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LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Dear Editor:

David Morrison deserves commendation and congratulations for seeking out the eight wooden plaques in the MacFarlane collection, correctly described as “the earliest surviving Inuvialuit graphic art of any significance,” at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington (Arctic 59(4):351–360). Morrison’s analytical, eye-opening, landmark paper indeed represents “a unique window on traditional Inuvialuit culture and a unique opportunity to see that culture through Inuvialuit eyes.” Superb!

For some of the younger readers of Arctic, Morrison’s article may serve as their introduction to Roderick Ross MacFarlane. An account of the unique art collected by a fur trader need not mandate a discussion of his prowess as a naturalist, yet the author was perhaps remiss in not including an additional paragraph or two about his achievements as an ornithologist, and some additional references.

Although Morrison correctly indicates MacFarlane to be “one of the best amateur collectors the Smithsonian ever had,” citing Debra Lindsay’s second book (1993), his list of references omits Lindsay’s first book, The Modern Beginnings of Subarctic Ornithology, which quotes extensively from the letters between Robert Kennicott, the Arctic collectors, and the Smithsonian. MacFarlane’s important mammal list is cited, but the arguably more important bird list is not. No biographical sketch is offered to those readers whose interest in the man is whetted.

Readers are not told that MacFarlane, from the short-lived Fort Anderson, “contributed more specimens in a single year than any other collector in the museum’s history” (Deignan, 1947:7), including 170 sets of lesser golden-plover eggs, 70 of the red-necked phalarope, 30 of the lesser yellowlegs, 20 each of the semipalmated plover, least sandpiper, and buff-breasted sandpiper, and the first-ever egg sets of the stilt sandpiper (three) and the sanderling (one). We owe to him, apart from a single set found at Point Lake by John Richardson in 1821, all we know about the nesting of the now probably extinct Eskimo curlew (Housto, 1997). MacFarlane’s 33 clutches of Eskimo curlew eggs and the downy young from another five pairs in the Smithsonian are arguably of equal importance to the Inuvialuit sketches. MacFarlane’s egg collection and accompanying notes indirectly led to Fred Bodsworth’s novel, Last of the Curlews, which sold three million copies in 1954 and 1955; to the prize-winning Hanna-Barbera television movie of the same name in 1972; and to...

For those interested, and for the record, I offer additional references to the scientific achievements of Roderick Ross MacFarlane.

**REFERENCES**


Sincerely,

C. Stuart Houston, OC
863 University Drive
Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada
S7N 0J8

Dear Editor:

James Raffan’s review of *Last Great Wilderness: The Campaign to Establish the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge*, by Roger Kaye, which appeared in the December 2006 issue of *Arctic* contains some very fundamental errors. In the sixth paragraph of the review, Raffan claims: “On 28 April 2005, both the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate voted to approve the 2006 budget and thereby opened the door for drilling in a portion of the refuge.” At the end of the paragraph, Raffan mistakenly concludes, “With the door now open to drilling, ANWR has lost credibility as a ‘symbol of restraint.’”

The April 2005 action referred to by the reviewer was only the first step in a long and complicated congressional budget process that never authorized Arctic Refuge drilling. Later in the year, in separate measures, both the U.S. House and the Senate specifically removed Arctic Refuge drilling from final legislation. In the end, the door for drilling in the Refuge was not opened, contrary to what Raffan claims. Each time that an attempt to open the Arctic Refuge to drilling fails, and there have been several such failures over the past 20 years, the Refuge gains credibility as a “symbol of restraint,” as it was originally intended.

In the same paragraph, Raffan wishes that the book had addressed the current controversy over possible oil drilling in the Refuge, and suggests that by not doing so, Kaye has conveniently “compartmentalized” the subject to avoid the oil controversy. This is an unfair characterization because from the beginning, Kaye clearly specified that this is a history of the effort to establish the Arctic Refuge, which ended about 1960, not a history of the oil controversy that began after oil was discovered on Alaska’s North Slope in 1968. A history of the prolonged oil drilling controversy would easily constitute a separate book. Raffan is also misleading by suggesting that the Arctic Refuge oil drilling controversy spans only five years, when in fact it has been a hot political topic for over a quarter century.

Sincerely,

Francis Mauer
791 Redpoll Lane
Fairbanks, Alaska, U.S.A.
99712