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The Winter Flights of 1964

The Antarctic issue from fifty years ago – Vol. 3, No. 11, September 1964¹ – carries on page 480 a story headed “United States Airmen Break Antarctic Winter Barrier”, which describes “the first flight ever made into the Antarctic in winter”. Until this 26 June 1964 flight, the latest out-of-season flight to Antarctica had been in April 1961, to Byrd Station via McMurdo, about two weeks before sunset at McMurdo.²

The June mercy mission from Christchurch to Williams Field, McMurdo Sound was to evacuate the seriously injured McMurdo Station fire chief, and was undertaken by a C-130 ski-equipped Hercules of the US Navy VX-6 Squadron, one of two that had been sent from Rhode Island for the rescue. Two New Zealand naval frigates, Pukaki and Otago, were diverted to near 60° S to support the Hercules with “weather reporting and search and rescue duties”, and “a rescue team of four of New Zealand’s best mountaineers [stood] by at Christchurch ready if necessary to fly in the second Hercules if the rescue plane got into trouble.”

A change to clear calm weather, together with a full moon and the “best strip [the Hercules’ commander, Lt. Cdr. RV Mayer] had ever seen in [his] Navy career” helped the plane to make a safe landing on the specially prepared runway at McMurdo. Two hours later, the Hercules took off for Christchurch with the injured fire chief on board. The plane landed safely in Christchurch seven and a half hours after its departure from Antarctica, despite what Lt. Cdr. Mayer described as, with some understatement, “minor difficulties”. The Antarctic report of fifty years ago refers to this mission as “the most hazardous operation undertaken by the US Navy in all its years of Antarctic support”.²

² For an account of that flight see Bill Spindler’s South Pole Station website: http://www.southpolestation.com/trivia/igy1/medevac/kuperov.html.
The Changing Face of Non-State Actors in Antarctica

by Alan D. Hemmings, Gateway Antarctica, Christchurch, and Perth, Western Australia

From the International Geophysical Year and the commencement of the modern Antarctic era with the 1959 Antarctic Treaty, governments were the dominant actors in Antarctica and in decision-making about Antarctica.

Our thinking about Antarctic management, nationally and internationally, is predicated on the assumption that the state, “the government”, remains the driver. Taking New Zealand as a generally applicable example: the national Antarctic programme is led by a state entity (Antarctica New Zealand), which coordinates getting to/from the place (collaborating with other New Zealand agencies – such as the Royal New Zealand Air Force – and other governments (USA and Italy)), runs the facilities (Scott Base), contracts support staff, and manages the scientists. The scientists are overwhelmingly drawn from universities or Crown Research Institutes funded by the state. Going to Antarctica is thus largely a state-controlled function. It is government agencies (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Antarctica New Zealand, Department of Conservation, etc.) that represent New Zealand at Antarctic meetings, and it is the Officials’ Antarctic Committee that advises government on policy. Ministers make the final decisions. Even for those states that contract out parts of their Antarctic programme to the private sector – as the US has historically done for support services – the state remains in the driver’s seat, through contractual and national legal arrangements.

This picture has been complicated by commercial activities in Antarctica – fishing and tourism – which are manifestly not planned, conducted or funded by the state. New Zealand has, like other Antarctic-active states, companies fishing or conducting tourism in Antarctica. These activities, like those directly run by the state, are subject to the obligations under the Antarctic Treaty system, including various duties around environmental protection under the Madrid Protocol, and these are managed through the state. So, for a fishing company to catch fish in a particular area, its government has to make the proposal through the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, and must ensure reporting obligations are met if the fishing is sanctioned. Similarly, a tourism company needs to meet prior environmental impact assessment (EIA) obligations under the Madrid Protocol – and does so through its own government. In short, for commercial activities, the state rides shotgun on the private carriage.

Something similar happens in relation to a third category of non-state actor operating in Antarctica: environmental non-governmental operators such as Greenpeace and Sea Shepherd. They too must meet the obligations of the Madrid Protocol, and this often (always with Greenpeace) means that some sort of EIA for their proposed Antarctic activity is done through a state. Adding to the complexity here is that the activity against which these e-NGOs are protesting is an activity not itself regulated by the Antarctic Treaty system – whaling.

Notwithstanding the critical role the state plays in mediating between the aspirations of these actors and the international legal obligations of the Antarctic Treaty system, the state is plainly not the driver of the activity. Their engagement with Antarctica therefore represents something of a complication of the already complex set of relationships there between states.

These three non-state actors (fishing industry, tourism industry, e-NGOs) have also sought to engage with the formal Antarctic governance structures. They have persuaded progressive states such as New Zealand to include representatives on the national diplomatic delegations to Antarctic meetings; and they have each gained independent “expert” status recognition for their international umbrella group at the Antarctic meetings. Tourism companies are represented by the International Association of Antarctica Tourism Operators (IAATO), fishing companies by the Coalition of Legal Toothfish Operators (COLTO), and e-NGOs by the Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition (ASOC).

IAATO, COLTO and ASOC are players in the Antarctic political arena. They operate at the political level through the usual routes: influencing national policy domestically, arguing...
economic/employment/regional-development/territorial sovereignty/environmental considerations. They integrate themselves at the operational/technocratic level within the Antarctic Treaty system, assisting scientific and management projects and engaging in the processes of environmental management. And of course, through being able to speak at the Antarctic Treaty meetings, they can directly support/counter proposals and express their interests.

These non-state actors within the Antarctic Treaty system, notwithstanding their still constrained formal status at the diplomatic meetings (only states participate in legal decision-making), have significant de facto participant rights and influence. In my view, IAATO has appreciably greater influence than a non-Consultative Party within the Antarctic Treaty system. My sense is that it also has more influence than ASOC, and that this difference arises in part through the absence of the sort of presence in the Antarctic that we saw when the major member of ASOC (Greenpeace) had a high profile presence there (a station and annual ship activity). The peculiar situation of Sea Shepherd, as a group outside the ASOC coalition, and targeting an activity outside formal Antarctic Treaty system purview (i.e. whaling), means that their undoubted high activity levels can’t generate comparable influence within the system (whatever their influence elsewhere).

Hitherto, a fourth activity area, bioprospecting, has generally been conducted as a part of, or adjunct to, national Antarctic programme science. If and when it breaks out and becomes a commercial activity in its own right, it will likely follow the non-state actor approach just outlined.

A second sort of non-state actor has emerged in the past decade, with a disguised operational role in cases of emergency. Whatever issues may arise in relation to some parts of the fishing and tourism industries (e.g. ships under flags of convenience, where the registering state is not itself a party to Antarctic instruments), generally some form of responsibility is possible through contractual relationships, or through the place where the activity is organized or whence it departs. At some point a real connection is generally found to an Antarctic Treaty Consultative Party (such as New Zealand). However, the complexities of the international insurance and re-insurance market mean that in situations of misadventure, functional control of decisions around a vessel may suddenly pass to an entity with no apparent linkages. This has, as I understand it, happened in relation to both shipping and aircraft in the Antarctic area following accidents. Under these scenarios, at precisely the point where there may be a risk to the Antarctic environment (as well, of course, as to human safety), the entity now in control of affairs may have no legal obligation whatsoever in relation to the Madrid Protocol.

We have also seen the emergence of logistics carrier services – companies providing certain sorts of services on an essentially ad hoc basis, whereby the responsibility for the vessel or aircraft involved may not be so predictable as in the conventional “tourism company X advertises holidays on cruise liner Y operated by international cruise company Z” model. Here, one might see a ship flagged anywhere contracted to deliver a particular service (say, establishing fuel caches for a state or non-state operator). The corporations that play these roles do not themselves have a presence in the Antarctic Treaty system – they are not any sort of expert observer in their own right, nor are they included in the delegations of their state or other actor (IAATO, say). There is no guarantee that their “parent”
state is itself a Party to any part of the Antarctic Treaty system. Russia first pointed to the appearance of these sorts of companies, and the possible complications that might arise with the appearance of actors in Antarctica who may have no real connection to a state for whom Antarctic legal obligations apply. Some of these issues may (for shipping) be addressed when the International Maritime Organization’s “Polar Code” is adopted, since the majority of the world’s maritime states are members, compared with the 50 members of the Antarctic Treaty system.

There are also a small number of private non-commercial actors, generally aboard yachts, travelling to Antarctica. These yachts may be registered just about anywhere, and their owners and crews may or may not know that there are any regulations, let alone feel inclined to comply with them. The Madrid Protocol applies to them too, and of course if they get into difficulties they may also need rescuing.

So, what is the take-home message here? That in relation to non-state actors, the situation in Antarctica has become much more complex in recent decades than we reflexively assume. Non-state actors now pursue various interests in Antarctica, and the interests are diversifying and increasing. The downturn in Antarctic tourism activity due to the Global Financial Crisis (GFC) will end, and, anyway, the GFC seemingly had no effect on other sorts of non-state actor activity, such as fishing. For some of the non-state actors our existing arrangements – legal and administrative – will probably apply just fine. For some others we may find ourselves in situations where somebody conducting an activity, or making a decision in relation to an activity, has no obvious connection with an Antarctic Treaty system state. Hopefully, via chains of connectivity (through contractual obligations or political channels) we shall still be able to ensure that these activities – and the actors – are appropriately responsive to established Antarctic duties and norms. The increasing application of global obligations to Antarctica under various international legal regimes and initiatives, such as the “Polar Code”, should give us improved cover for the majority of the world’s 193 states who are not parties to the Antarctic Treaty system. But it may also require us to enquire more fully into who will make critical decisions in Antarctica under various scenarios before we sanction particular activities there. Having that sort of discussion at an Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting, however, will not be politically easy.
As if the Weddell Sea were not Big Enough: Two Explorers and One Challenge in 1914

by Ursula Rack, Polar Historian, Gateway Antarctica, University of Canterbury

In December 1912, a mutiny ended the German Antarctic expedition led by Wilhelm Filchner. The expedition’s survey area had been the Weddell Sea. Felix König, a member of that failed expedition, while on his way home to Austria was already developing a plan to continue where Filchner had had to give up. But, unbeknownst to König, another explorer, Ernest Shackleton, had plans of his own for the Weddell Sea. Thus a dispute arose between these two great explorers, and suddenly the Weddell Sea did not seem like a big enough place.

Felix König was an Austrian lawyer and sportsman. He was invited by Wilhelm Filchner to join his Antarctic expedition of 1911–1912 as a mountaineer and dog handler. Filchner’s expedition ended in disaster. When they reached South Georgia, a mutiny set the definite end to the expedition in December 1912. König, on his way home from South Georgia to Austria, made plans to continue where Filchner’s expedition had been abandoned.

Ernest Shackleton was a well-known and experienced Antarctic explorer. He took part on Robert F. Scott’s first Antarctic expedition (1901–1904) and led his own expedition in 1907–1909. He stated that he already had plans to equip another expedition in the near future, but in 1909 announced it only within his circle of friends. This expedition would explore the Weddell Sea and would be the starting point to traverse the Antarctic continent.

So, in 1914, the Weddell Sea did not seem big enough, and these two men found themselves in the middle of a dispute over their ambitions to explore the same area of the Antarctic. As with any argument, there were two sides to the story.

This article illustrates the arguments behind this dispute, and how the contemporary print media presented the men’s positions in the debate.

The exact time when this conflict started cannot be determined. There is also almost no correspondence available to retrace the events. However, there are a certain number of newspaper articles available that give a good insight into the controversy. The first evidence of König’s plans that is accessible is the report of the committee meeting of the “Austrian Antarctic expedition” of 16 January 1914, quoted by the k.k. Geographical Society. It presents to the public the plans of the Austrian Antarctic expedition, led by Felix König. The expedition was supported by members of the imperial family, the Austrian Academy of Science, and many national and international scientists and celebrities, and these are reflected in the list of attendees of that meeting. After the description of the formalities, the first address stated: “It is now seven months since, in that very building, Dr. König has [...] introduced his plans for an Austrian Antarctic expedition.” That means that the official introduction of his plans would have been in June 1913. In the same report it is mentioned that a “few weeks ago Shackleton announced the plan for an English Trans Antarctic Expedition.”

The following statement stresses that Shackleton’s plans for scientific work in the Weddell Sea appear to be similar to König’s plan (see maps overleaf). After this address the floor was handed over to Otto Nordenskjöld, the famous Swedish Antarctic explorer. He stated emphatically the importance of science in that region (Nordenskjöld had overwintered at the Antarctic Peninsula in 1901–1904).

Austrian and British newspaper articles from the following months illustrate the development of this discussion of who was entitled to an expedition into the Weddell Sea. The tone on both sides was getting more and more competitive and the situation seemed deadlocked. Shackleton and König had similar

2 k.k. means “kaiserlich-königlich” (“imperial and royal”) and was used after 1867 for the western part of the Austro-Hungarian dual monarchy.
4 Ibid., p. 22.
arguments for their priority and claimed similar scientific work and routes. In March 1914 a report appeared in a newspaper that “Lieutenant Filchner asserts that he has transferred to Lieutenant Koenig the right to carry on the uncompleted programme of the Filchner expedition, which entitles Koenig to priority over Sir Ernest Shackleton.”5 The day before this item appeared, an open letter from König was published in The Times of London: “I have just received an answer from London. Sir Ernest Shackleton refuses cooperation with the Austrian Antarctic Expedition, and writes to me that he is willing to come to an understanding only with regard to the subsequent tabulation of meteorological and magnetic observations.”6 In some previous newspaper articles the sharing of a base had been proposed from König’s side, showing a link to the idea of scientific cooperation in the spirit of the First International Polar Year and the Antarctic expeditions of 1901–1905.

It is conspicuous that König had the more powerful supporters on his side: Roald Amundsen, Wilhelm Filchner, Otto Nordenskjöld, and Sir Clements Markham, the former president of the Royal Geographical Society. It seems that Markham still had power to intervene in issues such as this one, as shown in a report in the Arbeiterzeitung (Wien) on 19 March: “Also the Englishman Markham appears now to put in a word for Dr. König. [...] he declares that one has to leave the area to Dr. König where he worked already in former times [...]”7 That meant that König should conduct the expedition in that area where Filchner had landed on his expedition in 1911/12.

However, even after that decision, the controversy continued, and was reflected in the newspapers through quoted parts of open letters and interviews. Frequently these items repeat themselves, but it is notable that they show that for a while there was consideration given to the idea of a meeting in Germany between the two expedition leaders to discuss their plans. This was mentioned in Hugh Robert Mill’s biography of Shackleton. He stated that Filchner was trying to “[...] bring the two expeditions to some sort of modus vivendi.” He wrote begging Shackleton to come to Berlin in the last week of July to meet König “[...]”8 However, because of the closeness of the planned departure of the expedition, Shackleton suggested that König should come to London. Mill also stated that because of the coming war, Shackleton would have been in danger if he had decided to follow Filchner’s proposal: “Had he gone to Berlin there is little doubt that his endurance would have been tested for the next few years, not in the southern ice, but in the Ruhleben internment camp.”9 That could not have been the case, because the internment camp Ruhleben was not established before November 1914. Nevertheless, this meeting was not going to happen.

In the end Shackleton’s ship Endurance left London on 1 August 1914 for Antarctica. König’s departure was prohibited by the Austro-Hungarian government as a result of the outbreak of the First World War and instead of going to Antarctica he joined the war as a lieutenant in Galicia in Poland. In September 1915 he was captured, and he spent until June 1918 in Krasnoyarsk, Siberia, as a prisoner of war.10 He never again saw the Antarctic.

6 The Times (London), 5 March 1914, p. 25.
7 “[...] Jetzt tritt auch der Engländer Markham auf den Plan, um für Dr. König sein Wort einzulegen. [...] [en] erklärt, daß man Dr. König das Gebiet überlassen müsse, in dem er schon früher gearbeitet habe. [...]”.
9 Ibid.
COMMEMORATIVE MEDALLIONS
New Zealand in the Antarctic • Fifty Years • Jubilee

Bronze and silver medallions commemorating New Zealand’s 50 years in Antarctica, 1957-2007, are still available in limited quantity and in mint condition from the New Zealand Antarctic Society. Each medallion is beautifully presented in a specially designed limited edition presentation box.

Each medallion is 63.5mm diameter, with both sides fully covered by the designs.

Silver Medallion NZ$100.00
Bronze Medallion NZ$80.00

The cost is inclusive of GST, handing and postage charges within New Zealand.
Overseas orders, please add NZ$5.00

Two purchase options:
- By Cheque to: NZ Antarctic Society Inc, PO Box 404, Christchurch.
- By Credit Card to: NZ Antarctic Society Inc, PO Box 404, Christchurch, or e-mail your credit card details to Treasurer@antarctic.org.nz.

ORDER FORM

Name: _____________________________
Address: ___________________________
Phone: (______)________

Please send me:
Qty Silver Medallion at NZ$100.00 each = ____________________________
Qty Bronze Medallion at NZ$80.00 each = ____________________________
For overseas orders, please add NZ$5.00 = ____________________________
(GST Inc) Total = ____________________________

Card No: __________________________
Expiry: / _____________
Signature: ________________________

Visa □ Mastercard □ AMEX □
Name on card ____________________________

Non-scientific Antarctic books, particularly expedition histories, are often found in bookshops under “Travel”; others appear under “Biographies.” However, there is a far bigger range of Antarctic books than just histories and biographies (including autobiographies).

Prior to about 1898, Antarctic books were mainly fiction, or speculative geography books with Antarctica loosely outlined at the bottom of a world map. The Antarctic Peninsula was the best known region, from visits by American sealers in the 1820s, followed by the Ross Sea region from visits by Ross, Wilkes and Charcot in the 1840s. The expeditions of the Heroic Era (1899 to 1922) again focussed on the Ross Sea, and then the Americans returned under Byrd in the 1930s – still in the Ross Sea, but with aerial capabilities that allowed them to range more widely. These and a few later expeditions generated histories and reports related to those expeditions, but Antarctica was still essentially an unknown, unmapped continent until c. 1956 and the commencement of the International Geophysical Year.

Alongside these expedition-centred books was a growing range of fiction, beginning in the early 1800s and continuing to the present day. The extent of Antarctic books now is vast, and includes children’s books, animal stories, edited reprints of historic and recent diaries, and coffee-table style illustrated books.

As early as 1910, bibliographies of Antarctic books and articles began to appear. Some related to a particular expedition or to a particular nation’s involvement with Antarctica, and many more were of general interest. For an Antarctic reader, many well-researched books will also include a bibliography, which is particularly useful, as it will include sources and/or further reading on the topic: a very tidy way to expand your reading range on your topic of interest. With the growing collectability of Antarctic books, there are now also several publications about single collections of books: not necessarily the bibliographies of a purist, but usually well-researched, and illustrated with books in original condition and in pristine dust jackets – rarities today, when so many books are being issued in paperback.

Below is a selected list of bibliographies. But, first, some notes on a few:

- Doumani’s Antarctic Bibliography is now at Volume 24, and continues with several different authors.
- Ingleton’s is a three-volume collation of a private library, extending in its coverage beyond Antarctica. This is the sale catalogue. Bookseller’s catalogues are a good reference, and often list ephemera and rarer publications thought too uncommon to include in major bibliographies.
- It is probable that no one bibliography will cover all your interests, unless your focus is on a single expedition (see, for example, Haskell’s bibliography about the Wilkes expedition); but if you have to limit yourself to just one bibliography, take a close look at Rosove’s, which, together with the follow-up edition, Additions and Corrections, gives a fairly complete coverage of a topic we all have an interest in.
Bibliography:


Natalie Cadenhead was born in on 28 December 1966, in Christchurch, New Zealand. She began her schooling at Merrin Street Primary School, which was just around the corner from her family home. As she grew up, she attended Cobham Intermediate and Burnside High School. Natalie continued her love affair with learning after high school, attending four universities, completing course work or earning a degree in each one. Her record of qualifications is long and impressive, consisting of a BA (Hons) in Classics and Anthropology (1987) and postgraduate Certificate of Proficiency (1988) from the University of Otago, a New Zealand Certificate in Craft Design, Woodturning, Textiles and Art History (Christchurch Polytechnic, 1991), a BA (Hons) in the Philosophy of Science and Personal Identity (University of Canterbury, 1993), and a Postgraduate Diploma (1996) and a Master of Library and Information Studies (1999) from Victoria University of Wellington. At the University of Canterbury in the summer of 1998–99, Natalie was also one of fourteen students to participate in and complete the inaugural Graduate Certificate in Antarctic Studies programme. The inaugural course and its graduates were all extremely successful, laying the groundwork for what is now 15 years of that programme. As a student on the certificate course, Natalie did a project on “Antarctic metadata – management, issues, concerns and recommendations”. She did group project work on “Human artefacts in Antarctica – treasure to be conserved or junk to be removed?”, which reflected her interests in the historic huts of the Ross Sea Region, the Heroic Era, the Trans-Antarctic Expedition and International Geophysical Year (TAE/IGY), and Antarctic expeditioners’ social conditions.

Her love of learning also led to Natalie meeting George Rogers 30 years ago at the University of Canterbury. Fifteen years ago they were married. Natalie and George’s home was frequently filled with the sounds of happy young people, their nieces and nephews, who Natalie adored. Natalie and George often entertained friends and family in their home, and together screened many a science fiction or mystery movie on their large projector screen in the living room. Their home was also always a shelter to the cats and dogs that Natalie loved, including their cherished dogs, Claude and Louie.

Natalie’s career was as varied and interesting as her education. After employment in a range of jobs, including as a librarian at the University of Canterbury, a vegetation surveyor for the New Zealand Forest Service, and a Web designer, in 1998 she landed her first “dream job”: with Antarctica New Zealand as the Information Specialist. She made many trips to the Ice with Antarctica New Zealand, clocking up 210 days in Antarctica during her career. She undertook a range of jobs there, including with the field training team, project management work with the ANDRILL science group and working in the historic huts as part of their conservation projects. As Information Specialist, Natalie was instrumental in negotiating with the University of Canterbury to set up, under an MOU, the Antarctic Collection at the University of Canterbury Library in 1999–2000. This collection of maps, books, aerial photos and journal reprints remains as a unique and important Antarctic Collection at
the University, and globally, which is accessible to students and the public alike.

After Antarctica New Zealand, Natalie became Curator of Antarctic and Social History at Canterbury Museum (August 2005–March 2012). Here she loved fossicking through the Antarctic collection, receiving new materials for curation and investigating their provenance, and sharing the collection and even the “behind-the-scenes” materials with anyone who wished to see the treasured items. In 2005, when the United States and New Zealand were nearing the end of their joint clean-up and retrograde of all the building and other materials from their long abandoned International Geophysical Year (IGY) science base at Cape Hallett, it was Natalie, above all others, who recognised the rusted, degraded materials as something of an historical treasure. She ensured that all the materials were not sent to the landfill, but were instead gifted to the Museum to be restored and set up as a temporary exhibition reflecting what life on the Ice during the IGY had been like. In the end, 28 tonnes of materials were removed from Cape Hallett Station, Antarctica, and it was Natalie who sifted through them all (even though the materials were thoroughly covered in penguin guano), to create the Cape Hallett Exhibition at Canterbury Museum, which ran as a very popular attraction in 2007 and will once again be on display from August 2014 through February 2015 as part of New Zealand’s IceFest. Even with the smell of penguin guano, Natalie called it a “joy” to be going through all the materials from what she called a “Kiwi–US bach on the Ice”.

In April 2012, Natalie took on a new role as Advisor – Arts, Culture and Heritage for the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (CERA), a government entity responsible for the rebuilding of earthquake damaged Christchurch. Natalie excelled in this role, since it combined her love of heritage with her energy and enthusiasm for helping people.

In addition to her full-time jobs, Natalie worked for the past 10 years as a visiting lecturer, contributing to the University of Canterbury Antarctic Studies courses ANTA101 and ANTA102 and to the university’s Postgraduate Certificate in Antarctic Studies. The focus of her teaching was usually social history, but she would also occasionally deliver informative lectures on the New Zealand Antarctic Society (NZAS) and on New Zealand’s role in Antarctica. Natalie was a strong volunteer contributor to the NZAS, not only in her role of Editor of Antarctic, from Vol. 27, No. 3, 2009, but also as volunteer on a range of projects, including as a member of the NZAS Archive Sub-committee.

Outside of work, Natalie had many interests and hobbies. She was an avid reader of Agatha Christie novels, an accomplished euphonium player and member of more than one brass band; she was a quilter, gardener, animal lover, life-drawing artist, wood turner and, together with husband George, a renovator. This varied array of interests was a reflection of her clever mind and her ability to master more than one topic, subject or idea. She was a woman with ideas. But what set her apart from most people with good ideas was that she coupled those ideas with the energy to deliver the end product. She would never suggest something then walk away from it. She was someone you could count on.

Those who met Natalie could see that Natalie was small in stature. But for those of us who worked with Natalie over the years, we came to know Natalie as a giant. She was a clever thinker and she had an incredible energy and warmth.

Natalie Cadenhead, aged 47, died peacefully, from complications related to influenza, on Thursday 26 July 2014 surrounded by her family. We, in the Antarctic community, will miss her.
Children’s Illustrated Book: 
Dogs of the Vastness – Ice Dogs of Lyttelton

A beautifully illustrated book has been commissioned by the NZAS Canterbury Branch to complement the bronze sled dog to be installed in Lyttelton.

The book is designed to appeal to both children and adults and to encourage questions. It tells a story from a sled dog’s point of view as the dog learns about the adventure ahead, interspersed with historical anecdotes and photos of Lyttelton’s links with the Antarctic from 1900 to 2014.

All donations towards the Sled Dog project would be most gratefully received; see donation slip below.

**BOOK ORDER**

(Please print and return with your pre-payment.)


Price: $19.99 + $2.85 P&P.

I enclose my cheque for $ . The first 100 copies will be signed by both author and illustrator and 50 will be allocated on the basis of one signed copy per person per paid order as received.

Please make cheques payable to ‘NZ Antarctic Society Sled Dog Project’ and return with this slip to:

The Treasurer
New Zealand Antarctic Society Canterbury Branch
PO Box 404
Christchurch 8140

Electronic payments may be made to NZAS Canterbury Branch Sled Dog Project account number 03-0802-0095005-018. Please show your name in the reference field, and send an email with the transaction date, amount and address for postage to New Zealand Antarctic Society Secretary John Rogers: secretary@antarctic.org.nz.

**DONATION SLIP**

(Please print and return with your pre-payment.)

I enclose my charitable donation of $ for the Lyttelton Sled Dog Project.

Please make cheques payable to ‘NZ Antarctic Society Sled Dog Project’ and return with this slip to:

The Treasurer
New Zealand Antarctic Society Canterbury Branch
PO Box 404
Christchurch 8140

Name and address for tax receipt:

Electronic payments may be made to NZAS Canterbury Branch Sled Dog Project account number 03-0802-0095005-018. Please show your name in the reference field, and send an email with the transaction date, amount and address for postage to New Zealand Antarctic Society Secretary John Rogers: secretary@antarctic.org.nz.
The New Zealand Antarctic Society Inc was formed in 1933. It comprises New Zealanders and overseas friends, many of whom have been to the Antarctic and all of whom are interested in some phase of Antarctic exploration, history, science, wildlife or adventure.

A membership to the New Zealand Antarctic Society entitles members to:

- *Antarctic*, the quarterly publication of the Society. It is unique in Antarctic literature as it is the only periodical which provides regular and up-to-date news of the activities of all nations at work in the Antarctic, Southern Ocean and Subantarctic Islands. It has worldwide circulation.
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by Laura Tomlin

Delighted to meet you Ivan, doorman of Willy Field.

Terrorbus – antarctipun?

Erebus, be-feathered, bewitching,

observes our off-the-shelf delivery…

Not to hospital green, but – Chelsea Cucumber, so I hear.

Dismount, initiated.

There I’ll climb. “To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield”.

Here I’ll lay my head. Slow shutter speed.

Hello, hallowed hallways, hangars… A Hut where Hillary slept.

Where else, but Edmund’s nook, to cook, mess about, scheme, screen, toast triumphs, wait...worship?

Imbibe. Dedicated to peace, science… and remembrance.

Re-seal. Beyond black and white knuckles,

Fata Morgana mocks.

Retreat. Fridge in reverse holds false worlds of tee-shirts.

Gallery of hundred-yard stares speaks truth to the newbie:

Here we cannot know endurance.

Here, but by the grace of backup gennies, go we.