

THE LAND BEYOND: A MEMOIR. By JACK D. IVES. Fairbanks, Alaska: University of Alaska Press, 2010. ISBN 978-1-60223-077-4. xxvi + 186 p., maps, b&w and colour illus., appendices, endnotes, references, index. Softbound. Can\$24.00.

The first 10 years of operation of the McGill Sub-Arctic Research Laboratory (“the Lab”), located at Schefferville, Quebec, in the centre of the Quebec-Labrador Peninsula, are the focus of this book. The Lab was a year-round residential, teaching, and research outpost of McGill University from 1954 to 1971. Today it is the McGill Sub-Arctic Research Station. The author, Jack Ives, was associated with the Lab throughout its first decade and was the resident director from 1957 to 1960.

Ives provides a fascinating personal and academic account of life at this remarkable university outpost during its early years. However, revealing and thoughtful as that account is, the book accomplishes much more. Ives goes to great lengths to place the Lab and its work into a context of Arctic and Sub-Arctic research and teaching in Canada from before WWII up to the 1990s. The timing of his own work at the Lab in the 1950s, and after that, his work with the federal Geographical Branch and the Institute of Arctic and Alpine Research, University of Colorado, gave him a valuable vantage point for commentary on the evolution of polar science in North America, especially Canada, in those early post “Heroic Age” years.

Ives is one of those people with a remarkable memory for details of everyday life, who at the same time keeps disciplined personal and academic notes. As a result, readers get a very personal account of life in a tiny academic outpost, with its day-to-day problems of personality, sewage, and burst pipes, within a thoughtful account of programs conducted at and from the outpost, all within the context of the polar science of the day. It is difficult today to appreciate just how little was known about the huge region within which the Lab and its occupants were located and how difficult fieldwork (and even flying) were in those days. This account tells how it really was, with a delightful mixture of the personal and the objective.

This decade was a time when Canada was struggling to build a capacity for polar research. Ives stresses that most of the graduate students who spent a year at the Lab were immigrants or expatriates. A good proportion of them went on to productive careers in North America, laying foundations for the polar science of today.

I can do no more here than cite a few themes and topics to illustrate the scope of the book.

We tend to gloss over or hide personal conflicts, which are an integral part of the world of research, in the polar regions or elsewhere. Personality and ego play key roles in each generation of scientists, sometimes helping, sometimes hindering. Ives treats such matters as a perfectly natural part of his narrative. Tensions between personnel during the long winter at the Lab, between the Lab and McGill, on campus at McGill, between McGill and the Arctic Institute

of North America (AINA), and between McGill and federal agencies all receive interesting attention. As McGill and AINA were leaders in polar research in those days, these conflicts, often very personal, provide valuable insights into the evolution of polar science in North America. Readers of the journal *Arctic* have a special interest in AINA. They will be interested in Ives’ perspective on McGill-AINA relations from the days of their shared expeditions to Baffin Island in the 1950s to AINA’s departure from McGill and Montreal in 1975.

In these days of GPS, satellite phones, and satellite imagery of earth and atmosphere, it is difficult to evoke the staggering effort that was required only a few decades ago to conduct useful polar field work. Ives and his students, for example, used isobases (lines joining points of equal post-glacial uplift) as one means of determining the post-glacial evolution of the huge Quebec-Labrador Peninsula, from the Atlantic to Hudson Bay, from Ungava Bay to the St. Lawrence. This one task involved painstaking, time-consuming, patient work with theodolite and staff in difficult terrain where the best available maps were the still-new aerial photographs. Later, this work was extended, often by the same people, to Baffin Island.

Theodolites seem primitive to the GPS/Total Station users of today. So do the logistics of Ives’ and others’ field parties of those days. They went into the field with minimal weather forecasts, in float planes, landing on rivers and lakes selected from air photos. Thereafter they traveled by canoe and on foot, out of contact with the Lab for weeks or months. While some government and private-sector organizations in Canada were quite experienced at this sort of thing, the universities were still feeling their way. This book contains the first, apparently complete, account that I have seen of circumstances surrounding the deaths of two male students who were working from the Lab on the Koroksoak River, northeastern Quebec, during the summer of 1960. This was a tragic and messy business that took place at around the same time that McGill lost two female students, who were doing canoe-based fieldwork on Great Bear Lake in the Northwest Territories. Ives says that the head of the Geological Survey of Canada, which even then had a hundred years of experience of this sort of thing, told him that the Survey lost around two field people a year in those days.

Ives is still upset that the deaths of the women received far more attention than those of the men. In part this had to do with the fact that one of the female students was the daughter of a Member of Parliament. In large measure, however, it had to do with public and professional shock that women were allowed in the field. While several women conducted field research from the Lab during the field season, only one female student lived there year-round (in the mid 1960s) during its almost 20 years of operation. Ives addresses this bias in polar science in his usual direct fashion.

My personal experience suggests that the Geological Survey of Canada figures on field deaths reflected a general state of affairs. Fieldwork in the North was primitive and

dangerous. We should all remember those who died doing fieldwork in Arctic North America in those days. They were usually young and in their prime, and they laid the foundations for the polar science of today.

Ives says that his memoir and its time frame (1950–70) form a mirror for today. The memoir speaks of a time when there was a surge of interest in polar affairs, which focused interest and resources into the International Geophysical Year (IGY). In recent times, there has been another such surge of interest channeling energies into the International Polar Year. He notes that government and other interest in the North waned markedly in the decades after the IGY. Perhaps we should look into his mirror?

This book, with its index, glossary, endnotes, and “Research results 1954–64” and “Wider impacts” sections, will be enjoyed by anyone with an interest in polar science. For those with memories of the times and places described, even second- or third-hand memories, this memoir is a gem.

*Peter Adams, Professor Emeritus  
Department of Geography  
Trent University  
Peterborough, Ontario K9J 7B8, Canada  
peteradams@trentu.ca*

**JAMES FITZJAMES: THE MYSTERY MAN OF THE FRANKLIN EXPEDITION.** By WILLIAM BATTERSBY. London: The History Press and Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2010. ISBN 978-1-55488-781-1. 224 p., appendices, b&w illus., maps, bib., index. Hardbound. Cdn\$35.00.

The name James Fitzjames is well known to anyone with more than a passing interest in Sir John Franklin’s last expedition, if only because it was he, as captain of HMS *Erebus*, who co-signed the message scrawled around the margins of the only note ever found to reveal the fate of that expedition, to the effect that the ships had been abandoned and that Franklin had died on 11 June 1847 (McClintock, 1859:286). Why, then, should Battersby describe him as “the mystery man of the Franklin expedition”? In fact, as the author carefully explains, there are two major mysteries about the man. First of all, there is the fact that almost nothing has ever been published about his antecedents. Sir Clements Markham, for example, confined his description of Fitzjames to the somewhat vague positive descriptors: “among the most promising officers in the navy at that time ... strong, self-reliant, a perfect sailor, imaginative, enthusiastic, full of sympathy for others, a born leader of men, he was the beau ideal of an Arctic commander” (p. 17). Undoubtedly on the basis of these remarks (plus expansion of them in his work of creative non-fiction), Cookman (2000:55) described him as “young (thirty-three), well-educated, aristocratic, wealthy, of good family, Church of England, fast-rising in the service—and thumpingly, lispily English to the core.” On consulting an obvious possible

source, O’Byrne’s (1849) *A Naval Biographical Dictionary*, Battersby was puzzled to find no information as to Fitzjames’s date or place of birth. O’Byrne’s work was based on questionnaires that he had sent to all naval officers, now held in the manuscripts section of the British Library. Being an impressively thorough researcher, Battersby then consulted Fitzjames’s questionnaire, to discover the puzzling fact that Fitzjames had left the spaces for answers to the questions on those topics blank.

Among Fitzjames’s papers at the National Maritime Museum, Battersby found the certificate of his baptism at the church of St Mary-le-Bone in London; his parents are listed as James Fitzjames, gentleman, and his mother, Ann Fitzjames, his date of birth as 27 July 1813, and that of his christening, 24 February 1815. But all Battersby’s efforts to find any further information on Fitzjames’s parents were to no avail. However, as the Franklin expedition was heading into the Arctic, Fitzjames took the opportunity to send letters back to England from the Whalefish Islands with the transport *Baretto Jr.*, to, among others, Elizabeth Coningham (Fitzjames, 1845). A.H. Markham reported that her father, the Reverend Robert Coningham, was Fitzjames’s uncle and guardian, but also, confusingly, that Elizabeth was his sister. Battersby had little difficulty in tracking down the Coningham family (Elizabeth was, in fact, the wife of the Reverend’s son, William), but could find no connection, by blood or marriage, with any Fitzjames family. He began to wonder if the Fitzjames name was false, and whether James had been illegitimate, as the prefix “Fitz” hinted. By this point Battersby must have thought he had reached a dead end.

Success in historical research, however, is often a matter of pure luck. In the Admiralty files in the National Archives at Kew, Battersby stumbled across a letter from Captain Fleming Stenhouse (Fitzjames’s captain) of HMS *Asia* to Captain George Elliot, First Secretary at the Admiralty, in which he mentions, as an aside, that Fitzjames was the son of Sir James Gambier. The latter, who was married, was British consul-general in Brazil from 1809 until 1814. Thus, since James Fitzjames was born in 1813, he must have been born in Rio de Janeiro, the product of an affair that Sir James had been conducting the previous November. James and Ann Fitzjames, listed on the baptismal certificate may well have been Sir James Gambier and his wife, Jemima. The Coninghams were probably chosen as foster parents because Lady Gambier’s family, the Snells, were relatively close neighbours, and perhaps friends, of the Coningham family in Hertfordshire. A further pointer to Brazil having been James Fitzjames’s birthplace is that quite early in his career in the Navy, he is described as being fluent in Portuguese; Battersby suggests that James may have been in the charge of a Portuguese-speaking nursemaid, who accompanied the family (and the infant James) back to England from Brazil. It is scarcely to be wondered that Fitzjames was not at all keen to reveal his age and place of birth on O’Byrne’s questionnaire.