riparian modes of analysis understand the planet as contingent, solvent, and motile. Even as the sea resists human or terrestrial forms of inscription, however, humans—particularly within the European colonial tradition—have imposed notional cartographic lines to subdivide the globe for navigational and geopolitical ends and to attempt to solidify human positionality in measurable terms. Mishuana Goeman calls this process “colonial spatialization,” or the “nationalist discourses that ensconce a social and cultural sphere, stake a claim to people, and territorialize the physical landscape by manufacturing categories and separating land from people.”<sup>3</sup> As Goeman’s work on Indigenous conceptions of land suggests, geographic forms of inscription do not always track at sea, especially if (following Tim Ingold) the fictive lines of navigation are understood to be a form of writing.<sup>4</sup> If *oceanic studies* designates a field, then *hydro-criticism* designates a practice of disaggregation. A hydro-critical methodology might ask what alternate modes of expres-

## ENGLISH LANGUAGE NOTES

57:1, April 2019 DOI 10.1215/00138282-7309688

© 2019 Regents of the University of Colorado

sion and knowledge projects emerge if the standard were not the linearity of territorial geographies but instead the multidimensional vortices of the aqueous globe. In this sense oceanic studies seeks to move away from Western political demarcations of the globe when studying planetary relations, and toward other analytic dimensions for thinking about surfaces, depths, and the extraterritorial sphere of planetary resources and relations, all of which are suggested by the geophysical, historical, and imaginative properties of the sea. My own work in the field of oceanic studies (most recently on the polar regions) has been anchored by this assumption. The ocean, in other words, exemplifies structures of nonlinear or nonplanar thought. Not a metaphor, the sea has a scalar fluidity that enables the hydrographic world to be at once global and microecological. The modes of inquiry variously known as oceanic studies, hydro-criticism, the new thalassology, and the blue humanities situate the seas and other waterways—not “territory” per se—as central to critical conversations about human and nonhuman relations and exchanges on a planetary scale.<sup>5</sup>

The trace of the human in the sea has a long history, whether in the form of industrial detritus and agricultural runoff or in the still-present atomized bodies of enslaved and jettisoned Africans during the Middle Passage, which, as Christina Sharpe writes, perpetually recycles histories of anti-Black and imperial violence.<sup>6</sup> In our present moment of anthropogenic climate change, human effects are registering in marine environments in accelerating new ways: whether in the volume of microplastics now discernible in Arctic sea ice, or in the Pacific biota now flowing into northern polar waters as the Arctic warms.<sup>7</sup> More perceptibly, states persist in extending sovereignty claims to the sea, as exclusive economic zones at sea spread beyond “territorial waters” and are, in turn, superseded by submarine continental shelf claims, as the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) permits.<sup>8</sup> Such is the context in which I turn to insistences from a variety of US sources that “America is an Arctic nation.”<sup>9</sup> What are the political intentions and critical implications of this assertion when applied to a region characterized by shifting states of hyperborean liquidity? In the meditation that follows, I circle back to the land- and state-based conceptions of the globe proposed by European and American colonialists in order to consider nationalist claims to the aqueous planet. For even as UNCLOS envisions continental borders as subaqueous and porous, it does so in the service of entrenched sovereign claims by nations.

I have heard America’s Arctic identity or sovereignty proposed often in the years I have been working in oceanic studies, the polar humanities, and nineteenth-century US literature and culture. The question of what relationship the United States has to the Arctic has been posed directly and indirectly by State Department representatives, meteorology professors, naval lawyers, resources for Arctic and sub-Arctic Native and First Nations holdings at the National Museum of the American Indian, oil and gas barons, Iñupiat and Inuit residents of Alaska, and academic humanists. The range of intentions of these various constituencies in making the case for an Arctic America reflects their diverse interests and investments. For even if hydro-critical scholars do not politicize the ocean, states do. This short essay considers some implications of American claims to the Arctic in our present

Anthropocenic epoch, drawing on a late nineteenth-century US expedition to the Canadian archipelago to throw into relief some of the challenges of importing terrestrial ideologies to oceanic spaces.

The first things that come to mind when US residents think about the Arctic are cold, ice, snow, and polar bears, according to a research survey by the Arctic Studio (2015). A statistically notable number of respondents also indicated penguins, which are not found in the Northern Hemisphere. Survey respondents were asked, “How important is the Arctic to your identity as an American?” Not very, the results demonstrated: “Most Americans ascribed a low importance to the Arctic in relation to their national identity.”<sup>10</sup> The spherical distortion that most US-oriented maps exhibit—in which the archipelagic states of Alaska and Hawai‘i are displaced and radically out of scale—is one factor in the relative disinterest in and misinformation about the Arctic held by Americans. Brian Russell Roberts and Michelle Stephens have identified such distortions as a reflection of a “continental bias” in the American geographic imagination.<sup>11</sup> The United States and other circum-Arctic nations anchor their interests in the region on the landmasses that each nation claims above the Arctic circle. Yet the concept of “territory” in oceanic spaces is fraught, in part because it privileges the human or the cartographic over the nonhuman world—the ideological over the phenomenal world. As the melting of the polar ice caps causes the seas to rise, the contours of the land that interrupts the aqueous globe are themselves transformed, whether they delineate low-lying islands or coastal cities. Even the relevant legal boundaries are porous. The Law of the Sea stipulates that the “sovereignty of a coastal State extends, beyond its land territory and internal waters and, in the case of an archipelagic State, its archipelagic waters, to an adjacent belt of sea, described as the territorial sea. . . . This sovereignty extends to the air space over the territorial sea as well as to its bed and subsoil.”<sup>12</sup> The oxymoronic notion of “territorial waters” serves the strategic purposes of those nation-states making claims to Arctic resources, yet it imposes land-based (and Western) notions of property on a medium resistant to such inscriptions. As the Inuk author Rosemarie Kuptana writes forcefully, “The Inuit Sea is once again discussed in Canada and in the global community in the context of sovereignty and security and in the absence of Inuit.”<sup>13</sup> Kuptana’s objection calls to mind an analogous history in the United States of oxymoronic legal categories created in the erasure of the voices and the rights of Indigenous people, African Americans, and other people of color: most notoriously, the Supreme Court established Native tribes as “domestic dependent nations” in *Cherokee Nation v. Georgia* (1831), enshrined segregation in the “separate but equal” ruling in *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1898), and judged US island territories “foreign in a domestic sense” in the Insular Cases of the early twentieth century. Understood within this juridical, political, and discursive history, the notion of “territorial waters” decenters and minoritizes the oceanic. In specifying the “bed and subsoil” as included in territorial seas, too, the UNCLOS definition preserves for states their claims to mineral resources for potential extraction.

From a US-oriented geopolitical perspective, Arctic America came into being with the acquisition of Alaska in 1867. In the intervening 150 years the region has

been important for US military strategy and shipping security and, increasingly, as a repository of fossil fuels and other natural resources. For these reasons, and despite the Arctic Study survey's conclusion that US citizens do not self-identify with the Arctic, the polar region remains a hot topic. In the words of the State Department's special representative for the Arctic during the Obama administration, Admiral Robert J. Papp Jr., "The future of America is inextricably linked to the future of the Arctic."<sup>14</sup> The other seven circum-Arctic nations—Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Russia, and Sweden—identify similar national value in the North. Arctic nations are attentive, as well, to the effects of climate change on Indigenous Far North residents and on the planet more broadly, especially as the Arctic is a climate multiplier. (A 2°C global rise in temperature would actually result in an increase of 3.5–5°C in the Arctic.)<sup>15</sup> The accelerating melting of the North's polar ice caps and consequent sea level rise, too, is an Arctic crisis with global effects. "From a national security perspective," the former head of a US Navy commission on climate change has argued, "climate change is all about the water: where it is or isn't, how much or how little there is, how quickly it changes from one state (e.g., solid ice to liquid water) to another."<sup>16</sup> If it takes a sense of threat to American military or energy "security" to compel the global laggard United States to respond to global warming (as the sole nation in the world to reject the conditions of the Paris Agreement on climate change), then state-directed interventions in the polar regions may not lack value.

Yet "America" is of course not one nation—not just the United States—but dozens of countries across two continental landmasses. Like the Arctic, the idea of America is subject to misidentifications and territorializations that overwrite what was once fluid (and bicontinental) as a circumscribed singularity. "America" is a land grab. The US government's sense of America as an Arctic nation is dependent on an extension of a continental logic: that the state of Alaska is a territorial foothold granting access to fossil fuel extraction and Northern sea routes for the polity of the Lower 48.<sup>17</sup> National security as pegged to military, economic, and energy resources is not the only frame with which we might think of the United States as an Arctic nation, of course. Another polar model for thinking of America as an Arctic nation recognizes that human survival requires human-nonhuman collaboration, resource preservation, and ecologically responsive infrastructure. The polar regions are no longer climate outliers on the planet, remote regions exceptionally hostile to human life; as they warm, temperate regions themselves become inhospitable by the same processes. (The developing world registers the most extreme effects of anthropogenic climate change but profits the least from the industrialization that propels it.) The United States could do more to recognize forms of geopolitical organization that do not presume continental supremacy, that loose the nonsensical "territory" from "territorial seas," that understand the cryosphere as a model for new forms of relation, that turn to Indigenous knowledge and traditional ecological knowledge for guidance.

In our contemporary Anthropocene moment of Arctic and Antarctic polar ice-sheet collapse, human life on earth can feel ephemeral, both because of and despite humans' irreversible impact on global climate and the geological record.

Ecological injustice in the forms of pollution, lack of access to clean water, environmental racism, and food inequality have rendered the American climate extreme and hostile. My provocation is that we extend this argument in a more precipitous direction: America is an Arctic nation now because it has become both environmentally and politically inhospitable to human life. The polar regions are key to thinking about human and nonhuman futurity during the Anthropocene, as there is a direct relationship between irreversible anthropogenic climate change and the Arctic. The global trade interests of early modernity, when the first Northwest Passage expeditions were launched in search of faster routes to Asia, inaugurated, in turn, industrialization's appetite for fossil fuels (and increase in human energy consumption). The oil and gas deposits now targeted for extraction would not be accessible had the carbon usage that necessitates their mining not produced the irreversible warming effects presently melting the polar ice sheets. Humans must attend to the nonhuman processes of accumulated and diminishing ice. US claims to the Arctic today reveal an outmoded yet continuous drive to national sovereignty, a drive that was self-consuming for many polar expeditions and continues to be self-consuming today.

### **A Hard Case**

Consider, by way of example, the life and death of Charles Buck Henry (born Charles Henry Buck), a participant in the US-sponsored Lady Franklin Bay Arctic Expedition (LFBE), led by Adolphus Greely, a Civil War and Indian Wars veteran with no sailing experience.<sup>18</sup> The expedition traveled in 1881–84 to Ellesmere Island, the northernmost island in the Canadian archipelago, to participate in the first International Polar Year, a scientific survey conducted by a number of nations. After resupply ships failed to reach their camp, eighteen of the twenty-five men in the LFBE either starved, died of scurvy, or—in the case of Henry—were executed for theft of food. The hostility to human life experienced by expedition members in the Arctic not only takes the forms customary to polar voyaging in its climate extremity but also reflects the limitations of expeditionary practice organized primarily around territorial claims. These imperatives were at play in the LFBE. The life of Private Henry exemplified American sovereign cruelty, as he practiced violence in many of its most common racist, interpersonal, colonialist, and rhetorical forms in the nineteenth century: he had fought in the Indian Wars; was incarcerated for forgery and theft; murdered a Chinese immigrant in territory illegally occupied by the United States; performed minstrelsy songs in blackface; stole food from his starving crewmates, who carried out the captain's order to execute him for it; and ultimately furnished those crewmates with food in the form of his own corpse. Henry's life was a violation of borders, whether territorial, political, social, or corporeal. His habitual contravention of sovereign boundaries did not change its methodology when relocated from the United States to the Arctic: Henry doubled down on territorial forms of violence rather than find new forms of relation in the hydrographic space of the polar regions. His time with the LFBE illuminates what happens when "America" puts the "nation" in the Arctic and consequently extracts and exploits resources in self-depleting ways.

The primary mission of the LFBE was to establish an international weather station in northeastern Ellesmere Island as part of the first International Polar Year, a collaborative, multinational effort to record Arctic climate data. Participants in the International Polar Year included the circum-Arctic nations as well as the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Germany, France, and the United Kingdom.<sup>19</sup> Yet even as the men were engaged in global scientific objectives, Greely's expedition brings into relief some of the limitations of nationalist rhetoric and practices in marine spaces. The ambit of Henry, the executed food thief, provides a narrative thread. Henry joined the US Army's Seventh Cavalry shortly after its 1876 rout by Lakota and other Plains Indians at the Little Bighorn. The Seventh Cavalry continued to skirmish with Native warriors, and Buck served on the edges of US territorial claims in the 1870s and early 1880s. He was imprisoned for forging a commanding officer's signature to requisition whiskey; following his release or possibly his escape, he made his way to Deadwood, South Dakota (a town illegally established by gold miners in Lakota Territory), where he murdered a Chinese man in a gambling confrontation. He was a large man and a "hard case."<sup>20</sup> Reversing his middle name and surname, Henry then joined the Fifth Cavalry, Greely's own division, and was recommended for service in the Arctic—a further frontier for US territorial exploration. Fresh from the Indian Wars, Henry and the men of the LFBE were assisted by two Inughuit or northern Greenlandic Inuit, called by the crew Jens Edwards and Thorlip Frederik Christiansen, who in the usual practice of white Western Arctic expeditions had been pressed into hunting and translation service (and who both died on the venture). Henry's pre-Arctic biography demonstrates the blurred margins between extralegal US claims in Indigenous territories and state-sponsored exploratory missions.

In their Fort Conger winter quarters Henry coedited the expedition's newspaper, the *Arctic Moon*, which found satiric humor in the history of land grabs and governance claims. Writing from a part of Ellesmere Island named for Henry Grinnell, an American titan of shipping and an Arctic patron, a correspondent to the editor offered himself up for public office: "As Grinnell Land is a reorganized territory of the United States and having a Territorial form of Government, a Delegate from this Territory is to be seated who is to take his seat at the opening of the 47th session of Congress." The self-nominee's platform included "liberal appropriation for the purchase of lime-juice, compulsory education, unlimited emigration, a hundred and sixty acres of land, one musk-ox and two Esquimaux dogs to each actual settler."<sup>21</sup> Grinnell Land was not then and never has been a US territory, and the mock candidate's platform invokes a range of contemporary US political issues regarding land use, sovereignty, immigration, and settlement in its references to Western territorial expansion and the forty acres and a mule offered to formerly enslaved Black Americans (albeit in Arctic-appropriate terms). The article's invocation of "a Territorial form of Government" is most directly a reference to the status of territorial claims under American imperialism, but the subsequent joke about trying to work frozen land with a musk ox and two huskies shows that a US sense of "territory" would not mean much in the Arctic cryosphere. This candidate's statement shows the men of the LFBE playing with the expectations of US territorial and

post-Reconstruction practices in the few years before America would launch its most aggressive and widespread practices of seizing overseas territories in the Philippines, Hawai'i, and Guam (all themselves archipelagoes).

The crew engaged in other forms of playacting as well, particularly in their Christmas variety show. The presentation included Henry's minstrel performance of "plantation melodies"; another sailor dressed as an "Eskimo belle."<sup>22</sup> One act that Greely recorded in his voyage narrative "was a representation of an Indian council, which ended with a war-dance. . . . Most of the actors had served in the far West, and some had spent months continuously in Indian camps, and so were thoroughly familiar with the parts portrayed. I doubt very much if a more realistic representation of the wild red-man was ever presented in the Arctic Circle, if elsewhere."<sup>23</sup> While these were common forms of "humor" in the nineteenth century—designed to emphasize and mock racial and ethnic differences and to enforce white supremacy through cultural appropriation—the resonance of such performances in the Arctic is less clear. The Native interlude, for one, stages a scene of sovereignty: an Indian council. For the white members of the LFBE, the council becomes an occasion for diversion, a rejection of the legitimization of any form of Indigenous sovereignty. Just two weeks before this performance, in fact, the Inuk hunter Edwards had tried to escape from the expedition and head north. He was tracked by a large party and, according to Greely, "returned to the station without objection, and in time recovered his spirits. No cause for his action in this respect could be ascertained other than his intense desire to return to his home."<sup>24</sup> Edwards's displacement from his people and his acquiescence to his continued custody in the hands of the US voyagers take on particular acuteness when considered as a preamble to the supremacist dominance staged a fortnight later. The sense of *home* experienced by Edwards is insufficient cause, to Greely, for him to claim it. He eventually drowned while hunting for food for the other men.

Later in the expedition, when theatricals had yielded to the spectacle of looming starvation, Greely presented a series of lectures to keep the men occupied. His first talk, nearly two hours long, was on "the physical geography and the resources of the United States," a topic of wish fulfillment in a region that the expedition regarded as barren.<sup>25</sup> Despite the hunting efforts of the Inughuit men Edwards and Christiansen, the absence of material for sustenance became calamitous. Henry was exposed as a serial thief of the expedition's scant food, which included tiny shrimp and *tripe de roche*, a rock lichen that earlier Arctic expedition members (on similarly disastrous missions) had resorted to eating, along with their leather boots.<sup>26</sup> Henry raided their old winter quarters for sealskins and sealskin thongs and was caught "stealing shrimps out of the general mess-pot."<sup>27</sup> After the order to execute Henry had been carried out, Greely noted that "fully twelve pounds of seal-skin were found cached among his effects."<sup>28</sup> Sealskin is minimally edible for a human in extremity, and a particular challenge for one with teeth weakened by scurvy—a disease that could have been avoided had white expedition members been willing earlier, as Inuit commonly were, to eat raw seal, an antiscorbutic. (In this context the *Arctic Moon* proposal for a political platform founded on "liberal appropriation for the purchase of lime-juice," Anglo-Americans' preferred

antiscorbutic, takes on special irony.) The LFBE failed to use local resources in communal ways, maintaining notions of privacy and property that were unsustainable in extreme climates. We see this in a diary entry from another expedition member, Roderick Schneider, who was also suspected of (but not caught) stealing food: “Although Henry has told before his death that I had eaten a lot of sealskin, yet, although I am a dying man, I deny the assertion; I only ate my own boots and a part of an old pair of pants.”<sup>29</sup> Resources are shared in the extreme climate of the Arctic, as the work done on behalf of the expedition by Inughuit hunters demonstrates. Schneider’s defense was that he ate only his *own* boots and clothing: access to food and self-consumption were understood by him as principles of personal ownership, not of the collective good.

After the return to the United States of fewer than a third of the men, when whispers of cannibalism had begun to circulate (and would severely undercut any tragic heroism attributed to the expedition), Greely told newspapers that he knew “nothing of the cannibalism, but that if it was practiced the men did so privately and on their own responsibility.”<sup>30</sup> Greely’s sense of a “private” form of cannibalism is striking, especially in light of the communal practices that typically govern resource consumption in the Arctic. Individualist claims to resources neglect the collective good and hollow out possibilities for sustainability. What is more, the public shame of private cannibalism propelled the survivors to engage in a bizarre fiction. “To represent Henry’s devoured body,” newspapers reported, “sticks were tied to the bones and a wooden ball adjusted to the skeleton for a head, and the whole frame wrapped in muslin. This was put into a casket and palmed off for the body of the dead man.”<sup>31</sup> The LFBE began as an international collaboration to gather scientific information on the nonhuman environment; it ended in a ghastly show of self-consuming resource mismanagement.

In its outlandish horror, Henry’s career in contravention while engaged in US national expansion shows some of the flaws in importing a proprietary Western nationalism to an oceanic space. The reification of unequal terms such as *territorial seas* (like *domestic dependent nations*, or island territories judged “foreign in a domestic sense”) claims affiliation for the sake of control, without incorporation or justice. In a continuing Anthropocenic moment of resource extraction, a hydro-critical approach understands Henry’s grim career as an argument against legislating visible and submarine boundaries, instead embracing the interdependence and interrelation of the human and the nonhuman, the terrestrial and the aqueous. Attending to such misrecognitions of planetary relation is one imperative of hydro-critical practices. As regions simultaneously fluid and terrestrial, inhabited and not, stateless and multiply contested, the Arctic and Antarctica provide models and resources for nonlinear understandings of movement in time and space. This circular logic brings the polar regions more directly into the sphere of planetary imaginaries, in which we reorient our perspective away from land-based and Western Hemisphere-based visualizations (in which the Arctic and Antarctica are both remote and subject to territorial claims) and toward a centering of what has too long been imagined as the ends of the earth.



HESTER BLUM is associate professor of English at Pennsylvania State University. She is author of *The View from the Masthead: Maritime Imagination and Antebellum American Sea Narratives* (2008), which received the John Gardner Maritime Research Award. Her edited volumes include *Horrors of Slavery* (2008), William Ray's 1808 Barbary captivity narrative; the essay collection *Turns of Event: American Literary Studies in Motion* (2016); and a special issue of *Atlantic Studies* on oceanic studies. Her latest book is *The News at the Ends of the Earth: The Print Culture of Polar Exploration* (2019).

### Notes

- 1 I use the term *hydrophysical* instead of *geophysical* (or related terms like *geographic*) to resist the presumption of "earth" or "land" or "ground" inherent in the *geo-* prefix.
- 2 I expand more fully on this position in Blum, "Prospect of Oceanic Studies."
- 3 Goeman, "(Re)mapping Indigenous Presence," 296.
- 4 In his meditation on the "anthropology of the line," Ingold argues that "any history of writing must be part of a more comprehensive history of notation" (*Lines*, 11).
- 5 See Blum, "Introduction"; and Blum, "Prospect of Oceanic Studies."
- 6 Sharpe, *In the Wake*, 40–41.
- 7 Peeken et al., "Arctic Sea Ice"; Katz, "Alien Waters."
- 8 *United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea*, Art. 76, Pt. IV (December 10, 1982), 53.
- 9 On the US political front, see most trenchantly Papp, "America Is an Arctic Nation." Papp was the special representative for the Arctic in Obama's State Department; visitors to this site in the post-Obama era will find a note at the top of the webpage that reads: "This is historical material 'frozen in time.' The website is no longer updated." All of the Obama White House archives have this notice—the "frozen in time" designation is not a special Arctic pun. Yet global warming has made obsolete the notion that freezing is a state of permanence anywhere on the globe, whether in the form of Siberian permafrost or the Svalbard Global Seed Vault.
- 10 "Most Americans ascribed a low importance to the Arctic in relation to their national identity," the survey concluded. See Hamilla, "Arctic in U.S. National Identity."
- 11 Roberts and Stephens, "Introduction," 12.
- 12 *United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea*, 27. The porousness encompasses the atmosphere as well: "This sovereignty extends to the air space over the territorial sea as well as to its bed and subsoil."
- 13 Kuptana, "Inuit Sea," 10. See also the astute discussion of this issue by Waller in "Connecting Atlantic and Pacific."
- 14 Papp, "America Is an Arctic Nation."
- 15 Schlosser et al., "A 5°C Arctic in a 2°C World."
- 16 Titley, "Global Warming a Threat to National Security."
- 17 This is a colonial logic that I have not generally found of interest or relevance in my own work on polar writing and ecomedia, but, given the quickening of such rhetoric in contemporary discourses on climate change and resource extraction, I explore its implications in this meditation. See Blum, *News at the Ends of the Earth*.
- 18 The biographical information on Henry is drawn from Stein, "Arctic Execution"; Copley, "Measure of Human Grit"; *New York Times*, "Private Henry's Record"; and Greely, *Three Years of Arctic Service*.
- 19 Subsequent IPYs were observed in 1932–33, 1957–58, and 2007–8.
- 20 Henry's size was notable; even after months of privation during the LFBE, he weighed 203 pounds, among a crew whose average weight was 176 pounds. See Greely, *Three Years of Arctic Service*, 252. All future references to this volume are taken from this edition.
- 21 "To the Editor," *Arctic Moon* 1, no. 2 (1881), Adolphus Greely Papers, 1876–1973, Stefansson Collection (hereafter cited as Steff MSS), Dartmouth College.
- 22 Greely Papers, Steff MSS 64, box 2: 20, 1. For more on blackface performance in the polar regions, see Mossakowski, "'Sailors Dearly Love to Make Up.'"
- 23 Greely, *Three Years of Arctic Service*, 131–32.
- 24 Greely, *Three Years of Arctic Service*, 123.
- 25 Greely, *Three Years of Arctic Service*, 580.
- 26 After his first Arctic expedition the British polar explorer John Franklin became known as the "man who ate his boots" during a terrible overland crossing to the Coppermine River delta.
- 27 Greely, *Three Years of Arctic Service*, 699.

- 28 Greely, *Three Years of Arctic Service*, 700.
- 29 Greely, *Three Years of Arctic Service*, 703–4. In a striking incidence of oceanic textual circulation, Greely had access to Schneider's diary through a quirk of North American waterways. As Greely writes in a note, "Schneider's diary, stolen without doubt by a seaman of the relief squadron, was found in a mutilated condition on the banks of the Mississippi River, and was sent to me by Mr. J. A. Ockerson, U.S. Civil Engineer, as these sheets were going to press" (703–4).
- 30 *Reading Eagle*, "Wooden Man Buried." A similar account appeared in several other newspapers, including *New York Times*, "Victims of a Blunder."
- 31 *Reading Eagle*, "Wooden Man Buried."

### Works Cited

- Blum, Hester. "Introduction: Oceanic Studies." *Atlantic Studies* 10, no. 2 (2013): 151–55.
- Blum, Hester. *The News at the Ends of the Earth: The Print Culture of Polar Exploration*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2019.
- Blum, Hester. "The Prospect of Oceanic Studies." *PMLA* 125, no. 3 (2010): 770–79.
- Copley, Frank Barkley. "The Measure of Human Grit: A Traitor's Death in the Arctic." *American Magazine* 71, no. 3 (1911): 330–39.
- Goeman, Mishuana. "(Re)mapping Indigenous Presence on the Land in Native Women's Literature." *American Quarterly* 60, no. 2 (2008): 295–302.
- Greely, Adolphus W. *Three Years of Arctic Service: An Account of the Lady Franklin Bay Expedition of 1881–1884 and the Attainment of the Farthest North*. New York, 1886.
- Hamilla, Zachary D. "The Arctic in U.S. National Identity (2015)." *Arctic Studio*, December 19, 2017. [www.arcticstudio.org/ArcticStudio\\_ArcticInUSNatlIdentity2015\\_20171219.pdf](http://www.arcticstudio.org/ArcticStudio_ArcticInUSNatlIdentity2015_20171219.pdf).
- Ingold, Tim. *Lines: A Brief History*. London: Routledge, 2016.
- Katz, Cheryl. "Alien Waters: Neighboring Seas Are Flowing into a Warming Arctic Ocean." *Yale Environment* 360, May 10, 2018. [e360.yale.edu/features/alien-waters-neighboring-seas-are-flowing-into-a-warming-arctic-ocean](http://e360.yale.edu/features/alien-waters-neighboring-seas-are-flowing-into-a-warming-arctic-ocean).
- Kuptana, Rosemarie. "The Inuit Sea." In *Nilliajut: Inuit Perspectives on Security, Patriotism, and Sovereignty*, edited by Scot Nickels, Karen Kelley, Carrie Grable, Martin Lougheed, and James Kuptana, 10–13. Ottawa: Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, 2013.
- Mossakowski, Tomasz Filip. "The Sailors Dearly Love to Make Up': Cross-Dressing and Blackface during Polar Exploration." PhD diss., King's College London, 2014.
- New York Times*. "Private Henry's Record." September 12, 1884.
- New York Times*. "The Victims of a Blunder: More Light on the Dreadful Story of Greely's Camp." August 14, 1884.
- Papp, Robert J., Jr. "America Is an Arctic Nation." December 2, 2014. [obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/blog/2014/12/02/america-arctic-nation](http://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/blog/2014/12/02/america-arctic-nation).
- Peeken, Ilka, Sebastian Primpke, Birte Beyer, Julia Gütermann, Christian Katlein, Thomas Krumpfen, Melanie Bergmann, Laura Hehemann, and Gunnar Gerds. "Arctic Sea Ice Is an Important Temporal Sink and Means of Transport for Microplastic." *Nature Communications* 9 (2018): 1–12. [www.nature.com/articles/s41467-018-03825-5](http://www.nature.com/articles/s41467-018-03825-5).
- Reading Eagle*. "A Wooden Man Buried: Why and How Private Henry Was Shot." August 14, 1884.
- Roberts, Brian Russell, and Michelle Ann Stephens. "Introduction." In *Archipelagic American Studies*, edited by Brian Russell Roberts and Michelle Ann Stephens, 1–54. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017.
- Schlosser, Peter, Stephanie L. Pfirman, Rafe Pomerance, Margaret Williams, Brad Ack, Phil Duffy, Hajo Eicken, Mojib Latif, Maribeth Murray, and Doug Wallace. "A 5°C Arctic in a 2°C World: Challenges and Recommendations for Immediate Action." Briefing Paper for Arctic Science Ministerial, Columbia Climate Center, Columbia University, New York, NY, September 28, 2016. [academiccommons.columbia.edu/doi/10.7916/D8640WKN](http://academiccommons.columbia.edu/doi/10.7916/D8640WKN).
- Sharpe, Christina. *In the Wake: On Blackness and Being*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016.
- Stein, Glenn M. "An Arctic Execution: Private Charles B. Henry of the United States Lady Franklin Bay Expedition 1881–1884." *Arctic* 64, no. 4 (2011): 399–412.
- Titley, David. "Global Warming a Threat to National Security." *Cognoscenti*, February 20, 2013. [www.wbur.org/cognoscenti/2013/02/20/climate-national-security-david-titley](http://www.wbur.org/cognoscenti/2013/02/20/climate-national-security-david-titley).
- Waller, Nicole. "Connecting Atlantic and Pacific: Theorizing the Arctic." *Atlantic Studies* 15, no. 2 (2018): 256–78.