



BORDER CROSSINGS AND POLAR BEARS

How Indigenous Hunting Rights in Canada Become Part of a Transnational Economy

“Big Game” hunters from “first world” nations fly around the world to kill megafauna to put on their walls: caribou, elephants, rhinoceros, polar bears, and many other rare or even endangered species are involved. The 2015 death of “Cecil the lion,” illegally killed in Zimbabwe by a US American dentist, is a relatively recent rendition of this phenomenon, drawing international condemnation (Hall). In the United States, former President Trump’s backpedaling on a ban on imports of such “trophies” caused outrage among animal protectionists for its illegality. However, it was just a symptom of a broader global phenomenon of the sale of the right to kill, sometimes in the name of conservation, sometimes in the name of supporting local communities, and sometimes in the name of tradition and of continuing Indigenous hunting rights.

In this essay, I consider a specific case study—a uniquely Canadian phenomenon of the sale of killing rights by Indigenous peoples in Canada to non-Indigenous, non-Canadian trophy hunters who want to hunt polar bears in Canada. These hunters, primarily of European ancestry, come mainly from the United States and, more recently, also from Western Europe. What can we understand about the role of the Canadian state, the national government, the US-Canadian border, the philosophical constitution of a more-than-human world in both Indigenous and European-derived epistemologies, and the politics of Indigeneity in the international marketplace through this one case study focused on human-animal relations?

At every stage of this series of events involved in hunting polar bears, we see the importance of the notion of the nation—the nation of Canada, the nations of Indigenous communities, specifically First

Jane Desmond
University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign, USA



<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2180-4265>

Nations and Inuit, the transnational communities of the circum-Arctic nations and their legal agreements, and the transnational marketplace for wealthy, elite (predominantly male) hunting access to limited animal goods/lives. Ultimately, I hope to demonstrate both the necessity and the utility of anchoring our transnational analyses in a more-than-human world because access to and protection of living non-human beings, often termed national or human patrimony, plays a crucial role in defining the nation and communities.¹

The right to kill embedded in Indigenous hunting rights in Canada is extremely contentious terrain.² For example, in 2013, the Canadian Minister of the Environment used her Twitter account to celebrate a cousin's first killing of a polar bear by posting a picture of the dead animal. Soon after, the Minister, Leona Aglukkaq, an Indigenous member of the Inuit, found her Twitter account erupting. Activists decried the killing of a member of an endangered species, while other posters defended Indigenous hunting rights (Young),³ which is not the only instance of such a Twitterverse eruption over Indigenous hunting. As Chickasaw Nation American Studies scholar Elizabeth Rule later pointed out in a 2018 article on a related cyber defamation of Inuk throat singer Tanya Tagaq,

1 For just a sample of works investigating non-human animals' crucial symbolic and material associations with community and national identities, see works by Canadian-based scholars Kim TallBear and Zoe Todd and US scholar Claire Jean Kim, among others. See also Burton and Mawani, whose edited volume *Animalia* includes the work of Indigenous Canadian scholar Daniel Heath Justice. Zahara and Hird argue that Canada's North is a site of colliding cosmologies as Inuit and other Indigenous cosmologies are pitted against settler colonial epistemologies in public policy development of animal management.

2 Debates and contests over Indigenous harvesting rights span several species in Canada and the nearby Northwest United States. See, for example, Beldo and von der Porten, Corntassel, and Mucina. In 2020, contestations over the rights to hunt have grown into violent conflicts between Indigenous and non-Indigenous lobster fishermen. See Bilefsky. See also C. Kim. In addition, Engelhard provides an extensive historical analysis of the symbolic import of polar bears, including Indigenous and settler colonial perspectives and artistic renderings.

3 Young presents a starting point and calls for further research on how Inuit community members are using the web and the ways that some Inuit perspectives regarding environmental debates and knowledge are both potentially more widely dispersed and assimilated or marginalized in wider consumption across Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities concerned with environmental issues. His early findings suggest that in the digital realms he investigated, like Twitter and Wikipedia, knowledge systems between "science" and "Indigenous" ways of knowing become opposed to each other and that broader epistemologies of Indigenous concepts of relations with the more-than-human world are reduced to "information" that is deemed either accurate or inaccurate by "science" standards.

following her posting of a photo of her infant daughter next to a freshly killed seal, Indigenous hunting rights in Canada are subject to ongoing transnational commentary and engagement.⁴ In this essay, I investigate a related but different, and as yet less examined, component of Indigenous hunting—the sale of the right to kill to outsiders—predominantly to white Americans and white Europeans who want to hunt polar bears. As we will see, at the heart of these debates lies the bear’s life, and intersecting that life is a phalanx of forces, histories, economies, laws, and cultural practices that gather new meaning in a transnational sphere.

Only Indigenous subsistence hunters can legally hunt polar bears in Canada, but they can sell that right with certain restrictions. Non-Indigenous hunters from the US and elsewhere come to Canada, pay up to \$50,000 US/\$63,030 CA to kill a polar bear guided by Indigenous guides, and then ship parts of the animal back home to put on their wall as a trophy. Various countries have different bans on importing certain “trophies,” and this legal landscape is in flux. Currently, it is illegal to ship polar bear parts into the United States. However, hunt organizers stress on their websites that bear parts can be taxidermized in Canada after the kill and can be stored for years (presumably until the laws change again).⁵ Alternatively, they note that “replica” taxidermy mounts can be prepared, which are “difficult to differentiate from the real thing” (globalhuntingsafaris.com) so that a trophy for the wall back home can still be obtained. In the meantime, photo documentation of the hunter with the dead animal, such as those featured in hunt advertisements, can serve as a virtual “trophy.”

Canada is the only country in the world that allows the commodification and sale of Indigenous polar bear hunting rights, and this practice

4 Elizabeth Rule (Chickasaw Nation), in her 2018 article “Seals, Selfies and the Settler State,” argues that this case is a continuation of broad-based gendered violence against Indigenous women by non-Indigenous communities and the state, tying the critiques (even threats) emanating from some “settler environmentalists,” as she terms them, to a campaign to denigrate Indigenous mothers as “culture bearers” and thus to continue a campaign of both subtle and overt forced assimilation that stretches back through residential schools, and the taking of Indigenous children from their homes for adoption. While my focus here is on a more male-centric world of polar bear hunting, the broader debates do involve transnational non-Indigenous environmentalists as well as non-Indigenous scientists and state officials.

5 By contrast, the importation of polar bear parts into the UK remains legal, although a movement to prohibit trophy hunting imports is gaining traction. Furthermore, polar bear skins and body parts command high prices in China; however, I have no information regarding how they are acquired. At this time, Mexico also prohibits the importation of polar bear trophies.

articulates a complex moral economy of wildlife life, death, and commodification. This moral economy is delineated through treaty rights that form the core of Indigenous sales of hunting options in Canada, the opinions of Indigenous hunters and communities, the competing claims by international animal activists, and the rhetoric of the big game hunting outfitters themselves to chart the intersecting and divergent assumptions about ethics, rights, and the value of animals that underpin this complex phenomenon.

My analysis of this shifting terrain is based on examining news reports from Indigenous and non-Indigenous Canadian and international sources, NGO reports, scientific articles, online videos of polar bear hunts, and representations online of hunting outfitters. I have not yet done fieldwork in the hunting communities with the hunters or outfitters themselves, and obviously, such first-hand observations and conversations might provide additional viewpoints. Thus, what I offer here is a preliminary set of observations and questions about how Canadian investments in polar bears come to have symbolic, cultural, and economic meaning in the current debates about trophy hunting, transnational hunters, and the maintenance of what are termed traditional cultural practices in the Canadian northern communities.

A note about terminology: The Canadian government has ongoing relations with numerous Indigenous communities, and these result in a variety of designations, complex treaty interpretations, constitutional recognitions, governmental interventions and supports, and new commitments to restorative justice. I also recognize that some Indigenous scholars have rejected the terms “Aboriginal” or “Indigenous” because, like the US term “Native American,” it can flatten the complex relations between numerous populations into a homogenized vision of a historical past merely opposing Indigenous and settler populations. However, in this research, I am focused on legal and historical relations between local communities in specific parts of what is now “Canada” and the polar bear, or Nanuq, who has been so central to those communities both economically and symbolically. At times, these relations are governed across large configurations of communities termed “Indigenous” in public discourse, and at others, they apply more specifically to unique communities. Where I can, I will specify which.

I endeavor to use the desired terminology supplied by those communities in the polar regions most connected to polar bears, including the Inuit. Long “studied” by European and European-American anthropologists, this diverse community is now setting the terms for collaborative research with their communities and outside scien-

tists and proposing the term “Inuit Nunangat.” A recent white paper on the “National Inuit Strategy on Research” produced in 2018 by Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami (ITK), the national representational organization for the 65,000 Inuit in Canada, to guide future non-Indigenous research relations with Indigenous peoples, proposes using the term “Inuit Nunangat” to refer to the communities and governance structures previously designated in English as the “Arctic,” or “the North” in Canada. It includes 53 communities and roughly 35% of Canada’s landmass (“National Inuit Strategy on Research”). “Inuit Nunangat is the distinct geographic, political, and cultural region that includes the Inuvialuit Settlement Region (Northwest Territories), Nunavut, Nunavik (Northern Quebec), and Nunatsiavut (Northern Labrador),” states the Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami (“National Inuit Strategy on Research”). These are some communities in which polar bear trophy hunting is most prevalent.

Hunting rights for all Indigenous populations are tightly controlled and vary both according to an individual’s geographic location relative to their community of origin, the current interpretations of historical treaties and their presumed geographic reach, and the person’s enrolled status or not, governing what type of legal documentation to hunt they must carry while hunting.⁶

In this essay, I recognize the distinct differences among Indigenous communities and the complex Canadian governmental designations of Indigenous belonging (which differentiates between multiple longstanding non-European communities and which employ the term “Aboriginal” to guarantee certain rights in the Canadian constitution, including Aboriginal harvesting rights of certain animals). However, Canadian law also distinguishes further between Aboriginal rights, which are held by First Nations members, including “status” and non-status Individuals (which is similar to “enrolled” and non-enrolled members of tribes in the US), the Inuit and the Metis (whose claims are not explicitly adjudicated as “before contact”).

As the preceding paragraph makes clear, the matrix of relations between polar bears, local communities, and the Canadian legal landscape as well as the international animal protectionist one, including designations in the global Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species, or “CITES,” registry, make any discussion of hunting polar bears in Canada not only highly complex but subject to ongoing transformation as international regulations and local eco-

6 For information on Indigenous hunting and fishing rights, see Istvanffy and Johnston.

conomic and cultural policies in Canada evolve. My goal in entering this discussion is not to prescribe, as an outsider, what “should” be, nor merely to describe, again from a position outside Canada, what appears to be, but rather to begin to think through the construction of a scholarly format through which those of us specializing in the anthropology of tourism, in transnational North American or transnational European Studies, and Animal Studies or the study of human-animal relations, might contribute to discussions going forward—for it is clear that transnational debates about human-polar bear relations are going to continue to be highly contested in the future, especially as the intensifying effects of global climate change decrease the presence of some of the bear’s home ranges on sea ice (Fountain).

HUNTING POLAR BEARS

Although numbers cannot be precise, it is estimated that there are currently, at most, approximately only 30,000 polar bears worldwide, of which two-thirds reside in Canada (George). They are found in four provinces and three territories in Canada, but most of these bears are in Nunavut (*Socio-economic Importance of Polar Bears*). With its 85% Inuit population, Nunavut Territory is part of Inuit Nunangat (Dowsley 161). Beyond Canada, the rest of the world’s polar bears live in the US, Russia, Denmark/Greenland, and Norway, none of which allow commercial non-Indigenous hunting.

Why focus on polar bears? For both Inuit and non-Indigenous populations, like international wildlife protection agencies, the polar bear carries immense cultural weight in addition to their economic value. As the apex predator in the Arctic, the polar bear symbolizes strength, power, and freedom. For example, the World Wildlife Federation (WWF) recently considered changing its panda logo to that of the polar bear. In 2011, the Coca-Cola company decided to change the color of its iconic red cans for the holiday season to white to draw attention to the polar bear’s plight, joining with the WWF and featuring an image of a mother polar bear and her cubs. The image of a strong, brave, and innocent victim of climate change was a powerful goad to consumers beyond the Arctic who had never seen a polar bear except, perhaps, in a zoo.

For many in Indigenous communities, the polar bear has equally strong and longer-lived cultural symbolism, prominently in Inuit mythology and cosmology (Englehardt). The polar bear is then a textbook definition of a charismatic species, and as such, it facilitates international debates about its future. While Indigenous individuals can legally hunt these animals (in Alaska, in Russia, in Greenland, for example),

it is only in Canada that non-Indigenous trophy hunt killings are countenanced—it is the only place in the world where the notion of a culturally contiguous and subsistence hunting of these bears is transposed into capitalist commodification (“Beyond the Edge.”)

The development of commercial sport hunting of polar bears is historically a government initiative to bring income-generating possibilities to native peoples (Waters et al.). The rise of this business is caught up in international legal changes, indicating the global dimensions of the trade in killing polar bears. Fifty years ago, US conservationists began to worry about the number of bears in Alaska being killed for trophy hunting. In 1972, the US added polar bears to the protections of the new Marine Mammal Protection Act (since they spend most of their time on sea ice, the bears are considered marine animals), which effectively closed out trophy hunting in Alaska. Just a year later, in 1973, the International Agreement on the Conservation of Polar Bears was signed by all five polar bear nations (the US, Canada, the then Soviet Union (now the Russian Federation), Denmark (for Greenland), and Norway. From 1973 onward, Canada claimed the right to have Inuit-led trophy hunts, while all four other signatories refused to allow trophy hunting (Waters et al.).

The Canadian government-led efforts to develop touristic trophy hunting of polar bears, despite a slow response by Inuit communities, some of whom refused (and still do) to sell their right to hunt to outsiders. Objections seem centered on whether this type of hunting was disrespectful to the bear and whether it upended the traditional moral and spiritual economy of Inuit hunting (Waters et al.). Although numbers are hard to come by, it seems that most Inuit communities do not hold such hunts or do so rarely. Communities themselves decide how many tags (i.e., permits) to sell to outsiders. A maximum of 50% of available tags can be sold to outsiders (“Polar Bears in Canada”). One interview with a Quikiqtarjuaq elder (referred to as “M.A.”) in 2004 by scholar Martha Dowsley echoed this concern about respect: “In the old days you were told to only kill what we needed. I’m so against how it is now. We were told not to play with animals, now there’s sport hunting and fishing derbies” (qtd. in Waters et al. 7). Historically, these “guided hunts” sold to outsiders have represented a maximum of 20% of the total “harvest” (“Polar Bears in Canada”).

The total number of bears that can be legally killed each year in Canada is tightly controlled by regional commissions. These commissions, in turn, are modeled on a cooperative management mechanism that unites (at least in theory) both European-derived “science” based knowledge (for example, population counts derived from helicopter

surveillance) with historical and experiential knowledge about polar bear populations developed by Inuit elders and current hunters, who derive their sense of the health of contemporary herds based on sightings and in relation to past numbers of encounters. A massive report issued in 2019 by the Nunavik Marine Regional Wildlife Board, titled “Nunavik Inuit Knowledge and Observations of Polar Bears: Polar bears of the Davis Strait Subpopulation,” and printed in both English and Inuktitut, attempted to document some of the historical knowledge from Inuit communities and the types of evidence they bring to their discussions of polar bear populations, making it more available outside the Inuit community.

Tensions between these two ways of knowing are well documented. Indigenous-oriented publications like *Nunatsiaq News* reported in 2014 that “there’s still a huge gap between how Inuit and [non-Inuit] scientists want to count polar bears.” However, the commitment to co-management has been there since the mid-1990s.⁷ In 2018, for example, Environment Minister Joe Savikataaq in Nunavut announced the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board’s recommendation of 34 bears for the season. Some groups wanted more (“Public Hearings”). Polar bear numbers are contentious, with non-Inuit scientists frequently arguing against increased quotas. “Kivalliq hunters have frequently insisted that their on-the-land observations are more accurate than the complicated mathematical projections of wildlife researchers,” says Savikataaq. At the base of these arguments are the validity of two different concepts of evidence and cultural power in decision-making. The local groups decide how many bears can be killed each year, and then, among those, how many of those “tags” will be sold to non-Indigenous, non-local hunters. (The sale of killing rights does not increase the number of polar bears killed). At present, approximately 600 tags to kill bears are available across the country.⁸ Some Inuit leaders and community members feel that the number is too low to allow them to keep the bear numbers in check in their communities, posing a danger to humans. With climate change impacting bears’ ability to find food, more bears are approaching human habitation.

THE “OTHER” BORDER:
On Canada/US Culture,
Power, and Politics

RIAS—Vol. 18, Spring–Summer, № 1/2025

7 Polar bears are divided for these purposes into several subpopulations, each of which is monitored, and the number of bears that can be killed in each region varies from year to year based on cooperative estimates of the population of the bears in the area.

8 The latest available hunt statistics from 2020–21 indicate a “harvest” in Canada of 475 polar bears killed through hunting, which does not include any bears killed in self-defense. See Letts.

A Canadian Broadcasting Corporation report in 2018 (“Inuit Community”) details these clashes as it focuses on the town of Arviat, Nunavut, on the Western shore of the Hudson Bay, where local bear patrols try to protect the community of 2,500 people (“Inuit Community”). Deputy Mayor Alex Ishalook says he must keep reminding children of the danger. With up to 8 bear sightings a night, the local bear patrol and wildlife officers are on call 24 hours a day/7 days a week to deter bears that come too close to the inhabitants. The bears can only be killed if they pose an active danger to a human. However, sometimes it is too late.

Local hunter Brian Aglukark refers to some outsiders’ perceptions of the bears when he says, “We don’t think they are cute. They are dangerous creatures and very scary.” Aglukark sadly witnessed the mauling death of local resident Aaron Gibbons as Gibbons was trying to protect his three children from a bear. Gibbons’ sister, Darlene Gibbons, told CBC News that change is urgently needed: “The polar bears are being overprotected now without talking to the elders or hunters around here.”

After these reports, things have gotten worse. On October 30, 2024, Alex Ishalook, chair of the Arviat Hunters and Trappers Organization and vice-chair of the Kivalliq Wildlife Board, addressed government biologists during the Nunavut Wildlife Management Board meeting, venting frustration at the harvest quotas, saying, “There’s been lots and lots of encounters by polar bears—damages to cabins, close calls, people being chased [...]. Our concerns are getting stronger and stronger” (Letts). He wants his Kivalliq region to return to a pre-2007 quota of 20 tags from the current allotted 14.

The complex entanglements of the role of human-driven climate change, which is forcing the bears to search for food scraps in human settlements, the role of the national government, the local efforts at community protection, and the sometimes contested nature of elders’ knowledge based on their lived experiences as well as historical knowledge, are all clear in these powerful news reports. However, these contested knowledges are not widely known beyond the communities involved. As Dr. Victoria Qutuq Buschman, the first Inuk Ph.D. in Conservation Biology, notes, “[...] the public is largely unaware of the Indigenous contexts that shape Arctic conservation, especially in the pursuit of ethical, equitable, fair, just, and meaningful conservation that supports Indigenous rights, sovereignty, and reconciliation with colonial forces laid out by nationally and internationally recognized rights and responsibilities” (Buschman). While Buschman is hopeful about Indigenous-driven conservation efforts in the cir-

cumpolar region and the widening influence of local communities in charting conservation policies, she underlines that “The colonial legacy of conservation in Indigenous homelands in the Arctic, both historically and currently, strains relationships between researchers, practitioners, and Indigenous communities (“Arctic Conservation”), just as is detailed in the reports from Arviat, Nunavut.⁹ Unsurprisingly, these strained relationships, the bear-human clashes, and their deadly potential for some Indigenous communities are not featured in international hunting promotions, which focus instead on producing memorable individual experiences for the trophy hunter.

WHAT IS BEING SOLD?

A key question for cultural studies scholars of North America, as opposed to biologists and economists, is just what is being sold. The scarcity and the challenge of the experience of killing a polar bear are part of the lure.¹⁰ Numerous hunting outfitters based in Canada

9 Writing about the discipline of conservation science, Dr. Victoria Qutuq Buschman notes Indigenous Arctic youth’s difficulties in getting involved in scientific education, including often having to leave home to pursue such education. She argues for transformed opportunities to bring youth into scientific conversations and unite Indigenous on-the-ground research with non-Indigenous research efforts. Both these initiatives could/do serve as bridges between the oppositional construct of “science” vs. “cultural knowledge,” which currently seems to dominate the characterization of the regional commissions. “Conservation as a discipline and practice will continue to evolve. Strengthening the potential for ethically-conscious, culturally relevant, and fully knowledge-based conservation in the Arctic is contingent on continuing to grow space for Indigenous world-views, knowledge, and ways of life.”

10 When the US included the polar bear in the Marine Mammal Protection Act list in 1972, the commercial sport hunting of polar bears in Alaska was closed off, thus limiting such hunting to Indigenous populations. The act established, according to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, “a national policy to prevent marine mammals from declining beyond the point where they ceased to be significant elements of the ecosystem of which they are a part.” Thus, American big-game hunters began to look north. A US Fish and Wildlife Service, a part of the US Department of the Interior, with its ruling in 2008, made it impossible to import the trophy from such hunts into the US. A legislative move in 2014, approved by the Obama administration, enabled hunters who had killed prior to the institution of the ban to import their trophies into the US. The Trump administration tried to relax trophy import bans as part of dismantling several other wildlife protections via executive orders. However, activists decried these attempts, and Trump eventually shelved them. See “After Legal Loss.” Notably, Donald Trump Jr. was a big-game hunter. Currently, as hunting outfitters note on their websites, importing polar bear parts to the US is impossible, but they can be taxidermied and stored in Canada in case such a ban is lifted. In addition, it is possible

or the US offer the opportunity to kill polar bears. Among them are Quality Hunts (“Hunt Polar Bear in the Frozen Arctic”), Ameri-Can Expeditions, Inc. (“Hunt Polar Bears in the Arctic North”), and Hunt Nation (“Nunavut Polar Bear, Grizzly Bear, Muskox, Caribou Hunting #13”). The consolidator Global Hunting Safaris (“Hunt Polar Bear”) also offers polar bear hunts in Nunavut, even offering a rental rifle and ammunition, and up to 12 full hunting days or until a bear is killed. Often, these (non-Indigenous owned) companies have been in operation for decades and offer hunting “expeditions” to shoot other large wildlife species such as moose, muskox, and bighorn sheep. Stressing the unique experience that polar bear hunting provides, one company’s promotional text states: “Polar bears are a unique and amazing animal. Adult polar bears can weigh over 1,500 pounds and can reach almost 10 feet in length. The largest polar bear ever recorded weighed over 2,200 pounds, and when mounted, stood 11 feet 1 inch tall. The oldest wild polar bear on record died at the age of 32. They can swim under water for up to 3 minutes. Nanook also swim extreme distances, the longest known being 220 miles. Why would you not want to harvest one of these magnificent animals?” (“The Best Polar Bear Hunt”).

Killing such a “unique and amazing animal” comes with a high price tag, and these hunts are expensive propositions sold to a global elite, especially US hunters. Published figures for 2024 costs posted by outfitters run approximately \$40,000 to \$50,000 US (approximately \$50,911.00 to \$63,639.00 CA at the time of writing) for a ten-day hunt for one hunter with an Inuit guide, Inuit assistant, and dog team. The hunt ends as soon as a polar bear is killed. Rates vary somewhat by the outfitter and the location of the hunt. Tag fees paid to the local government from these fees are a small fraction of the cost, only around \$2,000 US or \$2,888.62 CA.

Part of what is being sold, if only obliquely, is an Inuit cultural experience for outsiders. When the Canadian government approved the sale of hunts to outsiders, it was on the basis that those hunts be conducted in “a traditional manner,” for example, only using dog sleds, even though many contemporary Inuit hunters use snowmobiles. Some communities had to relearn how to use dogs since mechanized transport largely replaced them. Some imagined “traditional” past is part of this

to import them into other countries. The issue of illegal importation remains to be investigated, especially given the length of the US-Canadian border and the number of crossing points available. When US hunters pulled away from Canada because they could not import trophies of their shoot, non-US hunters swiftly filled the gap, especially hunters from the EU.

sale, ignoring the complicated, ongoing negotiation of the interface between rural Inuit and non-Inuit/international communities that is at play in contemporary Indigenous communities. For example, many Inuit of all genders are engaged in land-based economic activities, such as hunting and fishing, in addition to market-based capitalism. This feature is masked in the presentations of hunting trips (Arriagada and Bleakney).

One large outfitter of big game hunts, Canada North Outfitting (www.canadanorthoutfitting.com), is now celebrating its fortieth anniversary and claims to be the oldest, largest, and most reputable outfitter operating in the Canadian Arctic. Its website underwent a dramatic overhaul between 2018 and 2022, with a new substantial emphasis on Inuit cultural traditions and Inuit employees/guides, although these individuals are not named. Earlier website versions featured old, undated black-and-white photos of Inuit cultural practices, not contemporary life, subtly de-contemporizing the communities. The new website emphasizes the privilege the company feels in being able to partner with Inuit communities year-round, not just in hiring guides for hunting but in providing monetary and material support for a whole range of cultural events. The company supports children's daycare centers, events for senior citizens, local Inuit ice hockey teams, a drum dance festival, and a traditional throat-singing group. A promotional video narrated by CEO Shane Black, who does not identify as a member of an Indigenous community, shows these activities, accompanied by still photos on the website.

Also new since 2018 is the company's expansion from the hunting business only to now include some "adventure tourism," so they can offer guided treks by Inuit guides to visitors who do not come to hunt. The company is currently offering a training program to assist Inuit guides in transitioning from hunting to adventure ecotourism. However, this is a small part of the overall business.

Many of these companies also stress the fact that polar bears are not endangered (they are listed as "vulnerable populations," not "endangered species") and that (some) bear populations are slowly growing, not declining, due to strict government conservation rules. The hunting company sites I examined rarely, if ever, mention the important impact of climate change, shrinking sea ice, and pollutant contaminants that are currently threatening certain polar bear populations, which scientists forecast can have significant negative effects in the future (Routti et al.). Despite the respectful language appreciating Indigenous hunting skills and the photos of contemporary Indigenous individuals, including smiling children and adults at company-

sponsored cultural events, the emphasis remains on uncomplicated notions of tradition and cultural continuity. The inclusion of a “Photo Archive” in black and white on the Canada North Outfitting website, featuring photos of Inuit kayakers in skin-covered boats and hunters, reinforces this notion of unbroken tradition. From these sites, the casual viewer with little knowledge of Canada (which one may assume would be the case for most international customers) would be unlikely to learn much about the contemporary complexity of Indigenous community life in Canada or the extreme economic need that some of these communities experience, or even the fact that without the presence of an Indigenous guide, such hunting is illegal for outsiders.

The hunts depend on and pay for Inuit expert knowledge of where to find the bears and how to get in a position to kill them. The website salutes this knowledge: “Hunting is at the very core of Inuit culture. Comprehensive knowledge of local wildlife and survival techniques combined with incredible patience, tracking skills, physical and mental strength, stamina, and courage required to become an effective hunter provider are fundamental values in traditional Inuit culture, still passed down from generation to generation.” These decidedly manly values were complemented in a 2018 website version, which noted that women contribute by sewing warm clothing for the hunt.

Reports vary on whether the income from such hunts, split with hunting outfitters, makes a key difference to communities or the individuals involved. Indeed, hunting sales are not solving the problem of high poverty and food insecurity in Inuit communities. Estimates vary, but the International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW, an International NGO) argues that the estimated value of trophy hunting is a mere one-tenth of one percent of Nunavut’s GDP (as of 2008). While wages certainly can make a big difference to those employed as spotters and guides, these are relatively few individuals, and their profits are shared with companies. The meat from the polar bear does come back to the community, though (the trophy hunters have no need for it), and some have argued that the income is used to finance cultural maintenance activities by community members, including hunting for “country foods” (Dowsley; Waters et al.).

The latest reports (2018) peg the number of tags for polar bears in total from Indigenous or sport hunts at around 500 a year, although not all of these are used, and the number killed is probably less.¹¹ Still,

11 The skins are also a valuable source of income, and Canada exports around 300–350 skins a year. Depending on size, a polar bear rug on the legal market can obtain between \$16 K and \$35 K (Canadian). See Weber.

this is not an insignificant number of the estimated 20,000 polar bears in Canada. However, beyond these economic issues, polar bear hunting could be seen as both successful ecotourism and “conservation hunting” (Dowsley 162). Hunting by outsiders is closely monitored and is dependent upon, as anthropologist Dowsley puts it: “Inuit themselves . . . struggling to develop the industry in a culturally appropriate way. . . there is a strong cultural interest in engaging in subsistence harvesting and traditional methods of distribution and consumption of wildlife products” (166). However, the largest commercial outfitters take most of the business, and these appear to be owned by Euro-Canadians or Euro-Americans, based on their websites, not by the Indigenous hunters employed by those outfitters, both for their knowledge and to meet legal hunting requirements. Indeed, with language implying that smaller outfitters are not as reliable, these operations can subtly promote a perception of Indigenous businesses as unreliable.

With all these hunting complications, cultural tourism as opposed to sport hunting tourism might seem to offer an alternative, as with the polar bear viewing tourist industry in Churchill, Manitoba, and some Indigenous leaders like Inuit activist Aaju Peter, who calls tourism “the most sustainable path for the Arctic,” are in support of this. However, the Canadian government, which underwrites a great deal of the Inuit economy, has yet to put substantial money into building the tourist infrastructure, like museums, transport, hotels, and so on, that might expand that sector in these more remote communities. By contrast, hunters usually arrive singly or in small groups and spend little time in town, needing little food and lodging since they camp outside on the hunt, thus contributing little to these tourism sectors as well (A. Kim). This vision of various modes of generating income reveals the ongoing roles of the nation state in fostering or inhibiting various ways the Inuit have to make a sustainable living out of the access to the land and its inhabitants that treaties have granted them.

The tensions of privatization in a communally oriented community, along with “worries over the response of sentient bears to perceived mistreatments” in a cosmological and socio-economic Inuit system that regards both bears and humans as active participants, cause ongoing tensions (Dowsley 168). Quotas can be seen by Inuit hunters as disrespectful to the bears, predicting death, negotiating it, and as polar bears are considered especially intelligent and having the ability to hear people’s words and even thoughts, there can be a worry that the bears will retaliate, moving away or removing themselves from the hunt (169–170).

Statistics¹² underline how many non-urban Inuit communities struggle with issues of poverty, lack of access to education, legacies of residential schools, and food insecurity. Killing a polar bear can address some of these key issues, bringing in dollars, providing food, and helping to cement a sense of community belonging, as the meat is traditionally shared among the whole community, not just with the hunter's family, with provisions made for the most vulnerable, such as the elderly and single mothers. However, how does this commodification interrupt the language of spiritual closeness that some indigenous hunters use to describe their relations to the land and animals? That many Indigenous communities have rejected the option to sell their rights to kill bears may indicate a resistance to the notion. Does the structure of the hunting experience somehow lead the non-Indigenous hunter to embrace, or at least encounter, this spiritual sense of closeness?

It should be noted that in these hunts, the presence of and guidance by Indigenous hunters is a legal requirement. Indigenous skill in knowing where to find the bears at different times of the year and tracking them is crucial to the entire enterprise and a legal requirement. The guide positions the hunter for the kill shot. The only thing the non-Indigenous hunter has to do is endure the cold, pay attention, and be able to fire a high-powered rifle through a scope accurately. This piercing bullet (or occasionally high-powered bow) concentrates the masculine moment of white pleasure in the penetrating bullet's kill. It is hard not to find echoes of the so-called "Great White Hunter" of European imperialists in nineteenth-century colonized African countries. The physical challenges of heat and terrain to "bag" an elephant are similar to the extremely demanding remote landscapes where polar bears are found, both inaccessible without the expert knowledge of local guides who do not shoot the animal themselves. Numerous website photos document the (mainly white) hunters' successes, each with a solo hunter posed with a gun or high-powered bow and arrows behind the massive slain body of a polar bear, white fur against a white snow landscape, sometimes punctuated with blood red marks of the kill. The crucial role of the Indigenous guides, who make it all possible both legally and literally through their skills and knowledge, is invisible in these virtual trophies.

These particular colonial critiques do not seem central to the reported Indigenous debates about polar bear hunting that I have been able

12 Figures supplied by the National Inuit Strategy on Research.

to access.¹³ Instead, these debates concentrate on the notion of a sustainable harvest and the tensions between Indigenous counts of polar bear populations (based on sightings and comparisons in elders' memories) and those of the Canadian government, enmeshed in the high-tech scientism of aerial counts. Although the present Indigenous harvest of polar bears is at a mean annual sustainable harvest level of approximately 3.5% of the Canadian polar bear population ("Polar Bears in Canada"), International (non-Indigenous) activists have seized upon this sport hunting to criticize Indigenous hunters selling of their tags or the right to hunt. Moreover, not surprisingly, online commentary can easily turn to racist tropes denigrating members of Indigenous groups, like these comments posted on CNN.com: "Inuit' just use the money to buy booze anyway[...]" and "Natives in Canada survive by collecting welfare checqs (sic) from the Feds" (qtd. in Young). However, others push back, noting that the number of bears killed in this sale is tiny compared to the billions of animals raised for food, often in horrific conditions and slaughtered worldwide each year. These commentators see the Indigenous hunters as unfairly singled out. Others, in turn, note that farm animals like chickens are not endangered and that not killing polar bears is an easy step to take.

In the end, it is the charismatic status of the polar bear and its centrality to both animal protection groups and to Indigenous communities that fuels these debates, pitting European-derived "science" against Indigenous modes of knowledge to estimate the health of polar bear populations.

Of course, "tradition" does not guarantee humane treatment for humans or animals. Not only do notions of what counts as traditional change over time in variable historical contexts and across communities (Hobsbawm and Ranger), but so do notions of what constitutes humane treatment. Each of these concepts varies across communities as well. However, the sale of the right to kill positions the polar bear as a material resource to be mined rather than as a part

13 Currently, these critiques are not as widely circulating as previous (non-Indigenous) activist critiques of a different type of commercial hunting in Canada, the seal hunts, which received widespread condemnation from many international animal welfare groups. Although they made clear they were not criticizing the harvesting rights granted to Indigenous communities, the impact of the campaigns drastically lowered the international market for seal pelts, and that also had an impact on Indigenous hunters' ability to sell those skins. See Randhawa; see also Nadasdy, detailing Aboriginal-state relations in northern Canada, who argues that state power emerges explicitly in struggles over the notions of "knowledge," including knowledge of the animals' land; see also TallBear.

of a complex web of relations between humans and the more-than-human world, and that perhaps is where the deepest divisions come in. When the right to kill is commodified and transferred to an outsider, that web of relations becomes redefined. In this extraction, the polar bear becomes, at least for some consumers, a commodity fetish in a global economic and symbolic capital system.

At the same time, for many Inuit, it seems that a different notion of relations encompasses this commodification. As anthropologist George Wenzel suggests, “subsistence” hunting is not simply about killing an animal in order to eat (Wenzel). It positions hunting as a means to sustain a community through complex webs of economic and cultural relations based on long-standing values of sharing and reciprocity.

HUMAN AND MORE-THAN-HUMAN FUTURES

The sale of the right to kill polar bears to non-Indigenous outsiders may seem like a simple, straightforward economic transaction. Nevertheless, its meanings, contentious as they are, are produced at the intersection of discourses of sustainability, conservation, cultural identity and rights of self-determination, international sports tourism, national and international law, international animal protection NGOs, Indigenous cosmologies and epistemologies, colonial legacies, and ethology. Given the growing urgency of anthropocentric climate change, which threatens polar bears’ futures in the warming Arctic, these debates will likely only intensify in the future.

In these analyses and the development of policies for the future, Indigenous conceptions of the Anthropocene are key—as the debates charted throughout this paper have made clear and as works by Indigenous scholars such as Kim TallBear (Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate enrolled member, South Dakota), Zoe Todd (Metis), and Kyle Whyte (Potawatomi) have argued. Todd, for example, notes that “Not all humans are equally implicated in the forces that created the disasters driving contemporary human-environmental crises,” nor are they “equally invited into the conceptual spaces where these disasters are theorized or responses to disaster formulated” (“Art in the Anthropocene” 244).

Beyond this assigning of cause and effects, Whyte argues for a recognition of what he provisionally terms “Indigenous climate studies,” developed by Indigenous scholars, knowledge bearers, allies, and scientists (153) that position anthropogenic climate change as part of continuing colonial impacts which in the past have disrupted locales, land usage, knowledge, and epistemologies of relations among humans, ecosystems and spiritual beings.

He notes, too, that climate changes differentially impact Indigenous populations, affecting them earlier and more severely than other populations (154). Indigenous communities, he says, will formulate their own visions of futures based on experiences of navigating numerous periods of environmental change and displacement. In this way, he echoes the arguments of Inuk conservation biologist Victoria Qutuq Buschman, quoted earlier, who sketches a vision of circum-polar conservation in which Indigenous communities not only participate in nation-state and international-organization-driven efforts but often lead in defining policies for their regions.

For those of us analyzing the roles of borders in defining the contemporary movement of goods, people, ideas, cultural practices, services, and animals or animal bodies across national borders, and the relationship of that mobility to economics, the nation-state, and Indigenous rights, the case of the “right to kill” polar bears reveals how complex such movement is. By anchoring our analyses not only in the actions of humans but also in broader conceptions of the more than human world, in—as Zoe Todd has written in another context—the central role of humans and animals, together, as active agents in political and colonial processes (“Fish Pluralities” 217), we come to see that geopolitical configurations often lean on the non-human as well as the human spheres.

Future affordances of human rights and social justice must also consider the protection of animals and the challenges of defining what “justice” for non-human animals might be. Indeed, such case studies can help us, as both Indigenous and non-Indigenous scholars engaged with the “more-than-human-worlds,” have stated, to foreground the challenges of articulating routes to furthering “justice” across borders. These include the borders of the human and more than human, the borders of the state(s) between Canada and the US, Indigenous nations and communities, and the imagined futures of equity in a shared world defined by climate change.

Articulating and reconciling what these notions of “justice” might consist of regarding practices and policies will not be easy, as they may involve a contestation of variable ontologies and epistemologies about the more-than-human. As Indigenous scholar Kim TallBear reminds us, Indigenous beliefs about the world, including what non-Indigenous scholars often now term the “more-than-human-world,” should not, following the work of anthropologist Paul Nadasdy, be delimited simply as “beliefs” about the world but acknowledged as “knowledge” about the world. “Like our methodological choices,” TallBear writes, “language choices are ethical choices and are key in this

project of constituting democratic relations and worlds.” In the case of polar bear hunting rights, the sale of these rights to non-Indigenous, non-Canadian, predominantly US hunters, and the transnational economies of knowledge, value, and bodies that ensue in still-shifting legal terrains, the future remains to be written. The impacts of those political debates will surely affect not only the human communities involved but also their “more-than-human” communities, kin, or conceptions in this ongoing, very complex, and contested realm.

Abstract: This article considers a specific, highly complex, and contentious case study, the uniquely Canadian phenomenon of the sale of hunting rights by First Nations Canadians to non-Indigenous, non-Canadian trophy hunters who want to hunt polar bears in Canada. These hunters, largely of European ancestry, come mainly from the United States and, more recently, from Western Europe as well. Ultimately, this analysis demonstrates both the necessity and the utility of anchoring transnational analyses in a more-than-human world because access to and protection of living non-human beings plays a crucial role in defining nations and communities. The essay addresses questions such as “What can we understand about the role of the Canadian state, the national government, the US-Canadian border, the philosophical constitution of a more-than-human world in both Indigenous and European-derived epistemologies, and the politics of Indigeneity in the international marketplace, through this one case study focused on human-animal relations?”

Keywords: Indigenous rights, hunting, polar bears, trophy hunting, Canada, Canada-US Border

Bio: Jane Desmond, past IASA President, is a Professor in Anthropology and Gender and Women’s Studies and Co-founder and current Director of the International Forum for US Studies, a center for the Transnational Study of the United States. She also holds appointments in the Unit for Criticism and Interpretive Theory, the Center for Global Studies, and the College of Veterinary Medicine. She is the author or editor of five books, including the 2016 monograph *Displaying Death and Animating Life: Human-Animal Relations in Art, Science and Everyday Life* (University of Chicago Press). Her primary areas of interest focus on issues of embodiment, display, and social identity, as well as the transnational dimensions of US Studies. Her areas of expertise include performance studies, critical theory, visual culture (including museum studies and tourism studies), the critical analysis of the US from a global perspective, and, most recently, the political economy of human/animal relations. She has previously worked as a professional modern dancer and choreographer, in film, video, and the academy. She is the Founding Resident Director of the international Summer Institute in Animal Studies at UIUC and the “Animal Lives” Book Series at the University of Chicago Press. In addition to academic publications, she has written for a number of public publications such as CNN.com, *The Washington Post*.com, and the *Huffington Post*, and her creative work has appeared on PBS and at numerous film festivals.

WORKS CITED

- "After Legal Loss, Trump Administration Disbands Illegal Trophy Hunting Council." *Humane Society International*, 10 Feb. 2020, www.hsi.org/news-resources/us-disbands-trophy-hunting-council/. Accessed 13 Jan. 2025.
- Arriagada, Paula, and Amanda Bleakney. "Aboriginal Peoples Survey on Inuit Participation in the Wage and Land-Based Economies in Inuit Nunanga." *Posted on Canada Statistics*, 2019, www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/89-653-x/89-653-x2019003-eng.htm.
- Beldo, Les. *Contesting Leviathan: Activists, Hunters, and State Power in the Makah Whaling Conflict*, University of Chicago Press, 2019.
- "Beyond the Edge: Official Movie Trailer." *YouTube*, uploaded by Rialto Distribution, 27 Aug. 2013, www.youtube.com/watch?v=Md-EHh2mf_w&ab_channel=RialtoDistribution.
- Bilefsky, Dan. "In 'Lobster War,' Indigenous Canadians Face Attacks by Fishermen." *The New York Times*, 20 Oct. 2020, www.nytimes.com/2020/10/20/world/canada/nova-scotia-lobster-war.html. Accessed 13 Jan. 2025.
- Burton, Antoinette and Renis Mawani, editors. *Animalia: An Anti-Imperial Bestiary for Our Times*. Duke University Press, 2020.
- Buschman, Victoria Qutuq. "Arctic Conservation in the Hands of Indigenous Peoples." *The Wilson Quarterly*, Winter 2022, www.wilsonquarterly.com/quarterly/the-new-north/arctic-conservation-in-the-hands-of-indigenous-peoples. Accessed 3 Jul. 2022.
- Dowsley, Martha. "Inuit-Organized Polar Bear Sport Hunting in Nunavut Territory, Canada." *Journal of Ecotourism*, vol. 8, no. 2, 2009, pp. 161-175, <http://doi.org/10.1080/14724040802696049>.
- Engelhard, Michael. *Ice Bear: The Cultural History of an Arctic Icon*. University of Washington Press, 2016.
- Socio-Economic Importance of Polar Bears*. ÉcoRessources Consultants, Government of Canada, 11 Jun. 2011. www.canada.ca/en/environment-climate-change/services/species-risk-public-registry/related-information/socio-economic-importance-polar-bears.html. Accessed 13 Jan. 2025.
- Fountain, Henry. "Global Warming Is Driving Polar Bears Toward Extinction, Researchers Say." *The New York Times*, 20 Jul. 2020, www.nytimes.com/2020/07/20/climate/polar-bear-extinction.html. Accessed 13 Jan. 2025.
- George, Jane. "Arctic States Need to Speed up Polar Bear Conservation: WWF." *Nunatsiaq News*, 1 Feb. 2018. nunatsiaq.com/stories/article/65674arctic_states_need_to_ratchet_up_polar_bear_conservation_action_wwf/
- Hall, Jani. "Cecil the Lion Died Amid Controversy—Here's What's Happened Since." *National Geographic Special Investigations Unit*, 2018, www.nationalgeographic.com/special-investigations/2018/08/20/cecil-the-lion-died-amid-controversy-heres-what-happened-since/

- nationalgeographic.com/animals/article/cecil-african-lion-anniversary-death-trophy-hunting-zimbabwe. Accessed 13 Jan. 2025.
- Hobsbawm, Eric, and Terence Ranger, editors. *The Invention of Tradition*. Reprint, Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- “Hunt Polar Bear.” *Global Hunting Safaris, LLC*, 2024 www.globalhuntingsafaris.com/hunts/hunt-polar-bear.html. Accessed 13 Jan. 2025
- “Hunt Polar Bear in the Frozen Arctic.” *Quality Hunts*, 2024, qualityhunts.com/product/hunts/featured/polar-bear-frozen-arctic/. Accessed 13 Jan. 2025.
- “Hunt Polar Bears in the Arctic North.” *Ameri-Cana Expeditions, Inc.*, www.ameri-cana.com/north-american-hunting/canadian-arctic-polar-bear-hunt. Accessed 13 Jan. 2025.
- “Inuit Community Calls for Change in Polar Bear Protection Measures.” *YouTube*, uploaded by CBC News: The National, 4 Dec. 2018, www.youtube.com/watch?v=h9JxLqrmDLY.
- Istvanffy, Jay, and Barbara Johnston, editors. *A Guide to Aboriginal Harvesting Rights: Fishing, Hunting, Trapping, Gathering*. Legal Services Society of British Columbia, 2017.
- Justice, Daniel Heath. “R is for Racoon.” *Animalia: An Anti-Imperial Bestiary for Our Times*, edited by Antoinette Burton and Renis Mawani, Duke University Press, 2020, 153-62.
- Kim, Alexander. “Tourism Could Bring Wealth and Pride to Nunavut.” *Open Canada*, 30 Jun. 2016, opencanada.org/tourism-could-bring-wealth-and-pride-nunavut/. Accessed 13 Jan. 2025.
- Kim, Claire Jean. *Dangerous Crossings: Race, Species, and Nature in a Multicultural Age*. Cambridge University Press, 2015, pp. 205-252.
- Letts, Daron. “‘Enough is Enough’: Arviat Hunter Decries Low Polar Bear Hunt Quota.” *Nunatsiaq News*, 1 Nov. 2024, nunatsiaq.com/stories/article/enough-is-enough-arviat-hunter-decries-low-polar-bear-hunt-quota/. Accessed 3 Jan. 2025.
- “Marine Mammal Protection Act Policies, Guidance, and Regulations.” *National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries*, www.fisheries.noaa.gov/national/marine-mammal-protection/marine-mammal-protection-act-policies-guidance-and-regulations. Accessed 13 Jan. 2025.
- Nadasdy, Paul. *Hunters and Bureaucrats: Power, Knowledge, and Aboriginal-State Relations in the Southwest Yukon*. University of British Columbia Press, 2003.
- “National Inuit Strategy on Research.” *Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami*, 2018, https://www.itk.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/ITK_NISR-Report_English_low_res.pdf. Accessed March 20, 2022
- Nunavik Marine Regional Wildlife Board (NMRWB). “Nunavik Inuit Knowledge and Observations of Polar Bears: Polar bears of the Davis Strait sub-population.” Project conducted and report prepared by M. Basterfield, C. Furgal, K. Breton-Honeyman, J. Rae,

and M. O'Connor, 2019, nmrwb.ca/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/NunavikInuitKnowledge_PolarBears_DavisStrait-1.pdf. Accessed 13 Jan. 2025.

"Nunavut Polar Bear, Grizzly Bear, Muskox, Caribou Hunting #13." *Hunt Nation*, Butch Manasse Outdoor Adventures & Safaris Worldwide, LLC, 2025, www.hunt-nation.com/hunt/nunavut-polar-bear-hunting-13/. Accessed 13 Jan. 2025.

"Polar Bears in Canada." Department of Environment, Nunavut, Canada, 2022, www.gov.nu.ca/sites/default/files/publications/2022-01/polar_bears_in_canada.pdf. Accessed 13 Jan. 2025.

"Public Hearings Wrap up for 2018-2019 Western Hudson Bay Polar Bear Quota." *CBC News*, 14 Jan. 2018, www.cbc.ca/news/canada/north/western-hudson-bay-polar-bear-quota-2018-2019-1.4485372. Accessed 13 Jan. 2025.

Randhawa, Selena. "Animal Rights Activists and Inuit Clash over Canada's Indigenous Food Traditions," *The Guardian*, 1 Nov. 2017, www.theguardian.com/inequality/2017/nov/01/animal-rights-activists-inuit-clash-canada-indigenous-food-traditions. Accessed 19 Mar. 2022.

Routti, Heli, et al. "State of Knowledge on Current Exposure, Fate and Potential Health Effects of Contaminants in Polar Bears from the Circumpolar Arctic." *Science of the Total Environment*, vol. 664, 2019, pp. 1063–83, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.02.030>.

Rule, Elizabeth. "Seals, Selfies, and the Settler State: Indigenous Motherhood and Gendered Violence in Canada." *American Quarterly* vol. 70 no. 4, 2018, pp.741-754.

TallBear, Kim. "Why Interspecies Thinking Needs Indigenous Standpoints." *Fieldsights*, 18 Nov. 2011, <https://culanth.org/fieldsights/why-inter-species-thinking-needs-indigenous-standpoints>. Accessed 1 July 2022.

"The Best Polar Bear Hunt in the World." *Outdoors International*, 2020, web.archive.org/web/20200927013801/https://outdoors-international.com/best-polar-bear-hunt. Accessed 13 Jan. 2025.

Todd, Zoe. "Fish Pluralities: Human-animal relations and sites of engagement in Paulatuuq, Arctic Canada." *Etudes/Inuit Studies*, vol. 38, no. 1 and 2, 2014, pp. 217–38.

---. "Indigenizing the Anthropocene." *Art in the Anthropocene: Encounters among Aesthetics, Politics, Environments, and Epistemologies*, edited by Heather Davis and Etienne Turpin, Open Humanities Press, 2015, pp. 241–54.

von der Porten, Suzanne, Jeff Corntassel, and Devi Mucina. "Indigenous Nationhood and Herring Governance: Strategies for the Reassertion of Indigenous Authority and Inter-Indigenous Solidarity Regarding Marine Resources." *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, vol. 15, no. 1, 2019, pp. 62–74 DOI: 10.1177/1177180118823560

- Waters, Megan, Naomi Rose, and Paul Todd. "The Economics of Polar Bear Trophy Hunting in Canada." *Humane Society International* and International Fund for Animal Welfare, 2009, www.hsi.org/wp-content/uploads/assets/pdfs/economics_polar_bear_hunting_2010.pdf. Accessed 13 Jan. 2025.
- Weber, Bob. "Recent Fines Show Canada Cracking Down on Polar Bear Trade." *The Globe and Mail*, The Canadian Press, 30 Jan. 2017, www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/recent-fines-show-canada-cracking-down-on-polar-bear-trade/article33830866/. Accessed 13 Jan. 2025.
- Wenzel, George W. "Polar Bear as a Resource: An Overview." University of Akureyri Research Centre, Northern Research Forum, Third Open Meeting, 2004, www.rha.is/static/files/NRF/OpenAssemblies/Yellowknife2004/3rd-nrf_plenary-2_pp_wenzel.pdf. Accessed 13 Jan. 2025.
- White, Erick. "5 Things You Might Not Know about Indigenous Hunting and Fishing Rights." *CBC News*, 17 Oct. 2017, www.cbc.ca/news/canada/sudbury/hunters-and-gatherers-indigenous-hunting-fishing-rights-explained-1.4347488. Accessed 13 Jan. 2025.
- Whyte, Kyle. "Indigenous Climate change Studies: Indigenizing futures, Decolonizing the Anthropocene." *English Language Notes*, vol. 55, no. 1, 2017, pp. 153–62.
- Young, Jason C. "Polar Bear Management in a Digital Arctic: Inuit Perspectives Across the Web." *The Canadian Geographer/Le Geographe Canadien*, vol. 60, no. 4, 2016, pp. 466–478. DOI:10.1111/cag.12284
- Zahara, Alexander R.D., and Myra J. Hird. "Raven, Dog, Human: Inhuman Colonialism and Unsettling Cosmologies." *Environmental Humanities*, vol. 7, no.1, 2016, pp. 169–190.

