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This article suggests that culling campaigns against canids in postwar Canada have striking affective dimensions. Drawing on examples of canid management in the 1950s and 60s from Nunavik, Alberta, and Ontario, we contend that the killing of supposedly rabid dogs and wild canids was predominantly about affect excess and emotional management. The wildness of these animals was perceived to lead to excessive nonhuman affectivity, which was seemingly exacerbated by rabies. Human encounters with these animals were characterised by excessive affective responses, a result of longstanding fears of rabies anxieties about northernness and assertions of ‘civilization’ in the context of settler colonialism. This fear was then channelled into round ups and killings of canids. The killing was an “emotional practice” (Scheer) designed to soothe anxieties, to cleanse and to civilize. Drawing on archival and other documentary sources, we aim to show the value in exploring more fully the intersections between affect and animal histories.

In 1963, Povungnituk (now Puvirnituq), a small Inuit settlement in what is now known as Nunavik, Canada, experienced what was described as a serious dog problem. The human population of Puvirnituq in the 1960s was small – around 500 – most of whom were Inuit. But a small population of settlers ran a general store, a school, and a church, and were joined by a transient population of (usually white) researchers. One such researcher was anthropologist Frank Vallee, who was there to study Inuit social cooperatives. In 1963, his wife Anita Vallee complained bitterly in her February newsletter of the “problems of the Arctic”, of which “none is more serious than dog control.”[[1]](#footnote-1) According to her:

In Povungnituk there are as many dogs as there are people. Imagine more than four hundred Eskimo dogs inhabiting a village about 700 yards long by about 300 wide, within those boundaries they run, fight, play, sloop, defecate, urinate, bark and howl. In moving from place to place in the settlement, one literally picks one’s way among the dogs and their garbage.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Anita Vallee was disgruntled by the dogs because she experienced them as wild and uncontrollable, as well as dirty and disgusting.

 Yet the dogs’ mobility and their ‘disgusting’ habits were not the only issue. As rabies was present in the Arctic, the dogs seemed to pose a health threat because “through biting and other forms of interaction, viruses circulate with alarming disease and rapidity”.[[3]](#footnote-3) Beyond being an annoyance, the *qimmiit,[[4]](#footnote-4)* with their mobility and propensity to bite, generated significant unease due to their status as potential disease vectors amongst whites in the settlement. Frank Vallee explained that “a population among whom the rabid virus is present is an anxious population.” Moreover, he asserted that large numbers of loose dogs in the settlement “sharpen[ed] the edges of anxiety.”[[5]](#footnote-5)

Anxiety spurred white settlers into action. Frequent town meetings were called and memoranda from Puvirnituq reveal the struggles of Mick Mallon, a teacher-cum-government agent, to assuage the quickly escalating unease of white residents towards the Inuit’s dogs.[[6]](#footnote-6) Years later, Mallon complained that while he had expected “the sympathy of a professional skilled in cross-cultural nuances”, Frank Vallee had also been taken in by the widespread rabies fears.[[7]](#footnote-7) In an attempt to control and contain the difficult and troubling emotions generated by *qimmiit* and rabies, Frank Vallee insisted that the settlement begin a campaign of shooting loose dogs. Lethal force against the *qimmiit* became a legitimate tactic to control both the potentially dangerous disease-ridden dogs, and also the emotions that they inspired. A dog-control patrol was established, composed of Frank Vallee and an unnamed Inuk, and the two were quickly joined by Mallon. In an attempt civilize the land and protect the populace, the trio set out to cull the dogs. According to Mallon, Frank Vallee “accepted the white man’s burden”, when he “shot [a] dog’s jaw off.”[[8]](#footnote-8)

 But this violent and colonialist attempt to “civilize” the Arctic and protect the health of Puvirnituq residents did not contain the troubling emotions amongst the white settlers: it only created new ones. For Anita and Frank Vallee, participating in and witnessing the slaughter did not relieve their anxieties. Instead, it deepened them significantly. As they later reflected on their actions, Frank Vallee was plagued by “recurring fantasies associated with Western marshalls[sic] on posse patrol, African colonial troops liberating villages from prowling tigers, SS troops smelling out the *maquis*, and the like.”[[9]](#footnote-9) Whilst he imagined himself as a liberator, accepting the “white man’s burden” came with great costs: it required acting like a Nazi. Anita Vallee echoed this unease when she reflected on the actions of the patrol, comparing them to “storm troopers.”[[10]](#footnote-10) The Inuk who had joined Frank Vallee was similarly plagued by troubling emotions and “screamed about the black dogs which he could see through the walls of the house.” Other Inuit, meanwhile, struggled with feelings of grief, anger, and loss.[[11]](#footnote-11)

As the *qimmiit* slaughter in Puvirnituq illustrates, there were complex entanglements amongst anxiety, rabies, violence, and settler colonialism in postwar Canada. Using this example alongside the rabies panics that struck Alberta and Ontario in the 1950s and 1960s, we argue that the history and geography of culling campaigns against canids in postwar Canada are best understood when we foreground affect and emotion. Each case demonstrates that human and animal affects were woven together in ways that produced violent, if sometimes lamented, ends. Put bluntly, the killing of potentially rabid dogs, coyotes, wolves, and foxes was predominantly about emotional management. The innate wildness of these animals was perceived to lead to an excess of animal affectivity, which was then worryingly exacerbated by the rabies virus. Encounters with these animals meshed with longstanding fears of rabies, (often colonial) anxieties about Northernness, and a sense of upheaval at a time of modernization, to create excess affect in humans. This fear was then emotionally channelled into round ups and killings of canids, forming part of a wider history and geography of lethal campaigns against animals.[[12]](#footnote-12)

As with other diseases, rabies has intensely affective histories and geographies that were, and are, intimately linked to changing medical knowledge and practices.[[13]](#footnote-13) Doctors, veterinarians, officials, and others talked the language of public health and the control of rabies, but we argue that excessive human affect was the main driver behind the killings. Fear of these animals was transformed into violence against them to contain what was seen as excessive animal affect and the human affect it generated. The killing was an “emotional practice,” in Monique Scheer’s terms, that was intended to soothe anxieties about wildness, animality, and northernness.[[14]](#footnote-14)

This violence was intended to cleanse and civilize. Yet rather than containing troubling emotions, it led to further ones, such as guilt and grief. We draw on the slaughter of canid wildlife and *qimmiit* in postwar Canada to suggest that the affective dimensions of public health can spill over into violence against nonhumans; that emotional practices contain a lethal edge; and that while rabies is now often treated as “neglected tropical disease” in contemporary public health discourse, we need to pay attention to its association with northern wildness historically.[[15]](#footnote-15) Furthermore, we argue that affect transforms human-animal relations and geographies: the killing of the *qimmiit* devastated the lives of the Inuit and provincial ecologies were fundamentally transformed.

**Affect, Emotion, and Human-Animal Histories**

The central claim of this paper is a theoretical one: that an attention to affect and emotion offers an important way to access and understand human-animal relations in the past. While the history of emotions has expanded dramatically in recent decades[[16]](#footnote-16), it is not surprising that historians are somewhat more wary of affect. While the affective turn has been a fruitful one across a range of disciplines in the social sciences and humanities, the impact has been less evident in historical studies, a gap even more pronounced in animal history. Given the textual nature of historical work – even that which aims to center the lives of animals – affect is hard to capture and seems to be analytically fraught, especially if it is defined as only ever pre-cognitive, pre-personal, universal, and ahistorical. Susan J. Matt makes this suspicion clear, advocating for a more complex understanding of the interplay between the biological and discursive in the understanding of emotion: “[feelings] have a neurological basis but are shaped, repressed, expressed differently from place to place and era to era.”[[17]](#footnote-17)

 We agree with Matt’s position on the enmeshment of affect and emotion, alongside this historicity of both. We do not wish to follow the lead of those neuroscientists who conceive of affect as only ever pre-cognitive and universal across time and space. Nor do we want to separate affect entirely from intentionality. Ruth Leys has offered an effective critique of the limits and dangers of such an approach. In her examination of Silvan Tomkins, Paul Ekman, Brian Massumi, and others, Leys contends that these affect theorists operate from the assumption “that affect is independent of signification and meaning.”[[18]](#footnote-18) For Leys, this leads to a doubling down on the separation between mind and body, rather than an opening up of the ways in which intentionality might exceed its mindedness and likewise also be rooted in the body. We are similarly wary of suggestions that cognition comes “too late,” after an automatic, nonconscious affect has been worked out through the mind.[[19]](#footnote-19) However, this doesn’t mean that there is no difference between affect and emotion. Donovan O. Schaefer, drawing on the work of Lisa Barrett and Sianne Ngai, offers a clean definition in a complex debate: “affect-emotion is best understood as a continuum from micro to macro, rather than a different register altogether.”[[20]](#footnote-20) For Schaefer, affect is ever-present and “always humming through the immanent field of power relations.”[[21]](#footnote-21)

 One way to get at questions of affect and emotion is offered by historical anthropologist Monique Scheer. In her articulation of emotional practices, Scheer argues against the rigid separation between affect and emotion. This runs against some strains of affect theory that historians may be particularly suspicious about, especially those proffered by psychologists and neuroscientists trained in Silvan Tomkins’, or more properly Paul Ekman’s Basic Emotions hypothesis, which assert that there nine universal basic affects that persist across individuals and social contexts. Scheer contends that this way of thinking “depoliticizes” and “naturalizes” affect[[22]](#footnote-22), rather than acknowledging “the mutual embeddedness of minds, bodies, and social relations” which, in turn, allows us “to historicize the body and its contributions to the learned experience of emotions.”[[23]](#footnote-23) For Scheer, then, emotional practice is both the “doing and experience” of affect and emotion, both of which rooted in “the mindful body” with its many connections to structure, discourse, and power. Put differently, affect is best understood as an assemblage of bodily responses, feelings, and cognitive processing, always intersecting and interacting with the political and cultural contexts within which it emerges.[[24]](#footnote-24) Emotion then, as the social expression and performance of affect within the specific historical and geographical context, is “thickly, if fluidly, entangled” with affect.[[25]](#footnote-25)

 Like Scheer, we contend that that these “mindful bodies” – human and animal – are sites of encounter and struggle over meaning, practice, politics, and relationality. A focus on the body allows us to move from understanding the world as only made in and through discourse to an equal emphasis on material embodiment and relationality. Schaefer notes, affect has been particularly helpful in understanding the imbrication of human and animal lives, opening “a window onto the way that bodies operate prior to and in excess of language.”[[26]](#footnote-26) And yet, language – or discourse as language made in and through power – matters not only in the way it writes all kinds of bodies, but also in the way that it brings various bodies into being as legible and encounterable. In the afterword to *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*, feminist theorist Sara Ahmed offers an instructive articulation of the way in which affect, emotion, and power are sutured together, especially when bodies are thought to be excessive, or improperly placed. Describing the figure of the stranger, Ahmed notes that “to recognize somebody as a stranger is an affective judgement: a stranger is the one who seems suspicious; the one who lurks… There can be nothing more dangerous to a body than the social agreement that *that* body is dangerous.”[[27]](#footnote-27) Indeed, it is in the affective nature of the response – the quickness with which we determine bodies as in or out of place – that we see the impact of social norms. Put succinctly, Ahmed contends “there is nothing so mediated as immediacy.”[[28]](#footnote-28) Those responses which seem ‘natural’, ingrained, or automatic are, Ahmed would suggest, determined not just by bodily impulse but also by systems of power. And so, affect and emotion are inevitably rendered through the historical context in which they emerge, through the interplay of power and politics. As we argue here, affect can become the target of specific forms of power that seek to harness it for a variety of ends, even as it inevitably exceeds attempts at control. Indeed, the separating of affect from emotion elides ways that “forms of power work through affective life.”[[29]](#footnote-29)

 We contend that there are ways to study affect, emotion, and human-animal relations that might deepen our attunement to the more-than-human assemblages that inevitably make up the world, both in the past and present. So, history and geography matter in terms of how we account for affective life. But we also want to say something bigger about the relationship between animals, affect, emotion, and history. As Rob Boddice contends, emotions not only have a history, *they make history*.[[30]](#footnote-30) Similarly, Bathsheba Demuth has argued that humans’ and dogs’ emotional and affective responses to one another shaped history.[[31]](#footnote-31) The affective entanglements we describe here, in different times and places in postwar Canada, show that emotions forged a fraught and often lethal history for canids. Perceived affective excess in animals led to extreme emotional responses in humans, situated within colonialist attitudes towards northernness, which various state authorities leveraged to manage and contain the real and imagined risks posed by rabies. Following Sara Ahmed’s guidance not to trace what emotions are, but what they *do,*[[32]](#footnote-32)in the cases that follow we explore how people interpreted and felt the affective lives of animals, which induced a series of effects that curtailed and often ended canid life. We suggest that these effects cohered in what Ben Anderson, drawing on Raymond Williams, has named ‘structures of feeling’, which shape, coerce, and limit affective life and result in both representations and practices that have emotional charge.[[33]](#footnote-33) Anderson insists that affects are made in and through encounters; they are transpersonal. He writes: “Any particular body’s ‘charge of affect’ therefore carries traces of other bodies and both reflects, and contributes to, some form of complex, changing, relational field.”[[34]](#footnote-34) In this way, affects can become a “collective condition,” moving and shifting between bodies in ways that create particular conditions for the governing of affective life that are both temporally and spatially specific.[[35]](#footnote-35) Anderson’s work concerns itself with the way in which affective life is both organized and simultaneously exceeds the capacity for its organization.[[36]](#footnote-36) Similarly, we are interested in the ways that the affective registers produced by canids in postwar Canada moved from nonhuman to human bodies and institutions like the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and various wildlife authorities. We further suggest that these affects coalesced in an historically situated ‘structure of feeling’ that results in emotional practices that served to sooth anxiety and bolster the settler colonial Canadian state.

We offer two case studies – one on the slaughter of sled dogs in Nunavik and the other about rabies panics that unfolded in the provinces Alberta and Ontario – as heuristics that allow us to develop our theoretical claims. Other scholars, including the authors here, have offered full-length articles and texts on elements of these case studies, some of which we rely on to assert our key claims.[[37]](#footnote-37) We do not seek to duplicate their efforts. Rather, our main contribution is conceptual instead of empirical. We offer the stories of (presumed to be) rabid dogs, wolves, foxes, and coyotes in various parts of postwar Canada as instructive vignettes that allow us to understand how affective economies persist across time periods, geographies, and canid life. As Pascal Eitler notes, “it might be useful to attribute a history to those animals that have had direct encounters and confrontations with humans over a longer period of time and whose modes of existence have been traceably influenced by humans.”[[38]](#footnote-38) We contend that our reactions to those canids who are presumed to harbour rabies offer a valuable archive to trace these affective and emotional histories.

As such, we seek to build on and expand the emerging scholarship on the intersection between animals, affect, and emotional management through tracking its evolution in Canada.[[39]](#footnote-39) We suggest that the relationship between animality and affect needs to be understood within its entanglement with changing public health practices, wider cultural norms (in this case colonialist fears of northern wildness), and its historical and geographical context. Significantly, it needs to be situated alongside efforts to manage and mitigate excessive human and nonhuman affect.

Rabies raised the affective stakes of canid histories in postwar Canada. Historians have shown how this disease has stalked the relationship between humans and dogs. Its fearsome symptoms and the lack of effective treatment, until Louis Pasteur’s announcement of a rabies vaccination in 1885, raised anxieties despite the relatively low number of cases. Alongside Michael Worboys and Neil Pemberton’s pioneering *Rabies in Britain*, historians have traced the classed and gendered medical and popular understandings and management of this disease. They have shown how ‘mad dog’ scares animated urban life; how rabies seemed to strip its victims of their humanity; and how the disease motivated the impoundment and slaughter of street dogs.[[40]](#footnote-40) While much of this work has focused on Europe and North America, historians have begun to investigate the histories of rabies in the Global South. They show how colonialism spread Western rabies control measures, such as the impoundment and slaughter of street dogs, to Southern Africa, India, China, and Singapore, as well as how Pasteur Institutes proliferated across Asian and African colonies. However, much of this scholarship focuses on nineteenth- and early-twentieth century cities, when fears of rabies were at their height, and tends to only focus on urban dogs. In this article we instead focus on rural areas and consider dogs alongside other animal vectors of the disease. This echoes Karen Brown’s approach in *Mad Dogs and Meerkats*, which we develop by stressing the affective, rather than mainly medical, responses to the disease.[[41]](#footnote-41)

Our focus on rabies in northern climates is also significant. While some nineteenth century commentators marveled at how the tropics seemed free of rabies, the increased suppression of the disease in Europe and North America has since turned rabies into a ‘neglected tropical disease’ within postwar global health discourse. One of our aims here is to challenge this framing, by exploring the links made between rabies and Northernness in the postwar Global North. These associations unconsciously reheated the arguments of some nineteenth-century commentators who blamed Spitz dogs for spreading rabies in Massachusetts and New York. The dogs’ northern origins were said to make them unsuited to the hot and humid summers of the East Coast, while also making them savage, as shown through their bad tempers and tendency to bite. The *New York Times* even declared them to be most dangerous animal it the United States, ahead of the rattlesnake.[[42]](#footnote-42) Here, we show how this often-overlooked understanding of the disease – as a disease of the wild and frozen North – has existed alongside its framing as a ‘neglected tropical disease,’ and how this has altered the lives of canids in postwar Canada.

In Canada, defining the North is a less straightforward process than one might assume. Indeed, many scholars writing about Canada’s North note its capaciousness.[[43]](#footnote-43) Geographically, when the North is mentioned, some think of the Arctic Circle; others take the North to mean the three northern territories (Yukon, Northwest Territories, and Nunavut); still others might point to territory that has permafrost, which includes most Canadian provinces. But if the North is geographically indistinct, it is even more culturally flexible. Sherrill E. Grace suggests that the North must be understood as a discursive formation made in and through settler colonialism, one which simultaneously invents the North as “deadly, cold, empty, barren, isolated, mysterious” – as other – alongside, and sometimes coincident with, other representations of it as a site of “sublime beauty, abundance, natural resources waiting to be exploited.”[[44]](#footnote-44) Perhaps because of this adaptability, the North is a source of Canadian national identity, even, or especially, for southerners who have never visited it. As an idea, then, rather than an actual homeplace of the Inuit since time immemorial, the North offered a highly malleable metaphor to suture the cracks in an emerging nation. In the context of the rabies panics that emerged in postwar Canada, the North was discursively produced and deployed as dangerous and vast, a source of infection that, if left unchecked, would sweep across the rest of Canada.

**The Sled Dog Slaughter**

In 1920 there were 20,000 dogs in the Arctic; by 1970 there were less than 200 left.[[45]](#footnote-45) What rendered *qimmiit* nearly extinct was a complex series of events which unfurled throughout the region wherein (usually white) settlers and members of the Canadian government conducted a campaign to slaughter *qimmiit* throughout the Arctic. The Qikiqtani Truth Commission and Makivik Corporation concluded that there were many reasons for the killing of sled dogs: if they were deemed to be sick, a threat to public safety or simply a nuisance.[[46]](#footnote-46) Others have argued that the death of these dogs was emblematic of the cultural transformation imposed on the Arctic by the Canadian colonial project[[47]](#footnote-47), or was a misguided attempt at safeguarding public health.[[48]](#footnote-48) Whilst these arguments have merit, we draw attention to the historically specific affective dimensions of the sled dog slaughter and argue that affect also held an important role.

In the early twentieth century, the Canadian state sought to establish sovereignty over the Arctic, initially through Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) patrols, which increasingly interfered in the lives of Inuit. It attempted to force them to assimilate into white settler Canadian culture, violently relocating and coercing many Inuit into permanent settlements throughout the Arctic.[[49]](#footnote-49) By the 1950s, many Inuit had been forced to give up their nomadic way of life and were cohabiting in settlements with white Canadians. When fears of the savagery of *qimmiit* and the danger of the Arctic dovetailed with those of rabies, white Canadians’ affective responses had lethal consequences for the dogs.

Many white Canadians feared the Arctic, its people, and its animals. Nineteenth century tales of often-disastrous polar explorations had shaped white understandings of the Arctic and transformed it into a hostile, icy wasteland in the white Canadian imagination.[[50]](#footnote-50) These narratives extended the hostility of the environment to its inhabitants, who living under such conditions, were described as primitive and savage.[[51]](#footnote-51) These racist imaginaries were projected onto the dogs of the Inuit, who were considered not yet fully domesticated.[[52]](#footnote-52) In 1824 British explorer William Edward Parry transported the skeletons of a wolf and *qimmiit* to England in his attempt to prove that the *qimmiit* were not actually dogs at all, but wolf-dog hybrids. On his expedition, although his team relied upon *qimmiit* dog teams to survive, in his published diaries, Parry described their “long melancholy howl like that of a wolf” and how they were often “mistaken for that animal.”[[53]](#footnote-53) The idea stuck and in 1869 *The American Naturalist* described the *qimmiit* as dogs of “a barbarous nation” who retained many “wolfish trait[s]” from this “ancestry.”[[54]](#footnote-54) These characteristics were reaffirmed with Jack London’s famous 1903 novel *The Call of the Wild*,which emphasized the harsh environment of the Canadian North and its corrupting effect on creatures there, who in their struggle to survive, reverted to a primitive and wild state.[[55]](#footnote-55) The harnessing of affective registers was utilized to buttress a settler colonial claim to what was thought of as an unruly land that authorized state repression.

 When the Canadian government sought to establish sovereignty over the Arctic with RCMP posts and patrols, the newcomers from the RCMP continued to see the region as an uncivilized and inhospitable place.[[56]](#footnote-56) Like their polar-explorer predecessors, the RCMP officers also relied upon dogs to survive and traverse the Arctic yet did not trust the animals entirely. One RCMP officer stationed in what is now Nunavut described them as “strange dog of the northeast Arctic … half Arctic wolf and half dog”, which “never seems to respond to an offer of friendliness from man.”[[57]](#footnote-57) In 1924 the suspicions of the RCMP were confirmed in Chesterfield Inlet when a team of police sled-dogs attacked Maggie Clay, an officer’s wife. The “half-savage” Arctic dogs were unable to control what we might regard as their own affective responses, according to eyewitnesses. Statements given to the Canadian press reiterated the untrustworthiness of the Arctic dog, describing how although one had “accidentally drew blood”, afterwards “it and the others then set upon her.”[[58]](#footnote-58) Supposedly unable to resist their innate bloodlust and instinct to form packs, the sled dogs mauled Clay so severely that she eventually died. The event caused waves of horror in witnesses and prompted the RCMP into action to control their feelings of unease: a Corporal named Petty perfunctorily concluded his report of the event by noting that “of course, all dogs connected in the matter were at once shot.”[[59]](#footnote-59)

 When news reached the Canadian South, the press sensationalised the affair, emphasizing the dangerousness of the Arctic and its dogs, and stoking further fears of both. The *Winnipeg Evening Tribune* described the “tragic death” of Clay who fell prey to the “vicious” and “blood-maddened dogs”, whilst the *Toronto Globe* described it as a “stark and cruel tragedy”.[[60]](#footnote-60) The news dwelt on Clay’s white femininity against a backdrop of a wild and hostile environment and warned readers of the dangers of getting too close to the Northern wilderness. The dogs were quickly established as villains, who despite being under the supposedly civilizing care of white RCMP officers had reverted to a savage state and attacked Clay in frenzied bloodlust. RCMP histories embellished the duplicitous nature of the dog attack by describing how Clay, as the dog’s mistress, had “fondled and fed [them] in puppyhood”.[[61]](#footnote-61)

 Over the next 30 years, Canada continued to extend control over the Arctic, more RCMP patrols were set up, as well as permanent settlements and schools. [[62]](#footnote-62) Yet, Clay’s death haunted the RCMP force.[[63]](#footnote-63) The perceived danger of *qimmiit* was a cause of concern for members of the public, who feared that the RCMP’s reliance on the dogs to pull sleds exposed them to potential harm. In 1961, the RCMP responded to a letter querying the usage of the dogs, informing the author that Clay’s death was “the *only* case of a member’s wife or child being attacked and killed by dogs in the North.”[[64]](#footnote-64) Despite this, white RCMP officers appeared unable to control their own affective responses to *qimmiit:* the letter explained that the dogs were “untrustworthy… less reliable than the ordinary house pet with which most people are familiar in the South.” This was attributed to the *qimmiit* having an “instinct to kill, which is very likely hereditary” because the “female dogs have, over the years, been crossed with Arctic Wolves.”[[65]](#footnote-65) The alleged ancestry of the *qimmiit* meant that more than Southern house dogs, they were liable to descend into a wild and violent state, with sometimes lethal consequences. Whilst the public was frequently warned to be aware of the danger posed by these dogs, when these ideas joined with fears of rabies, lethal violence was instigated against the *qimmiit.*

 White visitors to the Arctic first encountered rabies there in 1875. Explorers found an “Arctic Dog Disease”, a nosology which persisted well into the twentieth century until the disease was conclusively confirmed to be rabies.[[66]](#footnote-66) The fox was blamed as the primary reservoir of this disease, being called “the original Canadian villain” by the *Winnipeg Tribune*.[[67]](#footnote-67) Foxes and the Arctic North became linked, with newspapers warning that foxes in the South could “spread what is sometimes called ‘Arctic madness.’”[[68]](#footnote-68) Affective responses to the Arctic further developed in the 1950s: it was no longer merely feared for its hostile environment and savage wildlife, but for the terrifying zoonoses it harboured.

 As Inuit were increasingly forced to move to permanent settlements in the Arctic, their dogs quickly came under suspicion as disease vectors. Whilst Inuit had historically used large packs of *qimmiit* to pull sleds, hunt, and travel long distances, in settlements, many Inuk lived with their dogs who no longer served hunting and transport purposes for most of the season. Thus, *qimmiit* began to roam the settlements in packs. The mobility of the *qimmiit* provoked affective responses: many whites treated them as a disgusting annoyance that fouled settlements and feared them as potentially dangerous. When rabies broke out almost every year from 1959 onwards, the status of *qimmiit* was elevated from nuisance to threat.

 The paternalistic and colonialist interest taken by the Canadian state in the lives of Inuit became enfolded with public health discourse and practice. Studying Arctic settlements in 1961, a physician named Robert Fortuine described the plight of Inuit as “desperate” due to the “debilitating and often fatal diseases which have long been endemic among [them] as a result of their traditional ways and customs. These are zoonoses, or animal-borne diseases”, and the blame for their transmission lay in “intimacy with animals”.[[69]](#footnote-69) Despite the absence of any recorded human deaths from rabies in Canada’s northernmost region,[[70]](#footnote-70) Fortuine nonetheless declared the disease “of major significance.” The lack of human deaths was “merely good fortune” because the Inuit were “constantly bitten by their dogs.”[[71]](#footnote-71) In reality, Inuit had their own methods for dealing with rabid *qimmiit,* usually by killing a sick animal. In contrast, the RCMP and white civilians chose to quell their fears by engaging in their own methods of dog and disease control that targeted *qimmiit* en masse.[[72]](#footnote-72)

 The terror of rabies triggered a massive response in the Arctic; affects cohered in emotional practice. The sight of a fox close to a settlement in 1960 spurred public health officials to action, and they inoculated hundreds of Arctic dogs as a precaution.[[73]](#footnote-73) Alongside these extensive inoculation campaigns, veterinarians advised that “vaccination is only part of the control programme” and advocated for “the tying [up] of all full-grown animals… as well as the destruction of all stray and unused dogs.”[[74]](#footnote-74) But, the effectiveness of tying up *qimmiit* was hampered by the animals’ tenacious chewing, as well as the scarcity and unaffordability of chains in the Arctic. So many *qimmiit* still wandered loose through settlements.[[75]](#footnote-75) Thus, despite widespread vaccination drives, the whites felt that their growing unease towards *qimmiit* could only be quelled with lethal force. The slaughter of these supposedly useless animals was justifiable for public health reasons.

 Returning to the case of Puvirnituq that opened this article, killing led to new emotions. In Puvirnituq, Inuit witnessed their dogs being slaughtered, and later reflected on their experiences in testimony to the Makivik Corporation.[[76]](#footnote-76) The centuries of scaremongering which had established the *qimmiit* as dangerous creatures for white Canadians was countered by the Inuit’s own understandings and histories with *qimmiit.* Rather than deadly and deceitful beasts, the Inuit regarded *qimmiit* as their “only allies”, according to one resident, Samisa Sala.[[77]](#footnote-77) *Qimmiit* were crucial for hunting, but they also played a role in many Inuit mythologies and were sometimes given a shared name with family members, spiritually linking them.[[78]](#footnote-78) This radically different relationship to relationship to *qimmiit* made the lethal force unjustifiable. Matiusi Amarualik testified that:

They said the dogs were ferocious, they didn’t want the dogs mauling and killing people, those were the reasons given… [But] I used to sleep between our dogs and was never afraid of them… When they said our dogs were murderers, I didn’t believe them.[[79]](#footnote-79)

During the slaughter, many Inuit suffered intensely as they tried to protect their dogs. Eli Qumaaluk described how “I couldn’t even sleep at night trying to keep the dogs alive”.[[80]](#footnote-80)

 Yet the same colonial relations which had shaped how whites saw the dogs prevented many Inuit from taking action to save their dogs. When the dogs were slaughtered, Taamusi Sivuaraapik struggled when he “tried to resist” because he found “police or any *qablunaat*[[81]](#footnote-81)… really intimidating, we would not say anything… That’s how it was. Heart thumping with rage … anger, but intimidation.”[[82]](#footnote-82) Aside from rage, others felt grief, and Sala concluded that “my spirit was broken.”[[83]](#footnote-83) With dog slaughters taking place throughout the Arctic, and these feelings lingered and grew. In the 1990s they resurfaced in the newly established province of Nunavut, resulting in years of national debate, truth commissions and monetary compensation for many with an aim to heal the historical trauma.[[84]](#footnote-84)

 Ultimately, the Puvirnituq affair had little to do with public health or the actual dangers of the dogs, but rather the perceived threat of *qimmiit* and the affective responses they provoked. In settlements, whites feared and detested the *qimmiit* due to their alleged wolfishness and ‘savage’ Arctic temperament. When these ideas intermeshed with the dread provoked by rabies, feelings of anxiety and fear grew and fermented resulting in lethal violence intended to control both the dogs and the emotions they inspired. Yet in Puvirnituq and other Arctic settlements, the slaughter of dogs did not relieve white residents’ anxieties, even if they had instigated the killings. Instead, it complicated their feelings of anxiety and unease as they reflected on their role in the canicide, and simultaneously spread feelings of widespread grief, anger, and loss amongst the Inuit.

**Rabies Panics in Alberta and Ontario in the 1950s and 1960s**

Dogs were not the only canids that presented as affective animals;[[85]](#footnote-85) wolves, foxes, and coyotes also demonstrated a troublesome excess of affect, which, in turn, authorized all manner of emotional responses on the part of humans. We can look at the case of wild canids suspected of being rabid in Canada – sometimes in the face of little evidence – to see how this unfolds. The panics began in 1952. That summer, a rabid fox crossed the border between the Northwest Territories and northern Alberta and bit four dogs in Fort Fitzgerald, Alberta, initiating the beginning of the crisis.[[86]](#footnote-86) In the eight months that followed, the disease spread some 750 miles, reaching the southernmost portion of the province. Over the course of the next few years, the infectious disease moved eastward, and was well established in Northern and Central Ontario by 1958. By all accounts, rabies was spreading inexorably south.[[87]](#footnote-87) Indeed, in 1958, the *Toronto Daily Star* named the city of Toronto “surrounded” by the disease.[[88]](#footnote-88)

 That rabies seeped in from the North was significant to the anxiety it produced. Indeed, its northern origin was often mentioned in accounts of both the severity and extent of the disease. For example, in the film “Rabies in Your Community”, explored in more detail below, as well as numerous press reports, the North was rendered an ungovernable space of infection where the elimination of rabies proved an impossibility.[[89]](#footnote-89) Associated with the narrative of a malign and chaotic North, the wildlife that moved down from the northern reaches of Canada was already tainted. Indeed, the North was often described as “harbouring rabid foxes for many decades” in the form of “Arctic madness” that later established itself in the wildlife populations of both Alberta and Ontario.[[90]](#footnote-90) Wild animal bodies were suspect, harboring the potential for infection and painful death to more valuable animals and to people. And so, animals like wolves, foxes, coyotes, bears, cougars, lynx, and skunks became lively targets in a militarized ecology of fear.

 Over the course of the crises in Alberta and Ontario, rabies was described in terms that situated it not only as a northern, but also an affective and embodied disorder. It was presented as an inversion of appropriate animal life made manifest in a kind of affective excess. This was clear in descriptions of “furious” or “mad dog” rather than “dumb” or “paralytic” rabies.[[91]](#footnote-91) In dogs, furious rabies could be characterized by “capricious” or “irritable or depressed” behaviour, where the animals displayed “anger, are easily excited, fretful, change from one place to another, are easily frightened on the slightest cause or may become very affectionate… and demonstrate an increase in sexual desire.”[[92]](#footnote-92) In wildlife, similar affective changes were noted. Rabid foxes, for instance, the first and worst culprit of rabies spread in both Alberta and Ontario, were said to be “very bold, without fear of man or beast” and instances were described in which they attempted to kill fenced dogs and penned livestock. But rabies also rendered foxes incapable of distinguishing between animate and inanimate objects, and they attacked both car bumpers and tractor tires with abandon.[[93]](#footnote-93) These ways of describing rabid foxes persisted after the original panics subsided. As late as 1963, the Saskatchewan Department of Public Health noted that while rabid foxes “retained their native cunning” they also “lose all fear of their natural enemies.”[[94]](#footnote-94) The Department ominously advised that “whenever a fox does not act like a wild fox, it should be considered rabid until proved otherwise.”[[95]](#footnote-95)

 In Alberta, wolves proved particularly unmanageable once they contracted rabies, as they were afflicted, like their dog kin, with its furious form.[[96]](#footnote-96) As a 1952 article in the *Washington Post* about the epidemic recounted, this led wolves to terrorize communities in northern Alberta:

A frightening brush with a mad timber wolf was experienced by Mr. and Mrs. Steve Kowal, who farm west of Fort Vermilion. This beast, after biting 12 hogs and a cow, attacked the Kowal home. The 150-pound animal gnashed at the wood on the entrance and hurled all its weight forward in an attempt to open the door. It took the combined strength of the Kowals to keep the mad beast out…A few miles away another wolf attacked a farmer working on a tractor in the field. The animal chewed tractor tires before disappearing.”[[97]](#footnote-97)

In this telling, Alberta farmers were beset by ravening hordes of giant rabid wolves, slavering at the door. Wolf aggression was amplified by rabies, generating unpredictable animal affects that frightened whole communities.
 In Ontario, the epidemic was squarely pinned on the red fox; the numbers bear this focus out. For example, across the years 1958-1960, foxes and livestock (presumed to be bitten by foxes) showed the highest cases of infection. Like wolves in Alberta, advice from government officials was that any fox encountered should be presumed rabid. By 1961 after the crisis in Ontario had crested, Department of Agriculture officials continued to assert that “an estimate that 60 per cent of all foxes killed are rabid would be a conservative one.”[[98]](#footnote-98)

 The 1958 Canadian Department of Agriculture film entitled “Rabies in Your Community” dramatizes many of these affective dimensions, as well as the emotional responses deployed to manage them. The film dramatizes the experience of a rabies outbreak in a town “on the edge of lived-in country where the foxes of the North first meet civilization” as part of an education campaign to convince the public of the urgency of the threat.[[99]](#footnote-99) The narrative follows a boy whose dog is bitten by a fox that it chased and killed. Admonishing his son not to touch the body, the boy’s father notes that the fox “has a strange look”—an uncommon embodiment that could signal infection – and calls the Health of Animals vet for the district. The narrator intones: “A maddened rabid fox, made fearless by infection. That was how the trouble started in our community one day on Ed Brown’s farm.” The film follows what happens as the dog is penned and watched for changes in character. In the end, it does have dumb rabies and displays a “droopy” affect; it is eventually killed. But all kinds of other responses are at play too. The vet has to contend with townspeople who are either fearful, or conversely, skeptical of both the risk and of the idea that dogs should be tied. For example, one of the town councilors, Mr. Johnson, notes that “There’s been one rabid fox in all the time I’ve been around here, and he’s dead. You threw an awful scare into my grandson. He goes slinking around corners with the dog tied to a piece of rope around his neck.” Soon enough, one of Mr. Johnson’s cows becomes rabid from a fox bite and he is sufficiently terrified that he may have also contracted rabies that he has a change of perspective. In this film, we see both the threads of the narrative we have traced in this article. Unbound northernness is named as the origin of the crisis where an untamed landscape gives rise to uncontrollable wildlife. Furthermore, the film relies on affect – the dog’s changed behaviour after infection, the boy’s sadness at the loss of his dog, the councilor’s outrage and skepticism at first, which then morphs into fear of contagion – to tell the tale of what happens when rabies from the North is allowed to fester, unchecked. “Rabies in Your Community” ties fear of the North and fear of rabies into an effective public education tool to quell anxiety about the disease.

 There is some evidence to suggest that the evocation of affect that was part of the persuasive power of “Rabies in Your Community,” alongside other outreach efforts may have been *too* effective. Simply put, such efforts produced affective excess. As early as 1955, the president of the Toronto Humane Society, W.G.F. Grant, noted, “There is no need for alarm. Unnecessary fear can be a serious deterrent to effective control of the disease.”[[100]](#footnote-100) Similarly an article in the *Toronto Daily Star* posited that “it’s an agonizing disease, inevitably fatal once you contact [sic] it but, even if a person went out deliberately to catch it, he’d have a hard time succeeding.”[[101]](#footnote-101) In 1968, after years of warnings about the severity and extent of the outbreak, the Ontario Humane Society warned that fear of the “dread disease” led members of the public to suspect that any behaviour even slightly outside of the norm was evidence of rabies and “the reaction is to publicly threaten to shoot, on sight, all dogs found at large.”[[102]](#footnote-102) While harnessing and amplifying fear in anti-rabies education may have proven effective, once loosed, it was difficult to control.

 These affects and their social expression via programs aimed at eradicating rabies did not leave animal life untouched; they *did* things that reshaped human and canid life. In Alberta, fears generated by both the way in which rabies presented and the public relations efforts to highlight the risks, produced what Karen R. Jones has termed “lupophobia”[[103]](#footnote-103) that authorized an “aggressive and extensive wildlife depopulation” campaign to shoot, poison, and trap all possible mammalian vectors for rabies in Alberta, with special focus on foxes, wolves, and coyotes.[[104]](#footnote-104) This was accompanied by the language of invasion and battle to describe a campaign compared to “an atomic onslaught.”[[105]](#footnote-105) The goal was to eliminate any threat, to impart a kind of affective certainty in anxious times. This certainty was secured through the weaponization of landowners, farmers, and trappers. As noted wildlife biologist Douglas Pimlott catalogued, during the period of the crisis, “39,960 cyanide guns, 106,000 cartridges, and 628,000 strychnine pellets” were distributed in the effort to eliminate all wild canids. In 1953 and 1954 alone, “170 trappers were hired to ring the settled area of the province with 5,000 miles of traplines and poison stations.”[[106]](#footnote-106) Historian George Colpitts notes that these traplines, if extended end to end, would have run between Edmonton, Alberta and St. John, Newfoundland.[[107]](#footnote-107) In addition, thousands of bait stations were installed across Alberta and British Columbia; these provinces were literally blanketed in poison. The results of this systematic program were astonishing: the wolf population in Alberta went from a stable 5,000 animals in 1950 to between 500 and 1,000 by the late 1950s.[[108]](#footnote-108) An estimated 246,800 coyotes were purposely killed in the same period.[[109]](#footnote-109)

In Ontario the response may have been less lethal, but it was similarly disproportionate. A series of articles in *The Globe and Mail* in 1958 and 1959 discuss the “all-out war” on the fox,[[110]](#footnote-110) which resulted in bounties and “giant foxhunts”[[111]](#footnote-111) as means to eliminate the threat.[[112]](#footnote-112) Poisoning campaigns were also advocated for by various government agencies. For instance, in a Department of Public Health memorandum to the Ontario Department of Lands and Forests, Dr. W.G. Brown stressed the need to control fox population, much like the depopulation campaign in Alberta (though on a much smaller scale) since they were “the source of the menace of rabies to our human population at this present time.”[[113]](#footnote-113) The Federal-Provincial Interdepartmental Rabies Committee agreed that experimental depopulation should be undertaken in two counties – Durham and Prince Edward – even as they noted there was no evidence to point to its success: “The Committee realizes that there is no proof that depopulation of foxes will eliminate rabies in a given area. However, there exists a public health problem and a danger to livestock, both of which must be considered.”[[114]](#footnote-114) Not only was there no proof that depopulation would work, but there was also no proof of rabies in Prince Edward County at all.[[115]](#footnote-115)

 What is potentially more astonishing than the quantity of animal casualties is that the numbers of wildlife found to be rabid were vanishingly small, especially in Alberta where the response was the most extreme. For instance, at the height of the epidemic in 1952–53, only 39 foxes, 17 coyotes, and 6 wolves were found to be rabid in Alberta.[[116]](#footnote-116) Indeed, from 1952–1957, only 10 wolves were diagnosed with rabies across Canada. In Ontario, rabies numbers were far higher than those in Alberta. For instance, in 1958 and 1959, some 3745 animals were documented with rabies, including 273 cats and dogs, 1623 farm animals and 1846 wild animals, a catchall category that included wolves, foxes, skunks, and raccoons. But Toronto was never under threat of being inundated with the disease. Across Canada, human deaths caused by rabies were even more miniscule: 16 deaths between 1925 and 1961.[[117]](#footnote-117)

 And so, it seems in the absence of immediate danger, threat was nonetheless felt and harnessed by various wildlife authorities, sometimes with effects that exceeded their intention. George Colpitts reminds us that this trajectory has a longer history. Commenting on the link between rabies control and moral reform, he notes that “rabies panics in England from the 1830s onwards coincided with moral reform movements that saw the behaviours of ‘wild’ and ‘unruly’ elements of society, both human and urban canine, as a larger problem of unseemly and uncontrolled behaviour in urban environments.”[[118]](#footnote-118) And so, anti-rabies campaigns could be enacted in places with little evidence of rabies outbreak. What mattered was the affective states such perceived threats produced and the certainties that could be offered through their elimination.

**Conclusion**

Affects are constantly infusing embodied practices, resonating with discourses, coalescing around images, becoming part of institutions, animating political violences, catalysing political communities, and being known and intervened in, amongst much else.[[119]](#footnote-119)

The lethal human encounters with *qimmiit* and wildlifedescribed in this article were ostensibly about shoring up public health that was under threat from the potentially deadly rabies virus. But while these interventions were rendered and legitimized through the supposedly objective and clinical language of preventative health measures, we contend that the killing of these canids was about more than the halting of a rather limited spread of rabies in postwar Canada. Instead, the panics which authorized violence against dogs and their wild kin were less about disease and more about efforts to remake the world in ways that assuaged anxieties about an untameable North and excessive wildness. As such, the killing of these apparently dangerously affective animals offered the assertion of control over a host of unruly affects; lethal measures curtailed the affective excess of canids while simultaneously mollifying their unwanted and sometimes complex impacts on human emotions. In each of the cases presented here, canids and people were sutured together in an affective assemblage, tied in knots of power that often meant that for settlers to feel at home in places they claimed as their own, that intemperate and unrestrained animality had to be swiftly and efficiently dispatched. These assemblages were both immediate and physical *and* rooted in deeply-held and long-standing cultural colonialist attitudes towards northernness. As such, dog and wildlife slaughter operated as an emotional balm that re-established and policed the boundaries between people and animals that unseen, but powerful viruses can reveal as fiction.

Of course, these attempts to re-assert control over a lively landscape were and remain elusive. Rabies still remains and outbreaks emerge cyclically in the Canadian north, disrupting the image of the disease as a problem caused by free-living dogs in the Global South. The lessons offered in the cases studies presented in this article show how affect and emotion are often embedded in efforts to manage zoonotic risk, then and now. More than ever, perhaps, it is imperative to understand and critique the conditions in which excessive human affect leads to unnecessary violence against animals.
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