Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter now, including display on the World Wide Web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis.

Catherine Cole April 12, 2022

The Act of Listening:
Benevolent Sexism & The Survivor's Voice
in Louise Erdrich's *The Round House*

by

Catherine Cole

Dr. Mandy Suhr-Sytsma
Adviser

English Department

Dr. Mandy Suhr-Sytsma
Adviser

Dr. Sarah Higinbotham
Committee Member

Dr. Christine Ristaino
Committee Member

2022

The Act of Listening:
Benevolent Sexism & The Survivor's Voice
in Louise Erdrich's *The Round House*

By

Catherine Cole

Dr. Mandy Suhr-Sytsma
Adviser

An abstract of
a thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

English Department

2022

The Act of Listening:
Benevolent Sexism & The Survivor's Voice
in Louise Erdrich's *The Round House*

By Catherine Cole

Through *The Round House* by Louise Erdrich and the writings of Indigenous scholars, this thesis focuses on the aftermath of sexual assault and the importance of centering the voices of Native survivors in interpersonal relationships. Rather than advocating for one response to sexual violence as a comprehensive solution, I argue that the positionality of survivors means communities should always center their voices to decide which approach is best. I assert that an outside enactment of justice cannot adequately replace or represent a survivor's experience and needs.

Using *The Round House,* I examine the three main characters – Bazil, Joe, and Geraldine – to explore varying responses to sexual assault in interpersonal relationships. The negative models of Bazil and Joe demonstrate that even well-intentioned Indigenous men, who are also suffering from the traumatic aftermath of sexual violence, can perpetuate harm against the survivor by only amplifying their own voices. Bazil and Joe use the United States legal system and Indigenous precedent, respectively, to determine applicable solutions. While each framework may have inherent value, the two approaches cause only damage because they ignore Geraldine's objections.

Instead, the two men should have attended to Geraldine's demonstrated needs. Geraldine's well-being fluctuates in relation to the level of familial support. Bazil and Joe abandon Geraldine in her self-imposed isolation to enact their respective plans, and so her physical, mental, emotional stability plummets. Bazil and Joe's need for personal gratification upsets their familial dynamics and worsens Geraldine's trauma. Ultimately, Geraldine highlights that personal gratification must come second to communal support and intentional listening in the wake of sexual assault.

The Act of Listening:
Benevolent Sexism & The Survivor's Voice
in Louise Erdrich's *The Round House*

By

Catherine Cole

Dr. Mandy Suhr-Sytsma
Adviser

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

English Department

2022

Acknowledgements

Thank you to my adviser, Dr. Suhr-Sytsma, for your encouragement, kindness, and insight. Your approach to reading and teaching has taught me to look at literature and life with curiosity and thoughtfulness. Thank you also to my committee members, Dr. Sarah Higinbotham and Dr. Christine Ristaino, for your generous support and time. Finally, thank you to my dad for making all the characters in *Winnie-the-Pooh* have their own silly voices, my mom for curling up with me and *Harry Potter and The Prisoner of Azkaban* every night after work, and my grandmother for giving me the world of *Little Women*. I first loved reading books because I loved reading them with you.

Table of Contents

Introduction:

Is "Good" Good Enough?

I took a self-defense course in my first year of college. As we gathered in the gym and sat on the floor, my teacher started the class by asking us why we were there. As the circle of women shared their reasons, I pondered my own. I had convinced myself that if I knew how to throw a punch, escape a chokehold, and block a knife, I too could escape any man that wanted to hurt me. Two psychologists, Peter Glick and Susan Fiske, refer to these displays of "dominative paternalism, derogatory beliefs, and heterosexual hostility" as "hostile sexism" (119). My mother, aunts, and grandmother had prepared me to recognize these forms of violence. I was ready to defend myself accordingly. Unfortunately, I spent college learning the pervasive and extensive nature of sexism and misogyny. The men who told me, "You're too pretty to carry groceries," or warned me, "You need to watch the length of your skirt," were dangerous too, just unexpected. After all, structural oppression is enabled by "benevolent sexism." In the same paper, Peter Glick and Susan Fiske defined benevolent sexism as "subjectively positive (for the sexist) attitudes toward women in traditional roles: protective paternalism, idealization of women, and desire for intimate relations" (119). Essentially, even seemingly well-intentioned men can cause long-term, harmful consequences against women. While benevolent sexism may be less overtly harmful, Glick and Fiske assert that "both forms of sexism serve to justify and maintain patriarchy and traditional gender roles" (119). They argue that perpetrators of sexism justify their actions through "benevolent ideologies," and therefore reinforce the need male control in society (120). Their understandably broad argument has limited consideration of ethnic and racial elements, but these factors are necessary for examining the influence of sexism on non-white women.

I agree with Glick and Fiske that benevolent sexism is an avenue for silencing all women and cementing female subordination to men and patriarchal systems. I do however want to extend their analysis by examining the influence of colonialism as a means of controlling Indigenous women. As noted by Andrea Smith, "The intersections of gender violence and colonialism in Native women's lives force numerous contradictions upon Native antiviolence advocates…. The federal justice system is premised on the ongoing colonization of Native nations" (Smith 37). Underlying colonial forces help sexism extend past negatively impacting individuals to becoming an integral structure of society, and consequently make enacting change more difficult for antiviolence advocates. As a white woman, I have never personally experienced racism. In part, I developed my thesis because I want to become a more knowledgeable, anti-racist ally to the BIPOC community through intentional learning. I will defer to Indigenous women's experiences and their written scholarship for contextualizing the violence of benevolent sexism and influence on Native nations. Pairing their insight with the lens of *The Round House* by Louise Erdrich, I will then investigate the impact of "benevolent sexism" on Native women via their interpersonal relationships with Indigenous men.

Louise Erdrich is a German American woman and a premier Indigenous author of the Anishinaabe nation. She is an enrolled citizen of the Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa. As a Pulitzer Prize and National Book Award winner, Erdrich is extremely accomplished in weaving interesting, relevant tales that have socio-political relevance (Karell). *The Round House* is a part of Erdrich's "justice trilogy." The trilogy explores various ways of enacting justice in the face of settler colonial violence (Peterson xii). Connected by intergenerational storytelling and overlapping characters, each novel pursues a different approach. In *The Round House,* Erdrich looks to investigate retribution, or a method of justice that centers upon ensuring punishment

instead of dedicating time to the rehabilitation of wrongdoers. *The Round House* occurs on a fictional Ojibwe reservation in North Dakota. The plotline revolves around a white man, Linden Lark, raping an Indigenous woman, Geraldine Coutts, and the traumatic aftermath of the attack. Geraldine's son, Joe Coutts, is a young thirteen-year-old boy and the narrator of the story. The family struggles to navigate through the lingering harm and determine a pathway forward.

Geraldine's attack lays the groundwork for representing a common problem that Native communities face: white men robbing Indigenous women of their autonomy through sexual violence. Unfortunately, white men do not act alone. They are supported by an inequitable society. The social acceptance of violence manifests in structures like the legal system, and then those social organizations perpetuate harm through inaction. Deer examines the intersection of colonialism and sexual violence as she writes about their impact on individuals, saying, "Sexual assault mimics the worst traits of colonization in its attack on the body, invasion of physical boundaries, and disregard for humanity. A survivor of sexual assault may experience many of the same symptoms - self-blame, loss of identity, and long-term depression and despair - as a people surviving colonization" ("Decolonizing Rape Law" 150). In looking at the overlap between rape and colonization, Deer finds a shared space of pain. The use of the word "surviving" highlights the daily struggle of every individual grappling with the aftermath of violence in an unsafe space. She encourages readers to hold perpetrators accountable because she pinpoints the damaging effects of violence as "symptoms" of a larger cause. However, accountability must be centered upon the survivor's voice.

Whether or not individual responses account for survivors' input can thus illustrate the flaws of structural inadequacies in Western society. Though "autonomy" is usually defined as self-governance of an individual's own self and "sovereignty" is the oversight of a nation, the

terms will always be mutually influential because they determine *who* can act and *how.* Indigenous writer Leanne Simpson highlights the shared space of these terms in her book *As We Have Always Done,* especially when she titles a chapter "The Sovereignty of Indigenous Peoples' Bodies." She acknowledges the overlap between the violation of Indigenous women's bodies and the stripping of their rights by pointing out, "dismantling the power and influence of Indigenous women became important to the destruction of Indigenous nations" (Simpson 111). Simpson extends Deer's approach because she directly addresses the effect of complicit perpetrators who support white men:

> [The white women promoting assimilation-based teachings at Methodist missions] were out to destroy our agency, self-determination, body sovereignty, and freedom and to contain us under the colonial heteropatriarchy within which they lived and used to have power over us. White women were out to destroy our intelligence and political systems.
>
> This is genocide.
>
> This is sexual and gendered violence as a tool of genocide and as a tool of dispossession. It is deliberate. (Simpson 97)

Simpson's work provides social context for *The Round House's* fictionalized events. She reinforces the importance of agency, and the intersection of colonialism and power. The excerpt details how social systems can disrupt an individual's "agency, self-determination, body sovereignty, and freedom," and specifically Indigenous people's sense of self through the word "our." The overarching motivation of colonizers is "genocide," and the "sexual and gendered violence" is simply "a tool" to achieve extinction. It is incredibly important to recognize the larger social implications of sexual violence, though this paper will focus on the interpersonal consequences of Indigenous men ignoring a survivors' autonomy.

Though a white man is the attacker in *The Round House,* Simpson's example of white women who teach in Missions demonstrates that oppression works on various levels. White women may be threatened by "benevolent sexism," but their actions can still perpetuate "colonial heteropatriarchy." Deer highlights how Indigenous men can also contribute to violence against women through Navajo Nation Peacemaking Courts. The Peacemaking Courts are a restorative model meant to reconcile the perpetrator and the victim ("Decolonizing Rape Law" 155). Deer points out that one account fails to mention a survivor in any capacity. Their voice is ignored. Deer notes the importance of avoiding "further victimization" of survivors when pursing various solutions, and this insight illustrates how well-intentioned actions of Native men – and a wider Indigenous community – can negatively impact a survivor ("Decolonizing Rape Law" 156). They can become complicit in perpetuating trauma. This is why Erdrich's work is so important. Julie Tharp in "Erdrich's Crusade: Sexual Violence in *The Round House*," pinpoints Erdrich's concern for these prevalent attacks and the troubling statistics that support her fear (28-29). Erdrich says,

> I found out that one in three Native women suffer rape and sexual violence in a lifetime, knowing that practically no one even gets around to reporting it, when I found that over 80 percent of these crimes are committed by non- Native men…it felt like a small devastation of my spirit. (National, 2013, as cited in "Erdrich's Crusade," 2014)

Tharp continues on to intertwine Erdrich's quote with an analysis of her writing, saying "despite the emotional difficulty [that Erdrich experiences while writing], in *The Round House* Erdrich creates an approach that seems almost calculated to attract and transform readers" ("Erdrich's Crusade" 29). Tharp goes on to cite the format of the novel, Geraldine's job, role of Bazil as a judge, and the age of Joe Coutts as the causes for its ability to "attract and transform readers"

("Erdrich's Crusade" 29). While I agree that these points are strong facets that contribute to the novel's impact, I specifically disagree with Tharp's interpretation that they were points independent of – and "despite" – the "emotional difficulty" Erdrich experienced. I would argue that *because* of the "emotional difficulty," Erdrich was able to "attract and transform" readers of *The Round House* ("Erdrich's Crusade" 28-29). Through using the pain to focus the story on a realistic person instead of a statistic, Erdrich lays the groundwork for her audience to understand how rape traumatizes Native communities. As a result, readers feel the same "devastation of [their] spirits" when moving through the novel that Erdrich underwent when researching prevalent statistics ("Erdrich's Crusade" 28-29). For example, the emotional impact of witnessing Geraldine in the hospital causes the audience to become invested in the novel's outcome and, hopefully, fight to ensure that the above statistic decreases in real life.

Erdrich set *The Round House* in the year 1988, and she interweaves the period's unique legal complexities with the overarching impact of Western society on Indigenous communities. For example, Erdrich publishes *The Round House* before key legislation like the Violence Against Women Act. The Act combats the lack of judicial oversight when non-Indigenous rapists harm Native women (Jimenez 2). While its implementation has improved protections for Native communities, the threat of sexual violence remains a harsh reality for Indigenous women. Prior to its authorization, Erdrich uses *The Round House* to navigate a gaping space within the legal system and introduce an important conversation. Today, as VAWA is not a perfect solution, Erdrich's work addresses lingering concerns. Erdrich shows the difficulties of prosecuting the novel's key attacker through a conversation between Bazil and his son Joe. She also opens the conversation to let readers explore the ongoing, ever-present pitfalls of the American legal system building upon and editing itself. In a messy construction of kitchen utensils, Bazil mimics

the flawed United States justice system to point out that each case's harmful decision builds upon past precedent:

> Take *Johnson v. McIntosh.* It's 1823…Justice Marshall went out of his way to strip away all Indian title to all lands viewed—i.e., "discovered"—by Europeans.
>
> I pointed at the bottom of the mess. I suppose that's *Lone Wolf v. Hitchcock*.
>
> And *Tee-Hit-Ton*.
>
> …But this one—my father teased a particularly disgusting bit of sludge from the pile with the edge of his fork—this one is the one I'd abolish right this minute if I had the power of a movie shaman. *Oliphant v. Suquamish.* He shook the fork and the stink wafted at me. Took from us the right to prosecute non-Indians who commit crimes on our land. (*The Round House* 228-229)

Justice Marshall using *Johnson and McIntosh* to justify the loss of Indigenous land for monetary gain primes the court systems for further loss of jurisdiction as well as personal rights. In an arbitrary choice, he gives the rights to Europeans who "discovered" an already inhabited land. *Lone Wolf v. Hitchcock* then lets Congress "void treaty obligations negotiated with Indians (wards of the nation)," so the United States can choose to honor or ignore agreements based on their personal interest (Carden). As "wards of the nation," Indigenous people are also further limited because they are not recognized as a fellow nation with the same rights as American citizens. Finally, *Oliphant v. Suquamish* ensures that there is no viable legal recourse for Indigenous women who are sexually assaulted, as their own nation's laws become unenforceable against outside attackers. The visual representation of the *Oliphant v. Suquamish* case as a "particularly disgusting bit of sludge" with a "stink" further communicates its detrimental effects. Even worse, Linden Lark represents men who understand the legal system and use the

loopholes to their advantage. Lark says himself, “I’ve been boning up on the law” (*The Round House* 161). The law is supposed to hold people who inflict harm accountable. Instead, Lark demonstrates that perpetrators will weaponize their knowledge without consequence.

Lark is an obvious antagonist, and so I am particularly interested in refocusing on the characters of Bazil and Joe through the lens of “benevolent sexism.” Coming from a place of shared trauma, Bazil and Joe seek to provide Geraldine with closure through their own versions of justice. Bazil and Joe, by continuing to pursue their own plans in place of amplifying Geraldine’s voice, implicitly suggest that they know better. Their benevolent intentions disguise inherent sexism. Each one chooses a form of retributive justice, either through the United States legal system or Indigenous law, to punish Lark. Legally, retributive justice usually occurs “following the determination of guilt, a judge imposes the appropriate sentence, which can include a fine, incarceration, and, in extreme cases, a penalty of death” (Hermann 72). In *The Round House,* Basil and Joe become self-appointed judges of wrongdoing and inflict punishment upon Linden Lark for committing rape. There are, of course, many reasonable critiques of United States and Indigenous law. Rather than opining about the substance of either system, I will focus on showing that the execution of subjective justice in *The Round House* is harmful. First, it is important to compare the shared pattern of sexism across Lark, Bazil, and Joe. Then, in a later chapter, I will contrast their lack of intentional, direct support for Geraldine.

Though with benevolent intentions and far fewer repercussions, Bazil and Joe are similar to Lark because they prioritize their own wants, purposefully ignore Geraldine’s wishes, and consequently inflict pain. The character of Lark will outline this framework, and then the next two chapters will detail Bazil and Joe’s behavior through the same lens. Let us look at relevant scholarship, the nuanced overlap between the three male characters, and then track Lark’s

behavioral patterns. Tharp says that Lark is one of the many male characters who, together, represent "the implication is that individuals from the very ordinary all the way to the governor's office carry racist and sexist attitudes and practices that essentially institutionalize abuse" ("Erdrich's Crusade" 34). I agree with Tharp's interpretation in part, because Lark does personify "the racist and sexist attitudes" of those in power who "institutionalize abuse." However, I want to focus on another layer of nuance. Particularly, Tharp's choice to use the phrase "very ordinary [individuals]" in association with Lark. The context of the sentence implies that Lark represents other white men who benefit from systematic oppression. That's true. I will investigate how internalized colonialist misogyny impacts the behavior of those who are disenfranchised by the same system of power as Indigenous women. Through the characters of Bazil and Joe Coutts, we can see how individualized beliefs of right and wrong plus the institutionalized systems cause family members of survivors – who are seeking fair recourse – to perpetuate sexist harm. It is important to recognize the similarities in their behavioral patterns as well as acknowledging that all inflict varying degrees of pain.

First, Linden Lark violates Geraldine through ignoring her bodily autonomy and committing rape. Lark learns that Geraldine has an important file, and forces Mayla – Lark's nonconsenting, kidnapped lover – to convince Geraldine to retrieve the document. Lark throws a sack over Geraldine's head, rapes her, and then leads Geraldine to join Mayla and Mayla's baby at the Round House. The violence embedded within this choice is captured by Lark's threat to Geraldine:

> He said, Sshhh, sshhh. I have another book of matches, a lighter even, down the hill. And you, he shook me and said into my face, you, if you move an inch I will kill this baby and

> if you move an inch I will kill Mayla. You are going to die but if you say one word even one word up in heaven after you are dead I will kill them both. (*The Round House* 162)

The act of Lark hushing Geraldine in the moment with a quick, "Sshhh, sshhh" foreshadows the silencing she endures to protect Mayla and the baby, even after escaping. Geraldine must be afraid of Lark's seemingly boundless power and his opportunity to make good on the threat of killing her. After all, he extends his power beyond earthly constraints to include if Geraldine utters "one word even one word up in heaven." While an exaggeration, this statement emphasizes the power imbalance between Geraldine and Lark as captive and captor and as Indigenous woman and white man. The location of this attack, in the Round House, solidifies this wider discrepancy. Thomas Matchie, in "Law Versus Love in *The Round House*" particularly delves into this claim by explaining how traditional stories shape the conception of it as "a symbol of communal love and justice provided by old tribal law" (354). Lark can not only verbally attack two women and a child within the space, but also even store "matches" and a "lighter" just down the hill as a tangible threat. Lark violates Geraldine as an individual person as well as a place of deep importance to the Indigenous community.

Lark succeeds in silencing Geraldine as she believes his threat against Mayla and her baby. The pain that Geraldine experiences highlights her true lack of autonomy; accordingly, the pain reverberates through the community to maximize the negative impact. As Geraldine lays in a hospital bed, her husband and son come to visit. As Joe approaches her bed, he notes the difference in Geraldine's appearance before and after the attack. Like Joe, readers are only just putting together the piece of what happened. As a result, this is a key moment in parsing out the truth about Geraldine's well-being. Erdrich writes:

> My mother was a beautiful woman—that's something I always knew. A given among family, among strangers… Now I saw my mother's face puffed with welts and distorted to an ugly shape. She peered through slits in the swollen flesh of her lids.
>
> What happened? I asked stupidly. She didn't answer. Tears leaked from the corners of her eyes. She blotted them away with a gauze-wrapped fist. I'm all right, Joe. Look at me. See? And I looked at her. But she was not all right. (*The Round House* 10)

In this scene, Geraldine is experiencing physical, mental, and emotional trauma. Geraldine is covered in "welts" and "gauze," and she can only see through the "slits in the swollen flesh of her lids." The lingering mental effects – and deeper shift in Geraldine's personhood – is reflected in her behavior. When Joe asks for an explanation, Geraldine suddenly becomes responsible for detailing the attack to her son. Geraldine's lack of response and involuntary reactions show she is mentally unequipped to respond. Particularly, as Geraldine cannot voice to Joe that she was attacked and instead "didn't answer," she ultimately silences herself as a protection method. Then, while attempting to reassure Joe that she is okay despite her physical appearance, "tears leaked from the corners of her eyes." Even as Geraldine blots the tears away "with a gauze-wrapped fist," she cannot conceal the physical manifestation of her lingering trauma. She cannot stop herself from crying. Geraldine attempts to reassure her son, but, with one look, Joe understands the separation between her claim and her physical appearance. She cannot control the obvious signs of trauma, and they highlight the lack of autonomy she has even in presenting herself to the world. Ultimately, Lark's choices force Geraldine to enter a state of silent suffering.

It is important to acknowledge the wrongdoing of the attacker Linden Lark, and then to take the arguments one step further by considering the gradient of sexism. Geraldine's husband and son decentering her voice shows how a survivor's struggle extends past an attack to also

include the pathway forward afterwards. I want to acknowledge that Bazil and Joe are also suffering, and their actions are driven by a desire to help Geraldine. Their behavior is also far less damaging than Lark's choices. Still, by recognizing the repetition of Geraldine setting a boundary, a male character ignoring her voice in favor of their own decision, and the consequential negative impact, Erdrich demonstrates that even the protagonists – the "good guys" – can perpetuate large-scale harm through "benevolent sexism." Geraldine's husband and her son seem to represent two potential pathways of retribution, Western and Indigenous, respectively. Erdrich addresses the historical and present-day flaws within the two systems when they ignore a survivor's voice. But, because the two pathways come from husband and son wanting to help the third member of their family, interpersonal relationships drive the initiation, completion, and fallout of their choices. The focus of my argument is therefore about centering survivors' voices in interpersonal relationships. Contrasting the sexist pattern with moments that highlight Geraldine's autonomy and her self-determined path to healing, we can see Erdrich critique retributive justice and show the power of restoring autonomy to the survivor. This lens is important because everyone wants to be the protagonist when reading a novel. After all, the main character is usually a "good" person and the audience identifies with their positive traits. By considering how even their flaws can negatively affect the community, Indigenous men may be able to reflect on their own behavior and consider how to best uplift survivors' voices through communal support.

Bazil:

An Eye for An Eye, But Who Gets Hurt?

After Linden Lark attacks Geraldine, the Coutts family searches for a way to heal from the pain. The shared yearning for repair coexists with Bazil and Joe inflicting unintentional harm on Geraldine. In first focusing on Geraldine's husband Bazil Coutts, we can see how he ignores Geraldine's personal needs, like comfort and security, in favor of his own goal of legal resolution. Bazil wants to put Lark behind bars. He lets his personal experience and emotions justify ignoring Geraldine's protests against the case. Although to a significantly lesser degree than Lark, Bazil consequently perpetuates sexist treatment too. Bazil's approach embodies "benevolent sexism," or the "subjectively positive orientation of protection… [which still] serves to justify women's subordinate status to men" (Glick 763). He frames going to court as a "protection" for Geraldine against Lark. Bazil may truly believe that he is helping his wife, but his behavior reinforces "women's subordinate status to men" by replacing Geraldine's voice with his own. He prioritizes his beliefs over Geraldine's autonomy, silences her understandable disagreements, and causes harm to her well-being. This chapter will confront the faulty reasoning justifying Bazil's choices and the resulting pain to argue against decentering the survivor's voice.

Bazil is hopeful for a legal remedy because of his role as a judge. The importance of his job is shown after Geraldine goes to bed, when Bazil works with his son to try and cross-reference past court cases with Geraldine's experience to try and find a legal solution. As his father insists that they grab the stack of files, Joe observes, "His voice was hard and urgent… And it was then that I began to understand who my father was, what he did every day, and what had been his life. Over the course of the next week, we culled several cases from the corpus of his work" (*The Round House* 44). The tediousness of reviewing cases "every day" lets Joe gain

insight into "what had been [his father's] life" and, more so, the very essence of "who [his] father was." The inherent connection between Bazil and the law is reinforced by Erdrich using the word "corpus" to refer to Bazil's work. Since the term derives from the Latin word "body," it serves to visually reinforce Bazil's deep connection to the legal system as even a tangible piece of himself. The scene also highlights Bazil's emotional connection to the legal system, and how he relies on his work for a solution as a person rather than as a detached judge. After all, Bazil is also suffering because this case revolves around an attack on his wife. Particularly, the descriptor of his voice as "hard and urgent" reflects the severity of the situation, and implies the underlying personal pain is unforgettable even while "cull[ing] several cases." Ultimately, Joe's observations highlight Bazil's reliance on his judgeship for finding meaning in life during difficult situations.

By describing Bazil's commitment to his judicial role and the tone of his voice, Erdrich foreshadows how Bazil processes the pain of the attack himself through the court system. *The Plague of Doves* and *The Round House* by Seema Kurup claims that since Bazil Coutts is "responsible for the well-being of his wife and son, he must reconcile his faith in the law with an overwhelming desire to defend his family by any means… He must master his anger and need for vengeance to uphold the central obligation he bears to the tribal community as their judicial representative" (68). I agree that Bazil carries the weight of a community-wide responsibility through his role as a judge. His job also does establish the baseline of his character; however, I would argue that Bazil does not "master his anger" to balance vengeance and community. He lets the court system fuel his frustration. He encourages his family to participate in the process, even when it is detrimental to his wife's mental well-being. Bazil, as the support system for his young son and traumatized wife, cannot not break down. He instead comes to terms with the attack via enacting his desperate desire for justice.

As Bazil explains, he wants a legal resolution so that perpetrators are accountable for their actions. In the kitchen discussing his job as a judge, Bazil explains to his son, "Our records will be scrutinized by Congress one day and decisions on whether to enlarge our jurisdiction will be made. Some day. We want the right to prosecute criminals of all races on all lands within our original boundaries. Which is why I try to run a tight courtroom, Joe. What I am doing now is for the future, though it may seem small, or trivial, or boring, to you" (*The Round House* 229-230). First, this sentence reestablishes Bazil's end goal: "the right to prosecute criminals of all races on all lands within our original boundaries." There are also underlying implications noting the personal stake embedded in his hopes. The inclusion of "all races" – perhaps particularly referencing white men – may be a nod to Geraldine's attacker, Lark, and "all lands" could gesture to the conflicting laws over jurisdiction causing Geraldine's case to halt. Despite – or perhaps because of – Bazil's personal ties, he associates justice with the courtroom. He believes upkeeping records can ensure that Congress will "enlarge [their] jurisdiction." Bazil therefore ignores Joe's comments about his job as "small, or trivial, or boring" because he desperately wants his life's work to ensure a peaceful process of healing for his wife. Unfortunately, the timeline is unachievable. Bazil's goals are reduced to "some day."

Bazil ties processing the attack to the legal system, even though a resolution requires his wife's unwilling participation. Bazil does not take a step back and let Geraldine dictate their pathway forward. To serve his own healing, he continuously involves Geraldine despite her objections. Bazil forces Geraldine to relive the attack so that he can gather relevant information. The recounting furthers his healing process but worsens Geraldine's trauma.

In place of processing his own emotional turmoil through independent legal research, Bazil's role as a judge grows to influence his family's path forward. Bazil's choices embody

benevolent sexism. He repeatedly argues that a legal resolution is necessary despite Geraldine's clear refusal. The weight of Geraldine's disdain becomes evident. One of the first instances of Geraldine's disapproval comes when the Coutts family sits in their bedroom together after eating dinner. Geraldine begins to open up about the attack and Bazil presses for more information:

> "Where?" said my father.
>
> "Somewhere."
>
> "Can you say anything about where?"
>
> "Somewhere. That's where it happened. He kept the sack on me. And he raped me. Somewhere." "Did you go uphill or downhill?"
>
> "I don't know, Bazil."
>
> "Through the woods? Did leaves brush you? I don't know. What about the ground gravel? brush? Was there a barbed-wire fence?"
>
> My mother screamed in a hoarse voice until her lungs emptied and there was silence.
>
> "Three classes of land meet there," my father said. His voice pulled tight with fear. "Tribal trust, state, and fee. That's why I'm asking."
>
> "Get out of the courtroom, get the damn hell out," my mother said. "I don't know." (*The Round House* 159-160)

The conversation between their family is the first time readers hear Geraldine share her story. To maximize its impact, Erdrich purposefully reduces the scene to only dialogue to build to Geraldine's command. Erdrich's decision is seen through the character of Joe and the lack of descriptive elements. Though present, Joe does not interject during his parents' exchange. He becomes a passive vessel through which readers can see the argument. Bazil is also reduced to dialogue, so there are no physical reactions or verbal intonations to couch his words. The focus is

Geraldine's experience, but the cost is loving comfort from her family. Neither father nor son validate or comfort Geraldine during the exchange, so they seem to deprioritize supporting her voice.

The rapid-fire conversation demonstrates that Bazil's main intention is to gather information for the court case. He ignores the negative impact of prioritizing fact-finding over Geraldine's well-being. Bazil specifically continues to challenge Geraldine's memory. He re-asks the same question – "Where?" – in an abundance of ways. His desperation for any sort of direction – even going so far as to ask whether there was "gravel," "brush," or "a barbed-wire fence" – is, of course, because he wants to determine jurisdiction. This interest comes at the cost of supporting Geraldine. She tries to reclaim her voice - and the focus of the conversation - by screaming. Geraldine yelled "in a hoarse voice until her lungs emptied" and demonstrates the extent of her frustration. The scream also reinforces how badly she does not want to be quieted. The text reads, "then there was silence." However, Geraldine's agency and her husband's silence does not last long. Bazil reclaims the conversation to explain his relentless pursuit of knowledge in service of his version of justice, saying "three classes of land meet there." These different groups mean that there are three possible jurisdictions that could govern her case. Bazil is desperately scrambling for a solution through determining jurisdiction instead of listening to his traumatized wife. Geraldine is then forced to clearly articulate her desire that he leave the law and focus on her pain. She orders her husband to "out of the courtroom, get the damn hell out." In doing so, Geraldine restates a clear boundary to uplift her voice. This moment is representative of a larger hope, because Geraldine wants her husband by her side as they move forward together down her own, self-determined pathway.

Joe's father consistently violates Geraldine's boundaries to move the court case forward. Bazil tries to collect evidence so that they can prosecute the case, including a key file. Bazil needs more information from Geraldine about its location and contents. He recruits Joe, who overheard Geraldine discussing the document, and Special Agent Bjerke, the FBI agent assigned to investigate Geraldine's case, to interrogate Geraldine. Detailing Agent Bjerke's arrival and his conversation with Bazil and Joe Coutts, Erdrich writes:

> Special Agent Bjerke was in our kitchen the next morning to approach the problem of questioning my mother about the particular file.
>
> Would it help if we had a woman? To talk? We can get a female agent to drive over from our Minneapolis office.
>
> I don't think so.
>
> … We'll have to break through her denial, is how he put it, and I felt a miserable dread.
>
> The three of us went upstairs. My father first, then Bjerke, me last… We entered and sat down in two folding chairs he'd pulled up next to her bed. He lowered himself, like a dog that knows it isn't welcome, onto the end of the bed. My mother moved to the far edge of the mattress and lay hunched, her back to us, the pillow childishly held over her ears. (*The Round House* 150-151)

Whether because of debilitating pain or a purposeful choice to ignore their attempts to converse, the physical posture of Geraldine – laying "hunched," facing away from the entering group, and with the pillow against her ears – paints a clear picture of a woman who does not want to partake in her husband's plan. Yet, Geraldine's husband enters her room anyway. Bazil is the first person to breach her space and involve her in an unwanted conversation despite the clear dismissal in

Geraldine's behavior. He is not alone in this choice. Special Agent Bjerke and his son Joe follow Bazil's lead. They support and further worsen the violation of Geraldine's boundaries. The agent asks Bazil, rather than Geraldine herself, if she would prefer a female interviewer. After Bazil declines, Agent Bjerke continues to treat Geraldine as an object rather than an animate person. He asserts, "We'll have to break through her denial." In this sentence, the "we" refers to the three men becoming a collective force against Geraldine. Geraldine's consent becomes second to their goal of collecting evidence for a court case. Bazil does not object to Agent Bjerke's approach. His behavior shows tacit endorsement. Bazil's behavioral model causes the cycle of ignoring inconvenient autonomy to continue from father to son.

Like Bazil, Joe explains their decision-making as solving "the problem of questioning my mother." Like the agent, he places the men in a position of power, as the problem solvers, and his mother as the subordinate, inanimate "problem." Geraldine's wishes are ignored in his analysis. His self-assigned superiority continues into entering his parents' bedroom, as Joe calls his mother's response of placing a pillow over her head as "childish." Joe's phrasing implies that Geraldine lacks reliable decision-making skills and should rely upon adults for direction. Ultimately, Joe is learning to follow his father's lead. He is learning to silence his mother and dismiss her boundaries.

It also becomes clear that Bazil's choice to pursue a court case stems from the same anger that feeds into violent retribution. The shared source of anger underscores the detrimental impact of benevolent sexism, even though it is less damaging than its hostile counterpart. The emotional reasoning behind Bazil's behavior becomes clear when he sees Lark in a grocery store and responds with aggression. Anger drives Bazil. For context, Bazil goes to the grocery store with his son. Bazil knows that Lark is the rapist and has seen Geraldine's resulting pain firsthand. *The*

Round House offers no evidence of premeditation, but anger causes Bazil to act with immediate vengeance rather than rational behavior. As Joe and Bazil walk together, Joe suddenly sees Lark and observes as,

> My father threw the cream, surged forward, and grabbed Lark by the shoulders. He spun Lark, jamming him backward, then gripped Lark around the throat with both hands. As I've said before, my dad was somewhat clumsy. But he attacked with such an instinct of sudden rage it looked slick as a movie stunt. (*The Round House* 243-244)

Rather than promoting healing, Bazil's emotions cause more damage. In forcing a court case and hurting Lark, Bazil makes an independent judgement that negatively impacts himself and his family. Prior to Bazil "gripp[ing] Lark around the throat with both hands," he does not consult his son Joe. Just as Bazil ignores Geraldine's wishes in deciding to proceed with the court case, he is so taken by emotion – "an instinct of sudden rage" – that he fails to include the opinions of people who share in his trauma, his family. Bazil jumps to his own solution. In his treatment of Geraldine, Bazil places her wishes second to his own plans. Similarly, Bazil forgets his fatherly responsibility as a role model for his young son. The two are simply going grocery shopping, but Bazil carelessly "throws the cream" and attacks Lark instead of moving forward independently with his family. Indigenous writer Joy Harjo offers insight into Bazil's emotional turmoil through her explanation of the difficulties that Indigenous men face and their inherent vulnerability. She says, "Our males are as sensitive as the women, and carry gifts forward that have difficulty finding a place in a world that does not honor them. It's not an impossible test, but it wears away at the spirit" (Harjo 98). Bazil has also been deeply impacted by the attack, but he does not have the space to be "sensitive." He is trying to use "his gift," judicial knowledge and analysis of precedent, but the legal system is composed of systemic barriers that fail to "honor" him.

Ultimately, the failure does "wear away at [his] spirit." He cannot protect his wife, and, in turn, has "difficulty finding a place" for himself in the aftermath of the attack. His anger may be an understandable response vulnerability, but its manifestation in his behavior inexcusably impacts the people he loves.

Additionally, the outcome of the case and the grocery store incident is the same. Lark escapes unharmed both times. In fact, he enjoys the attack: "The thing was, Lark seemed to be smiling. If you can smile while being choked and can-beaten, he was doing it. Like he was excited by our attack" (*The Round House* 244). Lark's reaction represents the harm of Bazil continuing to feed and invest in a recourse determined by someone other than the survivor. He is distracted from his wife's recovery and worsening the perpetrator's hold on their lives. This interpretation of Bazil's decision is further supported by its incongruency with the Indigenous definition of "mino bimaadiziwin," or, "the good life." Madsen uses a commencement speech to point of Erdrich's definition of the good life: "With this knowledge you have the makings of *mino bimaadiziwin*, in Ojibwe, the good life. Knowledge with Courage. Knowledge with Fortitude. Knowledge with Generosity and Kindness. This is *mino bimaadiziwin*" (Web, 2009, as cited in Karell, 2013). Madsen goes on to discuss mino bimaadiziwin in the wake of colonialism and its accompanying challenges and claims Erdrich's "core theme is the challenge of self-definition within the context of Native American history and pressures applied by such institutions as tribe, family, Church, police and the BIA" (Karell 10). When looking at *The Round House,* each family member is struggling with "the challenge of self-definition" in the aftermath of the attack. Bazil can no longer be just a distant judge. Rather than give into anger to resolve his internal turmoil, mino bimaadiziwin dictates a different response. Though Erdrich does not specify who should receive the benefits of someone's "Courage," "Fortitude,"

"Generosity," and "Kindness," I am not advocating for Bazil to treat Lark with any positive behavior. Rather, Bazil should define himself in relation to the survivor, Geraldine. Lark is an outside "pressure" that Bazil can resist engaging. Bazil would be using his "Knowledge" of the attack and its impact on Geraldine to honor his wife. There is strength in support. By focusing upon her preferred approach, Bazil would give her his "Courage," "Fortitude," "Generosity," and "Kindness." Instead of being governed by anger, Bazil can lead with and through love.

The Coutts family grapples with the negative consequences of Bazil hurting Lark. Bazil himself suffers a heart attack moments later (*The Round House* 244). Plus, just as in the treatment of Geraldine with Agent Bjerke, his son again learns to mimic his behavior. Like Bazil's violence, Joe notes that

> I smashed the can on his forehead and opened a cut just over Lark's eye. A pure black joy in seeing his blood filled me. Blood and cream. I smashed as hard as I could and something—maybe the shock of my happiness or Lark's happiness—caused my father to let go of Lark's throat. (*The Round House* 244)

Joe, shockingly, strikes hard enough to draw blood. Whereas readers only have a second-hand impression of Bazil's internal emotional turmoil when he first strikes at Lark, Joe expresses joy in seeing "[Lark's] blood" directly to the audience. Erdrich again uses color to emphasize important points, particularly by shading the emotion as "a pure black joy." Erdrich's decision to involve Joe further ensures that readers do not believe this act of revenge is the correct choice. After all, the attack changes a young boy's perception of violence and willingness to engage. The speculation that Bazil stops because of the "shock of [Joe's] happiness," shows that Bazil may recognize that his son follows his lead in determining the morality of violence. He is too late to stop the communicated implication: righteousness can ignore someone's bodily autonomy. In

attacking Lark and communicating with Geraldine, Bazil reinforces the same message and creates devastating consequences.

When reclaiming the narrative surrounding Indigenous people from Western representation, Harjo says, “Maybe if we take care of our own story of our people, and make a story of justice, honesty, with a vision of caring for all within the tribe, we might inspire the same in others” (Harjo 100). The stories that we tell and consume are equally as important as the ones we live. Harjo’s point can critique Bazil’s approach, because she couples “justice” with “caring for all within the tribe.” The two go hand and hand, so Bazil cannot separate supporting his wife from holding Lark accountable. Geraldine’s voice should be centered. The term “story” is also important because it highlights the importance of *The Round House* as a teaching tool. Erdrich depicts flawed characters, but these mistakes demonstrate pitfalls that Indigenous men can avoid. In “taking care of our own story” and recording not only the good but also the harm, Erdrich can “inspire” better in future generations.

After the continuous violations of Geraldine’s autonomy, Erdrich reveals the heartbreaking results of the court case: the judge dismissed their claims because of uncertainty over jurisdiction. Joe returns home after a long day in town. Without forewarning, he stands outside of his house and recounts:

> I heard my mother scream. And scream again. And then I heard my father’s low voice grinding between her shrieks. Her voice veered and fell, just the way I’d just been riding, crashing hard, until finally it dropped to an astonished mutter.
>
> I stood outside, holding my bike up, leaning on it. Pearl was next to me. Eventually, my father walked out the back screen door and lit a cigarette, which I had never seen

him do. His face was yellow with exhaustion. His eyes were so red they seemed rimmed with blood. He turned and saw me.

They let him go, didn't they, I said. (*The Round House*, 226)

The harmful consequences of relying upon Bazil's pathway to justice manifest in each of the character's behavior. For Geraldine, Erdrich shows the effect through the description of her voice. Her voice goes from a loud "scream" to a quiet "mutter." She is, ultimately, silenced. The audience cannot decipher even one word that is Geraldine's own, only the pain embedded in a shriek akin to "crashing hard." Even her well-meaning husband and son contribute to this silencing. First, Joe hears Bazil's "low voice grinding between her shrieks." Bazil may be comforting Geraldine, but he interrupts her expression of pain. Next, Bazil is then the one to come outside to speak with Joe and explain the impact of her trauma. Perhaps Erdrich chose this approach because there are no words to describe her pain, but the effect of turning Geraldine's narrative to Bazil is silence. Then, Joe is the one to finally voice the court's conclusion. Even the metaphor articulating the rise and fall of her voice as it "veered and fell, just the way I'd just been riding, crashing hard, until finally it dropped" is Joe's creation. Consequently, Geraldine's voice never stands on its own.

Geraldine's voice does reach her husband and son, and, through these two characters, Erdrich amplifies how the negative outcome of one case can affect an entire community. Bazil and Joe act as extensions of Geraldine's pain and share her suffering. Particularly, her husband's face is "face was yellow with exhaustion" and his eyes are "so red they seemed rimmed with blood." The use of primary colors as descriptors causes the hurt to become tangible. In turn, Bazil's physical reaction seems more jarring. Turning to her son, Joe's role is a reminder that children are also hurt. Specifically, Joe comparing his mother's voice becoming silent to his bike

"crashing hard" emphasizes a child-like understanding of a mature, complicated situation. This metaphor makes his suffering, as a young boy watching his mother cope with a horrible trauma, seem even more unfair. It is important to remember that Geraldine's husband and son can be traumatized by her experience, and still worsen the negative impact upon Geraldine herself by contributing to silencing her.

Whether pursuing a court case or attacking Lark directly, Bazil's anger is detrimental to his wife. Geraldine does not request either approach, but his actions mean that she must grapple with his disregard and Joe's resulting, learned sexism anyway. Bazil's justification is insufficient, but an excellent teaching tool. People may automatically reject naming their own biases for fear of social rejection. One way to dismantle individual sexism may be to promote the understanding of its causes and effects through literature. Years after *The Round House*'s publication, Erdrich acknowledges other authors' approaches to confronting the aftermath of trauma. She notes that one work specifically finds "a better way to live than in a fog of revenge… What impresses me is the idea that in order to go forward you do your best to understand your enemy. As a writer, I do not judge. I just attempt to understand" (Olcese). Despite the temporal difference between Erdrich's words and *The Round House*'s release, there is a timeless resonance in the last sentence. Perhaps depicting Bazil's anger is not simply judging its emotional validity, but an attempt for writer and readers alike to try and understand the various responses to trauma and consequential handling of "enemies." Lark is an obvious enemy when applying Erdrich's statements to *The Round House.* However, anger is also a subtle villain that we can work "to understand." It can cause people to stay trapped "in a fog of revenge" rather than engage in purposeful healing. Through raising awareness, Erdrich's audience can contemplate the benefits and drawbacks of an emotionally driven response that ignores a survivor's voice.

Joe:

“Boys Will Be Boys”

Like his family, Joe suffers in the aftermath of Geraldine's traumatic attack. Joe's reaction mirror Bazil's behavioral pattern, as the two characters dismiss Geraldine's autonomy in favor of their own desires. In the case of Lark, Joe perpetuates benevolent sexism by ignoring his mother's protests and enacting his version of fair retribution. Joe, alongside his friend Cappy, kills Lark. Afterward, Bazil justifies attacking Lark through an Indigenous precedent of killing wiindigoos for the betterment of the community. For context, Julie Tharp uses shared traits across various stories to define the term wiindigoo as "a cannibalistic monster set loose by human greed, envy, and jealousy" (*Windigo Ways* 119). To fight a wiindigoo, Tharp goes on to explain that there must be communal support (119). I agree that Lark may be a wiindigoo; however, Joe's method to remove Lark from the community resists preexisting scholarship on wiindigoo justice. Joe chooses to be alone. He does not confide in his parents or his friends. Bazil's offered justification could simply be a father trying to protect his son, but his explanation may also be Erdrich warning against supporting the actions of benevolent sexism through Indigenous precedent. After all, Bazil justifies murder.

Still, Erdrich lets Joe's adult narration recognize his faults and attempt redemption. Joe also inflicts harm upon a young woman, Sonja, by watching her dance provocatively without her consent. Erdrich forces Joe to recognize his responsibility for Sonja's pain as a young man in the moment, and Erdrich then uses Joe's apologetic adult narration to make space for promoting women's autonomy. Although Joe hurts Sonja in a more obviously sexist manner, readers can draw parallels with the way Joe treats his mother. Joe ignores the women's pleas, prioritizes his own interests, and causes substantial harm. While adult Joe's attitude shift does not erase their pain, his mature perspective is important. Joe's reflection primes audiences to view sexist actions with similar regret. The novel ends abruptly after Joe kills Lark, so readers must independently

scrutinize Joe's actions. Joe's guilt about silencing Sonja encourages a critical view of his choice to ignore his mother's autonomy as well. Young Indigenous male readers can consequently consider their own power before inflicting harm, not afterwards like Joe.

Joe, as a young thirteen-year-old boy, is deeply affected by Lark's attack on his mother and the consequential trauma damages their relationship. Geraldine is processing her pain and Joe is grappling with his inability to help in her recovery. Even in the initial moments of the aftermath, the widening divide between mother and son becomes evident. Joe enters his mother's hospital room and watches as

> The nurse came in, raised the end of the bed with a crank. Laid another blanket over her. I hung my head and leaned toward her. I tried to stroke her wrapped wrist and cold, dry fingertips. With a cry, she snatched her hand away as though I'd hurt her. She went rigid and closed her eyes. This action devastated me. (*The Round House* 10)

By describing Geraldine's fingers as "cold" and "dry," Erdrich makes her appear lifeless and distant. Joe reaches out to comfort his mother as he "tried to stroke her wrapped wrist," but the original level of familial intimacy has understandably disappeared. Geraldine first physically distances herself and moves "her hand away as though [Joe] hurt her." She further isolates herself from her son emotionally, as, in place of explaining her reaction, she "went rigid" and "closed her eyes." Geraldine effectively cuts herself off from the conversation, and from her son. As a result, "this action devastated" Joe. His emotional reaction is reinforced by the surrounding scene, because a nurse is able to manipulate "the end of the bed with a crank" and put "another blanket over [Geraldine]." The unaffiliated, unknown nurse can provide more comfort to Geraldine than her son. While Geraldine is not at all to blame for her trauma-based response,

their interaction lays the groundwork for Joe's pain because he begins to understand his mother's suffering.

Joe desperately wants to relieve Geraldine's pain. After his family fails to receive a conviction for Geraldine's attacker, Joe decides to take matters into his own hands. Joe, despite Geraldine's strict orders to the contrary, ignores his mother's autonomy and attempts to seek revenge. Even though father and son share the same goal of retributive justice, Joe's decision is justified by traditional Indigenous law rather than the United States' court system. Despite the divergence in justification, Joe, like Lark and Bazil, repeats the pattern of ignoring Geraldine's boundaries and perpetuating her trauma.

To prove this interpretation, it is important to start with Geraldine explicitly expressing that she does not wish for her Joe to go down this pathway. In a conversation between mother and son, Joe enters her room and threatens her with his plan. Despite her objections, Joe continues to press:

> This jolt of strong reaction from her triggered something in me. I kept goading her.
>
> I'll do it. There is nothing to stop me. I know who he is and I'm going after him. You can't stop me because you're here in bed. You can't get out. You're trapped in here. And it stinks. Do you know it stinks in here?
>
> … Stop that, Joe.
>
> I turned away from the window. She was sitting up. There was no blood in her face at all. Her skin had a pasty, sunless quality. But she stared at me and spoke in an even and commanding tone.
>
> Now you listen to me, Joe. You will not badger me or harass me. You will leave me

> to think the way I want to think, here. I have to heal any way I can. You will stop asking questions and you will not give me any worry. You will not go after him. You will not terrify me, Joe. I've had enough fear for my whole life. You will not add to my fear. You will not add to my sorrows. You will not be part of this.
>
> I stood before her, small again.
>
> This what?
>
> All of this. She swept her arm toward the door. It is all a violation. (*The Round House* 90)

The back and forth between mother and son is quite powerful, because Joe and Geraldine are each fighting for their voice – their pathway forward – to be loudest. Joe argues that he should be allowed to attack and kill Lark. Weighed down by the pain of the attack, Geraldine is desperate to protect her son by stopping him. Joe lays out his plan, hears Geraldine's disagreement, and continues arguing. Joe claims her disapproval "triggered something" within himself. The vague language of "something" leaves room for interpretation when trying to understand his approach. However, "goading" implies that Joe wants control over his mother. He wants to cause a "strong reaction" rather than resolve the lingering tension. Joe wants to have the power of making his mother react, even in a negative way. In doing so, he is reclaiming power over his trauma. After all, Joe himself details the change his mother has undergone. He realizes that "a warm part of her was gone and might not return" (193). As a family member of someone who experienced a vicious attack and a young boy who lost the version of his mother he once knew, the desire for control is understandable. However, his approach is harmful. Joe even weaponizes the aftermath of Geraldine's trauma. He says, "You can't get out. You're trapped in here." Geraldine does sit

up and speak to her son, so he is able to provoke a reaction. The power Joe gains is at the cost of truly hearing his mother's voice.

When Geraldine insists upon speaking, she gains ground. The language she uses to describe how Joe's words hurt her not only defines her boundaries, but also sheds light on her experience handling the aftermath of her assault and the accompanying pain. She orders Joe to not "harass" and "terrify" or add to her "fears" and "sorrows," because these are all emotions that Geraldine is already cycling through as she copes with her trauma. Geraldine then demands that her son "not go after [Lark]." Geraldine does not ask, and so she regains control. While Geraldine's motivation may partially be protecting her young son from legal ramifications or psychological damage, Geraldine pinpoints her emotional response rather than tangible consequences. She says "You will not give me any worry… You will not add to my sorrows." Geraldine does want Lark gone, but she recognizes that this plan will have deep repercussions for her son's emotional well-being. Geraldine's word choice emphasizes the difference between wanting Lark to go unpunished versus keeping Joe uninvolved. Geraldine does not say "Lark deserves to live" or "We must spare him." She only insists, "You will not be part of this." The word "terrify" seems to reference Geraldine's reaction not to Lark's potential death, but to her son killing someone on her behalf. Joe ignores the potentially devastating consequences, but Geraldine, a mother who loves her son, cannot do the same. She therefore argues that he will be purposefully causing her "worry" and "pain" by continuing with his plan. She says, "all of this… It is all a violation." Erdrich uses the vagueness of the phrase "all of this" to highlight that the attack itself is not the only issue. No, the pain of the rape is compounded by Joe's perusing his version of justice and ignoring Geraldine's arguments. Joe's choice takes Geraldine's right to decide away. She even says, "You will leave me to think the way I want to think, here. I have to

heal any way I can." Geraldine wants time to "think" and "heal" rather than to concentrate on the self-centered decision-making of her son and its possible fallout. She does not dismiss any form of justice but insists upon the time and right to decide which avenue to pursue herself. Unlike Joe's approach, Geraldine's clear boundary lets personal healing and the pursuit for justice exist simultaneously. Geraldine centers her own voice.

Joe ignores his mother's wishes anyway. He steals Geraldine's autonomy by going forward and enacting a plan to kill Lark at his golf course. Upon arrival, Joe finds Lark in a secluded location and is suddenly joined by Cappy. After shooting at Geraldine's attacker, Joe details the following events:

> Please, no, please, no.
>
> I thought I heard those words, but I could have said them. Lark was trying to get up again. He pedaled one foot in the air, rolled over, onto his knees, and rose in a crouch. He locked eyes with me. Their blackness knocked me backward. The rifle was lifted from my arms. Cappy stepped forward beside me. I didn't hear the shot. All sound, all motion, had stalled in the sullen air. My brain was ringing. Cappy picked up the ejected casings from around my feet and put them in the pockets of his jeans. (*The Round House* 282-284)

Erdrich plays on the readers' expectations to emphasize the ensuing pain from Joe violating Geraldine's boundaries. Heim investigates Tharp's claim that Erdrich sets up *The Round House* like a classic detective novel, specifically analyzing Joe's hunt for clues. Heim claims: "*The Round House* can be read as crime fiction because it starts with a crime, the narrative follows the investigation, and the narrator and/or protagonist is directly implicated in the investigation and solving of the crime" (32-33). Erdrich's build-up using this specific genre makes the contrasting

realism in Joe enacting vengeance more impactful. In place of a final altercation, Joe silently finds Lark on the golf course. Instead of triumphant music or an overwhelming feeling of success, Joe cannot even bring himself to fire the killing shot. He recounts someone saying, "Please, no, please, no," but cannot identify the speaker. Particularly, Joe "thought [he] heard those words, but [he] could have said them." If Lark is the voice, then the line humanizes the otherwise unredeemable attacker. Lark begging for his life highlights a previously unseen powerlessness and reduces his untouchable sovereignty to a reliance on others' humanity. Alternatively, Joe may be the speaker. He might be regretful of violating Geraldine's boundaries and hopeful that he could snatch back his actions. After all, Joe is finally attempting to take a life and experiencing immediate repercussions. In either case, Joe's inability to identify the speaker solidifies the disorienting, overwhelming pain that he is experiencing. He is also unable to change the outcome. Joe cannot stop Cappy, who "lifted [the rifle] from my arms," "stepped forward," and "picked up the ejecting casings." The methodical steps support the quote's harsh, realistic, and unglamorized look into the pain that occurs when committing murder.

The novel further robs readers of feeling successful because Joe himself is unable to kill Lark. The point of view shifts so that Joe becomes nothing more than an onlooker. Joe watches as his dear friend, Cappy, steps in to complete the killing. When Cappy raises the rifle, Joe says, "All sound, all motion, had stalled in the sullen air." In a moment, it's over. The speed at which Cappy engages in violence may reinforce the idea that killing is easy, but its context demonstrates the truth. Joe is crying so hard his "face is drenched wet," he is "shaking," he feels "knocked backward," and his head is "ringing." At the end of the scene, Joe is no longer the protagonist triumphantly saving his mother, but just a lost boy. This moment emphasizes how

retributive violence fails to satisfy a hunger for justice and casts a wider net of trauma across interpersonal relationships.

Joe's decision to ignore Geraldine's boundaries must also be considered in the context of scholarly conversations surrounding *The Round House.* Thomas Matchie claims that "[Erdrich] brings law and love together to highlight the fundamental injustice that interrupts the life of a loving Chippewa family simply because there is no legal consistency on which they can depend (Matchie 353)" While I agree that Erdrich is pointing out there is "no legal consistency on which they can depend," she is also emphasizing how individuals themselves can further traumatize survivors in their pursuit of a legal solution. Matchie dismisses the misogynistic behavior of Joe as "immaturity" and "the actions of a boy" (356). Joe is a young adult, and Matchie's language ignores the trauma perpetuated by men who use ignorance as a defense to the harm that they cause. Erdrich points out the same mistake through the character of Joe. Even though Joe's actions are guided by his age and the example of his father's treatment of his mother, neither are adequate excuses for failing to unlearn control disguised as love. Boys who do not take responsibility for their actions grow into men who misuse power. Ultimately, even the best intentions are marred by the disastrous and painful consequences of Joe's choices. In silencing Geraldine, Joe purposefully violates her boundaries and reflects the larger failings of retributive justice.

The most devastating aspect of Geraldine's silencing is that she is right, justice would have prevailed without the intervention of her husband and son. She could have focused upon healing in her own time. Plus, substantially less harm would have been inflicted upon the community. Joe comes to this realization after Lark's death, when he encounters a man named Bugger who is crying and mumbling about the construction site. Bugger says:

> Poor girl…
>
> I stood up, jolted. I knew, down to the core of me, that he had seen Mayla Wolfskin. He had seen her dead body. If we hadn't killed Lark, he'd have gone to jail for life anyway. I spun around thinking I should go to the police, then stopped… The best thing for me to do was forget. And then for the rest of my life to try and not think how different things would have gone if, in the first place, I'd just followed Bugger's dream. (*The Round House* 310)

As Joe processes Bugger's confession, he grapples with the internal conflict of realizing how unnecessary his actions were to justice prevailing. Bugger "had seen Mayla Wolfskin. He had seen her dead body," and so Lark could have been charged with her death. While Lark going to prison for a different crime is an unexpected form of justice, the punishment would have had the same retributive effect that Bazil and Joe sought. Geraldine was, therefore, right to focus on her own healing while taking time to deliberate over various punitive measures. Joe should not have rushed into his version of justice. Joe acknowledges his mistake, but he categorizes it as the result of failing to listen to Bugger. He claims that if "in the first place, I'd just followed Bugger's dream," that the result would have been different. Joe fails to recognize that he also ignored his mother's voice in addition to Bugger; however, Joe sees the needless pain he inflicted. In the moment, Joe claims "the best thing for me to do was forget," but, as Joe's realization impacts him "down to the core," the lesson of autonomy seems to settle into his view of the world. Joe cycles through what-if scenarios until he finally understands the consequences of taking justice into his own hands and deciding to kill Lark. As much as Joe may "try and not think [about] how different things would have gone" if he had listened to his community, his takeaway is so deeply known within himself that it become an unchangeable, unignorable truth.

The regrets of young Joe's actions solidify into purposeful maturity as he ages. Erdrich demonstrates Joe's growth through his reflection on Sonja. Sonja, a former stripper in a relationship with the alcoholic and violent Whitey, has known Joe for his entire life and cared for his well-being. Together, they discovered Mayla's hidden money. When Sonja arrives to give Mooshum, Joe's grandfather, a lap dance for his birthday, Joe threatens to reveal the money that the found to Whitey and, consequently, endanger her safety. After performing, Sonja lectures Joe about the pain he caused and how similar he is to the men who hurt her for their personal pleasure. As Joe cries, Sonja explains why his regret cannot change his impact. She says, "I thought of you like my son. But you just turned into another piece a shit guy" (*The Round House* 222). The shift from "son" to "piece of shit," highlights how Joe's decisions cause pain, and the word choice of "guy" instead of "boy" demonstrates that Joe's power-hungry manipulation of Sonja equates to losing his innocence. Sonja is right, and she alters Joe's view of himself as well as the course of his life. Joe retrieves a tassel that Sonja dropped during her dance. The older version of himself explains its long-term impact:

> [My wife] wouldn't know that I put that souvenir tassel where I'll come across it by chance, on purpose. Because every time I look at it, I am reminded of the way I treated Sonja and about the way she treated me, or about how I threatened her and all that came of it, how I was just another guy. How that killed me once I really thought about it. A gimme-gimme asshole. Maybe I was. Still, after I thought about it for a long time—in fact, all my life—I wanted to be something better. (*The Round House* 223)

Not all men are, like Lark, overtly evil. As a married man who serves as a judge, the character of Joe represents a man that any reader could know or love in their real lives. Joe reflecting on his choice illustrates how each individual can contribute to oppression, and the good that can come

from realizing sexist behavior. Joe starts as a representation of Native men who perpetuate harm against Indigenous women in nonviolent ways. His growth reminds adult Indigenous men that they can self-reflect and change while also teaching future generations about preventable sexist behavior. As a physical representation of the harm he inflicted, Joe keeps the tassel as a reminder for "by chance" encounters in his daily life and moments of "on purpose" reflection. There is a responsibility for Joe to become a better person simply because of the disconnect between "the way I treated Sonja and about the way she treated me." Sonja viewed Joe as a son, and he used her as a tool. His growth demonstrates that while harm cannot be erased, intentional self-improvement remains necessary. Joe's maturation is not limited to a moment or an action, but a consequence of him thinking "about [wanting to be better than a gimme-gimme asshole] for a long time—in fact, all my life." Despite the importance of Joe's personal improvement, the harm remains. Joe does not conduct any reparations towards Sonja herself. There is also no evidence to suggest any outside consequences from his family or the community, and Joe does not share any tangible changes in his behavior towards women. Rather, readers must simply trust his own assertion and accept the harm he causes.

Similarly, Joe ignoring Geraldine's autonomy also causes irreparable harm. By examining the aftermath of Lark's death when Joe returns home, we can see the painful consequences of retributive justice even after seemingly achieving success. The damaging results appear when Joe discusses the ramifications of Lark's death with his parents. While Joe does not confess his involvement, there is an implicit understanding that Joe is responsible for Lark's death. Bazil takes on the role of a legal adviser. He tries to convince Joe to forgive himself by arguing a legal precedent:

Lark's killing is a wrong thing which serves an ideal justice. It settles a legal enigma…

> It could be argued that Lark met the definition of a wiindigoo, and that with no other recourse, his killing fulfilled the requirements of a very old law.
>
> I felt my mother's attention on me keenly.
>
> I just wanted you to know that, my father prodded.
>
> Lots of people had it in for Lark, I said.
>
> I looked from one of my parents to the other…But my father was also wrong, and about one thing in particular. He'd said I was now safe, but I was not exactly safe from Lark. Neither was Cappy. Every night he came after us in dreams. (*The Round House* 306-307)

Killing Lark has a clear negative effect on the Coutts family. First, Bazil and Geraldine grapple with the impact of his actions. Joe's father must reconcile Lark's death which is a "wrong thing," his desire to assuage Joe's guilt, and his role as a tribal judge who has hope for the legal system. Although Bazil notes that the killing of Lark was "with no other recourse," we must remember that Geraldine was never given the opportunity to heal on her own terms. Geraldine also has to emotionally process the conflicting emotions of losing her autonomy, loving her son, Joe killing Lark, and his justification. Joe wanted to hold Lark accountable for attacking his mother. Though he acted without her permission, Geraldine may feel emotionally responsible anyway. Geraldine is silent, but her presence speaks volumes. Geraldine stands unified with Bazil to support her son above all personal turmoil. Secondly, Bazil and Geraldine suffer because their son is struggling. Bazil articulating a defense of his actions and Geraldine's "attention on [Joe] keenly" hints that Joe's parents are scrutinizing their son's well-being because they recognize the pain he is experiencing. Even Joe himself says, "I was not exactly safe from Lark. Neither was Cappy. Every night he came after us in dreams." Joe recognizes his decisions will be ever-present,

painful ghosts. In discussing how Indigenous men engage in self-identification and exploration, McKegney gives greater insight into the problematic nature of Joe's behavior. He points out that when understanding healthy Indigenous masculinity, "the emphasis must be on exploring sources of wisdom, strength, and possibility within Indigenous cultures, stories, and lived experiences and creatively mobilizing of that knowledge in processes of empowerment and decolonization" (McKegney 4). Some could argue that Joe taking justice into his own hands and killing Lark does take "strength," but the most important part of McKegney's statement is "processes of empowerment and decolonization." I would argue that Joe does not empower the right person because he chooses himself over Geraldine. While the process does subvert the Western court system, it does not necessarily contribute to decolonization because his actions do not support wiindigoo justice.

An article in the *American Indian Quarterly* argues that "while there is no communal meeting to decide the fate of Linden Lark, the actions of Joe's community reflect agreement, support, and simultaneous arrival at a weighty decision" (Bender 147). Thus, wiindigoo justice was effectively implemented. I disagree. Joe's actions lack balance and communal support. In "Windigo Ways: Eating and Excess in Louise Erdrich's Antelope Wife," Tharp details the importance of balance in approving wiindigoo justice. She contrasts wiindigoo and protagonists in one example, saying, "We learn of the human urge to conquer and subdue the "other," balanced by the equally human urge to sacrifice one's self for the life of another" ("Windigo Ways" 119). The two sides are supposed to cancel out. Unlike a wiindigoo's desire to "conquer" and "subdue," the person fighting against its power only takes on the properties of a wiindigo because of their opposing, giving perspective. The person is also supported by the community.

Yet, balance is not restored. Joe's choice is not a "sacrifice," rather, it is selfish because it ignores Geraldine's wishes. While no one decides to turn Joe into the police, they do not rejoice either.

Instead, the Coutts family suffers harm. They become physically and emotionally lost. The same article says, "The wiindigoo embodies… a caution against satiating the individual's needs at the expense of the community" (Bender 147). Joe, to a lesser degree than a wiindigoo, also satisfies his own "needs at the expense of the community." He follows his own pathway to justice while dismissing his mother's explicit refusal and not seeking his father's counsel. When Joe's family piles into the car and begins to drive at the end of the novel, he says, "I don't remember that they even looked at me or I at them after the shock of that first moment when we all realized we were old… We just kept going" (317 – 318). They cannot "look" at each other. There is a resulting sense of isolation even within a shared space. Joe, Bazil, and Geraldine must all contemplate how to reconcile who they were before Lark's death and who they are now. They are all "old," because each person is burdened with a life experience learned too soon. While talking about the main character of another book release, Erdrich gives insight into Joe's trauma and even says, "Cedar has ideas about the world that collapse very quickly, but she keeps replacing her ideas with new constructs that collapse again, until she commits a murder. Then she is on some level destroyed. This is akin to Joe's experience in *The Round House*" (Coleman). Erdrich recognizes Joe's ongoing efforts to solidify his "ideas about the world," but recognizes that they are unsustainable, temporary solutions. He cannot find true justice. When Joe finally decides to commit murder, he "is on some level destroyed." Ultimately, Erdrich uses this ending to reinforce that enacting retributive justice independent of the survivor's voice is imperfect. The consequences are devastating.

I suggest that the pitfalls of Bazil's argument and the aftermath of Joe's decision warns against using Indigenous beliefs to justify benevolent sexism. Rather, Joe's actions are a lesson for dissuading future misogyny. Gargano examines another Erdrich work, *The Game of Silence,* and its story of wiindigoo justice. The two stories both have young protagonists confronting wiindigoos with different methodologies. By contrasting *The Round House* and *The Game of Silence,* the distinctions demonstrate where Joe's actions diverge from wiindigoo justice. As opposed to Joe's individualist approach, *The Game of Silence* shows an entire community approving the process of determining the decision to defeat the wiindigoo and the liberator. She takes on traits of a wiindigoo to defeat the wiindigoo, but not kill the man underneath the evil. He transforms back into a regular man who provides for the young woman who defeated the wiindigoo (*Game* 159-163). Joe's benevolent sexism – manifesting in how he acts with lone confidence and ignorant of the looming consequences – causes these differences and the illustrated results. It is incorrect to blame wiindigoo justice when chaos ensues because Joe ignores his mother's voice. These consequences show Erdrich's main critique is therefore not Indigenous precedent, but the purposeful silencing of a survivor's voice.

The consequences of Joe's behavior act as a deterrent for Indigenous male readers who may engage in benevolent sexism. Gargano points out "there is no real end to the storytelling process. In fact, [the main character Omakayas'] ultimate accomplishment in *The Game of Silence* is her own realization that she too is a storyteller, producing new variations on traditional themes" (Gargano 37). Gargano goes on to highlight how Erdrich makes readers "strive to experience" each novel, and the importance of their participation (37). After all, what is a story without an audience? I would argue that, like the main character in *The Game of Silence,* readers become the storytellers of their own lives. They can apply "traditional themes" and teachings,

and “the ultimate accomplishment” is a “new [and positive] variation.” “There is no real end to the storytelling process” because each person shapes their own story based on their experience and teachings. From *The Round House,* Indigenous men can learn from Joe’s actions to better support female autonomy. Additionally, we all may know a “Joe” in our own lives, or a well-loved man who also engages in sexist behaviors. He represents that people exist on a spectrum of “good” to “bad” rather than in binary boxes, and his actions emphasize that we have a responsibility to hold ourselves accountable. Joe’s story specifically serves as a cautionary tale for Indigenous men to recognize their own sexism and grow accordingly. The next chapter will highlight another pathway. While demonstrating why Joe’s attempt to eliminate Lark – the cause of Geraldine’s trauma – cannot substitute for support, Erdrich simultaneously highlights the underutilization of communal love and need for direct engagement of a survivor’s voice in the aftermath of sexual assault.

Geraldine:

The Powerlessness in Pyrrhic Victories

For argument's sake, let us rewrite *The Round House.* We can pretend Joe and Bazil enact their ideal forms of justice. They successfully punish Geraldine's attacker. Joe kills Lark alone, and no one knows. Bazil wins the court case, and Lark goes to jail. We could even say that Bazil and Joe successfully strangle Lark together in the grocery aisle. Would one of these victories be enough? Could you close the book and think, "Thank God, the horrible tragedy is over!" I couldn't. I would think about Geraldine, who would still be navigating the traumatic aftermath of rape alone. Geraldine would then also have to carry their weight of either potentially recounting the attack in court in front of husband, son, strangers, and Lark himself, or she would live knowing her young son killed on her behalf. Geraldine would be comforted only by someone else's version of justice. As Deer notes, it is important that punishment is not "for the sake of punishment, but punishment for the sake of the well-being of the community and the safety of survivors ("Righting Tribal Law" 143). I will not argue that the content of Bazil and Joe's proposed solutions are entirely right or wrong, because Erdrich seems to open a conversation about either through Geraldine's partial endorsement. The key issue is Bazil and Joe's implementation because the two characters ignore her voice. I want to consider their calls for justice and simultaneous dismissal of "the well-being of the community and the safety of survivors." They could have supported Geraldine's intentional steps forward, but they instead leave Geraldine in traumatic isolation. Their behavior, coupled with Geraldine's own approach, opens conversations to how best to support survivors.

Wiindigo justice may be a correct approach, but Joe's benevolent sexism overshadowed its complexities and ignored that Geraldine deserves to spearhead its enactment. Geraldine first

recognizes Lark's harmful behavior has impacted their entire family. She contemplates the way forward while sitting with Joe in a café and eating dinner. When questioned by Joe, Geraldine says:

> It's something Daddy told me. A story about a wiindigoo. Lark's trying to eat us, Joe. I won't let him, she said. I will be the one to stop him.
>
> Her determination terrified me. She picked up her food and deliberately, slowly, began to eat. She didn't stop until she'd finished all of it, which also frightened me. This was the first time since the attack she ate all the food on her plate. (*The Round House* 248)

Erdrich primes Geraldine, not Joe, as ready to confront Lark. As in *Game of Silence,* Geraldine temporarily embodies a windigoo to prepare for confronting Lark. Plus, Tharp describes wiindigoos as having "the human urge to conquer and subdue the 'other' through cannibalistic appetites" ("Windigo Ways"). This cannibalistic desire is highlighted in Lark through the line, "Lark's trying to eat us, Joe." Erdrich shows the same appetite in Geraldine because "she ate all the food on her plate." This hunger is out of character for Geraldine because her appetite returns for "the first time since the attack." Plus, Geraldine seems significantly more prepared. Unlike Joe's fear and confusion, Geraldine's is "deliberately" and "slowly" moving forward. She has clear "determination." Joe does not accept Geraldine's decision. He does not listen as she says, "I will be the one to stop him." Joe assumes responsibility and convinces himself the answer is killing Lark even though Geraldine does not explain how to "stop" Lark. Joe takes the choice away from Geraldine and moves forward alone. While complex, Indigenous justice is a possible avenue forward. There are multiple ways to defeat a windigoo, and Geraldine's speech simply serves as a reminder to center the survivor's voice instead of leading with assumptions.

A court case may also be viable. However, the United States' judicial system should not erase the survivor's voice in favor of upholding an unfair system. After Bazil attacks Lark and suffers a heart attack, Geraldine and Joe visit his hospital room while he recovers. When the two leave to eat, they begin to talk about the court case. Reflecting on her own testimony, Geraldine says:

> Last week, in the hospital, I sat there looking at your father and I suddenly wished that I had lied from the beginning. *I wish I had lied, Joe!* But I didn't know where it happened. And your father knew I didn't know. And you knew, too. I told you both. How could I change my story later on? Commit perjury? And remember, I knew that I didn't know, too. What would happen to my sense of who I am? But if I had understood all that would come of my not knowing, exactly what happened, him going free, him with the sick gall to show himself, I would have.
>
> I'm glad you would have. (*The Round House* 260-261)

Looking to Deer's point that punishment should consider the "safety of survivors," Lark should not have left the court room without reprimand. He retains the "sick gall to show himself," and his unnerving presence haunts Geraldine. She is not safe. Geraldine feels so emotionally charged that she would have even "lied" if she knew Lark could walk free. The United States legal system required a lie – a location specifically – to determine jurisdiction. Geraldine chose to tell the truth, and so the judge dismissed the case. Geraldine made this decision to retain her "sense of who I am." Geraldine implies that she, in part, made this choice because she defines herself in relation to her family's judgements. She says, "Your father knew I didn't know. And you knew, too. I told you both." It matters to Geraldine that she keeps her family's trust. The key distinction between Geraldine's testimony and Geraldine's confession is her family's acceptance. In the

former, Bazil and Joe include Geraldine only to press her for information. In the latter, Joe says, "It wouldn't matter *where*, if you had just said where" (*The Round House* 260). He begins by accepting a potentially immoral choice, and then reassures Geraldine that he is "glad" she would have lied. My point is not whether Geraldine should have committed perjury, but that familial support when managing the aftermath of rape can be deeply influential to restoring a survivor's sense of self. Deer, when discussing the restitution process of a rapist giving monetary compensation or material goods to a survivor, says, "The principle of restitution is to restore the victim to her position prior to the rape" ("Righting Tribal Law"147). I absolutely agree that a rapist should participate in restitution, but I want to apply this same principle to Bazil and Joe. It is their familial responsibility to help restore Geraldine "to her position prior to the rape." A court case or wiindigoo justice cannot substitute for support.

Geraldine's own process towards restoration establishes a baseline. While healing is not linear, Geraldine does make quiet improvements over time. There is an important difference between Geraldine engaging in silence to heal and a male character actively eliminating her voice. Lee Maracle discusses the impact of colonialism and ongoing tensions informing containment of male voices, saying, "Silence is not speaking. It's a choice. But it's part of the paralysis. Keeps us locked in – "in" being the operative word… It might be silence from your direction, because you're not in it, you're looking from outside. But it's not silence. So, it's breaking the locks." (Boyden 31-32)." Lee Maracle's perspective is an independently fascinating, and I would argue it is also applicable to understanding Geraldine as well. She may be making a "choice" to be silent in some moments and facing traumatic "paralysis" in other times. Either state of mind can be true, and they can even overlap, so it is important to consider how the Coutts family can support Geraldine's voice while she finds the words to speak. Readers, Bazil,

and Joe must consider if it is "silence from [their] direction, because [they're] not in it, [they're] looking from outside" or a purposeful choice. I argue that a combination of the two most accurately describes Geraldine's behavior, so she is at least partially "locked in" to her traumatic reality without escape. Bazil and Joe cannot assist from the outside. They must choose to either be "locked in" with Geraldine to support her voice or leave her in isolation to pursue their own forms of justice. Unfortunately, they choose the latter.

Comparing the family dynamics before and after the rape highlight Geraldine's recovery process, as well as the effect of Bazil and Joe. Specifically, how Geraldine's daily cooking task mixes with her self-imposed isolation. After returning home from relaxing with his friends, Joe sees firsthand the difference in Geraldine's behavior before and after the attack. He walks inside and the atmosphere has shifted because the house lacks Geraldine's usual influence. Joe says, "The air seemed hollow in the house, stale, strangely flat. I realized that this was because in the days since we'd found my mother sitting in the driveway, nobody had baked, fried, cooked, or in any way prepared food." (*The Round House* 22). Cooking will demonstrate a baseline to see the shift in Geraldine. Usually, she would have "baked, fried, cooked, or in any way prepared food" for her family. There is no easy way for anyone to fill the hole left, because "nobody" has taken on the burden in her absence. The result of the emotional trauma not only creates a gap in their family dynamics, but even becomes tangible in the "hollow… stale, strangely flat" air.

At the beginning, Joe's friend Cappy accompanies him on the walk home. Cappy does not come inside. Joe explains, **"**Without saying anything, it was clear that Cappy was just walking me home and would not go inside. I would not have let him anyway. My mother didn't want anyone to see her" (*The Round House* 21). The unspoken rule shows that Geraldine's isolation affects more than just herself, but also her entire community. After all, Geraldine "didn't want

anyone to see her" (emphasis added). There is an impenetrable boundary around her space that echoes in their familial relationship with the wider community. Joe, for example, feels a sense of protectiveness and a need to honor his mother's wish for distance. He will go outside, but not let even his dearest friends in his space. Geraldine does however improve. She starts by sitting at the dinner table with her husband and son:

> My mother took a sharp breath, and frowned. She shrugged away what he'd said, as if it irritated her… I also know she was trying to build up her shield. To not feel things. Not refer to what had happened. His emotion grabbed at her.
>
> With no ceremony, she picked up her spoon and plunged it into the stew. She choked her first gulp down. I sat poised. We both looked at my father.
>
> … I think, she said at last, that I should start cooking again. (*The Round House* 35)

Geraldine branches out away from isolation to spend time with her family, even while keeping some emotional distance. Geraldine tries to engage because she comes downstairs to eat with her husband and son. For context, the family realizes Bazil intentionally cooked a poor meal to reinvigorate his wife's culinary talent (*The Round House* 36). As Deer says, Bazil may be trying to "restore the victim to her position prior to the rape" ("Righting Tribal Law"147). Geraldine has a genuine, immediate reaction because she "choked her first gulp [of stew] down." She wants to enjoy his efforts at a meal. Then, she realizes his purposeful blunder and accepts his olive branch. Geraldine volunteers to "start cooking again" even as she continues to suffer through emotional turmoil. The rape's resulting trauma permeates her overall emotional well-being, so she attempts "to build up her shield." To resist all emotions means that Geraldine will "not feel things," but also have to maintain space from "what has happened." When discussing Indigenous theory, Elizabeth Archuleta recognizes that Indigenous women are not always immediately ready

to confront sexual violence's generational trauma. She says, "Many women have not yet reached a place where they can release their fear, so their lack of voice renders them invisible. A need to stay invisible makes obvious the racialized and spatialized violence that remains a by-product of colonialism" (Archuleta 106). Geraldine, as someone who personally experienced a violent rape, is similarly working to "release [her] fear." Keeping up a shield allows Geraldine to be emotionally "invisible," but physically present. She feels a "need to stay invisible" to protect herself, but efforts from her family can create a safe space that supports Geraldine returning to her once loved activities.

In fact, Geraldine flourishes with just Bazil's one act of support. Joe watches the improvement, observing that "My mother cooked all the next week, and even made it outside, where she sat on a frayed lawn chair scratching Pearl's neck, staring into the chokecherry bushes that marked the boundaries of the backyard" (*The Round House* 40). Familial support is a positive influence because Geraldine leaves her room and begins to cook. She eases into normality because she prepares food "all the next week." Geraldine leaving the house to go "outside" for an extended period also shows growth. She does not stand, ready to bolt, but sits down "on a frayed lawn chair." Geraldine's behavior shows a greater level of ease and comfort. Geraldine choosing to leave the house enlarges her safe space and reinforces her growth. She does however keep the "boundaries of the backyard" through the chokecherry bushes, and their dog Peal as protection. Geraldine ventures further into the community while keeping a fair emotional distance. The overarching growth from Geraldine starting in her room, moving to their entire house, and then exiting to the backyard signals improvement.

Unfortunately, healing is not linear. Joe returns to the house one day and sees a broken dish on the ground. He realizes that Bazil surprised Geraldine by greeting her with an unexpected

hug, and her fear caused a traumatic reaction (*The Round House* 42-43). Physically, Geraldine just dropped the dish. Emotionally, she retreated. Joe notes, **"**My father and I had followed her to the doorway, and I think as we watched her we both had the sense that she was ascending to a place of utter loneliness from which she might never be retrieved" (*The Round House* 42-43). Geraldine goes upstairs while her husband and son stay behind. Emotionally, she is "ascending" to another plane by herself. Bazil and Joe recognize the gravity of Geraldine going to "a place of utter loneliness." The word "retrieve" suggests that the two could join Geraldine in her self-imposed isolation and reconnect her with a supportive and loving community. They could bring her back and "restore [Geraldine] to her position prior to the rape" ("Righting Tribal Law"147). Joe only needs to try. He does not choose to close the distance between himself and his mother. Unlike the previous cooking connection, neither Bazil nor Joe reach out again. They embark on their plans to enact vengeance and only enter Geraldine's presence for information. Without emotional support, Geraldine truly is alone.

Geraldine's retreat to isolation is a dangerous space. Joe's grandfather, Mooshum, asks after her well-being and offers apt advice to Joe. With "an edge of harsh brilliance in his gaze… I knew he had been told something, at least, of what had occurred…. [He says] She gotta come out. Don't leave her to sit. Don't let her alone too much" (*The Round House* 33). Mooshum "had been told something," so he has basic knowledge of the attack and their resulting familial dynamics. He offers advice in place of gossip. The "edge of harsh brilliance" may be Erdrich emphasizing the importance of Mooshum's insight and the difficulties that taught the knowledge to him. Mooshum specifically warns against isolation. The action words of "leave" and "let" reinforce that Bazil and Joe have a responsibly to meet Geraldine's lonesomeness with acceptance. Mooshum, rather than directing Joe to a legal remedy or Indigenous retribution

solution, simply advises that "She gotta come out." For him, the most important piece is Geraldine rejoining the community. Indigenous theorist Archuleta also focuses on means of recovery, but she emphasizes rhetorical practices as political activism. She says, "Rather than view Indigenous women as victims, we should focus on their coming to voice and telling stories as a healing process" (Archuleta 108). Bazil and Joe do not help Geraldine in "coming to [her] voice." They leave her distant from any support. This emotional gap is shown through Geraldine's retreat into physical isolation:

> When the warm rain falls in June, said my father, and the lilacs burst open. Then she will come downstairs. She loves the scent of the lilacs. An old stand of bushes planted by the reservation farm agent bloomed against the south end of the yard. My mother missed its glory. The flimsy faces of her pansies blazed and then the wild prairie roses in the ditches bloomed an innocent pink. She missed those too. Mom had grown her bedding plants from seeds every year I could remember. She'd had her paper milk carton planters arranged on the kitchen counter and on the sills of all south-facing windows in April—but the pansy seedlings were the only ones that lived to get planted outside. After that week, we'd forgotten to take care of all the others. (*The Round House* 85)

As established earlier, familial support helped Geraldine come from her room to the kitchen and eventually the backyard. Unfortunately, Geraldine's space shrinks back to its original bubble of her room. Geraldine does not see "the reservation farm agent bloomed against the south end of the yard." She does not even have "her paper milk carton planters arranged on the kitchen counter and on the sills of all south-facing windows." The culpability for her emotional isolation extends past Geraldine to include Bazil and Joe. Bazil convinces himself that "she will come downstairs" for the plants. He does not choose to go into Geraldine's space, offer a meaningful

conversation, or even sit together in silence. Joe follows his father's behavior and does not offer any evidence of caring engagement. Just as how the two men had "forgotten to take care of all the [other flowers]," they assume that Geraldine will become self-sufficient alone.

Ultimately, it is understandable for survivors' families to want to assuage their own pain by helping the people that they love. While there are a variety of worthy solutions that can work in conjunction with one another, the most important piece is recognizing which one will help which survivor. Every person's needs are different. No individual solution can be a one-size fits all. As a result, survivors need to be centered. The National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls spoke to Indigenous people about various types of traumas. Across the board, the Inquiry found "Many of the testimonies we heard from survivors and family members in relation to healing directly engaged the need to begin to heal from the trauma of colonization, of exploitation, of violence, and of hurt. There were also key moments where that healing began. For some, this journey began based on a personal decision to move forward" (*Reclaiming Power and Place* 7). Geraldine deserves to, like all Indigenous women, make a "personal decision" to heal. After all, she is the one who must balance the aftereffects of "colonization," "exploitation," "violence," and "hurt." The way Geraldine grapples with her family's approaches demonstrates that another person's version of healing is not enough. It must be accompanied by support and direct care.

Conclusion:

Looking Forward & Remembering the Past

When speaking about the balance of sound and silence within her play, *Wings of Night Sky, Wings of Morning Light*, Harjo says, "Silence is a space of creative possibility, even as it can be a space of shutting down" (Harjo 56). Geraldine embodies the seemingly diametric possibilities of "shutting down" and "creating possibility." On the outside, no character in *The Round House* can definitively divine her thoughts, behavior, and mood because of her silence. Geraldine's boundary also simultaneously creates space for endless interpretations and understandings. Geraldine's silence contributes to an important conversation about the often-ignored voices of Indigenous women and girls. In this final chapter, I want to recognize the Native women who drive this conversation and the reason why pinpointing all forms of silencing – even the well-intentioned ones – is necessary.

Lawrence Gross coins the term "Postapocalypse stress syndrome (PASS)" and defines it as an effort "to capture the profound psychological effects an apocalyptic event can have on a population" (Gross 50). An apt diagnosis that may also reflect the traumatic, generational effect of sexual violence on Native individuals. Gross goes on to say,

> If there is one overriding characteristic of the characters in the corpus of Erdrich's works, it is that they are survivors. Despite all the attempts by the government and mainstream society to undermine Anishinaabe culture and, essentially, conduct genocide against the Indians, the Anishinaabe survive. (Gross 48-49)

Again, Gross' interpretation is applicable to *The Round House.* The United States legal system, a part of "the government," supports Lark because of the jurisdictional issue. The system consequently helps "undermine Anishinaabe culture." After all, the government is responsible

for the Anishinaabe nation not having the authority to hold Lark accountable. As established by Simpson's writing in the Introduction, sexual assault is a product of genocide. Geraldine, Bazil, and Joe are all apt representations of how "the Anishinaabe survive" despite a traumatic barrier. However, I do not want this thesis to imply that Anishinaabe people only survive. There are also sources of interest, learning, and celebration within the community. It is imperative that sexual violence against Indigenous women be eliminated, and it is also important to simultaneously recognize and encourage the coexistence of Indigenous joy. As noted in "Suspending Damage: A Letter to Communities," "damage-centered' research… operates with a flawed theory of change: it is often used to leverage reparations or resources for marginalized communities yet simultaneously reinforces and reinscribes a one-dimensional notion of these people as depleted, ruined, and hopeless" (Tuck 409). Indigenous communities deserve to be seen as more than "a one-dimensional notion" and also receive "reparations" for ongoing trauma, so I too want to advocate for change while acknowledging the importance of Indigenous pleasure.

Representing autonomy as multifaceted restores power to Native women. Contrasting isolating stereotypes with reality, Miranda points out "Indians engage in passionate, intensely intimate affairs of the heart and body which have been, somewhere, expressed in poetic, published form" in the work "Dildos, Hummingbirds, and Driving Her Crazy: Searching for American Indian Women's Love Poetry and Erotics." (139). Miranda's point reinforces that "passionate, intensely intimate affairs" cannot deserve to be hidden while simultaneously giving voice to violence. The elimination of Native pleasure gives power to perpetrators because they then control the harmful act and the context of its consequential narrative. It reduces Indigenous sexuality to violence. From bodily autonomy to sharing personal narratives, Native woman deserve complete command over their own "heart and body" as well as holistic representation.

Sexual violence and empowerment can be intensely personal, but discussing the two pieces in conjunction with one another supports Indigenous autonomy.

To answer how to honor Indigenous trauma and pleasure, I turn to Native women. Relevant scholarship shows the importance of vocalizing the true, multifaceted nature of Indigenous womanhood. First, Indigenous women are not static victims. They are actively fighting against forces that inflict trauma. There is a community of support working for change. In part, activism comes from speaking up. For example, in "How the Tenth Indian Survived: An Indigenous Reclamation," scholar Joy Meness contemplates her time in a boarding school. She writes, "This is my truth and the information I have shared here is what reading books, more specifically literature meant for children, has done for me, in that these books have helped me find a way to touch the past and bring it forward, perhaps illuminating the future." (Meness 317). Meness expresses her personal "truth" by sharing her experiences. In doing so, she adds her voice to the collection of literature that supported her personal journey to healing. She is a part of "illuminating the future" because her experience sheds light on past wrongdoing and plots a better way. This one personal story can then "touch the past and bring it forward" for the next generation. Like how literature helped Meness, representation of Native experiences can accurately memorialize trauma, demonstrate the causes of damage, and advocate for change.

In any context, Native women should also see holistic portrayals of themselves. Miranda uses the example of pleasure, saying,

> If Native women, who bear the scars from five hundred years of erotic murder in this country, suddenly become visible there is hell to pay… We cannot be allowed to *see* Indigenous women in all their erotic glory without also *seeing* and acknowledging all that has been done to make these women – their bodies and cultures – extinct. (145)

Miranda pinpoints that pleasure, harm, and bodily autonomy are deeply intertwined in Indigenous personhood. She then suggests that pleasure should not exist without the context of harm and bodily autonomy. Specifically, it is important to "see" the "erotic glory" of Indigenous women alongside the ongoing forces making them become "extinct." I agree, a complete bird's eye view does highlight the entire personhood of Indigenous women. I would then add that the other two points, "harm" and "autonomy," should also not exist in the absence of "pleasure." The "scars from five hundred years of erotic murder" should show the long-term impact of sexual violence while also reinforcing Indigenous women's right to bodily autonomy and personal pleasure.

Tuck provides guidance for moving forward in academic pathways through three key points. Tuck suggests that researchers must "revision our theories of change," "create mutually beneficial roles for academic researchers in community research," and "establish tribal and community human research ethics guidelines." (423-424). These are key notes to remember when considering effective remedies for benevolent sexism. The versatility in sexist oppression is why there are two pieces to reform. Individually, as this thesis address, we all have a responsibility to hold each other and ourselves accountable for supporting survivors in our interpersonal relationships. My thesis centers on the impact of Indigenous men, but anyone can be an unintentional contributor to silencing. The spectrum of sexism means it can be difficult to define and even harder to confront. On a larger level, any form of justice should incorporate the voices of survivors. When discussing the global gag rule – an anti-abortion policy that restricts United States assistance in foreign nations – Erdrich makes an applicable point, saying, "I see how we're in a time where women are the subject of hatred, fear, and we have to fight that all the time. I feel that there are fights we take for granted. When I look at the world, I see that women

are subject to cruelty" (Demkiewicz). Erdrich is right. The world's "cruelty" against women is rampant. Anti-abortion laws are one fight, as is stopping white men from raping Indigenous women. The reauthorization of the Violence Against Woman Act is an excellent step in holding perpetrators accountable (Department of Justice), but it acts as a temporary band-aid over a deep wound. As Deer asserts,

> It is evident that the federal and state systems (even if much improved) will not serve as the ultimate foundation for liberating tribal nations from the legacy of rape. Tribal laws themselves, grounded in the voices of survivors, will serve as the point of social change because true justice and healing are only possible when victims can seek accountability within their own judicial systems. (*The Beginning and End of Rape* 137)

By claiming that healing is "only possible when victims can seek accountability within their own judicial systems," Deer reinforces survivors' right to their version of justice in interpersonal relationships and also legal solutions. Following Deer's advice, legal scholars and politicians need to return oversight to Indigenous nations. A reallocation of power will let "tribal laws themselves, grounded in the voices of survivors," flourish and hold perpetrators accountable. However, to achieve widespread social change, actions cannot be limited to the legal system. *The Round House* demonstrates the importance of amplifying Indigenous voices in our interpersonal relationships as well. The choice to honor survivors' voices and attentively listen to their desires must also be at the forefront of our literature, classrooms, and personal lives.

Works Cited

Archuleta, Elizabeth. "'I Give You Back': Indigenous Women Writing to Survive." *Studies in American Indian Literatures*, vol. 18, no. 4, University of Nebraska Press, 2006, pp. 88–114, http://www.jstor.org/stable/20737352.

Bender, J.; Maunz-Breese, L. Louise Erdrich's The Round House, the Wiindigoo, and Star Trek: The Next Generation. American Indian Quarterly, [s. l.], v. 42, n. 2, p. 141–161, 2018. DOI 10.5250/amerindiquar.42.2.0141. 18 March 2022.

Boyden, Joseph, et al. *Masculindians: Conversations about Indigenous Manhood*, edited by Sam McKegney, University of Manitoba Press, 2014. *ProQuest Ebook Central*, https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/emory/detail.action?docID=4828061.

Carden, Mary Paniccia. ""The Unkillable Mother": Sovereignty and Survivance in Louise Erdrich's The Round House." Studies in American Indian Literatures 30.1 (2018): 94-116.

Coleman, Christian. "Interview: Louise Erdrich." *Lightspeed*, no. 91, Dec. 2017.

Deer, Sarah. "Decolonizing Rape Law: A Native Feminist Synthesis of Safety and Sovereignty." Wicazo Sa Review, vol. 24, no. 2, University of Minnesota Press, 2009, pp. 149–67, http://www.jstor.org/stable/40587785.

Deer, Sarah. *The Beginning and End of Rape: Confronting Sexual Violence in Native America.* University of Minnesota Press, 2015. *Project MUSE* muse.jhu.edu/book/42560.

Deer, Sarah. "'Righting' Tribal Rape Law: Proposals for Reform." *The Beginning and End of Rape: Confronting Sexual Violence in Native America*, University of Minnesota Press, 2015, pp. 137–57, http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctt17w8gfr.13.

Demkiewicz, Joanna R. “Louise Erdrich: Reproductive Nightmares, Real and Imagined.” *Guernica*, 20 Nov. 2017, https://www.guernicamag.com/louise-erdrich-reproductive-nightmares-real-imagined/.

Department of Justice. “Justice Department Applauds Reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act.” *The United States Department of Justice*, 16 Mar. 2022, https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/justice-department-applauds-reauthorization-violence-against-women-act

Erdrich, Louise. *The Game of Silence.* New York: HarperCollins, 2005.

Erdrich, Louise. *The Round House.* Harper. Kindle Edition, 2012.

Gargano, Elizabeth. “Oral Narrative and Ojibwa Story Cycles in Louise Erdrich's The Birchbark House and The Game of Silence.” *Children's Literature Association Quarterly*, vol. 31, num. 1, Spring 2006, pp. 27-39.

Glick, P., & Fiske, S. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70 (3), 491-512 DOI: 10.1037//0022-3514.70.3.491

Gross, L. W. (2005). The trickster and world maintenance: An Anishinaabe Reading of Louise Erdrich's tracks. *Studies in American Indian Literatures, 17*(3), 48-66,133. Retrieved from https://login.proxy.library.emory.edu/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/trickster-world-maintenance-anishinaabe reading/docview/210687254/se-2?accountid=10747

Heim, Cécil. “Chapter 2 – Windigo (and the) Law: Legal Epistemologies in Louise Erdrich’s The Round House.” *University of Lausanne*.

Hermann, Donald H.J. (2017) "Restorative Justice and Retributive Justice: An Opportunity for Cooperation or an Occasion for Conflict in the Search for Justice," Seattle Journal for Social Justice: Vol. 16: Iss. 1, Article 11. Available at: https://digitalcommons.law.seattleu.edu/sjsj/vol16/iss1/11

Jimenez, Laurel (2017) "The Body Subject to the Laws: Louise Erdrich's Metaphorical Incarnation of Federal Indian Law in "The Round House"," Access: Interdisciplinary Journal of Student Research and Scholarship: Vol. 1: Iss. 1, Article 3. Available at: https://digitalcommons.tacoma.uw.edu/access/vol1/iss1/3

Karell, Linda. "Madsen, Deborah L., Ed.: Louise Erdrich: Tracks, The Last Report on the Miracles at Little No Horse, The Plague of Doves. (Book Review)." Studies in the Novel 2013: 310–321. Print.

Kurup, Seema. "The Plague of Doves and The Round House." *Understanding Louise Erdrich,* University of South Carolina Press, 2016, pp. 58–70, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv6sj7pf.8.

Matchie, Thomas. "Law Versus Love: *The Round House.*" 2015. The Midwest Quarterly. (353-356).

McKegney, Sam. *Masculindians Conversations about Indigenous Manhood*. University of Manitoba Press, 2014.

Meness, Joy Jakubik. "How the Tenth Indian Survived: An Indigenous Reclamation." International Research in Children's Literature 13.2 (2020): 306–320. Web.

Miranda, Deborah A. "Dildos, Hummingbirds, and Driving Her Crazy: Searching for American Indian Women's Love Poetry and Erotics." *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, vol. 23, no. 2, 2002, pp. 135–149., https://doi.org/10.1353/fro.2002.0036.

National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women. “Tribal Provision: Myths v. Facts— VAWA Reauthorization.” National Task Force to End Sexual and Domestic Violence Against Women. 4 Mar. 2013. Web. 8 Mar. 2013.

Olcese, Abby. "Louise Erdrich on Storytelling, Family Lore, and Why Bookstores Will Inherit the Earth" External” The Pitch [Kansas City]. March 5, 2020.

Peterson, Nancy J., and Connie A. Jacobs. “INTRODUCTION.: Visions of Justice in Louise Erdrich’s Trilogy.” *Louise Erdrich’s Justice Trilogy: Cultural and Critical Contexts*, edited by Nancy J. Peterson and Connie A. Jacobs, Michigan State University Press, 2021, pp. ix–xxii, https://doi.org/10.14321/j.ctv1xx9n69.4.

Reclaiming Power and Place: the Final Report of the National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls. Canada, 2019. Web Archive. Retrieved from the Library of Congress, <www.loc.gov/item/lcwaN0028038/>.

Simpson, Leanne Betasamosake. “THE SOVEREIGNTY OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES’ BODIES.” *As We Have Always Done: Indigenous Freedom through Radical Resistance*, University of Minnesota Press, 2017, pp. 95–118, https://doi.org/10.5749/j.ctt1pwt77c.10.

Smith, Andrea. “Decolonizing Anti-Rape Law and Strategizing Accountability in Native American Communities.” Social Justice, vol. 37, no. 4, Dec. 2010, pp. 36–43. EBSCOhost, https://search-ebscohost-com.proxy.library.emory.edu/login.aspx?direct=true&db=fph&AN=75348151&site=ehost-live&scope=site.

Tharp, Julie. “Erdrich's Crusade: Sexual Violence in *The Round House*.” *Studies in American Indian Literatures*, vol. 26, no. 3, 2014, pp. 25–40.

Tharp, Julie. “Windigo Ways: Eating and Excess in Louise Erdrich’s Antelope Wife,” *American Indian Culture and Research Journal.* 27, no. 4 (2003): 119. vol. 26, no. 3, 2014, pp. 25–40.

Tuck, Eve. “Suspending Damage: A Letter to Communities.” *Harvard Educational Review*, vol. 79, no. 3, 2009, pp. 409–428., https://doi.org/10.17763/haer.79.3.n0016675661t3n15.

Winder, Tanaya and Joy Harjo. *Soul Talk, Song Language: Conversations with Joy Harjo.* Wesleyan University Press, 2011. *Project MUSE* muse.jhu.edu/book/10417.