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Many academics in political science and related disciplines struggle with the concept and even the very definition of the term "postcolonial." How do we decide who is postcolonial, who can legitimately speak about colonialism, and how does this translate into action? This essay is an exploration of the Canadian icon Emily Carr as a political actor who struggled to find her place in the colonial structure, before rejecting it in favour of those the structure had excluded and with whom she felt more comfortable: the indigenous peoples of the west coast of North America. Carr’s connection with them eventually inspired her life’s work and led her to what she characterized as the happiest days of her life, enjoying the soli-
tude of the western Canadian natural landscape with her menagerie of animals.

Can we read the life of Emily Carr contrapuntally to attribute to her a “postcolonial personality”? How did she understand and relate to the indigenous peoples and places she painted? Was her art a challenge to the colonial structure she was brought up in? Does Carr represent

Sylvia Nicholles is a political science student struggling through her final year. She still has yet to work out what her definition of politics is, but she’s getting there through her study of urban politics and theory.
Edward Said’s migrant, “whose consciousness is that of the intellectual and artist in exile, the political figure between domains, between forms, between homes, and between languages?”\(^1\) Certainly these questions are much too large to be answered conclusively in this essay, but through a discussion of Carr’s early life, her resistance to the structures placed upon her, her voluntary exile into the marginalized villages of the indigenous peoples she felt comfortable with and her spiritual journey into modern art, I will examine the complexities surrounding her life, work and relationships. I will explore whether she was an embodiment of the process of enacting theory into reality and if she represented a lived experience of resistance against a colonial structure. Finally, I will end with an exploration of what promise Carr’s lived experience holds for those attempting to forge a common citizenship with people who have been excluded by colonial and imperial structures.

Carr’s relationship with the colonial structure she was born into in the late 19\(^{th}\) century was complex. Her English colonial settler family in the metropolis of Victoria, British Columbia was highly religious. At this time, Victoria was the older, more settled city in relation to Vancouver. Carr was born to Richard and Emily Carr in 1871, the same year that British Columbia became a Province of the Dominion of Canada,\(^2\) placing her squarely into the colonial settler society of Fort Victoria. The building of Victoria as a fort is symbolic of the creation of the binary between metropolis and periphery, a dualism noted by Antonio Gramsci.\(^3\) Fortresses are built to guard, to protect, to fortify, and this is what the settlers of Victoria did in their culture and society. Said expresses that this process of entrenching a culture “differentiates ‘us’ from ‘them’, almost always with some degree of xenophobia. Culture in this sense is a source of identity, and a rather combative one at that.”\(^4\) Rebellion against the xenophobia of her culture was prevalent in Carr’s actions and her life. However, her childhood affected her; the colonial structures that were imprinted on her at an early age were not something she could easily give up. Inclined to both rebellion and conformity, the separation between colonial society and her Western Canada is a dualism that Carr struggled with her entire life.

**Early Years**

Emily described her father, Richard Carr, as “ultra-English, a straight, stern autocrat.”\(^5\) Richard was known for doting on Emily; however, he would often say that she should have been a boy.\(^6\) She rebelled from a young age, and after losing her mother at age fourteen and her father
two years later, she resisted her strict older sister, the matriarch of the household. Carr travelled to San Francisco at the age of nineteen to study art. In America she began to identify herself as Canadian, but from English parents. This trip to San Francisco affirmed her as an artist and marked the beginning of her lifelong work. Carr began to question the extravagance of the times she lived in, an extravagance made particularly clear when her art school in San Francisco moved from an old, rundown building to a newer, more elegant mansion. She comments, "we were a great deal more elegant here but we were not so cozy or so free as we had been in the old place...humanity was closer down there than up here." Carr describes a painting that hung in this mansion that reflected the then-ongoing colonization process: "Its subject matter was a long row of cannons and across the mouth of each a man was bound awaiting the signal, ‘Fire,’ which would scatter him to bits. I shall see the dreadful agony of those faces as long as I live." Her comments reflect an antagonism to art representing the brutal realities of colonization, and may have been the beginning of her moral unease with the subjugation of the "other" to the colonial structure.

Upon her return to Victoria, Carr travelled to Ucluelet (on Vancouver Island), where the indigenous peoples gave her the name Klee Wyck, or "Laughing One." This visit shaped later trips to other villages, and feelings towards the people and the places she attempted to capture in her art. Carr felt great sympathy for the indigenous tribes of the West Coast and she firmly blamed European colonization for their poor and dispirited condition. She befriended the people in Ucluelet and reveals in *Klee Wyck* that she felt "comfort and pleasure in the company of the First Nations people." Carr displays this notion of non-conformity to conservative Victorianism throughout her life: travelling solo as a young woman to London; her manner of dress later in life; her love of animals; her outspokenness; and, perhaps most importantly, her attempts to create distinctly Canadian art. To Carr, this meant defining the Canadian West as not only a settler territory, but also one in which the indigenous communities were involved. As Carr was acting in a time when Canada was still defining itself, her vision of Canada was uniquely separate from the civilizing missions sent to what were then defined as the "peripheries." She looks back in *Klee Wyck* to "her experiences with Indians" and her visits to Indian communities, giving us an image of the fully engaged, self-forgetting artist, 'fighting' her way through to her subjects, responding intensely and openly to their messages. 

\[1\] Please see Appendix 1 for my digression on the use of this word.
Michael Shapiro articulates an interesting relationship between art and nation building, as “[v]isual media, like the literary genres and print media...articulate a spatiotemporality that facilitates collective identity, for a ‘nation’ emerges as a mode of ‘moulding and interpreting space,’ as well as a locus of attachment.”12 Carr’s paintings reflect her choice to identify as Canadian, and her unique definition of what Canada encapsulated is important when reflecting on her challenge to how the colonial settlers defined Canada. Carr’s Canada was not one of building communities of exclusion, but rather a place of respecting, learning from, and creating citizenship based on a Canada shared with the peoples that already lived there.

Carr travelled to London in 1900, inspired by two artists who came to Victoria to paint; their prognosis of the Canadian landscape was that it was “crude, unpaintable. Its bigness angered, its vastness and wild spaces terrified them.”13 Carr’s time in London was fraught with homesickness, in part because “so few [in London] accepted Canada. These people called us Colonials.”14 Carr refused to let go of her Canada and allow it to be "polished" out of her, as her family in Victoria wished: “I am Canadian, I am not English. I do not want Canada polished out of me.”15 Her time in London confirmed that her life work was more important than conforming to the societal norms of the era, including finding a husband—she rejected two potential suitors during her stay. Carr’s non-conformity in London led to her being diagnosed with hysteria, a form of illness “commonly diagnosed for women at the time. It was thought to be the result of women’s emotional nature and their denial of their ‘God-given’ and socially ordained roles.”16

Carr’s return to Victoria indicated to her sisters that she was not going to conform, nor be "gentled" by England. Rather she says, “I was more me than ever, just pure me.”17 This rebellious sense of self caused her to be dismissed from her first job for the Vancouver Art Club, which she characterized as “[a] cluster of society women who intermittently packed themselves and their admirers into a small rented studio to drink tea and jabber art jargon.”18 Carr was deemed too shy, and not cosmopolitan enough for their liking. This pushed her even further from adult Victorian society towards children, animals and those excluded from colonial society: the indigenous peoples. In Vancouver, Carr began a lifelong friendship with Sophie, a woman from the Kitsilano reserve. Despite the language barrier between the two women, this bond was later

1 See Appendix 2. Emily’s rejection of colonial attitudes towards women is nicely summarized in these cartoon sketches.
characterized by Lawren Harris (an "official" member of the Group of Seven) as proving "that race, colour, class and caste mean nothing in reality; quality of soul alone counts. Deep love transcends even quality of soul...It is unusual, so deep a relationship between folks of different races." Harris’ opinion is not undisputed, as Carr never attempted to learn Sophie’s language; however, the relationship was still significant in that it transcended barriers of race.

Emily and her sister Alice travelled to Alaska in the summer of 1907. Carr saw this trip to Alaska as a transformative experience, giving purpose and direction to her life and her art. She writes: "[we] passed many Indian villages on our way down the coast. The Indian people and their art touched me deeply...by the time I reached home my mind was made up. I was going to paint totem poles in their own village settings, as complete a collection of them as I could." This trip had a profound impact on Carr’s understanding of art and what she could learn from the indigenous peoples: “Indian art broadened my seeing, loosened the formal tightness I had learned in England’s schools. Its bigness and stark reality baffled my white man’s understanding.” Through revering their art forms, Carr was able to express the hybridity of her personality and her struggle to find her place within (or out of) colonial society. She states, “I was as Canadian-born as the Indian, but behind me were Old World heredity and ancestry as well as Canadian environment. The new West called me...but the flavour of my upbringing pulled me back. I have been schooled to see outsiders only, not struggle to pierce...I had learned a lot from these Indians.” Carr probably wrote the above quotation from a literal perspective, but it shows her recognition of the outside/inside dichotomy that had been impressed upon her by her experience in London. Carr’s mention of how much she learned shows not only her sense of respect for indigenous people and their art, but also her ability to transcend the racist colonial travel literature popular in the era. Overcoming the deep racial biases of her time and trying to encapsulate the sense of power that shone out of the indigenous art she witnessed became themes in her painting later in life. Carr conveyed a wish to go inside the subject, beyond the boundary, and truly understand what she was creating. Her ability to think outside of the dichotomy shows her as a postcolonial actor, which stems from her inability to situate herself in available societal categories.

She confirmed her growing respect for the indigenous other through her dialogue with a potential buyer from England. This woman wanted to use Carr’s sketches to illustrate her own lectures, entitled "In-
dians and Artists of Canada's West Coast."24 Allowing this woman to borrow the sketches would have brought Carr a large amount of positive publicity; however, Carr refused:

"Thanks, but I'm not going to Vancouver."

"What! You cannot be so poor spirited! My work is patriotic. I am philanthropic. I advance civilization — I educate."

"You make nothing for yourself exploiting out Indians?"

"After expenses, perhaps just a trifle.... You will not help the poor Indian by lending the Alert Bay sketches? My theme centres around Alert Bay."

My interest woke. "You have been there? Are you familiar with it?"

"Oh yes, yes! Our boat stopped there for twenty minutes. I walked through the village, saw houses, poles, people."

"And you dare talk and write about our Coast Indians having only that much data."25

This dialogue, recounted in Carr's autobiography, shows her need to go inside, to truly understand. She rejects the colonial belief that one can understand and educate about a whole culture after a brief encounter with the other. Whether Carr was able to truly understand and to be on the inside of the culture is debatable; however, her attempts to go beyond a superficial understanding are commendable given the society she lived in, and should be understood as political actions.

Encounters with Modernity

Carr's quest to go beyond the surface led her to study art in France, where she was introduced to the modern art movement. She arrived in Paris with her sister Alice in 1910 and came into contact with another artist, Henry Phelan Gibb. While Alice was shocked at Gibb's art, Emily saw in it potential inspiration for her own art—at the recommendation of Gibb, she immediately signed up to study at L'Académie Colarossi.26 (Unfortunately she fell ill shortly after and, diagnosing herself with an "allergy to big cities," left for Sweden to recuperate.) Through her encounters with modern art, Carr found a way to redirect her sense of rebellion into visual expression, which allowed a deeper, more spiritual connection with the subject she was painting.27 Her time in France would give her the tools she needed in order to find a way to pierce the surface,
and her exposure to radical artists and ideas allowed her to channel her defiance of the colonial structures into art.

For Carr, her introduction to modern art in France did not mean that modernism itself was her goal; rather it was a "means to accomplish the recording of First Nations material." Upon her return to Canada another ambitious sketching trip ensued, this time to coastal and central northern British Columbia for six weeks. Before Carr, it is unlikely that any European woman took this trip unescorted. She came to identify the art of the indigenous peoples with a larger understanding of both nature and spirituality. Carr was never overly cognizant of the subtle meanings of the art she admired; however, her connection to the indigenous art she saw would influence her identification with nature and with being Canadian. Modern art became her medium for expressing the deep sense of connection she felt with nature. At a time when this style of art was rejected and even frowned upon, her belief that this style of art was the only way to capture the British Columbian landscape differentiates her sense of otherness from the art culture that prevailed in Victoria. After this trip, Carr attempted to sell her entire collection to the government of the time, but was rejected. She built a house, became a landlady and did not paint for the next fifteen years.

In 1927, Eric Brown introduced her to the art of the Group of Seven. He explained that these painters were also working in the modern, abstract style, and her introduction to them prompted Carr to start painting again. She submitted fifty sketches and paintings to the Canadian National Gallery in Ottawa and began a connection with the artists in the group, who were also trying to create a uniquely Canadian style of art. They rejected any association with "metropolitan" art, understood either in the colonial sense or in reference to cultural capitals.

This introduction to the group also introduced her to the ideas of theosophy. Through her struggles with theosophy, Carr began to reiterate the belief "in the central role of nature for the artist and the idea that an artist's work should grow out of a profound attachment to a place and absorption of its underlying character." The development of the natural theme found in attachment to space would prompt a new way of thinking about place and what she was capturing in her art. This movement towards a more profound attachment to the places she was painting would prompt her to use the lessons of power she learned from indigenous art to shift to a new locus of art: the nature of the West. Carr continued this theme until a serious heart attack confined her to hospital care, where she began to write about her experiences. Carr went on her last sketching trip in 1942, and passed away on March 2, 1945.
Reading into Carr's Art: What Type of Canada?

Carr spoke publicly about her art only twice, defending modern art and articulating a new way of thinking about seeing. Through these speeches, Carr defended her choice to engage with distortion as a technique to go beyond the subject of the art. She defined her art as "creative art," using the definition a child once gave it: "I think and then I draw a line 'round my think." ³⁴ She explains further that her art attempts to capture the bigger actuality of the thing, the part that is the same no matter what the conditions of light or seasons are upon it— the form, force and volume of the thing, not the surface impression. It is hard to get at this. You must dig way down into your subject, and into yourself. And in your struggle to accomplish it, the usual aspect of the thing may have to be cast aside. This leads to distortion, [which] raises the thing out of the ordinary seeing into a more spiritual sphere, the spirit dominating over the subject matter. ³⁵

She articulated that in the step to abstraction, the forms of representation are forgotten. Created forms expressing emotion in space take the place of the represented object. Carr commented that this way of seeing is called "pure vision," which is the vision that disconnects the subject from all practical and human associations. While it is clear that she was talking about her art, this philosophy also played a role in her relationships with the indigenous peoples and her attempts to overcome the dualisms that had been imposed on her.

Carr took the advice of Lawren Harris to shift from the indigenous theme to nature. She began to make movement, not place, her symbol for the expression of "something bigger." ³⁶ Reinvention of the Canadian natural space through movement is the theme for her later art, and is part of a larger spiritual journey. This shift also had political undertones, as it articulated her Canadian identity. Shapiro points out that often the nationalist project can be attached to landscape paintings, as "[l]andscapes, whether focusing on single monuments or framing stretches of scenery, provide visible shape; they picture the nation. Rather than mere depictions, landscape paintings often testify to 'political intentions.'" ³⁷ He explains that many landscape paintings have the effect of symbolically converting land into national space.
Do Carr’s paintings narrate a particular kind of Canada? Shapiro’s point is well taken—while it may not have been Carr’s intention to create a certain image of Canada, her art certainly has contributed to the nation-building dialogue. However, her Canada was not the same one as that which the colonial settlers had in mind. She did not create her art in order to impose an expansion of her colonial roots onto Canada. Rather, her deep respect for indigenous art forms and their lifestyles questioned the “inevitable progress of history.” Carr’s art attempted to go beneath the surface and encapsulate the spirit of the subjects she was painting, rather than to create a space in which civilization took precedence over the natural. Carr’s suggestion that she was “allergic” to big cities confirms her discomfort in colonial settings, and her simple, eccentric lifestyle casts doubt on the need for progress and the mission civilisatrice.

Erin Manning interprets Carr’s painting Old Time Coast Village as associating the landscape with an un-problematized emptiness, thus justifying the interpretation of the landscape according to European ideas of expansionism and settlement at the behest of the indigenous population. It is entirely possible to interpret this painting in such a manner; however, I believe that the absence of the indigenous inhabitants of this village may have more to do Carr’s respect for them, and should be understood as an emphasis of the nature surrounding the village, rather than an omission. The emphasis in the painting on movement and the deeper meaning found in nature is not depicting a Canadian West ready for expansion and settlement, rather it is a confirmation of the deep connection Carr felt with nature.

Perhaps the act of reading art or literature contrapuntally is an exercise that attempts to attribute too much weight to works of culture produced at a given time. Certainly, Carr would not have seen her work as political. She rebelled at the structures placed upon her, but she did not think abstractly about her work; rather, she believed that “workers should work and talkers should talk.” Carr’s art has captivated Canadians in part because it embodies her deviance: her devotion to going past colonial boundaries, to challenging the mainstream norms. It has made her a complex, compelling character. This may be because of her status as an outsider. Said characterizes an outsider as one able “to comprehend how the machine works, given that [the outsider and the machine] are fundamentally not in perfect synchrony or correspondence.” This was certainly true of Carr’s life and her abhorrence of the cultured, metropolitan centres she would ultimately seek to escape.
Other ways of life are often colonized in the city; in order to function in the city, one must conform to it. Maybe this is an explanation of why Carr could never fulfill the expectations of the metropolitan, colonial world she lived in. This world dismissed her experience as outside and discrepant. However, my aim in this essay has been to show that her experiences as an embodiment of the nomad, the person who has to migrate, gave her the ability to transcend the dualisms that surrounded her. Edward Said highlights that the aim of his work in *Culture and Imperialism* is to juxtapose the discrepant experiences of the colonizer and the colonized. His political aim is "to make concurrent those views and experiences that are ideologically and culturally closed to each other and that attempt to distance or suppress other views or experiences."\(^{41}\) Said highlights the discrepancy of experiences in order to expose and dramatize the political importance of differing cultural interpretations. Carr’s work and life are examples of living a discrepant experience and challenging the political orthodoxy of the time, although she would not have characterized it as such. She questions the alleged universalism of the metropolitan narrative of the indigenous other that was being constructed at the time in conjunction with the creation of the Canadian state.

How do Emily Carr's paintings affect the western viewer and their conception of their own culture? How does this exposure to alterity, embodied in "one of their own," force the westerner to reconsider the relationship between self and other? Said points out that "we cannot deal with the literature of the peripheries without also attending to the literature of the metropolitan centres."\(^{42}\) My contention is that we can extend his contrapuntal analysis of literature to art, and specifically for this paper, the work of Emily Carr. By exposing the type of schooling she received and her rebellion against what was expected of her as a Victorian artist, she effectively represents a bridge between the periphery and the centre through her abhorrence of the metropolitan and her inability to completely become part of the periphery. Her art forces one to question pictorial, impressionist paintings of Canada and search for the deeper meaning of citizenship in a shared land. Because Canada has an indigenous population that continues to suffer from the abuses of the colonial structure that was forced on them as part of a civilizing mission, questioning what it means to be "Canadian" is an important prerequisite for creating something new.

Carr’s experiences remind us that Canada is a created concept and something that can be re-conceptualized. Her idea of Canada was created through her status as an outsider and also as someone who had
elements of being on the inside. In this sense, she represents Said's nomad, but not as someone who did not have a home—she clearly did, that of her Canada West—rather, as a nomad in the sense of developing a rebellious questioning of what European settlers were defining as Canada. In this sense, she contributed to creating dialectics between the metropolis and the periphery through her actions and experiences as one cast out of colonial society. She therefore challenges western Canadians to reconsider how we think about Canada, and, indeed, the relationship between self and other.

Conclusion: Invoking the Other

In Postcolonialism, Robert Young says that "[i]n any system of force there will always be sites of force that are, precisely, forced, and therefore allow for pressure and intervention," and lists the following as themes in the books of French-Algerian sometime-exile Jacques Derrida:

> Force and its traces in language from which there must be emancipation or which at the very least must be subject to resistance, madness as the excluded other of the operation of reason, inside/outside structures, the same and the other, ... identity that is different from itself, ... the destabilizing encroachment of the marginal, ... the constitutive dependency of the centre on the marginal or the excluded, dissemination and the concept of a diaspora without the end point of a final return, and above all history as violence, ontological, ethical and conceptual violence....\(^{43}\)

All of these themes can be found in Carr's life. She did not perhaps recognize her actions as giving a history to the marginalized, silenced other, but certainly she challenged colonial structures through her violence done to a blank sheet of paper. The "exclusion of madness to the reason of the sane" is particularly relevant to Carr's life, as she fell ill and was committed to two institutions to overcome her illnesses while in the colonial centres of London and Paris. Significantly, she found her health to be the best while in nature, giving the eccentric, perhaps even "mad" side of herself priority over the wishes of others that she conform. I see this rebellion as a political act against the structure, and an example of using "madness" to one's advantage.

I shall end with a few comments from Brian Massumi's A User's Guide to Capitalism and Schizophrenia: Deviations from Deleuze and Guattari. In doing so I am attempting to contextualize Carr's life as an example of
putting theory into action using deviance and rebellion, creating a new
way of thinking about the postcolonial world we find ourselves living in.
Deleuze and Guattari embrace the schizophrenic’s detachment from the
world as an attempt to engage it in unimagined ways. Schizophrenia, to
them, is a positive process, an inventive connection, expansion rather
than withdrawal.44 They use this schizophrenic model, and the idea of
the rhizome45 to challenge the “arboreal” idea of knowledge which stip-
ulates “the discourse of sovereign judgment, of stable subjectivity legis-
lated by ‘good’ sense, of rocklike identity, ‘universal’ truth, and (white
male) justice.”46 The nomadic essence of rhizomatic thought does not
respect the artificial division between representation and subject, nor
between concept and being. This is much like Carr’s idea of pure vision,
the act of abstracting from the subject and creating intersubjectivity that
goes beyond the representation. This attempt to go beyond is a step to-
wards thinking contingently and embodies theory in action.
Perhaps Carr best summarizes it when she says:

Real Art is real Art. There is no ancient and modern. The dif-
ference between the two is not in art itself, but lies in environ-
ment, in our point of view, and in the angle from which we see
life...Now there are as many ways of seeing things as there are
pairs of eyes in the world, and it is a mistake to expect all peo-
ple to see all things in the same way... it is a mistake for any-
one to try to copy another’s mode of seeing, instead of using
his own eyes and finding his own way of looking at things.47

She offers us this question: How can we go beyond our colonial past to
find our own way of looking?

Appendix 1

And so, I digress. Through the process of writing this essay, I have
struggled with the appropriate terminology to refer to the indigenous
people of Canada. I would prefer to live in a country where the dichot-
omy between "us" and "them" does not exist and my struggle with which
word is appropriate and respectful would not be an issue. However, this
is not the case. The word “Indian” is one that conjures a negative image
of the process of marginalizing this group of people and is a term that is
inappropriately foisted upon a multiplicity of different peoples and cul-
tures within Canada. This term has the effect of universalizing and can
be used to justify attempts to “civilize” and co-opt "them" into "the sys-
tem.” The legacy left by the universalizing terminology of the "Indian" or
the "pre-modern" other is a tragic and terrible one in Canadian history, and one that still needs to be dealt with. As Paul Gilroy suggests in Post-colonial Melancholia, race is a category that we have not been able to properly address.

To return to Carr’s use of the term, one can see that there could be much controversy over how she applies the word "Indian." One could easily dismiss her usage as simply a relic of the age she was writing in: this certainly plays a part in the language she uses. However, when I began to look deeper into her writing, I saw that many of the narratives that involve her "Indians" are in fact descriptions of the situations she found herself in. Furthermore, many of these are positive descriptions of her relationships with these people. Carr was definitely in a position of racial and social privilege over the indigenous peoples she interacted with. Her writing does make an attempt to strip the word of its powerful negative connotations as it associates "Indian" with descriptions of the friendliness and warmth she encountered. It should be noted that not all of her experiences were of acceptance and warmth. Many times she was not accepted or even acknowledged in the communities she visited. Crucially, however, her descriptions of these times are not littered with the word "Indian."

Carr’s inability to transcend her language barrier is summarized when she writes of her trip to France: “I did not know French and would not learn. I had neither ear nor patience.”48 She rejects French and illustrates her inability to think outside the colonial English discourse of her time. Her use of the word "Indian," then, reflects her struggle with finding her place in the society she lived in. She refused to use the word negatively; however, she still used the word imparted during her colonial upbringing, instead of transforming the speech of the time by learning indigenous languages.

Perhaps through speaking in a colonial language she wished to present an opposing viewpoint of the people she interacted with in her trips to the villages and in her friendship with Sophie Frank. My contention is that we cannot know conclusively how she personally felt about the indigenous peoples she had relationships and encounters with. However, for her time, the positive portrayal in her writings suggests an attempt to go beyond colonial portrayals of "the Indian" to a more respectful understanding of the cultures she was interacting with, albeit limited by her inability to articulate a new, localized point of reference.
Appendix 2

*When the World Gets One Too Much*

*When the World is Midling Fair*

*When the World Gets One Too Much/When the World is Midling Fair* (c. 1905), in Braid, *Rebel Artist*, 40 (reproduced with permission).
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