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The Cosmological Liveliness of Terril Calder’s The Lodge:
Animating our Relations and Unsettling Our Cinematic Spaces
Salma Monani

Hybridity is key; as I am Métis.
Terril Calder, personal interview

I first saw Métis artist Terril Calder’s 2014 stop-frame feature, The Lodge, an independently made, relatively small budget film at its premiere showing, at the ImagineNative Film + Media Arts festival held annually in Toronto, Canada. The feature-length animation played to a full house at the Lightbox Theater downtown. Many were there to attend the five-day festival dedicated to Indigenous media made by and for Indigenous people. Others were there because as Toronto’s general public they wanted to catch a movie on a night out in the city. Since then The Lodge has shown at various other independent venues. It isn’t what you might think of as commercial fare. Its audiences are not huge.

However, for those who do view The Lodge, the film presents a creative space to re-think our sense of boundaries in a number of ways: boundaries between human/nonhuman, White/Indigenous, male/female, spectator/film-object. In this essay I argue that the film is thus an invitation to question the “naturalness” of hegemonic identity assumptions that demarcate such boundaries. I interviewed Calder (via Skype and subsequent email correspondence) soon after I saw the film, and I situate a close textual analysis of the film within the context of her intent and the burgeoning scholarly dialogue between Indigenous studies and ecocritical studies. The scholarly dialogue, as Joni Adamson and I write in the introduction to our recent anthology, Ecocriticism and Indigenous Studies: Conversations from Earth to Cosmos (2016), argues for “clear sighted understandings of multi-faceted human/more-than-human relationships” that exist outside of binaries imposed by Western notions of “progress” (14-15, emphasis added). Similarly Steven Loft, co-editor of Coded Territories: Tracing Indigenous Pathways in New Media, writes of an Indigenous “media cosmology”—“replete with life and spirit, inclusive of beings, thought, prophecy, and the underlying
connectedness of all things" that is not predicated on Western foundations of thought (xvi). Calder extends such Indigenous worldviews of connectedness to cinema and animation in particular.

The essay, thus, extends current conversations in animation studies, ecocinema studies, and Indigenous studies.¹ It argues that there are two entwined elements that this film offers us for the critical project of re-thinking eco-social crises—the animation mode itself coupled with Calder’s Métis sensibilities. In animation, we are used to (a) seeing the inanimate alive—‘objects’ talk, transform, act, be—, and (b) believing in their agency (at least as part of the film-world) because (c) the form is invitingly playful. Thinking of animation with these three characteristics imbues it with a sense of what I would like to call its cosmological liveliness, where agential existence is recognized beyond human agents. While the notion of such agential recognition has marked EuroAmerican ecocritical scholarship’s recent “ontological” or “cosmopolitical” turn, as Indigenous studies scholars such as Zoe Todd write, this turn does not necessarily acknowledge Indigenous cosmological worldviews, which have for centuries argued for nonhuman agency and vital materialism as a means to frame ethical relations with other beings—nonhuman, human, and the hybrid inbetweens.²

Thus, while various ecocinema scholars have argued for animation’s ability to imbue the “inanimate” environment with life, they have not considered how Indigenous worldviews can deepen such understandings.³ Specifically, existing ecocinema scholarship has not argued comprehensively how animation can prompt us to re-think the boundaries we commonly erect not only between human/nonhuman but also between human and human, whether these are racial, gendered, classist, or otherwise.⁴ Cosmological liveliness, I argue, with its roots in Indigenous thought, addresses these vital, entangled, and multi-faceted aspects of our environmental relations. At its premiere The Lodge was billed as a film that “interrogates colonial concepts of savagery, critiques the de-humanizing of Indigenous peoples, and explores the powerful medicine of our animal relations” (ImagineNative). The film, thus, seeks to interrogate how understandings of human/nonhuman bleed into social categories that demarcate humans in hierarchical terms.

<insert Figure 1 here>

As a self-reflexive piece that implicates cinema as part and parcel of such problematic boundary-making, The Lodge demonstrates how animation can be employed to re-tool cinema to resist the systems that erect such boundaries.
Ultimately, The Lodge generates a cognitive dissonance that unsettles the cinematic space, and by extension the extra-filmic space that contextualizes it. At the heart of this dissonance, through the meld of her Métis sensibilities and the animation mode, is Calder’s invitation to capitalize on Indigenous animation as a hybrid agent of radical potential to re-think our entangled material and social relations with the world.

To elaborate on this central thesis of Indigenous animation’s material-social agency, I organize my discussion into three parts. First, I begin by considering how Calder employs animation’s multiple forms—cell, digital, and stop-motion—to weave an intertextual multi-storied film-world that disorients passive viewership, celebrates Indigenous traditions of non-linear storytelling, and critiques Western ethnographic modes of storytelling that objectify animals and Indigenous peoples. Second, I draw on Calder’s use of animation’s plasmaticness (its ability to make the film-world’s environment mutable and malleable) to suggest how she uses the material presence of her stop-frame dolls as dynamic and flexible animal-human amalgams to confront the logics of this objectification. At the same time, I show how Calder employs animation’s playfulfulness to generate a double-coded trickster element, which invites us to pay attention to the cinematic frame as an embodied presence that reveals modes of cinema production and labor. Third, I argue that through such a presence Calder makes us aware of cinema’s complicity in systems of power that perpetuate the ‘naturalization’ of problematic eco-social entanglements. Awareness of such a presence is also a means by which such power can be resisted. Intertextuality, plasmaticness, and embodied understandings, as the sections below illuminate, are characteristics central to the cosmological liveliness of Calder’s animation. I conclude by considering how we as viewers might recognize our own part in the cosmological entanglements of cinema’s filmic and extra-filmic worlds.

STORIED RELATIONS: JUXTAPOSITING PEARLS, DANDELIONS, AND BEAVERS

The Lodge is a multi-layered story, which exploits animation’s various possibilities to generate a materially obvious and discursively complex intertextuality. Utilizing a mix of cell, digital, and stop-frame styles as well as the juxtaposition of non-linear storylines, this intertextuality serves three important functions that demonstrate how Calder’s Métis sensibilities imbue her animation with cosmological liveliness. It disorients passive viewership, inviting instead an active engagement with a complex world of hybrid and dynamic in-betweeness; it privileges Indigenous modes of storytelling, and at the same time, it critiques Euro-American
cinematic modes of storytelling that ‘objectify’ animals and Indigenous people simultaneously.

The Lodge’s main protagonist is Pearl Simpson a World War II British war bride who has come to live in the Canadian wilderness with her Métis husband, Hunter. She is played by a wire-frame doll with platinum blonde hair, heavily made-up eyelids, pencil-thin eyebrows, a painted mouth, long legs, and a slender figure (with neck often adorned with a double string of pearls). We are first introduced to Pearl through the opening credits and dream sequence that weaves her personal backstory into a political landscape. Lasting seven minutes, this sequence includes no spoken lines. The audience must work actively to make sense of the montage of cell, digital, and stop-motion animation presented in various shades of black and white, in the rough sepia sketches of line drawings, in the silhouettes of shadow-puppetry with a marionette feel, and in textured etchings of dense tree trunks through which a searchlight moves. The musical score, blending into the hum of war planes and the rumble of exploding bombs (clouds of black and white brush-strokes that rush at us), brings the audience into the mid-twentieth century. Yet, when these sounds merge into the jaunty beat of Edward Hamilton’s 1915/World War I marching song, “Pack up your troubles in your old kit bag and smile, smile, smile” the soundscape extends the time frame outside the era of World War II. The accompanying intertitle furthers this extension:

Immigrating to a new country is like jumping into a Void. It brings the potential of opportunity marred by the potential of utter devastation. Bewildered Colonists, Fur Traders, War Brides who found themselves cradled in the claw of the Canadian Wild reached for the aide of people who already called this place home.

The intertitle fades to “Bewildered,” which in turn fades out leaving behind the word “wild.” Hamilton’s voice dissolves to the momentary returning hum of planes, which dissipates into sounds of breathing and the slow, steady thump of a heartbeat. From black screen we cut to an extreme close-up of Pearl’s sleeping face, latticed with shadows of branches. As we will learn, Pearl is a character bewildered by her circumstances—a woman caught between worlds, of past and present, Britain and Canada, Whiteness and Indigeneity, “civilization” and “the bush” and the various perspectives that mark these distinctions.

As my epigraph indicates, such inbetweenness and its accompanying hybridity is of central concern to Calder, who is Métis and identifies as being of mixed European and Indigenous ancestry. Despite their mixed
ancestry, Métis people, like other Canadian Aboriginal peoples, have long pre-settler ancestral ties to North American lands and have also suffered from colonial histories of marginalization, such that identification with Indigenous life-ways and experiences is central to being Métis. In her 2015 interview, Calder notes that identification with Indigenous life-ways and experiences is central to being Métis: “We have a hybrid experience of culture as well as DNA but we gain a sense of who we really when a truly white person comes into our community and tries to ‘fix’ us.” Pearl plays the role of the “truly white person” in The Lodge. A recent immigrant from Britain, she wants to “fix” her new community. As the pioneering work of Métis scholar Kim TallBear shows, racist, colonial understandings of biology (DNA) problematically shape(d) how settlers culturally conceive(d) Indigenous peoples.

However, The Lodge argues not for the “fixing” of her Métis community but for the “fixing” of Pearl’s perceptions. It argues for Pearl to see Indigenous identity not simply based on the genetically problematic notion of race, but as a web of entangled ecocultural relations. Thus, Calder weaves the historical fiction of Pearl’s life in with two additional storylines—one that draws on legends and folktales, reaching back at least into the seventeenth century, and one that plays with the more recent twentieth-century natural history documentary film form. In rendering these stories distinctly, Calder fully exploits the stylistic possibilities of animation to counter “naturalized” narratives of settler cinema, including its fictional and documentary claims to Indigenous identities. The folktales (of the Anishnaabe legend of Dandelion and an early 1831 Scottish version of Goldilocks and the Three Bears) are interspersed into Pearl’s story in the form of animated shadow puppets—two-dimensional silhouettes against flat backdrops, composites of cell and computer wizardry. The natural history documentary (an ‘ethnographic’ exploration of the Canadian beaver) pops up as interludes to Pearl’s story, with imagery that occupies about fifty percent of the screen. Centered within the rest of the screen’s black frame, the scratchy, flickering black-and-white presentation of the Claymation-like animals has an old newsreel feel.

The presentation of these stories rejects the single narrative arc common to classical Hollywood cinema. Instead, in keeping with Indigenous modes of storytelling, Calder chooses the notion of “tradition-in-action.”
As Joanne Hearne explains in regard to Indigenous animation, “The notion of tradition as material that can be stored in transcribed texts and ethnographic films has been supplanted by tradition-in-action, a set of living and dynamic cultural practices” (91). The stories of Dandelion and Goldilocks and the Three Bears become essential means to grapple with Pearl’s story and its suggested messages and morals. For example, the legend of Dandelion, recalls the story of a man who, instead of choosing from the women in his own tribe, falls in love with a beautiful, yellow haired creature, who ‘invades’ his heart, much as the European plant invaded North American lands. The inclusion of this legend foreshadows Pearl’s ‘weedy and invasive’ presence in her husband’s Aboriginal community. The story of Goldilocks, when paralleled with Pearl’s own, also identifies Pearl as an intruder and outsider into the Métis community.

The newscast interludes of natural history documentary are no less meaningful. As Calder explains in our interview:

It was [a] conscious [decision]. Part of it was a way to deal with time. I was dealing with the forties and also the fur trade; so, I thought the interludes would be a good way to touch up on an earlier history and to help with that one additional context for Pearl’s situation: the idea of colonization.

In deliberately creating a story about the “The Life of the Canadian Beaver: The Fur Trade” through these interludes, Calder reminds her viewers of the historical contexts that frame The Lodge. These are the eco-social foundations of her own Métis identity and those of Canada as a colonial nation. At the same time, her aesthetic choice to present the beaver story as ethnographic cinema of ‘news reel’ era deliberately ‘talks back’ to cinema as part of the colonization project. As Calder further explains:

I thought it was really interesting to deal with the anthropological study of the species, like Indigenous people who are often studied as a species... And I wanted to show how absurd it is, not educational; I don't know, to me it's just funny.

Calder consciously highlights the absurdity of the colonial imperative to turn both Indigenous people and beavers into ‘objects’ of study. By animating the beaver scenes as black-and-white, with vaudeville-style music, a soothing male voice-over, and the slower frame-rate that recalls early cinema, she prompts viewers to chuckle at and reflect on the outmodedness of this ethnographic approach. Calder’s approach indictes a long tradition of filmmaking characterized by the Western natural historian/ethnographer adventurer-filmmaker, including Robert Flaherty’s Nanook of the North (1922).
It subverts the simplistic perspectives on time characteristic of those films, which sought to “preserve” dying cultures (as in Nanook of the North) or offered static conceptions of nature’s continuity (as is commonplace in much blue-chip wildlife documentary). Instead, she works, as Hearne might say, to “reinvent” the “visual codes and vocabularies” of this genre with an “especially flexible relationship to issues of historicity and tradition” (98). This relationship foregrounds dynamic systems in contrast to those perpetuated by a Western gaze that tends to ‘freeze frame’ or essentialize Indigeneity and environment.¹⁰

In all, The Lodge with its playful irreverence (of things like ethnographic authority and narrative linearity), which nonetheless addresses serious concerns—of human and nonhuman representation—illustrates what ecocritic Ursula Heise has suggested is animation’s “effectiveness as a means of stimulating debate about complex issues” (301). It uses humor as a politicized mode of address to show how animality and racism are historically entangled in colonial narratives. More specifically, playful yet serious, The Lodge’s intertextuality seamlessly meshes Calder’s Métis sensibilities into animation’s cosmological liveliness. This mesh is further engaged via Calder’s use of animation’s “plasmaticness”—the mode’s ability to make the film-world’s environment mutable and malleable. While the term plasmaticness is credited to Russian filmmaker, Sergie Eisenstein, its characteristics, not surprisingly, are central to much Indigenous thought. For example, multimedia Mohawk artist Jackson 2Bears elucidates his idea of remix theory, where “we can consider technology as something alive and filled with spirit” (19). Remixed animated colonial imagery and tropes, such as Ten Little Indians, 2Bear’s imbues his work with new and different meanings. Similarly, Calder uses animation to mutate the film-world’s given meanings.

Not only are stories of beavers and dandelions juxtaposed onto Pearl’s storyline but Calder places nonhuman characters alongside Pearl’s in her reality. Played by wire-frame dolls, Hunter, Pearl’s husband, embodies both a human body and that of a wolf; her clandestine Métis lover Mukwa is both handsome young man and bear; her Métis nemesis Waggosh, who runs the local trading store and traplines, is both woman and red fox. Pearl, herself, is both woman and rat. Through these transformational, “plasmatic” dual human and nonhuman representations, Calder interrogates colonially imposed notions of animality that “de-humanize” Aboriginal peoples to help us re-think the ethics of animal-human relations. To suggest how, I engage The Lodge’s invitation to contemplate who its storyteller might be.
HUMAN NONHUMAN RELATIONS: ANIMAL AND TRICKSTER STORYTELLERS

Animation is traditionally replete with talking animals, objects that perform self-propelled action, and environments that mutate and transform in delightful ways. Thus, in encountering the film-world of The Lodge, viewers might not be surprised to see its various nonhuman characters or question their agency or their plasmatic shape-shifting as unusual. Animation’s invitation to suspend judgment on preconceptions of how the film-world should resemble ‘reality’ affords The Lodge the creative space to re-think the possible dimensions of ‘reality’ itself. For example, Calder’s representation of the animated silhouette of a plant as the ‘character of Dandelion’ imbues its nonhuman body with kinetic subjectivity. Even as non-Indigenous scholars begin to recognize its capacity in animation, as scholars such as 2Bears, Loft, and Todd suggest such cosmological liveliness are central to Indigenous worldviews. Dandelion’s co-presence encourages viewers to extrapolate to ‘real’ stories of contact, between human/nonhuman, object/subject and Indigenous/non-Indigenous, and to understand that these categories are not exclusive, but overlap. Calder uses Pearl’s role as the film’s protagonist in combination with animation’s plasmaticness to show us how.

As the film’s storyteller, Pearl is shown dreaming of her escape from wartime Britain, and introduces us to the film-world through her voice-over. Calder thus gives us a narrator who completely turns on its head stereotypical expectations of Indigenous storytellers. Hearne writes that responding to the romantic “wise Indian characters who are forever imparting New Age wisdom to white protagonists,” Native animators work to “remember and reclaim the figure of the storyteller” (95). Pearl is clearly not the romanticized “wise [and often male] Indian” of recent Hollywood tropes; furthermore, her point of view does little to romanticize the “Indians” around her. Instead, Pearl’s perception of the Indians is pejorative, one that like the “wise Indian” also sees its precedent in EuroAmerican cinema, including the Hollywood fare that marked the industry’s mid-twentieth century Golden Era and coincided with Pearl’s lifetime.

In Pearl’s point of view, the Métis are quite literally animals. Her husband, Hunter, appears as a wolf clad in overalls. Pipe stuck between his teeth, heading out to check his traplines or working assiduously with chainsaw or axe on expanding their wooden cabin (the lodge), viewers see him through her eyes much like a chastised wolf-dog. He is, in her words, in need of being “tamed,” much like the rest of Canada around her, which she proclaims somewhat grandiosely in her clipped British accent, is the “middle
of nowhere” and “the perfect place for the likes of me, the Queen of the Jungle.” Pearl, accoutered in heels, pearls, hats, and feathery ruffs, looks down on Hunter. She also looks down on Waggosh, the Métis woman who runs the local trading post, and who appears as a wire-frame doll with plain clothes and mismatched teeth. Pearl suspects Waggosh of being Hunter’s lover; she refers to Waggosh as a “vixen” and an “immoral” and “precocious little fox” in need of a good “hunting.”

While Pearl accuses Waggosh of being immoral, she herself has taken a clandestine Métis lover, Mukwa. However, Pearl is also condescending towards him. She calls him a “stubborn, subordinate bloke” and sees him as a devoted but dumb bear. She describes the gifts of food, the bounty off the land—harvested fish, fowl, and beast—he brings her as “smelly, raw, though well-intentioned.” Discarding them unused behind the lodge, she cajoles him instead to get presents that connect her to White society, such as the Winnipeg Free Press.

Though she doesn’t want to, Pearl also sees herself as a sniveling rat. In the opening dream sequence, we are introduced to Pearl-as-Rat when Pearl-as-Human (dressed to the nines) sits on a divan looking at herself in a gilded mirror. Instead of a human face looking back at her, there is a squealing rat wearing pearls. In extreme close-up, the rat’s whiskers and teeth engulf the space of the mirror. Pearl-as-Rat is a manifestation of a deep shame at Pearl’s own sexual misfortunes, articulated in her mother’s words: “I told you so, you filthy thing.”

Ultimately, Pearl’s understanding of animality is distinctly deprecatory. Such attitudes have characterized much of Canada’s official colonial agenda throughout history. The 1870s Medicine Treaties, which came soon after the formation of Canada as a nation (in 1867), encouraged the “corralling of Native people onto reservations as if they were wild animals needing containment” (Goeman, 21, emphasis mine). The Métis, considered “half-breeds,” were seen as even less worthy than First Nations Indians. The federal Indian Act of 1876 explicitly refused to recognize them in treaties (Hogue, 121). Thus Pearl’s perspective echoes the official stance of Canada’s settler culture—Aboriginal people are demoted to something less than desirably human. As in the case of the beaver, their worth is purely utilitarian.

Yet, despite Pearl being the assigned storyteller, which would ordinarily encourage us to align our sense of the film-world with hers, Calder’s use of animation muddies Pearl’s colonial perceptions. As co-existent beings, the “animals” who live in her storyline are scaled to
Pearl’s size and physically occupy the same status as she does [See Figure 1, for example]. In addition, despite their animal appearances, they embody commendable ‘human-like’ characteristics. Both wolf-husband-Hunter and bear-lover-Mukwa tenderly attend to Pearl’s wellbeing, their gentle and caring ‘humanity’ challenging the understanding of animals as lesser. As Heise suggests of animation, “as obviously anthropomorphic as most of these highly individualized characters may be, they manage to unsettle the spectator precisely by making it unclear what exactly the categories of ‘human’ and ‘animal’ mean” (310). This blurring is consistent with Calder’s Métis sensibilities:

Pearl sees us as animals when she’s dehumanizing us. But that’s really part of our animal selves, which we don’t mind being. A huge part of my culture is to gain a clearer understanding of my animal self and to honor the connection... When someone says we are connected to that side of animality, we feel that that’s a gift (Calder, personal interview).

The mischievous double-coding of the characters as animal and human invites viewers to re-think Pearl’s colonial perspectives. For instance, though Pearl sees Hunter as an easily fooled animal, Calder makes it clear that he is aware of Pearl’s relationship with Mukwa. In one scene, Hunter-as-Wolf bathes Pearl in a tin tub shortly after Pearl has had a rendezvous with Mukwa. Unsolicited, Pearl explains that the red scratches on her back (left by Mukwa) are the result of tending her rose bushes. Hunter’s conspiratorial turn towards the camera and wordless eye-roll suggests he knows, as the audience does, the true cause of the scratches. Thus the film aligns us with Hunter, subverting Pearl’s point-of-view and exposing her as an unreliable narrator. Here, we also see Hunter’s willingness to accept Pearl for who she is. Audiences can read this acquiescence as supporting Pearl’s sense of Hunter as subservient, or they can read it as an example of his generosity of spirit, humanity in its quintessential form. This reading is upheld at the film’s climax, where Hunter admits that “despite everything you [Pearl] have put me through, I don’t want to see you destroyed.”

This climax scene in particular reveals that Calder does not use animality solely as a metaphor for human states of being, but also to invite us to think about animal well-being too. As Pearl reassesses her life, she sees Hunter for the first time in human form, which suggests a privileging of an anthropomorphic viewpoint. However, Calder’s intersplicing of the beaver story here resists such a reading. Calder’s decision to give human and beaver similar expressions of bewildered sadness levels the distinction between the two and invites our ethical consideration of both. The Lodge thus makes the audience aware of
alternative narratives of humanity and animality. As Starosielski suggests of animation’s blurring of human-animal agency, “subject-object relations [can] become co-extensive” (150).

Calder’s double-coding also invites us to imagine a counter storyteller to Pearl. Because this storyteller is technically invisible except as counter audio-visual moves its presence is instead embodied by the cinematic ‘body’, i.e., not just by what is on screen but by the cinematic frame itself. We can think of the cinematic frame as a trickster agent. First, it capitalizes on animation’s congeniality to Indigenous storytelling, emphasizing similar elements of “innovation, physical creation” and humor, and providing alternatives to Western narrative forms (Hearne 91). Second, it can prompt us to consider how human and nonhuman entities constitute its cosmological liveliness (versus that of characters in the frame). Recognizing such frames reveals modes of production, racial and gendered oppression, and cinema’s complicity (and agency) in these modes and oppressions – elements that are often invisible in mainstream cinema. To articulate what I mean, below, I emphasize how the material presence of Calder’s animation helps unsettle mainstream cinema and expose its eco-social contexts—in particular its often pointed refusal to acknowledge the labors of human and nonhuman alike.

BODILY RELATIONS: FILM/MAKERS AND QUESTIONABLE VIXENS-VAMPS/VICTIMS

To understand the cinematic frame as a presence is to become aware of it as a hybrid, entangled embodiment of nonhuman-human agency. Not only are ‘things’ in the onscreen story imbued with a cosmological liveliness, but the cinematic ‘body’ itself is enlivened. Recent work in Indigenous new media studies, while not specifically focused on animation, draws our attention to how the very act of recognizing the life breathed into “inanimate” technology is central to this awareness of a hybrid, agential presence as suggested by Steven Loft’s notion of “media cosmology” or Jackson 2Bear’s remix theory. Of Indigenous new media work, 2Bears writes:

...we often understand technology, as something alive and filled with spirit, something with which we are interconnected in what Little Bear called a ‘circle of relations’ and something that is part of a universe of ‘active entities with which people engage’ (14).

Such agency is also central to work in animation studies. As Ray Harryhausen and Tony Dalton write, “the animator is ever present, everywhere in the shot, an invisible spirit transforming the puppet into a living being” (9). While some scholars suggest that not all animation evokes such awareness, most point to stop-motion animation as a particularly evocative form. Hearne, for
example, writes:

nothing highlights the constructed nature of visual storytelling more than clay animation, which involves the painstaking work of creating and manipulating physical models that carry the actual fingerprints of their makers, foregrounding the physical traces of their artistic creation (98).

Calder’s stop-frame dolls also bear these traces. Repeated close-ups reveal the lines and gaps that attach Pearl’s mouth to her face and remind the audience that she is just a doll [See Figure 1, for example]. Calder explains that “I never made my dolls talk before and that took some learning” (personal interview). Though Calder’s statement might suggest a production flaw or a sense that Pearl’s “doll-ness” should not be visible, such a reading discounts her intent, which is to remind her viewers of the means of production:

You see the stage and you see how the elements come together but bizarrely you keep getting sucked back into the illusion; kind of like a punk rock aesthetic. You feel its means. You can feel the artist within the work (Calder, personal interview).

In contrast to the onscreen experience of mainstream Hollywood cinema, which often “feels like a roller coaster ride; I’m buckled in, it’s a dynamic thrill” but one that often steers away from pulling out of the onscreen experience, Calder wants us to “feel the labor” that grounds her film-world (ibid.)

Reclaiming this sense of labor is a necessary and eco-social challenge to the hidden mechanisms of mainstream cinema. We should think of human labor as inherently ecological, as it concerns the material bodies of workers and the environmental networks in which they are contextualized. Yet mainstream film industries often conceal both labor and material resources that undergird the fantasies of their screen entertainment. In cases where labor was acknowledged, as with that of Disney’s animators, the acknowledgments glamorized the labor, concealing the drudgery of workers treated as cogs in the machine of Taylorized production processes. Today transnational Hollywood and other mainstream film industries (such as Bollywood) continue to perpetuate problematic labor practices. For example, it is common to consolidate film revenue in the hands of a few by outsourcing labor to countries where working conditions are less equitable than those in home countries; the impacts are felt at home too where workers are laid off.

Central to problematic labor practices in the mainstream film industry are entangled continuing disparities based on gender and ethnicity. These
disparities are perhaps best exemplified by recent criticisms of Hollywood’s Oscar Academy Awards’ lack of diversity (e.g., Smith, et al.). The animation industry is no stranger to such discriminatory practices. For example, regarding gender, Heather Hendershot writes:

Typically, the most monotonous, low-paying animation work is performed by women. And for the past fifteen years, the majority of US cartoon manufacturers have sent their most tedious work to Korea, the Philippines, and other countries where animation workers are cheap and not unionized (117).

The Lodge works actively to ‘talk back’ to the industry’s discriminatory practices and deliberately sits outside mainstream filmmaking. Calder exposes the cinematic frame to reveal histories of production and consumption that have converted human and nonhuman bodies into ‘objects’ of racial, gendered, and species oppression.

Audiences are alerted to cinema as a player in Pearl’s story from the film’s opening shot. In it, sepia-toned, charcoal-drawn silhouettes of a man and a girl sit in front of a giant movie screen featuring a close-up of a starlet’s face. Furthermore, Pearl’s life (like those of the beavers) is often projected through a flickering, black-bordered frame and what resembles an old, scratchy, early twentieth century film-reel. In the scene immediately following the opening credits, we encounter Pearl through such a frame and in a film-noir darkness. With her husband gone to “check his traps,” Pearl rises. Dressed in a revealing corset, her slender hour-glass figure seem to match her words, “I’m not really a hide-in-the-shadows kinda girl.” As violin strains reminiscent of classic film-noir music envelop the scene, Pearl sits down at a typewriter, slips a cigarette between her lips, and searches for a light in her purse. Lamenting Hunter’s suspected unfaithfulness, she proceeds to compose a letter, the contents of which are revealed in a jazz number prominently featuring the words “with Valour, Vigour, Piss, and Vinegar.” While the opening dream sequence of war suggests that Pearl is a victim of grave trauma, here we get an added dimension to her character—she has spunk. One might argue that Pearl Simpson bears a strong resemblance to classic film starlets such as Jean Harlow and the animated Betty Boop. Like them Pearl embodies a similarly sexualized body—the curvaceous body, the big eyes, and long eyelashes. The Jazz number also recalls the Golden Age of cinema where actresses often performed songs to Jazz tunes.

The call-outs to early cinema also remind us of the sexual oppression inherent in this industry. Yet, whereas the patriarchal narratives of shows such as the Boop animation made light of such harassment, Calder
portrays Pearl’s molestation as a troubling incident and one that foregrounds how she sees herself. In all, Calder’s presentation of Pearl offers a layered critique of the cinema industry that normalizes misogyny and racism through narrative and bodily representations of women and non-Whites. Like the women of her time (onscreen and off), Pearl must contend with a culture that asks her to be feminine, but not “too feminine.” The historical realities of war-time Britain encouraged women like Pearl to be ‘feminine’ and fraternize with soldiers, especially those from overseas to help keep up their morale, and yet blamed women for sexual excesses, while at the same time letting men off the hook (Friedman; Goodman). War-brides was a derogatory term in Britain, where pregnancies often meant forced marriages, and in the U.S. and Canada to where such brides emigrated, they were also accused of both being immoral and motivated by better economic prospects in countries far from the homefront. At the same time, the emigration to Canada (nearly 50,000 war brides) fed into EuroAmerican discourses of nation-building in which these women were the mothers of the nation’s future generations, homemakers making the New World (Melynda).

In casting Pearl as a war bride, Calder works to generate this sense of history with all its conflicted and problematic messiness. Pearl has experienced the trauma of war, rape, and then relocation, all the time fed by cultural narratives that are undeniably oppressive as they seek to regulate her (mind and gendered body). As a result, Pearl’s coquettishness, self-loathing, loathing of the Métis and the lands around her, and her defiance make sense to the audience and invite its sympathy. However, this does not make these characteristics right or just. Calder explains that in conducting research for her film, she found herself questioning the systems of power that perpetuate oppression:

The question of why and what they [Europeans] were leaving came up. And it usually was a system that failed them to a certain extent. So why come here get a new life only to start imposing the same system in which you failed? It seems like a brand-new opportunity to learn to thrive. When you’re offered a brand-new chance, a brand-new life as Pearl is why bring the very things that actually oppressed you in the first place? (personal interview).

In her EuroAmerican contexts, Pearl seeks to elevate her own self-worth and escape her own persecution as a gendered being by claiming her White status and demeaning the Métis and others around her. Yet, paradoxically, in affirming the structures of power that define speciest and racist norms, she perpetuates the gendered and sexist ones that bind her. Unable to curb her
own sexual desires, Pearl will always be a “filthy” rat within such power structures even as she attempts to prove herself better than the “animals” around her.

The Lodge forces its viewers to confront this paradox of Pearl’s relational engagement with her world. Through her aesthetic choices, Calder invites us to view Pearl’s story within the cinematic frame of an older era of filmmaking; the various black-and-white images, the early century news reel replications, the scratches on screen, all prompt us to contemplate the ‘unnaturalness’ of Pearl’s norms and to reflect on cinema’s presence in the construction of such systemic power.

Yet, while revealing the material constructedness of cinema, Calder also draws on her Métis sensibilities to re-embody cinema with a different type of agency, a cosmological liveliness that resists problematic systems of power. The Lodge deliberately defies expected gender (as well as racialized and speciestic) hierarchies. In doing so, it articulates a sense of Indigenous feminism and queer politics, which challenges heteronormative hierarchies with recognition of complex colonial and Indigenous entanglements. While Pearl might be a White woman, Calder leaves the meanings of her womanhood ambiguous. Pearl’s life resists essentialist narratives of domestic homemaker, as she is without children, and she is not monogamous. At the same time as Pearl’s social status is up for grabs—(victim, vamp, both? neither?)—Hunter also confronts simple gendered binaries. Calder explains that he is a manifestation of the “country wife,” a term that was often used to describe native women who “paired with people who came over with The Hudson Bay Company” (personal interview). Despite the geographic and political importance of these alliances to the early fur traders and colonists, because of racial prejudice, the status of the “country wife” was often rescinded when White men moved back to Europe, or when White women emigrated to Canada to marry them. In casting Hunter as the under-appreciated “country wife” in Pearl’s marriage of convenience (her means to escape her past), Calder deliberately queers gender expectations. Hunter may be the chain-saw wielding husband, an image of stereotypical masculinity, but his ethics of care and his acceptance of Pearl’s promiscuity fly in the face of hetropatriarchal privilege and control. As gender norms are challenged, Calder reiterates her careful attention to the ethics of labor, drawing the nonhuman into the sphere of such ethics. Hunter, and other Métis, like Waggosh and Mukwa all trap and hunt, and demonstrate working relations with animals and the land. Amongst these characters, Pearl stands out as the problematically unethical one—throwing out and wasting the bounty
that Mukwa offers her, and intent on “taming” the land.

What is key to note is that Calder’s engagement with gendered and animal ethics of labor practices reminds us that her characters are enmeshed in both colonial and Indigenous systems of power. Hunter’s own community is critical of his alliance with Pearl. In one of the few sequences where the camera leaves Pearl’s space to follow Hunter, Waggosh relates the dandelion story to Hunter, suggesting he is foolish for having fallen for the false promise of a beautiful stranger who is an outsider to the community. At the same time, as Calder’s documentary interludes suggest, Indigenous peoples have also been caught up in profligate land-relations, speeding the demise of the beavers and playing a role in environmental destruction.

The Lodge shows characters negotiating the systems in which they are enmeshed. It invites its viewers to contend with cinema’s histories that constitute its role in such systems. In many ways, the lodge--in which the characters live, on which Hunter relentlessly works, and for which the film is named--seems to best symbolize this hybrid, dynamic, and contradictory space of negotiating such systems. Calder describes it as, “a place where she [Pearl] wants to have control but Hunter is constantly chopping up the lodge” and as “something that was born out of the land; made from the land...and it has its own entity—the floorboards squeak at Pearl” She also explains that, as a doll-house set, the lodge exerts its sense of material agency on her—in determining how she is able to film her story, what lighting she can use, and how she places her dolls (ibid.).

Ultimately, in such a world of cosmological liveliness, Calder’s Métis sensibilities conjoin with animation’s possibilities to generate more flexible identity constructs of human and nonhuman to help breach the walls of conventional systemic thinking. Such re-imaginings can prompt us to consider what it might mean to conceptualize a less hierarchical world, one that is more just and equitable for all.

<insert figure 3 here>

CONCLUSIONS: MÉTIS RELATIONS, ANIMATION, AND AUDIENCE INTERACTIONS
I began this essay by asserting that The Lodge exemplifies the radical potential of Indigenous animation. By situating the film at the intersection of Indigenous studies, ecocinema studies, and animation studies, I have argued that Calder’s Métis sensibilities highlight animation’s cosmological liveliness—its playful ability to enliven the nonhuman with subjective agency—to help us re-think not only the boundaries between human/nonhuman but
also among humans. Through her use of intertextuality (of story-types and of storytellers), plasmaticness (a sense of the film-world as mutable and malleable), and the embodied presence of animation, Calder demonstrates how understandings of human/nonhuman overlay onto social constructions such as race, gender, sexuality and resource consumerism (as with the cinema ‘body’ itself).

Bringing her Métis sensibilities to animation, Calder helps collapse and hybridize binary distinctions of not only human/animal but also of White/Indigenous, male/female. Such hybridization, I have argued, challenges structures of ‘naturalized’ power. Central to Calder’s critique is her awareness of cinema’s agency in such systems of power. In employing animation as her medium, Calder reveals cinema’s possible agency in re-thinking our relations. From the opening scenes that deliberately “bewilder,” the film constantly invites a cognitive dissonance, which in Calder’s sense of “a punk aesthetic” works to disrupt easy or passive immersion. Instead, in drawing our attention to the cinematic frame, The Lodge insists on reminding us of the blurry entanglements of our discursive logics with corporeal, material things.

In doing so, it actively implicates the spectator in the cinematic experience. To make sense of The Lodge’s non-linear, multi-storied dissonance, spectators “must hypothesize about the rules and operations of the animated world” which, as Starosielski writes, demands a high level of cognitive interaction (151). In such interactions, Calder’s Métis sensibilities invite us to what 2Bear describes as “a recombinant act that involves the slicing, cutting, and destruction of virulent colonial mythologies” (27). In recombining more holistic histories and stories, agency is afforded across the continuum—while The Lodge encourages interaction, audiences are prompted to actively engage.

How an audience engages is also important to animation’s potentials. As numerous film scholars since Stuart Hall have argued, filmmakers can encode messages, but audiences will decode those messages in ways that make the most sense to them. Ecocritic Chris Tong writes, “In fact, we often view the same film and arrive at different interpretations” (118). Such different understandings are part and parcel of film viewing, especially in animation films like The Lodge that actively encode high degrees of dissonance. Yet, to think of the power of audience agency as part of the animation film experience, I find it useful to join Indigenous ideas of cosmological openness—what Daniel Wildcat has suggested in his seminal Red Alert! Saving our Planet with Indigenous Knowledge are the ways we humans chose to listen
and collaborate with others—to ecocritic Tong’s definition of “ecological viewing.” Tong suggests that viewing film “ecologically” is to take hold “of the meaning making process without accepting or rebuffing the film world” (119), an approach that is central to much Indigenous philosophy. To engage the meaning-making process, Tong further argues, requires an understanding of spectatorship not as a passive pursuit but as a “politically engaged practice” that involves opening “one’s mind towards other scholars, other viewers, and the otherness of films” (114). I suggest that such an approach becomes especially productive when the “other” constitutes that and those who have been oppressed by discriminatory systems of power that generate eco-social inequities. To recognize such “others” not as one-dimensional stereotypes but as complex beings with layered identities, such as those evoked through The Lodge, opens up a space for inclusivity that demands analytical and ethical engagement without essentializing Indigeniety or environment. Ultimately, animated film-worlds like The Lodge provide critical, yet playful and imaginative spaces to practice the openness and interactivity of such viewing practices. As Indigenous activists at the frontlines of eco-social struggles such as those of the Alberta Tar Sands or the Dakota Access Pipeline indicate, if we are to ensure sustainable futures, such awareness of the cosmological liveliness of other beings is essential. As a decolonial endeavor, Indigenous animation like The Lodge encourages us to be re-animate our storied and material worlds with new imaginative possibilities of re-thinking equity and justice for human and nonhuman alike.
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NOTES
There is a rich and growing scholarship in Indigenous cinema and media studies on which this essay, and the larger project of Indigenous ecocinema I am working on builds. There is also a growing scholarship in ecocritical animation studies. Though less attention has been focused on their intersections, and this is where my work lies, I am indebted to the foundations these two fields provide. In Indigenous cinema and media studies there is the ground-breaking work such Beverly Singer's *Wiping the War Paint off the Lens: Native American Film and Video* (2001), Barry Barclay's "Celebrating Fourth Cinema" (2003) and Michelle Raheja’s *Reservation Reelism: Redfacing, Visual Sovereignty, and Representations of Native Americans in Film* (2010), Denise Cummings’ edited *Visualities: Perspectives on Contemporary American Indian Film and Art* (2011), and Dean Rader’s *Engaged Resistance: American Indian Art, Literature, and Film From Alcatraz to the NMAI* (2011) as well as more recent collections such as Elise Marubbio and Eric Buffalohead’s *Native Americans on Film: Conversations, Teaching, and Theory* (2013); Wilson, Pamela, Joanna Hearne, Amalia Córdova, and Sabra Thorner’s "Indigenous Media." (2014); Pearson, Gay Wendy and Susan Knabe’s *Reverse Shots: Indigenous Film and Media in an International Context* (2015) and Howe, LeAnne, Harvey Markowitz, and Denise Cumming’s *Seeing Red-Hollywood’s Pixelated Skin: American Indians and Film* (2013). Despite this rich scholarship, there is still currently not much work in Indigenous studies on animation. Two articles that stand out for their focus on children’s Indigenous animation are Jennifer L. Biddle’s ""My Name is Danny’: Indigenous Animation as Hyper-Realism" (2015) and Joanna Hearne’s chapter "Indigenous Animation: Educational Programming, Narrative Interventions, and Children’s Culture” (2008). There is also a large corpus of work on such mainstream animation. Paul Wells’ work is particularly well cited. For example, *The Animated Bestiary: Animals, Cartoons, and Culture* (2009); *Animation and America* (2002) and *Understanding Animation* (2013). Because this essay especially engages environmental themes, I also draw attention to the large corpus of work on animation by ecocritics. These include David Whitley, *The Idea of Nature in Disney Animation* (2008); Robin Murray and Joseph Heumann, *That's all Folks: Ecocritical Readings of American Animated Features.* (2011); Diedre Pike, *Enviro-Toons: Green Themes in Animated Cinema and Television* (2012); articles in Part III of Alexa Weik von Mossner’s *Moving Environments: Affect, Emotion and Ecology in Film* (2014); and a number of articles such as Nicole Starosielski, "‘Movements that are Drawn’: A History of Environmental Animation from the Lorax to FernGully to Avatar"
The “Ontological” or “Cosmopolitical” Turn is credited primarily to non-Indigenous, science and technology studies scholars such as Karen Barad, 2007; Jane Bennett, 2010; Bruno Latour 2004; Donna Haraway 2012; and Isabelle Stengers, 2005 who have been particularly influential in shifting Western academia’s focus to confront the dilemmas of planetary eco-social crises in the age of the Anthropocene. Zoe Todd’s 2014 blog post, “An Indigenous Feminist’s Take on the Ontological Turn,” which she republished with the added suffix to the title, “’Ontology’ is Just Another Word for Colonialism” in the spring 2016 issue of the Journal of Sociology, helps articulate the perpetuating discursive violence through the absence of Indigenous philosophies in Western academia’s “Ontological Turn.” Others such as Randerson and Yates, and myself in our respective chapter contributions to Monani and Adamson’s Ecocriticism and Indigenous Studies: Conversations from Earth to Cosmos (2016) similarly draw attention to the problems of such absence when we discuss ecocritical scholarship. See specifically my chapter’s footnote #2, which highlights why the concept of “vital cosm-o-ethics,” which I use to engage Navajo filmmaker, Nanobah Becker’s The 6th World: A Creation Story, draws on Indigenous worldviews as its frame, even though it might recall new materialist, Jane Bennett’s Western and secular idea of “vital materialism” (58). See also, collections such as those of Steven Loft and Kerry Swanson’s recent collection, Coded Territories: Tracing Indigenous Pathways in New Media Art (2014) and Gregory Cajate’s Native Science: Natural Laws of Interdependence (2003) as examples of Indigenous studies scholarship that highlights these animated cosmological relations.

For example, Adrian Ivakhiv in Ecologies of the Moving Image: Cinema, Affect, Nature (2013) draws on Sean Cubitt’s work to write, “the distinct qualities of metamorphism and transmutation that the genre has at its core” can help “refigure viewers’ perceptions of objecthood as well as subjectscapes” (214-216). See also, Starosielski, “Movements that are Drawn.” In “Plasmatic Nature,” Ursula Heise specifically considers Jane Bennett’s ideas of vital materialism, though she is dismissive of Bennett’s frame, stating that “nonhuman agency has been playfully explored [in animation film] long before new materialist theories arose” (308).

For example, Heise in her engagement with the Belgian animation Panique au Village (2009) does little to explore the presentation of the feathered
stereotypical portrayal of the character Indien, though she has much to say about nonhuman-human relations in this film. In “Movements that are Drawn” Starosielski wrote, “Ideologies embedded in animated films are not only ‘pro-environmental’ but serve to reinforce hegemonic conceptions of race and gender” (149). One might argue that in general eco-animation scholarship through its neglect of serious engagement with such concepts may be similarly criticized. There are a few exceptions though. See, for example, Cubitt’s “Ecocritique and Materialities of Animation” and Monani’s “In God’s Land: Cinematic Affect, Animation and the Perceptual Dilemmas of Slow Violence” (2016) that employs an ecocritical-postcolonial reading of Independent Indian film.

Officially today Canada recognizes Métis people as one of the continent’s three main Aboriginal peoples (along with Athabascan-Indian and Inuit communities), however, the politics of Métis identity continue to be fraught. For a sense of some of the debates that mark Métis identity consider Michel Hogue’s Metis and the Medicine Line: Creating a Border and Dividing a People (2015) and Chris Anderson’s “Moya ‘Tipimsook ‘The People Who Aren’t Their Own Bosses’: Racialization and the Misrecognition of ‘Métis’ in Upper Great Lakes Ethnohistory.” (2011) as well as his recent book Métis: Race, Recognition, and the Struggle for Indigenous Peoplehood (2014).

For example, TallBear writes in her pioneering 2013 Native American DNA, “without ‘settlers’ we could not have ‘Indians’ or ‘Native Americans’—a pan racial group defined solely in opposition to the settlers who encountered them” (5).

I’d like to acknowledge Miranda Brady, who is currently working on a 2016 Native American and Indigenous Studies Association conference paper that considers Indigenous feminism as a lens to analyze The Lodge, for her insight comment on how the Dandelion story also subverts the typical “captivity narrative,” where a European is made captive by Indigenous people.

Elise Marrubio and Eric Buffalohead use the term “talk back” as a framing means of understanding Indigenous cinema in their edited collection, Native Americans on Film: Conversations, Teaching, and Theory (2013).

While much has been written about the natural history and ethnographic film, good references include Michele Raheja’s seminal 2007 American Quarterly article, “Reading Nanook’s Smile: Visual Sovereignty, Indigenous Revisions Of Ethnography, and Atanarjuat (The Fast Runner).” See also, essays in Marian Bredin and Hafsteinsson Sigurjón Baldur’s Indigenous Screen Cultures In Canada (2010); Fatimah Tobing-Rony’s The Third Eye: Race, Cinema and
Ethnographic Spectacle (2006) and Corinn Columpar’s Unsettling Sights: The Fourth World on Film (2010).

10 The term ‘freeze-frame’ can be credited to Ann Feinup-Riordan, whose book title Freeze-Frame: Alaskan Eskimos in Movies (1995) plays on the cinematic and primitivism-preservation pun. Interestingly, Calder’s presentation of the natural history genre as animation also creatively bypasses the inevitable environmental resource base that the ‘live-action’ of such ethnographic films need (e.g., the resources to travel to distant places and shoot in unfamiliar conditions). Thus, one might argue that The Lodge also has a smaller ecological footprint than the films that she critiques.

11 There is a substantial corpus of work in film studies that articulates how particular points of view frame audience allegiance. For an overview of some of this research in the context of Indigenous studies see Salma Monani’s “Evoking Sympathy and Empathy: The Ecological Indian and Indigenous Eco-Activism.” (2014).

12 For example, much of Paul Wells’ work (2002, 2009, 2013). See also the essays in Susanne Buchan’s edited collection, Pervasive Animation (2013). In “Indigenous Animation,” Hearne also makes note of how animation often “manifest the film’s mode of production” (96).

13 Both Alice Gambrell ("In Visible Hands: The Work of Stop Motion.") and Sean Cubitt (“Ecocritique and the Materialities of Animation”) argue that Disney’s cell animation sought to represent an industrial standard of animation that ‘normalized’ and ‘naturalized’ the film-world that assisted viewers to be forgetful of the contexts outside of it. There is also debate regarding CGI (computer-generated-imagery) animation, which, in mainstream cinema has pushed so strongly towards simulating realism that it works often to conceal its own artificiality.

14 Recognizing how the film industry also hides unjust practices that govern the labor of animals makes this ecological dimension especially clear. See, for example, Gary Baum’s particularly hard-hitting 2013 investigative piece that draws attention to the problematic standards of animal welfare in Hollywood, “No Animals were Harmed.”

15 As suggested in articles such as Sean Cubitt “Ecocritique and Materialities”; and Alice Gambrell’s “In Visible Hands,” and Nadia Bozak’s The Cinematic Footprint: Lights, Camera, Natural Resources (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 2012).

16 See in particular Alice Gambrell’s “In Visible Hands.” Also, Heather Hendershot’s “Secretary, Homemaker, and 'White' Woman: Industrial Censorship
and Betty Boop's Shifting Design” (1995). One might also make the same argument for today's films, which often include within their DVD supplements, additional materials about the making of the film, though in immensely celebratory terms. For a thoughtful analysis on this topic see, for example, Luis Vivanco's 2013 “Penguins are Good to Think with: Wildlife films, the Imaginary Shaping of Nature, and Environmental Politics”.

17 For example, Michael Curtin and John Vanderhoef’s (“A Vanishing Piece of Pi: The Globalization of Visual Effects Industry” (2015) look specifically at the digital visual effects company VXF, which won the 2013 Oscar for Ang Lee’s Life of Pi. They also provide a nice summary of recent scholarship that looks at the impact of globalization on labor markets (see pages 220-222).

18 Miranda Brady and John Kelly also touch on this aspect of The Lodge briefly in their Indigenous Interventions: Media Tactics in History, Image, and Discourse (2017).

19 Calder mentions Harlow as one example in her personal interview regarding the film.

20 The history of the evolution of the Boop cartoons speak particularly well to this tension, as Hendershot reveals of the shows pre- and post-1935 series, which change with the imposition of Hollywood’s censorship code and result in a move to “revamp a vamp” (118). Hendershot writes, “both the censored and uncensored Betty Boop are abused” (ibid., 119). While early shows are overtly sexist and racist, the later ones are implicitly so.

21 In countries like Austria, which were on the losing side, war-brides were considered in even more derogatory terms in war-time propaganda, and often referred to as “whores and traitors” (e.g., see Friedman, 68).

22 Much has been written about Canada’s war-brides. Along with Goodman’s Women, Sexuality, and War, and Friedman’s From the Battlefield, see also, Tim Davidson and Ruth Pierson’s “War Brides” Davidson In The Oxford Companion to Canadian History (2013), Lisa Gabrielle’s newspaper article, “A Boom of Brides.” (The Globe and Mail. April 6, 2002), and Melynda Jarrat’s web resource “Canadian War Brides: The Authoritative Source of Information on Canadian War Brides from World War II.”
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