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Place-map-body

In a recent and valuable introduction to the critical study of geography and empire, Anne Godlewska and Neil Smith conclude their remarks by noting how necessary but difficult it is to re-construct the so-called "rival geographies" of those who have struggled against imperialism. This paper explores the substantive difficulties facing such projects of reconstruction using an example of a rival geography that has thus far been interred in the archives of colonial Canada. Following Edward Said's original formulation of rival geographies my effort at reconstruction has been informed by the post-colonial notion that in the struggle to "to reclaim, rename and rehabit the land," the impulse is "cartographic." However, in contradistinction to Said and many of the post-colonial theorists who have "remapped" his often polarized picture of colonial struggle with a discourse of "cartographies of struggle," "interstitial spaces," "Third space" and the like, this chapter is focused on an actual case of cartographic struggle in which maps were involved. This said, I am centrally concerned with at least two sets of questions raised by so-called post-colonial criticism: first, about the epistemic violence implicit in metropolitan representations of "pure" native space; and second, about the contested translations between space and political (including national) identity. In the case examined here cartography is the translating link, but in order to understand the power relations implicated in this link I focus most especially on how bodies are variously mapped and left out of maps, how they are represented and dissimulated with political effect by different cartographies of colonialism.

In interrogating the Canadian cartographic archive and in questioning the disembodifying translation effect that is the archive's colonial inheritance,
I learn from Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's essay on reading the archives. In this exemplary essay Spivak displaces Fredric Jameson's discussion of "worlding" in Heidegger by pulling it, if only for a moment, into the effaced arena of colonial cartography. Here, she says,

what emerges out of the violence of the rift [between earth and world] . . . is the multifarious thingliness of a represented world on a map, not merely "the materiality of oil paint affirmed and foregrounded in its own right" as in some masterwork of European art.

Reworking Heidegger Spivak argues that one of the ways through which colonialism "worlds" or constructs the colonized world is through "the necessary yet contradictory assumption of an uninscribed earth." It is such a disembodying, earth-evacuating assumption which in turn, she says, makes "the 'native' see himself as 'other.'" The fact that such lands were previously far from uninscribed not only reveals the mistakenness of the colonial assumption, it also indicates — to use Spivak's gratingly displaced translation of Heidegger — how "the multifarious thingliness of a represented world on a map" might also open up the possibility of other, native maps mapping and inscribing the land otherwise. In a more recent article discussing the fiction of Mahasweta Devi, Spivak finds a powerful example of such "native" inscription in the bodily form of what she calls "the socially invested cartography of bonded labor." The bonded labor in question is that of the prostitute Doulori who, at the close of Devi's story and Spivak's essay, lies down and dies vomiting blood on a map of India drawn in the clay courtyard of a school hut. "Doulori," writes Devi describing the dead body, "is all over India." In this violently embodied cartographic reinscription of the post-colonial map of India, Spivak suggests that Devi is providing her readers with a reminder about the sexually, ethnically and economically marginalized subjects that have been left behind by the move from colony to supposedly independent nation-state. In short, "the space displaced from the empire — the nation's space — comes to inhabit and appropriate the national map, and makes the agenda of nationalism impossible."

The displacing "space of difference" evoked by Doulori's corporeal cartographic reinscription of the national map shares much with the example from colonial Canada I wish to elaborate. This example also ends with the death of a subaltern woman, a blood vomiting end (in this case due to tuberculosis) that is marked on the Canadian landscape by a monument in St. John's harbor Newfoundland. Her name was Shawnadithit, and, in the words of the monument, she was "very probably the last of the Beothuks who died on June 6th, 1829." The Beothuk (otherwise known to the early colonists as "Red Indians" because of their practice of painting their bodies with red ochre) were the native population of the island before it became Newfoundland. In fact, their mass deaths from disease, starvation and murder can be interpreted as a form of embodied reverse of the island's colonial reinscription as new found land. This, in other words, was a colonial "worlding" that brought "othering" with a vengeance to the native inhabitants. Yet even here, in the form of a series of story maps drawn by Shawnadithit, a native cartographic reinscription of the land charts a story that is eccentric to and undermining of the sweeping narrative running from native land to colonial Newfoundland to modern nation.

To be sure, Shawnadithit's non-fictional history also departs in certain ways from the example of Doulori examined by Spivak. Devi's story takes place in decolonized terrain, albeit, as Spivak concludes, terrain that is simultaneously subject to the extraction of wealth that constitutes contemporary neocolonialism. It is a story that displaces the post-colonial national dreams of a colonized people not, as with Shawnadithit's legacy, the post-colonial national imaginary of a white settler-colony. And it is a story where the body of Doulori serves as a vehicle in the metaphorization of cartographic inscription. As Spivak has elsewhere noted (in relation to the metaphorical fate of another subaltern figure from Devi's work), the strict relationship between vehicle and tenor in metaphor means that such metaphorical moves are directly related to the simultaneous underplaying of substantive connections between the vehicle, in this case the woman's dead body, and that which the body as vehicle is employed to evoke, here, the situation of similar subaltern subjects "all over" India (the "all over" here evoked by the further instrumentalization of the map as another metaphorical vehicle). By contrast, Shawnadithit's cartography introduces immediate and politically significant links between bodies and maps. In fact the contrast is a double one because in addition to being actively produced by Shawnadithit's own hand, which is to say the "native" body as observer and inscriber, her map work is also distinguished from all dominant Western genres of cartography precisely insofar as it features representations of bodies inhabiting and moving through space. The mapped bodies discussed in this chapter, then, are not just dead or metaphorical vehicles, although in one case they are both, nor are they the passive objects of the masculine and imperial gaze, although the bulk of the discussion is concerned with how the body of Shawnadithit has previously been positioned in precisely this way. Instead, they are bodies depicted cartographically by a native woman, bodies which, representing the encounters between the colonized and colonizers, inhabit and thereby represent a space of embodied between-ness.

The disjunctive quality of the space of embodied between-ness can be better understood if it is compared with that against which I have opposed it in the title of this chapter. By "disembodied maps" I am referring first of all to the abstract colonial mapping of Newfoundland as such. In this sense, the "New" as it is commemorated in the contemporary toponymy reminds us that as the island began to emerge on the horizon of the European geographical imagination Newfoundland was something radically discontinuous.
and disembodied from the place as it had been understood, inhabited and experienced by those who had lived there previously. From its outline on the detailed Descelesiers map of 1550, and onwards, as Fabian O'Dea has documented, into and through the seventeenth century, the emerging European depiction of Newfoundland was as a basically empty space, a space seen from sea, delineated by coastline, and as a peopleless void within. Even coves and bays were not fully explored, and, as O'Dea notes in studiously eurocentric terms, it was not until the 1760s that Captain James Cook came “to establish a scientific basis for an understanding of the true shape of Newfoundland.”14 Whatever the merits of Cook’s theodolite and telescopic quadrant, this “true shape” was still even then largely just a matter of outline (Figure 17.1). Joseph Banks, who was traveling with the famed surveyor, admitted that “we Know nothing at all of the Interior Parts of the Island.”15 Yet even as such acknowledgements were made, the abstracting and disembodying effect of the Cartesian cartography simultaneously presented the interior as known as empty as uninhabited. Less than a century later, the anticipatory aspect of this colonial enframing effect became disembodied reality. By 1830 there were no living native bodies left.

Shawnadithit’s cartographic work survives as a rival geography that directly contests the disembodying abstraction of the colonial maps. However, in order to be read this way it also needs to be critically reinterpreted as the work of an embodied agent of knowledge. This means coming to terms with how “the last of the Red Indians” has been dug up and moved discursively in much the same way as Shawnadithit’s actual grave was dug up to make way for a new road. Disinterred and disembodied, she has been transported into the pantheon of modern Canada’s famous figures, a pantheon that otherwise includes explorers, fur traders, politicians and railway-men whose more general discursive duty in death remains as heroes and heroines in the romanticization of the very processes that caused the genocidal demise of native people like the Beothuk in the first place. One of the specific side-effects of this exercise has been to have turned the few statements and drawings Shawnadithit made for her custodians in St. John’s into anthropologically nationalized relics.16 Treated as disembodied relics of a national tragedy, they tend to be entombed in books and articles as just so many mawkish momentoes, the last fading gasps of a native informant whose people have gone forever. By contrast, I want to question this process of disembodying entombment, problematizing the convention by carefully examining just one of her maps in order to draw attention to the agency as opposed to the tragedy it embodies.

In attempting to reconstruct the cartography of Shawnadithit as an embodiment of agency I do not want to pretend that I am simply presenting a pure native perspective on spaces past. As Spivak has famously argued and as Jonathan Crush has recently reminded geographers, we cannot speak unproblematically about the subaltern speaking.17 Late-in-the-day posturing

Figure 17.1 Cook’s general chart of the island of Newfoundland.
by Western academics to either “allow the natives to speak for themselves” or to “give the natives voice” fails to come to terms with how in cases such as Shawnadithit’s the gendered and racialized subaltern subject is always being spoken about by others: she is always being represented and these representations demand a persistent vigilance as to their own politics. In short, to considerably modify Spivak’s discussion of the Srimadbhagavatadidga,

[1]there is no historically available authentic [Red] Indian point of view that can now step forth and reclaim its rightful place in the narrative of [Canadian] history.18

Instead,

we might teach . . . the way to informed figurations of that “lost” perspective. The geopolitical postcolonial situation can then serve as something like a paradigm for the thought of history itself as figuration, figuring something out with “chunks of the real.”19

In the colonial situation discussed here it is Shawnadithit’s cartographic legacy that provides the “chunks of the real” from which we can begin the work of reconfiguration. Examining her representations of the space of embodied between-ness it does indeed become possible to imagine a “lost perspective.” However, in order to do this it is first necessary to problematize the work of the discursive grave-diggers that have previously disembodied and reconfigured Shawnadithit’s maps as the work of a native informant.

Artifacts and appropriation: the native body and disembodied discourse

The story of the Beothuk Indians of Newfoundland is indescribably tragic—and on several levels. It is tragic, of course, because they were wiped out by white furriers and fishermen and Micmac Indians—hunted down like wild geese during a two-hundred-year cycle of haphazard genocide. And it is also tragic in other, subtle ways. There is, for instance, convincing evidence that the blood bath began as a result of an accident; that had it not been for a chance encounter these Indians might easily have survived as partners in the fur trade. There is also the tragedy of good but failed intentions. There were, in Newfoundland, perfectly sincere and humane people who tried after their fashion to save the Beothuks from extinction; they simply had no sensible idea of how to do it. Finally, there is the tragedy of a culture lost. Our knowledge of the Beothuks is abysmal because scarcely anybody bothered to find out anything about them until they were all gone. There is something inexpressibly forlorn in the

final picture of the lovely Shawnadithit, the last surviving member of her race (her features already suffocated by the ravages of consumption), trying as best she could, through a series of story-maps, to explain how her people lived, hunted and worshipped and how, one by one, they died.

Pierre Berton20

So begins the eloquent lament to what he calls “The Last of the Red Indians,” by one of Canada’s more popular and populist historians. Pierre Berton’s humanistic account of the genocide in Newfoundland—boldly inserted in My Country between colorful stories about the cultic Brother XII of British Columbia and the Catholic turned Protestant Charles Chiniquy of Quebec—manages with all the skill of a best-selling national raconteur to piece together a story-book strength narrative from rather patchy evidence and, in driving that tragic narrative home, repeat all the basic gestures of benevolent but Eurocentric appropriation. Just as with the earlier painful accounts of Harold Horwood, Ernest Kelly and Keith Winter, there can be no doubting the sincerity or anguish evident in Berton’s criticisms of what he describes as “the slaughter” of the Beothuk.21 Like Horwood who in a 1959 Macleans “Flashback” made an angry appeal to Canadians to remember “The people who were murdered for fun,”22 Berton describes for another generation how fishermen “set out on shooting parties, as they would for deer or wolves, to bag themselves a few head.”23 Like Winter who romanticized the Beothuk as stereotypical noble savages—“They had a mellifluous language, loved to sing and dance, and made a habit of welcoming all strangers with feasts and friendship”24—Berton too portrays them in terms that say more about the narcissism of the Euro-Christian imagination: “They were tall by earlier European standards, handsome, fairer than most Indians, with large expressive eyes . . . a shy, unwarlike race, who treated their women with respect, believed in the importance of marriage and were said to reject both adultery and polygamy.” Finally, as such unsavage-like savages, they made for what Berton, like Kelly, goes on to describe25 as “perfect victims.” They were, he says, “ripe for killing.”26 However, as he accomplishes all this, Berton, like the other three authors, seems oblivious to the way in which he himself is in turn appropriating and manipulating the story of the Beothuk as “perfect victims” in the staging of a national tragedy.27

Clearly the general re-examination of the brutality of colonialism in Newfoundland has not been without value. It has sensitized some of the scholarly anthropological and historical writing about the island to the politics of colonial knowledge,28 and it has also led to some more detailed research—most especially the work of Ralph Pastore—aimed less to dismiss than to complicate the monocausal, intentionalist accounts of extermination offered by the popular historians.29 Moreover, it has usefully upset the facile justifications proffered by apologists for empire who would, following
Diamond Jenness, the most imperial of Canada's anthropologists, 30 prefer to blame the bloodshed on the Beothuk themselves: "But very soon trouble arose for the Indians stole... [and] the fishermen retaliated by shooting every native that dared to show his face." 31 This said, even after Ber ton's book—indeed, it seems, as a partial response to what are dismissed as its "intemperate allegations"—Frederick Rowe repeated this same tired alibi, claiming like Jenness that "if there was any chance of a permanent friendly relationship... the Beothuk themselves probably destroyed it through their persistent habit of stealing." 32 It is not any individual critic's fault that Rowe, a senator from Newfoundland, still saw fit in 1977 to defend the island's settlers by rehashing the rhetoric of empire and blaming the Beothuk. However, because Ber ton's own account takes on so many of the characteristics of a morality play, it is complicit in setting a scene for an all too tokenistic argument between himself and the likes of Rowe. The tokens in such arguments are the bodies of the Beothuk themselves. Most problematically, the stage is set in such a way that their agency counts for nothing but drama. Instead, a singularized script is written for them, their corporeal experience becomes downplayed, and their place in the process of colonization is diminished to that of either a cute criminal bit-part in the drama of their own destruction. In the more romanticized dramas of Ber ton and his three predecessors the script so written at least makes for a picture of the Beothuk with which the modern Canadian reader can partially sympathize. Yet, it is this very same appeal to the contemporary citizen that holds within it the problematic gesture of disembodying misappropriation. Presenting Shaw nadithit as an attractive tragic figure and focusing on her gendered and racialized body as an object, as "[h]andsome, with beautiful teeth and a swarthy complexion,"33 the historians simultaneously dig up and disemboby her cartography as a hallowed artifact, relocating it to the national pantheon.

Key to the appeal that Ber ton's story affords his contemporary Canadians is the gesture of epistemic colonization that sets up the Beothuk as a special form of what Spivak, glossing Edward Said, has dubbed the West's "self-consolidating Other." 34 As Barbara Godard usefully argues in specific relation to the Canadian context, "it is through this encounter with the Other who is Native to this land, that a 'totem transfer' occurs and the stranger in North America 'goes native' to possess the land, to be Native." 35 In this role as Other, the Beothuk do in fact make "perfect victims." They are, after all, tall and "fairer than most Indians," the almost white but not quite natives who have nuclear family values and who, more fortunately still, are not around any more to be asking troubling questions of the Canadian state about returning their ancient lands. Moreover, the terrible documented horrors comprising the historic genocide create such an overpowering picture of violence that they seem almost to give an alibi to other, supposedly more "civilized," forms of colonialism in the rest of Canada.36 It is as if by repeating the litany of tragedy and by loudly and angrily berating Newfoundland's fishermen that the modern historians can somehow find a more general form of redemption. In the moment of passionately narrating the tragedy, they can, as Godard put it, go native.

At the heart, perhaps one might say the bleeding heart, of this whole process remains Shaw nadithit herself, and, most especially, the tension between her position as a native informant and what Ber ton describes as the fourth and final part of the tragedy, "the tragedy of a culture lost." There is indeed something inexpressibly forlorn here, but it is not what must have been Shaw nadithit's very real bodily pain. Instead, it is the tragic lengths to which the modern historians will go to try and recapture and retell her story for the modern Canadian audience. Ber ton criticizes what he calls the "uncanny meddling" of the so-called "Beothuk Institution" founded in 1827 by settlers who, having failed in their imperial mission of finding and civilizing the "Red Indians," began instead to try and educate Shaw nadithit for the purposes of transforming her into a native informant.37 However, it is equally possible to criticize the way in which Ber ton himself describes the "one valuable by-product" of the meddling, namely, the "remarkable series of drawings." 38 Compare his romantic turned ethnological description, of the lovely Shaw nadithit, "trying as best she could through a series of story maps, to explain how her people lived, hunted and worshipped..." with the account of William Epps Cormack, Shaw nadithit's custodian in her last few months in St. John's. Exchanging notes with Bishop John of Nova Scotia, Cormack commented:

Shaw nadithit is now becoming very interesting as she improves in the English language, and gains confidence in people around. I keep her pretty busyly employed in drawing historical representations of everything that suggests itself relating to her tribe, which I find is the best and readiest way of gathering information from her.39

In both cases the appropriative assumptions of what the anthropological critics George Marcus and Michael Fisher call "salvage culture" are in full operative force.40 The notion that Shaw nadithit is "interesting" insofar as she begins to learn English, highlights the more general imperial angst played out in nearly all the historical treatments of her people since. It is this angst, one that is ultimately preoccupied more with the lack of ethnological information than with the lack of people, that repeatedly transforms Shaw nadithit's maps into disembodied artifacts. Their connections to a lived process of cartographic inscription and struggle are thus neglected, and instead they are turned into a quaintly visual source of data for narratives detailing the ill-fated journeys of Captain David Buchan (who was sent out by the Governor to communicate with the Beothuk) and John Peyton (who became Shaw nadithit's master). Like the Chipewyan woman "Thanadelthur"
whose position in the nation-building deployment of the historical archive has been critiqued by Julia Emberly, Shawnadithit thus becomes transformed into another Canadian native informant, another slave woman in a national narrative for which she serves simultaneously as "heroic proxy and sacrificial victim." It is, I think, the responsibility of the contemporary critic to refuse such nationalizing artifactualization by returning to study the cartography as the work of an embodied agent of knowledge.

Clever with a pencil: Shawnadithit's new-found-land

All savage Nations, whose language is necessarily defective, are accustomed to symbols; ingenious in the use of them, and quick in ascertaining their meaning... Any that more particularly belong to the Beothuk may probably be painted out and explained with Mr. Peyton's help by Shawnadithit. She may also assist in depicting her own tribe and their dress and habits as she is clever with a pencil.

   Bishop John of Nova Scotia

Who would have thought death was warm plump with meat and men who smile too much, who ask questions with pencils, wanting you to draw the canoes, the tents, the chasms dug for winter houses. They ask you to speak your language so they can study its sound.

How full of holes it is, subterranean tunnels echo around your failing lungs.

Can they hear?

   Joan Crate

Joan Crate's evocative poem, itself - like this chapter - imposed on the past, nevertheless asks the critical question: "Can they hear?" Bishop John's comments, along with the endeavors of the information hunters described above, would suggest a chronic and interested deafness. In what follows, I want to challenge this failing, and contest in particular how the assumption put forward by the Bishop - of a "necessarily defective" language - has also, in various ways, been extended to treatments of Shawnadithit's cartography. Introducing here her map depicting the River Exploits and the journeys of the Beothuk and Captain Buchan's party, I will proceed to outline four ways in which the map's treatment as an artifact has suppressed attention to its lively, embodied and contested context. Such suppression, I will argue, effectively silences Shawnadithit's surveyor's voice. Although this attempt to reconsider a native informant (a subject that can only be read) as an agentic surveyor (someone capable of producing definitive descriptions) demands a certain "(im)possible perspective," it is, I think, vital in order to counter the more conventional sublation of the subaltern subject as body as object into the lower strata of evolutionary historical narratives. Following the pattern of Bishop John's self-contradictions, these are the same narratives that adduce the very skills of those like Shawnadithit to be the final proof of skilllessness, savagery and general historical backwardness. At one level, therefore, they self-deconstruct. Yet, at the same time, they also dominate and contaminate the historical record as a whole. They prescribe a disciplinary structure with which critics inevitably have to negotiate if they are to disclose some of the embodied processes of cartographic inscription. In figuring out these
processes that were situated in but not totally controlled by colonialism, Shawndadithit's cartography itself maps a route in-between (Figure 17.2).

The body drawing the map

Shawndadithit drew the map (along with at least three others) in the winter of 1829.46 Afterwards, it was only a matter of months before she died on 6 June, her burial being recorded in the register of the Anglican Cathedral. By this time, her presence in St. John’s and her work had attracted a great deal of curiosity, so much so that The Times in faraway London posted an obituary on 14 September.

Died. – At St. John’s Newfoundland on the 6th of June in the 29th year of her age, Shawndadithit, supposed to be the last of the Red Indians or Beothuks. This interesting female lived six years a captive amongst the English, and when taken notice of latterly exhibited extraordinary mental talents.47

The primary way in which her cartography was first received and reconstituted as a disembodied artifact was as testimony to such “extraordinary mental talents” reported by The Times. The Times did not explicitly say “extraordinary, for a savage, a Red Indian,” that was an understanding carried by the colonial context. It was also the guiding (mis)understanding of the Englishmen in charge in Newfoundland. Captured Beothuk women were often referred to in objectifying ethnological terms as “interesting females,”48 and the Rev. Wilson, much like Bishop John, had already testified to Shawndadithit’s “surprisingly” clever skills with a pencil.

She made a few marks on the paper apparently to try the pencil; then in one flourish she drew a deer perfectly, and what is most surprising, she began at the tip of the tail.49

Cormack, the University of Edinburgh trained anthropologist whose written annotations cover Shawndadithit’s cartography, thought in turn that he was getting an “interesting” information source when he took charge of her as president and founder of the salvage oriented “Beothuk Institution.” Even contemporary writers still speak of his good fortune with an eager anthropological gusto: “Luckily he arranged to have Shawndadithit sent to him in St. John’s where he questioned her extensively about her people.”50 However, what gets lost in all this astonished talk of luck, extraordinary talents and surprising interest are the interests of Shawndadithit herself. Like the ethnocentric fascination with Australian Aboriginal relics described by Paul Carter, such “activities divorce the project of study from the context of its production, that living space in which places have histories and implements are put to use.”51 I do not think it is useful, indeed it is just as arrogant, to diagnose Shawndadithit’s interests long distance in the sensationalist style of Winter’s Shawndadithit.52 Nevertheless, it is possible to at least take more careful cognizance of the circumstances, the living embodied spaces, in which she put pencil to paper.

Up to the time that Cormack “sent for her,” Shawndadithit had lived almost six years as an unpaid servant in the house of John Peyton Jr., the magistrate of the fishing community of Twillingate. This was the same house from which John Peyton Sr. had set out on many expeditions to kill the Beothuk, and also from which Peyton Jr. had begun his own infamous brutal assault in which the apparent Beothuk chief, Nonobasadut, was shot and bayonettet to death while pleading with Peyton not to take his partner, Demasduit, as a captive (a story mapped out in another of Shawndadithit’s maps). Her baby left behind to die as well, Demasduit was nonetheless captured and duly taken to the house where she was named Mary March. Shawndadithit’s own arrival at this house was in turn no less forced. By this time, Demasduit had died of consumption, her dead body having been carried back by Captain Buchan to the site of her capture. Shawndadithit, as her map shows, and as I shall discuss in the next section, observed this pathetic funeral cortège move up and down the river in 1820. After that, though, it was only three more years before she, along with her mother and sister, were taken captive, presented as reward material to Peyton, and transported to the courthouse in St. John’s. A failed attempt to let them go back to the interior only led to the more speedy deaths of her mother and sister from consumption. Shawndadithit, alone, returned to Twillingate to work for nothing but her keep from one of the families centrally involved in the final demise of her people. Very little is recorded in the archives about her experiences in this house. There is no mention, to introduce one plausible scenario, that she was raped or brutalized. Neither, however, is there any specific mention that she was not. It is impossible to know what living day to day in this family home of known Beothuk killers might have been like for her. However, since this was the place from which Beothuk hunts had started out and in which Demasduit had contracted tuberculosis, and since the pre-colonial Beothuk moved “camps” on a seasonal basis, being trapped in this one house for five years may well have felt like bodily incarceration – even if there was no cell as such.

As if this situation was not already grossly traumatic, she was then, five years later, taken to St. John’s a second time to be made the object of further governmental, missionary and philanthropic turned anthropological interest. This, then, was the context in which she drew the map. Clearly these were very different circumstances to those enjoyed by a cartographer like Cook, and, for that matter, different from the conditions experienced by native map-makers like the Inuit described by Robert Rundstrom.53 Shawndadithit’s cartography was instead drawn under duress, when she was already ill, her world and family destroyed. Considering this context at least makes it
possible to move beyond treating the map as a curio. The situation was alive with colonial power relations. Urging her on was Cormack eager to salvage information, reporting how through his "persevering attention and constant ending of "paper and pencils of various colours." Shawnadithit "was enabled to communicate what would otherwise have been lost."54 Far from enabled, however, Shawnadithit may very well have felt disabled by such circumstances, surrounded by people who while soliciting and gathering information treated her language as "gibberish."55 From this perspective, other optics than simply camping sites, numbers of bodies and colonial expeditions can be read in her map. There is a record of pain and misery, perhaps; a will to mark the truth about the interactions of bodies and their spaces of ravel; and, most of all, a need to communicate through and of an embodied Beothuk representation of space.

The embodied spaces of colonized and colonizer

Shawnadithit's cartography's expression of a Beothuk geographical imagination has also been hidden because of how the maps have been treated as artifacts of History. I use the capitalized form of the word here, following Ober Young, in order to represent the sort of Western history that disavows geographical provenance and claims the space of universal truth as the hole world's History.56 Converted into an artifact in the service of such history, Shawnadithit's work has been treated as a source of raw information to be drained of data about the various expeditions of Peyton and Buchan into the interior. Howley set the pattern for instrumentalizing the maps in this way, and others like Berton, Winter, Such and Rowe have followed in his lead. The History of these ill-fated missions is, as a result, often recounted in reat detail by the historians. The directions taken by the different settler stories are listed with febrile exactitude. From Shawnadithit's map of the Iver Exploits, for example, the information gatherers follow her depiction of the British party led by Buchan - the group she depicts crossing the lake. They retrieve data about the numbers in the group, the number of stops that were made, the camp sites, the place where Buchan left the coffin of emaciated, the vain search for the Beothuk around the edge of the frozen lake, and the trip back. Occasionally, as in Berton's account, it is noted that all this adventuring seems pathetic and ill-considered. But in this too there is disemboding gesture. The irony of Buchan's mission, a mission to return a dead body of a Beothuk woman who had been captured to be used as a go-between, becomes appropriated and disembodied as a tragic metaphor of the ider tragedy of miscommunication.

Only very occasionally, and then only briefly, are the actual positions of the Beothuk mentioned. It seems that because the historians find it impossible to corroborate these map depicted positions and journeys with any written cords their acceptance as History is denied. Because, by contrast, Buchan's journey is also recorded in conventional archives, Shawnadithit's mapping of it is used as a supplement. In this way, the treatment of her cartography parallels the more general way in which British imperialists have looked upon indigenous geographical knowledge elsewhere. As Matthew Edney notes in the case of India:

The British had a very low opinion of Indian knowledge as a whole, and of their geography in particular, thinking it too indefinite, too imprecise, or completely false. They had no qualms about using geographical knowledge from native sources, but they discarded it as soon as even the sparsest survey had been completed.57

The same seems to be true in Newfoundland. There is evidence that explorers used maps drawn for them by the Beothuk and/or Micmac for moving around.58 However, when it comes to the writing of History, such maps can only ever serve, it seems, as artifacts supplementing the true fount of knowledge, the colonial archive. Nonetheless, as Derrida has famously pointed out, there is a disruptive potential lying within such moments of supplementation,59 and, in the case of Shawnadithit's cartography, such disruption comes in the shape of the embodied geography that History hides.

Clearly marked on the map are the bodies, the travels and the camping sites of the Beothuk, a historical geography inscribed in red. Shawnadithit's drawing shows where they camped, the places from where they observed Buchan's party; and the tracks along which they followed him. It documents the overland routes the Beothuk made to move back and forth from the lake; the way in which they arrived to take down Demasduit's coffin, and the place they took her body to bury it next to that of Nonosabasut. Moreover, apart from just these movements, Shawnadithit's cartography also renders thematic a series of critical epistemic dynamics neglected by the information hunters. Most obviously, it documents the fact that the Beothuk were also observers and agents of geographic interpretation. Moreover, it reminds the contemporary critic that the Beothuk not only interpreted the land but the impact of colonialism on that land. Between the mythical purity of pre-colonial space and the emptiness of post-colonialism Newfoundland-style, her map lies on the threshold as a representation of colonial contact from a native point of view.

Despite the numerous references made to her maps, no effort is ever made by commentators to draw attention to the processes of observation and territorial inscription that they reflect. There is a point in his book at which Howley notes in passing how:

One tall birch tree on the summit of Canoe Hill was pointed out by Shawnadithit as the lookout from whence the Indians observed Peyton's movements.60
However, he makes little of this as an indication of Beothuk knowledge-making, and makes no connection at all with the more systematic observation and inscription of the land represented in Shawkadithit’s work. It seems to me, however, that we can see in her map a whole geographical imagination, a coherent assemblage of conceptions of space and time that relate intimately as bodies, lives, and deaths.

Again, I do not think it is useful to read too much into the map and anthropologize these conceptions. Rather, the important point is to simply acknowledge their existence. From this perspective we can at least begin to take direct account of how the island whose New “true shape” Cook inscribed with such diligence from the sea, was already far from uninvolved by the Beothuk on the land. Shawkadithit’s cartography documents how these inscriptions had another shape, one that was constituted and understood in the terms of another, less sea-bound geographic discourse. Her mapping of Buchan’s party’s route also documents how the arrival and movements of the colonialists presented new spatial developments that were nonetheless interpretable within these older and more landed geographic terms. Clearly, the Beothuk observed the men in Buchan’s party—men who were to become the new and official observers of Newfoundland’s interior—and they saw them not just, as Cormack notes, from point “A” on the river, but also, as the map itself underscores, from a specifically Beothuk point of view. The map does not tell us much about how the party and its route were interpreted in such terms as fear or friendship. However, it is possible to note that, despite the dreadfully ominous scene of the coffin-carrying cortege, Buchan’s group is still depicted by Shawkadithit as made up of people, albeit people with smaller bodies, and that the geography of their journey, their new track across the land, is marked with great care. In the context of a cartography that charts so close a connection between knowledge of the land and travel through it, these new colonial tracks surveyed by Shawkadithit constitute new found land: traveling that records the space of between-ness in the new colonial geography. Such new found land as seen from the perspective of those who were colonized is so rarely documented that historians entranced by the “New” of History seem to have forgotten that it can exist.

The context of cartographic recognition

It could be argued that Cormack himself, unlike the latterday historians, was more respectful of the autonomy of the native knowledge presented to him. Certainly he took more careful note of Shawkadithit’s observations, annotating the work to mark observations she must have mentioned. He also seemed to take her knowledge as a form of reliable knowledge about the Beothuk from which he could estimate such exact records as the numbers of those surviving in 1820. However, this same attention to exactness also betrays how Cormack in turn misappropriated the spatial specificity of Shawkadithit’s maps by treating them as anthropological artifacts. The care, the concern, the attention to detail was all directed towards the higher historical purpose of anthropological salvage. It is interesting in this respect to see how his careful annotation of Shawkadithit’s map with its close attention to the fate of Beothuk bodies, concludes by describing Beothuk deaths in the passive voice—“her Husband (who was unfortunately killed the year before)” and “The Tribe had decreased much since 1816.” No mention is made in this disembodied voice of the colonial clash of bodies and of who might therefore have been responsible for the deaths. It, History, just happened, and the map simply facilitates the accounting of this History’s consequences for the number of living Beothuk bodies. In general, then, it seems that Cormack’s regard for Shawkadithit’s drawing became his way of satisfying a need that he had outlined in The Edinburgh New Philosophical Journal: a way for him to procure what he called “an authentic history of the unhappy race of people, in order that their language, customs and pursuits might be contrasted with those of other Indians.”

Comparative anthropology was in this sense another formula for sublating Shawkadithit’s geography into History.

More recent treatments have continued this transfiguration of the cartography as anthropological artifact. In such treatments there generally appear to be two basic rhetorical gestures, in fact, the two same basic gestures that were part of Bishop John’s backhanded compliment about Shawkadithit’s cleverness with a pencil. One of these elevates the maps, praising their topographical accuracy, their artistic skill and their generally high quality as specimens of the supposed genre. The other gesture radically diminishes the work, pouring scorn on its “Indian” character, intimating its apparent sameness vis-à-vis some homogenized “Indian” norm, and firmly marking its difference as inferior vis-à-vis the strict scale and grid-oriented rigor of properly drawn Cartesian cartography. Howley, who was himself a celebrated cartographer of Newfoundland’s geology, begins and ends his own description of Shawkadithit’s maps with the second of these two gestures.

Although rude and truly Indian in character, they nevertheless display no small amount of artistic skill, and there is an extraordinary minuteness of topographical detail in those having reference to the Exploits river and adjacent country. These latter bear a striking resemblance to Micmac sketches of a similar character.

By contrast, Winter’s description puts the negative comparison with Western cartography in the middle.

The drawings are accurate in topographical details, but they lack regular scale: rivers and lakes appear larger than they really are. Nevertheless, the details of shoreline, islands, bends in the river, falls,
rapids, and junctions of rivers are accurate, and the relation of each of these to the other is correct. It seems unfortunate that Winter's avowedly pro-Boothuk account should end up sounding more like the patronizing praise of a paternalistic school report. Indeed, perhaps Howley's racist view of the maps' "rude and truly Indian" character is more honest, it makes the epistemic violence clear. Winter does not say the details are "correct" by Western standards, but the implication is there all the same.

Another more scholastic turn to Shawndadih's maps by the cartographic historian G. Malcolm Lewis also suffers the same schizophrenic ethnocentrism. Lewis includes the map depicting the Boothuk observations of Buchanan's party as one among many other examples of mapping by what he collectively homogenizes as "North American Indians." He too praises the "remarkable and readily interpretable detail" in the work. However, he also begins his essay with a sweeping assessment of the deficiencies in "Indian" mapping:

Indian representations of actual networks (whether drainage, routes or boundaries) were not drawn to scale and were characterised by gross distortions of direction.

Overall the general approach of such commentators shares the same imperial will-to-knowledge evident in Cormack's search for an "authentic history." It also operates like the White Australian accounts of Aboriginal spatial history critiqued by Carter. In these accounts, argues Carter, "[p]ools, pastures and tracks were taken out of context and used like quotations." The comparisons that treat Shawndadih's work as a decontextualized, disembodied anthropological artifact are no less coptively appropriative. There is an approach that delights in the artifact's quaint and quotable accuracies, all the while placing it low down in a supposedly larger comparative hierarchy. Such a hierarchy inevitably elevates the "true" cartography of those like Cook to the top, setting it up implicitly or explicitly as a standard against which all below is judged deficient. Lewis's own more recent multicultural epiphany may at first blush seem to afford a way of avoiding such imperial hierarchization. But his overarching desire to compare, contrast, and most of all, codify maps as artifacts representing "different cultures . . . at different stages of development" remains the same.

Maps and Dreams. His work relates to a late 1970s land rights struggle in British Columbia in which the Beaver people represented their lands cartographically. Although he was there as a researcher and assistant in the production of contemporary maps concerning the people's land use patterns, Brody reports Atsin - a Beaver hunter - telling him the following.

Oh yes, Indians made maps. You would not take any notice of them. You might say such maps are crazy. But maybe the Indians would say that is what your maps are; the same thing. Different maps from different people - different ways.

It is by maintaining Atsin's unihierarchical attention to different maps and different ways that Brody goes somewhere different from the anthropologizing and antiquarian treatments of Shawndadih's maps I have cited above. In this way, comparative questions like those broached by Lewis might still be pursued, but without the invocative desire to establish a developmental chronology.

In relation to Shawndadih's work, Brody's attention to what he underlines are the different "dreams" behind different maps opens a whole series of questions about the guiding assumptions of recent cartographic and cultural history. Some of this scholarship has examined and critiqued the connections between the imperial gaze, cartography and what Timothy Mitchell calls the "enframing" of territory. Mitchell's work itself functions primarily as a critique of modernity. However, as Sami Zubaida has noted, there are some unfortunate assumptions about "pre-modern" culture - including the historiast notion of pre-modernity itself - implied by the critical argument.

One of these is the suggestion that "pre-modern" cultures do not have a capacity, however differently organized, to picture people and places from a distance. What Brody might label the geographical dream of Shawndadih's map clearly problematizes any such simple generalization: it does picture and yet it does not empty or disembodied the colonial landscape. It therefore demands of critics a more nuanced reading of the differences distinguishing the disciplinary picturings of Europeans from the picturings of the people they colonized. In this vein, we can go back to Cook's map and compare its exact outline and empty center with Shawndadih's detailed depiction of pathways through the interior.

Cook's map can clearly be argued to represent an enframing moment in which we see, in Mitchell's terms, a "conjuring up [of] a neutral surface or volume called 'space.'" Such colonial conjuring of abstract space provided a seemingly blank frame of reference through which important parts (ports and other information vital for fishing and navigation) could be distinguished from the unimportant (the empty interior). Moreover, the emptiness so conjured can also be read as a representation of the lack of British interest in the interior, a gap in governmental knowledge, which combined with the
related lack of disciplinary power in this arena, ultimately made possible the violent processes of its actual emptying. Shawndadithit’s map, by contrast, pictures a peopled interior, a space of bodies, movement, life and death. Certainly, this is not the modern “world as exhibition” approach to picturing examined by Mitchell – although, as I have shown, this is precisely what the historians have attempted to make it. However, it does nonetheless embody a particular world view that divides the important from the irrelevant. It is in this vein that I think we can return to the assessments of the taxonomists about the lack of scale. Rather than a deficiency, the uneven scale in Shawndadithit’s map can be read as a rigorous and reliable picturing of the uneven possibilities for travel by foot across so uneven a landscape. Rather than set up an imaginary abstract grid of space on which all else falls into synchronic place, the complex time-space the map depicts traces the spatiality of bodies and movement. It is still a representation of space, still a picturing, and still an embodiment of a geographical imagination. Yet it is also a spatiality rooted specifically in the corporeal pathways of Beothuk journeying and knowing.

Bodies in between colony and nation
I have already outlined the ways in which national historians have transformed Shawndadithit’s maps into national relics. In this last section on the context of her cartography, I want to continue this process of problematization by examining the more substantive connections between mapping and national identity. As Thongchai Winichakul and Richard Helgerson have illustrated with book length discussions, there is a long and globally varied history connecting mapping and nation building.99 Clearly the connections go way beyond the practical business of charting the length and breadth of national territory. They also extend to the complex power relations underpinning the imagination and organization of the nation as a spatially coherent community. In Elizabethan England, for example, Helgerson argues that cartography was key to the developing break with the regime of dynastic loyalty. “Maps,” he says, “opened a conceptual gap between the land and its ruler, a gap that would eventually span battlefields.”100 Even today, national maps and atlases continue to serve as a major vehicle for teaching citizens the spatial reach of their nationality, allowing them – as Benedict Anderson emphasizes in the revised edition of his famous book – to dream the secular, national dream of continuous, horizontal community.101 Beneath such unbroken horizons many other dreams of community may, of course, exist, and yet the flatness of the map, what Anderson calls its “logotopia of political space,” would seem to hide them away. Returning to the differential spatiality of a map like Shawndadithit’s allows such dreams of alienation (and, indeed, of alien nations) to break the unbroken surface. Comparing her cartography with attempts to map Canada as a complex and regionalized yet mappable whole, illustrates a form of negotiation with nationalizing discipline that Brody evokes in his account of the Beaver people’s struggle. “Dreams collide: new kinds of maps are made.”102

In Canada in particular, as the chair of the Bank of Montreal noted in Volume Three of the Historical Atlas of Canada, “Mapping and nation-building are inextricably linked.”103 As the banker proceeded to suggest, and as numerous reviewers have agreed, the Historical Atlas itself has ably continued this tradition.104 At the same time, its pursuit of national cartographic representation (and, through this, integration) in the contemporary period of first nations’ struggle, has taken an uneven but sometimes new approach to the question of first nations within the nation of Canada. Unlike most previous national atlases of Canada, the Historical Atlas departs from a geographically exclusionary understanding of the country as just a white settler-colony and, for the first time, goes a considerable way towards putting native peoples on the map.105 Indeed, despite the biblical boast of mapping Canada “From the Beginning to 1800” – the subtitle given to the English edition of Volume One by the publishers – there is a sense in which the thorough attempt made to document a native presence on the land in the first volume fundamentally displaces the white settler colony thesis, and, with it, the very notion that the land had always been Canadian.106 Unhappily, the teleology of the three volume series as a whole concludes in Volume Three by addressing the twentieth century with only one obvious attempt – a Gitksan and Wet’suwet’en map – to mark the continuation of the same native presence into the places and politics of the present. But this, I think, creates all the more reason to re-examine the effort in Volume One to put native people, and amongst them the Beothuk, on the map. The embodied question marks of Shawndadithit’s cartography, I think, ask us to consider how even this effort itself is not without dangers.

Putting first nations on maps that chart a story of national development may well be inclusionary, but it may also be incorporative, coaptive and controlling too. Put another way, it may historically nationalize people and places who now, seeking decolonization, refuse this very nationalizing principle. In the miserable context of traplines, reserves and rejected land claims, being on a Canadian (as opposed to a first nations map) has most often coincided for native people with the violent disciplinary force of colonialism. It was with this same disciplinary structure of violence that the scholars working on the Historical Atlas inevitably had to negotiate themselves. Committed, as they were, to only using the most reliable and academically respected data, they turned chiefly to the disciplined information sources of Canadian archeology and anthropology rather than to the oral histories of first nations. According to Conrad Heidenreich, one of the Historical Atlas’s most conscientious researchers of native movements, “memory ethnography . . . was ruled out as being virtually worthless.”107 In its stead then the Historical Atlas sought to put native people on the map by turning first to archeologists’
assessments of so-called "Prehistory" and, second, to colonial records. Such assessments and records are of course interested, and as Cole Harris, the editor, warns in his preface to Volume One: "[m]ore than good will is required to penetrate an Indian realm glimpsed through white eyes." Certainly there was plenty of good will in Volume One - "we have tried to accord full place to native peoples" notes Harris - but in negotiating how "to penetrate an Indian realm" the scholars negotiating with the penetrative power/knowledge apparatus of the colonial archive still continued to gaze through white eyes - their own and those of the colonial record keepers before them. Thus, albeit marginally and supplementally, Shawnadithit's gaze provides a different and less penetrative perspective on a small part of the terrain mapped by the *Historical Atlas* as Newfoundland.

Apart from the inclusion of a Beothuk pendant and an archeological generalization of Beothuk space in the "Prehistory" section, the first major treatment of the Beothuk in the *Historical Atlas* comes in the second section on "The Atlantic Realm." The most detailed part of the plate in question illustrates the findings of an incredibly comprehensive attempt by Ralph Pastore to map Beothuk habitation and burial sites (Figure 17.3). This represents a notable effort "to accord full place to native peoples," and placed as it is between a plate showing the routes of various European explorers and a plate describing the migratory fisheries of Newfoundland, it has a certain displacing force on the *Historical Atlas's* narrative of nation. Nevertheless, this displacement is brought back into Historical line by the scene settings that enframe Pastore's map. The scene is seen or at least glimpsed, in the editor's words, through "white eyes." In the introduction to the so-called "Atlantic Realm" it is noted, for example, that the "advantages and disadvantages of settlement in Newfoundland were argued throughout the seventeenth century in both England and France." Nothing is said here about the possibility of a considerable discourse amongst the Beothuk about these same "advantages and disadvantages" of European settlement. The way that Shawnadithit's surveys represent a continuation of such a Beothuk discourse on into the nineteenth century is neglected, and this despite the fact that as maps they employ the same cartographic medium as the *Historical Atlas* itself. The narrative of national development in the Atlantic Realm instead concludes that "ravaged by malnutrition and disease and lacking guns, their summer fishing stations pre-empted by fishermen and their winter villages subject to the depredations of furriers, the Beothuk of Newfoundland became extinct." To be sure, the words above Pastore's map also reemphasize the Beothuk suffering: "Harassed by trappers and fishermen, weakened by European disease, and excluded from coastal resources, they died out early in the nineteenth century." In other words, the colonial violence is definitely noted. But at the same time, the suggestion that the colonists might be stealing the land - a suggestion evoked by the painful ironies surrounding the coffin in Shawnadithit's map - is never brought up, all the while the atlas twice mentions that the Beothuk themselves stole. For the reviewer Paul Robinson, this stress on Beothuk stealing came two times too many:

Somehow I found this explanation of the Beothuk's eradication too simple, too convenient, as if it were expedient to skirt nimbly a topic that most of us choose to ignore. The memory of Shawnadithit, her mother and sisters - the last of a race of people - is too strong in my
mind. They are deserving of better treatment, particularly in a book as majestic in its approach to our complete heritage as is the Historical Atlas of Canada.  

Robinson's criticisms—although they ignore the simultaneous attention to harassment in the preferred explanations—are well taken. However, I would argue that it is precisely the question of the Historical Atlas's "majestic" approach to cartographic completeness that is at issue. The nationalizing desire to produce a complete cartography that accords full place to native peoples is brought into crisis by the very disciplined lengths the research and narrative go to secure completeness.  

This epistemological tension becomes clearer in the second major moment in which a Beothuk presence is acknowledged, namely the final map of the volume entitled "Native Canada, ca 1850."  

In many ways the map "Native Canada, ca 1820." is an incredibly disruptive way to conclude an atlas subtitled "From the Beginning to 1800." Instead of a singularized colonial genesis story that might conclude by depicting the originative capitalist movement of the fur trade and fisheries in 1800, the map evokes a vast multiplicity of native movements. Instead of homogenizing native experiences, it charts diversity. And instead of mapping points of colonial control—which might be readily (mis-)used in court as testimony to the vigor of colonialism and the extinction of native rights—it highlights the complex dynamics of survival in the face of advancing colonial settlement. Here, then, perhaps more than in any other place in the Historical Atlas, we find a real radicalization of the plural "Des Origines" in the doubled-up sensitivity in the subtitle of the French edition of Volume One.  

Yet the epistemological tension noted above also works here too. In the end, the diversity and disruption is all recalled within a coherent map of the whole of Canada, a map that no native cartographers would ever have drawn let alone imagined as their national community. The various historical native movements—including those of the Beothuk—are charted so comprehensively and picturated so coherently in one map that the final result is their recollection on the single unbroken horizon of the modern Canadian nation. They become not first nations as such, but "Native Canada, ca 1820," a synchronic moment in Canada's progressivist march from archaic past into modern nationhood. Colliding with this coherency, the embodied space of in-betweens that comprised the new-found-land of Shawnadihatit's map introduces "a newness that is not part of the progressivist division between past and present, or the archaic and the modern." Instead, this newness is, to quote Bhabha again, "the foreign" element that reveals the interstitial.  

Most immediately we can note that the mapping of encounters in 1820 made by Shawnadihatit casts some doubt on the accuracy of the Newfoundland portion of "Native Canada, ca 1820." In this portion the likely seasonal routes taken by the Beothuk from the interior to the sea are shown by small arrows while larger arrows depict the advance of colonial settlement (Figure 17.4). In the context of the events portrayed by Shawnadihatit the Beothuk's seasonal routes, and particularly the route towards the south-west, seem quite unlikely. Moreover, as Cormack's annotations to Shawnadihatit's map suggest, the number of Beothuk around this time was probably about 27. Such reduced numbers—based in large part on Shawnadihatit's testimony—would suggest that by the end of the 1810s the whole traditional pattern of life and movement was equally reduced. By the 1820s then, survival in the interior, and most immediately in the winter of 1820, surviving the foray of Capt. Buchan's party up-river, were probably the more likely historical and geographical concerns. The fact that Shawnadihatit mapped these events and not (as far as we know) some seasonal hunting and gathering patterns also suggests their priority from the perspective of the colonized.
More significant than these questions of seasonal movements is the issue of how the whole colonial scene is represented. Shawnadithit’s map records the traveling bodies of the colonizers and the colonized. At the level of content, it portrays a middle ground, an interstitial space shared but traveled through and experienced differently by the two groups. At the level of how this embodied space is represented, Shawnadithit’s depiction of the scene is itself also something of an interstitial work. It employs the paper and pencil, “outline ordered” mapping format of the Europeans with whom she was communicating. Yet, as I have argued in the preceding three sections, it also reflects a series of Beowuk perspectives that problematize abstract European notions of space, scale, and time. The Historical Atlas perspective on “Native Canada, ca 1820” – as with the earlier map of burial and habitation sites (Figure 17.3, p. 327) – does not throw these same notions into question. It directly counters the myth that by 1800 Canadian history was primarily a matter of European struggle on the land, but it does not abandon the pan-Canadian perspective of the European explorers. Its representation, unlike Shawnadithit’s non-national picturing of people, is abstract, disembodied and detached. It is mapped out on the template of the modern nation. It still usefully represents the grand dynamics of contact – the small arrows of native movement outsize by the large incoming arrows of colonial settlement – but it does so completely within the framework of modern cartography. There is no space here for the embodied in-between moments of contact and conflict represented by Shawnadithit. Indeed, because the whole national scene of “Native Canada” must be brought together as such on a single sheet there is not even space, let alone the (possibilities of) non-synchronous time, to include the complexities of exchange, timing and native interpretation presented in Shawnadithit’s story map. Instead, with a flurry of colors and images befitting the European war-room, “Native Canada, ca 1820” allows the modern citizen reader to take in with a single glance a last synchronous slice of Canada’s non-modern past before the modernizing, nationalizing impulse of the next two volumes obscures the genealogy of that presence from the present. Shawnadithit’s map of the embodied space of inbetween-ness, by contrast, urges us to remember otherwise.

A Conclusion

Memory speaks:
You cannot live on me alone
you cannot live without me . . .
I can’t be restored or framed
I can’t be still I’m here . . .
in your mirror pressed leg to leg beside you
intrusive inappropriate bitter flashing

Adrienne Rich
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EMBODIYING THE URBAN MAORI WARRIOR

Gregory A. Waller

...after its theatrical release in 1993, Once Were Warriors had become the 
most commercially successful film ever produced in New Zealand. Based on 
the novel by Alan Duff that won the 1990 PEN Best First Book award and 
touted the production as its fourth “Maori feature film.” Although 
previously Maori films like Barry Barclay’s Ngati (1987) had gained accolades as 
some measure of prestige on the international film festival circuit, Once 
Warriors was the first such feature to turn a profit and garner a North 
American theatrical, video, and cable television release, no doubt in part 
because only Tamahori’s film approximates the high production values asso-
ciated with mainstream Hollywood movies, even as it gains a marketable 
awareness of difference by focusing on an endangered “indigenous” family in 
contemporary, urban New Zealand. "Once Were Warriors" begins, however, not with a glimpse into life on the 
streets, but with another view entirely, an opening image of New 
Zealand as a pristine, unpopulated, undeveloped landscape, where moun-
tain, water, and sky balance in sublime harmony. This is immediately 
recognizable as the type of image long-favored in travel brochures, coffee-
photography books, postage stamps, and documentaries like the 
NZBBC production, Land of the Kiwi (1987), which was telecast as part 
American public television’s “Nature” series. Literally within seconds, 
tamahori’s camera begins to move back and then down from this landscape 
switch to the New Zealand we have seen is in fact a colorful billboard 
ENZPOWER overlooking a busy freeway. Below, where the camera 
perches, is visually and aurally dense urban terrain: traffic whizzing by, wired 
walkways flanking the freeway, and graffiti artists at work on decrepit...