

LENSES OF INDIGENOUS FEMINISM: DIGGING UP THE ROOTS OF WESTERN  
PATRIARCHY IN *PERMA RED* AND *MONKEY BEACH*

by  
Pamela Kay CampBell

---

A Thesis Submitted In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS  
GRADUATE INTERDISCIPLINARY PROGRAM  
IN AMERICAN INDIAN STUDIES.

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

2012

## STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This thesis has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in his or her judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED: Pamela Kay CampBell

## APPROVAL BY THESIS DIRECTOR

This thesis has been approved on the date shown below:

---

Dr. Frances Washburn  
Director of Graduate Studies  
American Indian Studies

---

Date of Exam

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people I would like to thank for helping me to complete this thesis. There are too many to mention, and I am grateful to everyone who supported me through this process. There are some whose support really stands out.

My supervisor, Dr. Franci Washburn, has been wonderful to work with. Professionally, her comments and feedback have aided in honing my writing and helped me create a presentable Master's Thesis. Personally, she kept me on a forward path, even when the finish line seemed far away. I would like to thank Dr. Mary Jo Tippeconnic Fox and Dr. Amy Fatzinger for agreeing to be on my committee, and for their support throughout my duration as a graduate student. I thank Professor Eileen Luna-Firebaugh, who always took the time to answer my e-mails when I had questions, even while she was on sabbatical.

On a personal note, I thank my fellow student and friend Mascha Gemein, who spent several hours feeding, comforting and sympathizing with me as I made the long journey through choosing a topic and beginning to write. I also have to thank my other friends and colleagues in American Indian Studies who listened patiently and offered helpful advice as I thought out loud and changed my mind several times; namely April Petillo, Chandos Cullen, Katherine Brooks, Charlie Williams, Gina Richard, Rei Asaba, Gavin Healey, Howard Treadwell, Nobuko Ichikawa, and Sheila Rocha. I also offer a big thanks to Dr. Billy Stratton for introducing me to American Indian Studies, thus opening the door to a world I never dreamed existed. He also supported me and greatly helped me in my application process to the University of Arizona.

I would like to thank my brother Bruce, my grandmother Brenda, and my Aunt Kathleen, whose deaths taught me that life is short and precious. I give the biggest thanks possible to my parents, J.R. and Susie Campbell, who have always lovingly supported me. They raised me to dream big and believe anything is possible, and I want to prove them right. I also thank my sister Samantha, who can always make me laugh when I need it. Having a family at home that loved and supported me kept me going through many bleak hours. In this vein, I offer thanks to my best friends Katya McCurdy and Liz Ela, who are like family to me, and who prove that love can stretch across many miles and still stay strong.

Finally, I would like to thank my fiancé Daniel Balogh. In the last few months of revisions and research, he freshened my engagement with my thesis topic by asking questions and reading my drafts with interest. Knowing I have a life with him to look forward to gave me the push I needed to finally finish my thesis and turn my attention to the future.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	5
INTRODUCTION.....	6
CHAPTER ONE: A SNAPSHOT OF INDIGENOUS FEMINISMS.....	15
CHAPTER TWO: PATRIARCHY: NOT JUST “WOMEN’S TROUBLE”.....	34
CHAPTER THREE: LESSONS IN DOMINATION, LEARNED TOO WELL...	54
CHAPTER FOUR: THE ROOTS OF VIOLENCE AGAINST INDIGENOUS WOMEN.....	72
CONCLUSION.....	107
WORKS CITED.....	115

## ABSTRACT

Western patriarchy has become deeply ingrained in Indigenous Nations. Patriarchal ideology takes many harmful forms in Indigenous communities, most notably sexism, misogyny, family violence, and violence against women. Indigenous feminists are identifying and resisting patriarchy in Indigenous communities. However, Western patriarchy is so deeply rooted that many people believe it has always been there. Additionally, several Indigenous people resist all forms of feminism, believing the word “feminist” is synonymous with “white,” and therefore suspicious. In order to increase trust in Indigenous feminisms, it must be proved that Indigenous feminist theories stand up to scrutiny. The characters in Debra Earling’s *Perma Red* and Eden Robinson’s *Monkey Beach*, particularly the protagonists Louise White Elk and Lisa Hill, are negatively affected by Western patriarchal ideology in their communities. By examining these texts through Indigenous feminist lenses, my thesis seeks to prove that Indigenous feminisms are viable additions to Indigenous Studies.

## INTRODUCTION

This thesis examines the novels *Monkey Beach* by Eden Robinson, and *Perma Red* by Debra Magpie Earling. The analyses of these novels center around the negative experiences Indigenous characters have with Western patriarchy in their communities, in order to test the applicability of certain Indigenous feminist theories. In addition to literary analyses, this thesis also examines current issues in American Indian and Aboriginal communities in the United States and Canada that stem from the introduction of Western patriarchy into these communities, through an Indigenous feminist lens. My main research question is this: In what ways do the experiences of the characters in *Monkey Beach* and *Perma Red* reflect the negative effects of Western patriarchy in Indigenous communities as they are described by Indigenous feminists? Answering this question allows me to test the strength and applicability of Indigenous feminist theories.

My interest in Indigenous feminisms arose when I read both *Monkey Beach* and *Perma Red*, and I realized that the female protagonists in both novels had similar problems as Indigenous women, though they came from different cultures, nationalities, and time periods. I started to wonder who exactly was addressing the unique problems of Indigenous women. I had once heard the term “Indigenous feminism” in passing, so I decided to explore it further. I found a small but passionate group of Indigenous women scholars who are dedicated to improving the lives of all Indigenous people by addressing sexism and misogyny in Indigenous communities. As a woman, I am no stranger to sexism and misogyny, but as a white woman I have little experience with racism and colonialism. Indigenous feminisms address the intersection of racism, colonialism,

misogyny and sexism, which is the unique experience of Indigenous women in any country. However, the focus of this thesis is narrowed on one novel from the United States and one novel from Canada, partly because these countries represent the settings of the two novels I chose, and partly because Indigenous feminisms are mostly based in these two countries.

There is a need for a deep study of Indigenous feminisms. In Indigenous studies, theories based on Indigenous epistemologies are being continually developed. The existence of these theories strengthens the discipline, because it shows that Indigenous studies can stand alongside other disciplines in academia, rather than being placed under the umbrella of Ethnic Studies or American Studies, for example. Theories of Indigenous feminism have a place in Indigenous studies. Theorists such as Andrea Smith (2005), Luana Ross (2007), and Verna St. Denis (2007) note that Native women's issues are frequently ignored or effaced in favor of the national sovereignty issues that are certainly present in American Indian Studies, and likely in more global Indigenous studies as well. Indigenous feminisms address this issue by mainly focusing on those issues that directly affect Native women, or at least those issues that stem from Western patriarchy. They argue that what affects Native women affects all Native people. Particularly Andrea Smith (2005) argues that violence against Native women is both part of and echoes colonial violence against Indigenous people in general.

As noted by Andrea Smith and J. Khaulani Kauanui in the article "Native Feminisms Engage American Studies," (2008) the relationship between Native women and feminism is rocky at best. The development of Native feminisms did not necessarily

solve the problem of distrust of feminist theories because they are sometimes dismissed as insular “identity” politics. Smith defends Native feminism and its importance when she writes “Native feminism is not simply analysis, but it also mandates a commitment to a political practice of liberation” (248). The real-world implications of Indigenous feminisms mandate their recognition and applicability not only within the field of Indigenous studies, but also in physical Native communities. In *Monkey Beach* (2000) and *Perma Red* (2002), Eden Robinson and Debra Magpie Earling are using the medium of fiction to discuss the common issues of violence, disenfranchisement, cultural loss, and many others Native women face, and which Indigenous feminists address. Thus, my application of Indigenous feminist theories to these texts helps to validate their existence by proving that they can help to reveal the role Western patriarchy plays in Native American/First Nations female realities.

In addition to supporting theories of Indigenous feminism by applying them to literature, this thesis also expands the field of Indigenous literary studies. Writers such as Louise Erdrich, James Welch, Leslie Marmon Silko, Thomas King, Lee Maracle, and N. Scott Momaday are some of the most studied writers in the canon of Indigenous literature in North America, and while their works are worthy of attention, the works of other Indigenous authors are virtually ignored. Eden Robinson has garnered a lot of attention in Canada, but her work remains relatively unknown in the United States. *Perma Red* is Debra Magpie Earling’s first novel, and it has gained very little scholarly attention. These novels are rich additions to the genre of American Indian/Indigenous literature, yet they are seldom studied.



Both of the novels analyzed in this thesis can be described as coming-of-age stories. Each novel follows its female protagonist from childhood to adulthood. *Perma Red* follows the life of Louise White Elk, a young Salish-Kootenai woman growing up on the Flathead Reservation in Montana in the 1930s and 40s. *Monkey Beach* is set on the Haisla Reserve in Kitimaat Village, British Columbia during the 1970s and 1980s, told from the first person perspective of Lisa Hill. The two protagonists come from different cultures and time periods, but as Indigenous women, they share some common experiences.

Louise and Lisa both struggle to find a balance between their Indigenous identities and the powerful influence of Western culture in their communities. Most importantly, for the purpose of this thesis, both of the women are directly and negatively affected by Western patriarchy. White men in the novels consider Indigenous women to be nothing more than objects of desire, and these men do not always wait for permission to touch them sexually. The Indigenous male characters are negatively affected by Western patriarchy, as well. Some of them struggle to live up to the standards of manhood laid out in Western societies, while others internalize the Western patriarchal belief in the inferiority of women and abuse their spouses or rape their female friends. Western patriarchy is introduced in the Indigenous communities partly through residential and boarding schools. In *Monkey Beach* in particular, many Haisla people in Kitimaat Village are traumatized by their time in residential schools, where they were sexually and physically abused and taught to revile their traditional culture. The violence

and self-hatred bred in these schools spills out into the Haisla community, and many of the characters in *Monkey Beach* are the victims of sexual abuse and incest. The introduction of Western patriarchal ideologies in Indigenous communities caused many changes, and each chapter of this thesis examines a different facet of these changes.

Chapter One is a literature review of Indigenous feminist scholarship. It offers a brief history of Western feminisms in order to situate Indigenous feminisms as both influenced by Western feminisms, and improving upon them by expanding them to include the experiences of Indigenous women. Indigenous feminists are operating with the understanding that Indigenous women are not only affected by sexism, but racism, classism, and colonialism, three areas of oppression which are often ignored by mainstream feminists. The chapter summarizes the main works and theories in Indigenous feminist scholarship. It also includes the reasons behind some Indigenous women's resistance to Indigenous feminisms.

Chapter Two explores two Indigenous feminist claims that show how Western patriarchy affects all Indigenous people, not just women. I provide an in-depth analysis of the characters of Charlie Kicking Woman and Baptiste Yellow Knife in *Perma Red* in order to support Verna St. Denis's assertion that "Western patriarchy" [is] a problem for us all" (St. Denis 44). I describe the way in which the Western patriarchal subversion of Salish gender roles affects Baptiste Yellow Knife by removing all expressions of manhood which are familiar to him; and Charlie Kicking Woman by making him question whether or not a traditional Salish man is capable of being a good a man.

Additionally in Chapter Two I discuss Andrea Smith's claim that the same Western patriarchal notions which led Western men to colonize Native peoples extends to the environment, as well. In support of Smith's claim, I use the example of the reduction of oolichan, a fish that is vital to the cultural survival of the Haisla people, both in the fictionalized Haisla community in *Monkey Beach*, and the real Haisla community. I juxtapose Eden Robinson's claims that Alcan Aluminum is responsible for this ecological devastation with the clear role Alcan Aluminum plays in the economic development of the Haisla Community. My analysis shows the bizarre caretaker/destroyer dynamic of Alcan Aluminum, and how subsequently the Haisla community's choices in dealing with this company are limited.

Chapter Three investigates the relationship between Western patriarchal thought, and boarding and residential school practices in the United States and Canada. Renya Ramirez claims that the purpose of boarding schools for Native children was to insert patriarchal gender norms into Native communities (Ramirez 28), while Andrea Smith adds that the state violence perpetrated in these schools led to high rates of domestic and sexual violence in Indigenous communities, even after these schools were closed down (Smith 126). To test Ramirez's claim, I look at the paternalistic behavior of Mr. Bradlock, the Bureau of Indian Affairs agent, in his dealings with Louise White Elk in *Perma Red*. I support Smith's theory by tracing the violent legacy of residential schooling in Lisa Hill's family and community in *Monkey Beach*.

In the fourth and final chapter, I investigate four Indigenous feminist theories about the roots of violence against Indigenous women. The first is Dian Million's

assertion that Indigenous women are often thought of as promiscuous by mainstream Western societies, and the burden is placed on them to prove that these stereotypes are not true. This dovetails into Andrea Smith's claim that in the eyes of mainstream Western society, Indigenous women are inherently "rapable." That is, in this way of thinking, the rape of Indigenous women does not "count" because these women somehow deserve it (Smith 11). In the attempt to explain the high rates of Native-on-Native domestic and sexual violence, Devon Mihesuah offers the explanation that the loss of traditional gender roles has led Native men to feel useless and emasculated, and thus turn to drinking, violence, and "woman hating" (Mihesuah 57). Emma LaRocque, on the other hand, denies this as a viable excuse for Native-on-Native violence, and advocates that Native men who are abusive be held fully responsible for their actions. In order to test the strength of each of these claims, I use literary analysis from *Monkey Beach* and *Perma Red*, but I also expand my analysis to include a look at common cultural stereotypes of Indigenous women in the United States and Canada, the legal measures for protecting Indigenous women in both countries, and measures tribal governments in each country are taking to try to eradicate the misogynistic and sexist thought processes that turn to violence against Indigenous women if left unchecked.

Throughout the thesis, I use different terms to refer to Indigenous peoples. "Indigenous," "Native," and "Indian" are used interchangeably to discuss Indigenous peoples from either the United States or Canada. "American Indian" refers explicitly to Indigenous peoples of the United States of America, while "First Nations" and "Aboriginal" refer explicitly to Indigenous peoples of Canada. I use the term

“feminisms” to stress that there is no such thing as one unified form of “feminism,” because women, including Indigenous women, are diverse and have different ways of thinking. Where I use the singular term “feminist,” or “feminism,” I am either referring to a specific feminist theory, or I am writing about the general distrust and misunderstanding of the word “feminism.”

Finally, I try to make my analyses culturally specific whenever possible. However, due to the limited access I had to trustworthy anthropological texts concerning the Haisla and Salish-Kootenai peoples, and the limited time I had to search for more, I regret that my analyses are not as well-rounded as I would like in this regard. The anthropological information I found about these cultures mostly comes from texts published by white male anthropologists in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, so these findings must not be taken at face-value due to the troubled relationship between white anthropologists and Indigenous communities during that time period.

Indigenous feminisms are useful lenses through which to examine the myriad issues facing Indigenous women. The roots of Western patriarchy were planted in Indigenous communities so deeply, and so long ago, that they are hard to dig up. The roots of Western patriarchy in Indigenous communities are easily traced in the novels *Perma Red* and *Monkey Beach*. The characters in each novel are deeply troubled and affected by many elements of colonialism, but patriarchy in particular affects their interpersonal relationships and the way they view themselves as men and women. Identifying Western patriarchy as the base of some of some major problems in Indigenous communities is the first step in healing these communities. Indigenous

feminists are among the first activists to demand that Indigenous women's rights not be left behind on the quest for tribal sovereignty. Unfortunately, skepticism and distrust of Indigenous feminisms slows their forward movement. This thesis, above all, seeks to prove that Indigenous feminists have useful insights and diagnoses of some key problems in Indigenous communities. The more people listen to and respect these theories, the better chance there will be an inclusive future for all Indigenous people.

## CHAPTER ONE: A SNAPSHOT OF INDIGENOUS FEMINISMS

Indigenous feminist theories are useful lenses through which to identify the negative effects of Western patriarchy on the characters in Eden Robinson's *Monkey Beach* (2000) and Debra Magpie Earling's *Perma Red* (2002). These include the replacement of traditional gender roles with Western patriarchal definitions of masculinity and femininity, the breakdown of the traditional practice of fishing oolichan in *Monkey Beach*, the fragmenting of Indigenous families that resulted from boarding school policies and practices both in the United States and Canada, and finally, the frequent physical and sexual abuse Indigenous women suffer at the hands of Indigenous and non-Indigenous men alike. Western feminist theories were useful in that they pointed the damaging effects of patriarchy on Western women. Indigenous feminists improve upon these theories by making them inclusive of and specific to Indigenous women's issues.

"Feminism" is a polarizing word. It frequently calls up images of men-hating women. This stereotype of feminists is as deeply ingrained, as it is incorrect. According to Joyce Green, feminism as a theory "takes gender seriously as a social organizing process, and, within the context of patriarchal societies, seeks to identify the ways in which women are subordinated to men and how women can be emancipated from this subordination" (21). Feminisms (there is more than one type of feminism) are useful for identifying the ways that patriarchy is not only a problem for women, but for men as well. According to Allan Johnson, "patriarchy isn't simply about relationships between men and women. It encompasses an entire world organized around principles of control,

domination and competition” (qtd. in St. Denis 46). Neither of these descriptions includes hatred toward men; rather, they are criticisms of patriarchal structures based on control and dominance. Western societies are based on such systems of patriarchy, which went largely unquestioned until the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when the women’s suffrage movement began in the United States. When the Civil Rights Era arose in the 1960s and 1970s in the United States, feminists tried to ensure that women’s oppression was not ignored. Because citizens of Western societies are inundated from birth with patriarchal ideologies and practices, these ideologies can be difficult to recognize and dismantle. Feminists take on the task of identifying and protesting patriarchal practices. Likewise, Indigenous feminists take on the task of recognizing the negative effects of patriarchal systems in Indigenous communities.

Before beginning a discussion about the ways in which Indigenous feminisms are different from other feminisms, one must first form a basic understanding of the history of feminist thoughts and popular theories of today. Feminist theories are activist in nature, though feminist activists have a variety of concerns that they address in many different ways. Long before women’s movements were organized, individual women were speaking out against the mistreatment and marginalization of women (pacific.edu). These women, and countless others, were the harbingers of the feminist movement that developed in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century in Western countries. Women’s movements in the United States and Canada developed in much the same way. The main difference was that Canadian feminist activism in the 19<sup>th</sup> century was more subtle and



humor-based than in the United States ([thecanadianencyclopedia.com](http://thecanadianencyclopedia.com)). Feminisms in the United States and Canada both have progressed through three distinct “waves.”

The first wave of feminism did not arise until the late 19<sup>th</sup> century with the women’s suffrage movement in Western countries, including the United States and Canada. Indigenous women, particularly Iroquois women, were symbols of inspiration in this movement because some came from societies in which women shared equal power with men (Allen 1986; Wagner 2001). Suffrage was a main concern for feminists in this period ([pacific.edu](http://pacific.edu)). Victorian women were expected to be “angels in the house” (Tyson 90), so feminist activists of the first wave were subverting the Victorian “cult of domesticity” by speaking in public, demonstrating, and spending time in jail ([pacific.edu](http://pacific.edu)). The opponents of women’s suffrage at this time were both male and female. Notably, Queen Victoria of England dismissed votes for women as “mad, wicked folly” ([nationalarchives.gov.uk](http://nationalarchives.gov.uk)). Despite opposition, women in the United States earned the right to vote in 1920. Canadian women earned the right to vote at different times according to which province they lived in. Most provinces approved suffrage around the same time as the United States, but women could not vote in Québec until 1940 ([marionapolis.edu](http://marionapolis.edu)).

The second wave of feminism is simultaneously the most well known and the most criticized wave of feminism (Crawford 3). The time period of this wave stretches from the late 1960s and early 1970s to around 1992. The common criticism that feminists are “man-hating, hairy-legged bra-burners,” had its roots in the radical feminist group Redstocking’s protest of the 1968 and 1969 Miss America Pageants ([pacific.edu](http://pacific.edu)). This

trivializing view of feminism obscures the fact that the second wave demonstrated a very rich and prolific period in the history of feminist theories.

Like their first-wave predecessors, second-wave feminists sought to fight the oppression of women under male patriarchy (Rivkin and Ryan 765). Second-wave feminism arose in Canada and the United States in the late 1960s (Showalter 5). During this time, many feminists were concerned with critiquing misogynistic stereotypes in male literature, as well as reconstructing history to include more contributions that were specific to women (Showalter 5-6). Feminist theories of the 60s and 70s were informed by other theories, such as Poststructuralism, Marxism and psychoanalysis (Barry 122). During this time there was a disagreement among feminists over whether “womanhood” was “constructed” by male patriarchal language, or if it was an innate “essence” (Rivkin and Ryan 765-767). Essentialists and constructivists were unable to agree on the question of whether womanhood is biological or constructed. It was at this point that feminist theories began to shift from critiques of patriarchy and misogyny in the literary canon to an engagement with language itself; What does the word “woman” mean, and who creates the definition?

Third-wave feminism began in 1992 when then 22-year-old Rebecca Walker wrote an impassioned piece for *Ms.* titled “Becoming the 3<sup>rd</sup> Wave” in response to Clarence Thomas’s appointment to the U.S. Senate, despite allegations of sexual harassment (Crawford 8-9). In this piece, she urged other young women to stand up against gender discrimination. She ended her article with this declaration: “I am not a postfeminism feminist: I am the Third Wave” (Walker 87). Third-wave feminism is a

“generation-based” movement that wishes to get over the “stumbling block” of the second-wave and paint more inclusive portraits of what a feminist looks like (Crawford 10). Third-wave feminism “challenges the idea of dualism itself while recognizing diversity, particularity, or embodiment” (Mack-Canty 154). It is considered both postmodern and postcolonial, and is inclusive of any sexual orientation, gender identity, race, ethnicity, or class (pacific.edu, Crawford 8). Third-wave feminists struggle against traditional women’s issues such as reproductive and employment discrimination, but they have expanded into broader justice movements for workers, immigrants, and more (Crawford 5).

Though many Indigenous women are concerned with issues that are specific to them, pervasive stigmas and misconceptions of feminism prevent most of them from identifying as feminists. Oftentimes in Indigenous communities, women that identify as feminist are seen as “assimilated” because they are using a “white” or “colonial” theoretical approach (Green 23). In some instances, “Aboriginal women stigmatized as feminist have endured political and social ostracization and threats of violence and of other punitive tactics, like being denied access to programs, funding and so on” (Green 24). This type of external pressure may deter Indigenous women from feminism, but there are many other deterrents, as well.

Some Indigenous women resist feminism because they believe that they should be fighting primarily for the survival and sovereignty of their overall tribes, rather than injustices that are specific to women. Lorelei Decora Means, one of the founders of WARN (Women of All Red Nations), has been quoted as saying, “We are American

Indian women in that order. We are oppressed first and foremost as American Indians, as peoples colonized by the United States, not as women. As Indians we can never forget that. Our survival, the survival of every one of us—man, woman and child—as Indians depends on it. Decolonization is the agenda, the whole agenda, until it is accomplished” (qtd. in Ramirez 22). Means is just one of many Indigenous women that hold this worldview.

In the article “Exemplars of Indigenism,” M.A. Jaimes-Guerrero rejects what she calls “white” feminism as a concern of American Indian women (206). She raises the argument that though Native women experience “engendered racism,” (209), they “perceive their liberation from American colonization in the context not of individual rights, but of human rights as traditionally communal peoples” (206-207). In addition to maintaining that Native people are collectively interested in the rights of the entire tribe over individual members, she argues that the breakdown of Native rights into “civil” and “sovereignty” is a Western legal construct that not only fails to apply to Native nations, but also actively undermines the struggle for Native rights (207, 212). According to Jaimes-Guerrero, the division between “sovereignty” and “civil” rights leads Native people to see themselves as victims, “which thwarts longer-term goals of communal self-determination and self-sufficiency as well as the further disempowerment of Native women by erosion of traditional indigenous egalitarianism” (212). This quote suggests that Jaimes-Guerrero disagrees with Native women focusing on the fight for “civil” rights against sexism in their own communities rather than the needs of the whole tribe against

the United States Federal government on the grounds that Native women will be further disempowered if “traditional” societies are fragmented.

Still another explanation for some Indigenous women’s resistance to feminism is the belief that patriarchy is *not*, in fact, detrimentally affecting their communities. For example, Laura Tohe’s article “There is No Word for Feminism in My Language” discusses at length the power and strength of Navajo women. She writes:

My female relatives lived their lives within the Diné [Navajo] matrilineal culture that valued, honored, and respected them. These women passed onto their daughters not only their strength, but the expectation to assume responsibility for the family, and therefore were expected to act as leaders for the family and the tribe. Despite five hundred years of Western patriarchal intrusion, this practice continues (103).

Feminisms as ideologies, and in practice, have traditionally been based on the struggle against marginalization of women in patriarchal societies. Though Tohe recognizes that patriarchal intrusion has taken place in Navajo culture, she does not take it as a serious threat because it has not changed the matrilineal structure of Navajo society. In Tohe’s view, Navajo women have not been marginalized or detrimentally affected by patriarchy. Thus, Tohe maintains that feminist activism is not necessary for Navajo people.

Finally, some Native women shy away from feminism simply because they do not believe that it relates to their specific issues as tribal women. Some believe that feminism is actually anathema to Indigenous women. In *Indigenous American Women*, Devon Mihesuah writes:

Many traditional Native women . . . are not concerned with definitions of feminism, because they are secure in their identities as traditional women; they do not need scholars to tell them of the importance of women to their tribes. They usually have no interest in white feminist theory, because they

have witnessed white women enjoying the power privileges that come with being white at the expense of women of color (160).

Based on this quote, for some Indigenous women feminism is unequivocally a “white” theory espoused by nosy white women who are ignorant of their own privilege in society.

Sandy Grande is an American Indian woman scholar who shares this view. In her article “Whitestream Feminism and the Colonialist Project,” she begins by stating firmly that she is not a feminist. She recognizes that feminisms have made invaluable contributions to critical theory, but continues to say that white women’s “well-documented failure to engage race and acknowledge the complicity of white women in the history of domination positions ‘mainstream’ feminism alongside of other colonialist discourses” (329). This critique of feminisms simultaneously represents an understanding and a *mis*understanding of feminist theories. It is fair to say that the kinds of issues addressed by the white middle-class feminists of the second-wave do not really relate to lived experience in Indigenous communities. However, some Indigenous women scholars have been actively engaged over the past forty years in defining feminism on their own terms in order to address common concerns for women in Indigenous communities.

Indigenous women who identify as feminist are often mocked and maligned in their home communities as “traitors.” Despite this, Indigenous feminist scholars such as Kate Shanley, Andrea Smith, Luana Ross, Renya Ramirez, Joyce Green, and others have been working to develop and implement theories of feminism that are specific to Indigenous women—in other words, Indigenous feminisms. Because the introduction of this term is so recent, it is necessary to provide comprehensive definitions of what exactly “Indigenous feminisms” are. According to Joyce Green, editor of *Making Space for*

*Indigenous Feminism* (2007), “Aboriginal feminism brings together . . . two critiques, feminism and anti-colonialism, to show how Aboriginal peoples, and in particular Aboriginal women, are affected by colonialism and by patriarchy” (Green 23). Bagele Chilisa, author of *Indigenous Research Methodologies* (2012), offers this slightly different definition: “A postcolonial indigenous feminist perspective moves out of the cage of universalized Western gender theory and employs postcolonial and indigenous perspectives to reveal local standpoints that express girls’ and women’s agency and resistance to oppression” (Chilisa 261). Cheryl Suzack and Shari Huhndorf, co-editors of the 2010 collection *Indigenous Women and Feminism*, assert, “Indigenous feminist analysis and activism must aim to understand the changing situations, the commonalities, and the specificities of Indigenous women across time and place; it must seek ultimately to attain social justice not only along gender lines but also along those of race, class, and sexuality” (Huhndorf and Suzack 3). These three definitions show that Indigenous feminist theories: 1) Engage in the discovery and understanding of the effects of colonialism and patriarchy in Indigenous communities in general, and on Indigenous women specifically; 2) Illustrate the strength and agency Indigenous women possess through their resistance to oppression; and 3) Seek to be inclusive of all facets of discrimination (gender, race, class) in their analyses and social justice activism.

Among the earliest articles on Indigenous feminisms was Kate Shanley’s (Assiniboine) 1983 article “Thoughts on Indian Feminism,” printed in *A Gathering of Spirit*. At a leadership conference for Indigenous women, Shanley noticed that while many of the attendees were working for change for women, most seemed very reluctant

to self-identify as feminists. Shanley felt self-conscious, prompting her to write, “. . . I am a woman who refers to herself as a feminist. If most Indian women do not refer to themselves as feminist, does that fact make me somehow *less* representative, *less* Indian” (214)? In order to answer the question of how to reconcile feminist identity with Indigenous identity, she goes on to determine the ways in which the concerns of the Indigenous women’s movement differed from those of the mainstream.

Shanley recognizes that Native and non-Native women activists agree on issues like equal pay, reproductive rights, and child welfare, but there are issues which are specific to Native women, beginning with the dedication to promoting sovereignty. Thus, she writes, the struggle for equality looks different for Native women and mainstream women in the United States:

(1) on the individual level, the Indian woman struggles to promote the survival of a social structure whose organizational principles represent notions of family different from those of the mainstream; and (2) on the societal level, the People seek sovereignty as a people in order to maintain a vital legal and spiritual connection to land, in order to *survive* as a people (Shanley 214).

In Shanley’s view, Indigenous feminisms cannot be separated from the promotion of sovereignty for Native nations. She also asserts that though Native feminisms share some similar goals with mainstream feminisms, like Native sovereignty they must be recognized as powerful in their own right (215).

Paula Gunn Allen’s (Laguna Pueblo) 1986 book *The Sacred Hoop: Recovering the Feminine in American Indian Tradition* was a seminal work of Indigenous feminism, though Allen never used the exact words “Indigenous feminist” in reference to herself. She describes her critical approach to American Indian Studies as “tribal-feminism or



feminist-tribalism” (222). That is, “if [she is] dealing with feminism, [she approaches] it from a strongly tribal posture, and when [she is] dealing with American Indian literature, history, culture, or philosophy [she approaches] it from a strongly feminist one” (222). Allen does not immediately eschew feminist theories, though she does recognize that “feminists too often believe that no one has ever experienced the kind of society that empowered women and made that empowerment the basis of its rules and civilization” (213). Most of *The Sacred Hoop* is devoted to, as the subtitle suggests, “recovering the feminine in American Indian tradition.” Allen makes the argument that most Indigenous societies were historically gynocratic and matriarchal, and thus more egalitarian (2-3). She makes the further argument that mainstream feminisms could benefit from the knowledge that gynocratic societies once existed and were successful, and that they could exist again (213). Devon Mihesuah (2003) and Emma LaRocque (2007) have challenged Allen’s claims about most pre-contact societies being gynocratic and matrilineal, but *The Sacred Hoop* is still an oft-cited text by many Indigenous feminists.

The first edition of Lee Maracle’s (Stoh:lo) *I Am Woman: A Native Perspective on Sociology and Feminism* came out in 1988, but it quickly went out of print. By popular demand a second edition was published in 1996. Maracle writes in the preface to the second edition, “My original intention was to empower Native women to take to heart their own personal struggle for Native feminist being” (vii). Like all Indigenous feminists, Maracle initially struggled with the term “women’s liberation,” partly because of its relationship to white feminism and partly because of the widespread belief that a Native woman who focuses on issues pertinent to Native women is a traitor to her race

(15-16). Maracle believes that the women's movement should be "about the liberation of humanity from the yoke of domination" and "the fight against racism and sexism and their effects on our consciousness, no matter what colour [sic] we are . . . the struggle for unity between oppressed men and women" (138). Rather than bear resentment toward white women for excluding Native women from the general women's movement in Canada, Maracle advocates that Native women start "cleans[ing] the dirty shack that racism left [them]" (139) by addressing sexist practices in their own communities.

Over the past ten years, there has been a growing interest in Indigenous feminisms, so much so that edited volumes have come out on the subject. The first is Joyce Green's *Making Space for Indigenous Feminism* (2007). Green pulled together this collection following the 2002 Aboriginal Feminism Symposium, which she helped to organize. In her contribution, "Taking Account of Aboriginal Feminism," Green writes that though very few Indigenous women publish works about feminism, their contributions are nonetheless important (20). She attributes the general absence of Indigenous perspectives in the women's movement to "the unthinking racism of a movement that has often failed to see Indigenous women in their full historical and contemporary contexts: as simultaneously Aboriginal and female, and as contemporary persons living in the context of colonial oppression . . ." (20-21). Despite the marginalization they face both in the mainstream women's movement and from certain members of their communities, Indigenous feminists nevertheless "use feminist analysis as a tool for challenging racism and colonialism" (23). They accomplish this partly through educating other movements that are ignorant of issues of colonialism, racism and

sexism, and partly through suggesting alternate and more inclusive futures for their individual nations (24,26).

In the chapter “Feminism is For Everybody,” also found in *Making Space for Indigenous Feminism*, Verna St. Denis (Métis) describes her conversion to Indigenous feminisms. Previously she had shared the opinion of M.A. Jaimes-Guerrero and Lorelei Means that Native women should not prioritize their own concerns over those of the entire tribe (St. Denis 33). Over time, however, she changed her mind. St. Denis goes on to assert “Western patriarchy” is “a problem for us all” (44). Like Allen (1986), St. Denis explains that Native communities have unquestionably been changed by Western patriarchy. Because of this, any studies of women’s issues in Native communities cannot be separated from discussions of colonialism.

Emma LaRocque’s (Métis) chapter “Métis and Feminist” begins with the claim that though Aboriginal women are objectified, abused, and oppressed, they are also strong, gracious, determined activists and agents in their own lives. She points out that the issues of non-status Native people in Canada are generally ignored by status Indians (53). Aboriginal women are not accorded any positions of leadership in either the Canadian government or their own Aboriginal governments. They experience discrimination in all spheres of their lives (54). Ideas of tradition and “balance” have been skewed in First Nations to keep Native women confined to the realm of the domestic under the auspices of the reification of motherhood (55). In addition to the cultural devastation caused by patriarchal and colonial practices such as residential

schooling (58-59), widespread poverty creates situations in which Native women are vulnerable to violence.

Emma LaRocque is adamant, however, that poverty is *not* the cause of domestic violence in Native communities. In her opinion:

. . . neither colonization nor poverty explains everything about why or how Native men (and societies) may assume sexist attitudes or behaviors. This point has to be emphasized because male violence continues to be much tolerated, explained or virtually absolved by many . . . Aboriginal women, usually in defense of cultural difference, community loyalties or nationalist agendas, or out of reaction to white feminist critiques . . . sexual violence, in particular, is often treated as only one of many colonial-generated problems we face (61).

Aboriginal women sometimes shy away from identifying themselves as feminists because they want to present a united front against racism and colonialism, but to ignore or excuse violence against Native women, or speak of it generally as just another issue facing Native nations, is unacceptable. LaRocque emphasizes the point that self-determination is internationally recognized as a basic human right, but all too often that recognition only extends to collective cultures. She claims that self-determination should be an individual right, and that all people should be free of violence, even when that violence comes from within their own communities (61).

Andrea Smith's (Cherokee) chapter, "Native American Feminism, Sovereignty and Social Change" responds to the popular claim that decolonization naturally leads to an eradication of sexist attitudes and practices in Native communities. Smith writes, ". . . regardless of its origins in Native communities, sexism operates with full force today and requires strategies that directly address it. Before Native peoples fight for the future of their nations, they must ask themselves, who is included in that nation" (97)? In Smith's

view, gender issues are not separate from issues of survival in Native communities. Firstly, since Native women suffer death rates related to domestic violence at twice the rate of any other women in the United States, gender violence *is* a “survival” issue. Secondly, to decolonize without addressing sexism is to ignore the fact that gender violence was one of the ways through which Native communities initially lost their lands (98).

Smith draws attention to some Native women activists who are responding creatively to the pressure to ignore “individual” women’s issues in favor of national “survival” issues. As an example, she cites a brochure titled *Sovereign Women Strengthen Sovereign Nations*, generated by the Sacred Circle, an American Indian center for domestic and sexual violence found in South Dakota. These brochures draw an obvious connection between national and individual sovereignty rights. For example, in two adjacent columns labeled “Tribal Sovereignty” and “Native Women’s Sovereignty,” the brochure explains that “All tribal nations have an inherent right to . . . a land base: possession and control is unquestioned and honored by other nations. To exist without fear, but with freedom” (qtd. in Smith 100). Likewise, “All Native women have an inherent right to . . . their body and path in life: the possession and control is unquestioned and honored by others. To exist without fear, but with freedom” (qtd. in Smith 100). This brochure shows that sovereignty is not solely a national issue, but a personal one, as well.

In her 2003 article “Not an Indian Tradition: The Sexual Colonization of Native Peoples,” Andrea Smith makes the claim that “sexual violence does not simply just occur

within the process of colonialism, but that colonialism is itself structured by the logic of sexual violence” (70). In Smith’s view, entire communities of color (including Native nations) are victims of sexual violence because sexual violence is not only a tool of patriarchy; it is also a tool of colonialism and racism (71). Though entire Native communities are victims of sexual violence, Native men and women do not experience sexual violence in the same way, but “. . . when a Native woman suffers abuse, this abuse is not just an attack on her identity as a woman, but on her identity as Native” (71). Smith claims this as the reason why every Native woman she spoke to in her time as a rape counselor said at one point, “I wish I was no longer Indian” (71).

Smith expands her argument in her 2005 book *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*. In the introduction she writes, “Putting Native women at the center of analysis compels us to look at the role of the state in perpetrating both race-based and gender-based violence. We cannot limit our conception of sexual violence to individual acts of rape—rather it encompasses a wide range of strategies designed not only to destroy peoples, but to destroy their sense of being a people” (3). She explores the history of sexual violence and genocide in Native communities. She widens the traditional definition of sexual violence to include boarding schools, environmental harm, sterilization and medical experimentation, and spiritual appropriation (Smith 3-5). In this way, she is making the case that sexual violence in Native communities is not an individual problem that only affects women; it is the major tool of colonialism, and should be taken seriously by Native nations.

Like Smith, Luana Ross (Salish-Kootenai) also stresses the necessity of including colonial history in studies of Indigenous women's issues. In her 2009 article "From the 'F' Word to Indigenous/Feminisms," Ross expresses the familiar dissatisfaction with the ability of mainstream "white" feminism to adequately address issues which are specific to Native women, though she seeks to build a bridge with European American feminism (46). She also responds with caution to the current trend of transnational feminism in women's studies. She cites Eliza Noh's warning that "The prefixes 'trans-' and 'post-' are semantic smoke screens, erasing as if by magic the contemporary pervasiveness of coloniality from discourses on modernity and nationalism . . ." (qtd. in Ross 47). Ross applies Noh's criticism of transnational feminism to Native women, arguing that transnational feminism must always take into account the continuing reality of colonialism for Native women, particularly since in the United States Native nations by their very definition share a transnational relationship with each other (47-48).

Renya Ramirez's (Winnebago) 2007 article "Race, Tribal Nation and Gender" argues for a greater inclusion of Native women's issues in struggles for Native sovereignty (23). Ramirez also asserts, "tribal sovereignty should be central to our discussions of feminism, since it is truly a pivotal political concern in Indian country" (24). She believes that tribal sovereignty should be re-conceptualized from Native women's perspectives, in order to make tribal governments more inclusive. She adds, however, "rethinking sovereignty from Native women's viewpoints can lessen this tension between Western notions of tribal sovereignty and Native women's gender

rights” (30). A Native feminist’s conception of tribal sovereignty is inclusive, respectful, interdependent, and most importantly, not dismissive of gender rights (31).

In 2009, Dian Million’s (Tanana Athabascan) article “Felt Theory: An Indigenous Feminist Approach to Affect and History” was printed in *Wicazo Sa Review*. In this article, she insists on the inclusion of “felt scholarship—” that is, scholarship grown out of lived experiences in Indigenous communities—within the academy. She argues, “academia repetitively produces gatekeepers to our entry into important social discourse because we *feel* our histories as well as think them” (54). Throughout the essay, Million discusses the ways in which some First Nations women’s writings based on their “felt” experiences broke the wall of silence surrounding sexism and gender violence both from mainstream Canadians and within their own Native communities (54-55; 57-63). Because these experiences challenge (threaten) the Canadian meta-narrative, they are often singled out as being too subjective, and therefore not scholarly enough to be taken seriously in academia (64). Million pushes for the inclusion of felt theory and scholarship in the academy because without it, alternative histories of genocide and child abuse are too easily ignored or erased. Furthermore, she argues that Aboriginal people need felt theory and scholarship in order to understand their own current positions within the nation of Canada (72).

In 2010, Cheryl Suzack (Anishinaabe) and Shari M. Huhndorf (Yup’ik) collaborated with two non-Indigenous scholars, Jeanne Perreault and Jean Barman, as editors of the collection titled *Indigenous Women and Feminism: Politics, Activism, Culture*. Like *Making Space for Indigenous Feminism*, this second text grew from a



conference of Indigenous feminist scholars in 2005. In the introductory chapter, “Indigenous Feminism: Theorizing the Issues,” Huhndorf and Suzack stress that there is not a unified vision of Indigenous feminism. The collection seeks to open a discussion about strategies for constructing a theory and practice that is specific to Indigenous women (4). The editors also contend that though Indigenous women must be the ones to construct Indigenous feminist theories, “Indigenous feminism—as a political strategy and project—also requires the alliances that are built through the engagement, contributions, and support of Indigenous men and non-Indigenous women” (4). The collection expands discussions of Indigenous feminisms to include the role cultural production played in their developments (9). The third part of the collection, “Culture,” includes Indigenous feminist critiques of Canadian literature and art (12). The application of Indigenous feminist theories to literature is a very recent development. Furthering the practice of applying Indigenous feminist theories to literature is one of the goals of this thesis.

## CHAPTER TWO: PATRIARCHY: NOT JUST “WOMEN’S TROUBLE”

In the opening chapter of *Making Space for Indigenous Feminism*, Joyce Green explains that Aboriginal feminism brings together feminist and anti-colonial theories to demonstrate the ways in which Western patriarchy is harmful to Indigenous people in general, and more specifically, Indigenous women. Likewise, in her article “Feminism is for Everybody,” Verna St. Denis titles a section “Western Patriarchy: A Problem for Us All.” She calls for an analysis of Western patriarchy in the context of colonization because she argues:

. . . most, if not all Aboriginal people, both men and women, who are living in western societies are inundated from birth until death with western patriarchy and western forms of misogyny. In this view I am joined by an increasing number of other Aboriginal women who are also claiming that we have not escaped these social and political structures and ideologies at all (St. Denis 44).

It is significant that St. Denis specifies that Native people are now under the influence of *Western* forms of misogyny, because that suggests that misogyny is not exclusively a Western practice, as Emma LaRocque has also pointed out (2007).

If the assertion that Indigenous communities are affected by Western patriarchy seems slightly obvious, one must consider again Laura Tohe’s article “There is No Word for Feminism in My Language,” in which she writes, “When we leave our traditional world and step into the Western world, feminism becomes an issue, and we must confront and deal with the same issues that affect all women” (Tohe 109). From this quote, it seems that Tohe believes that the kind of patriarchy all women in the Western world face affects Navajo women *only* when they leave the reservation. Aside from the fact that Tohe is not considering Navajo women who were not raised on the reservation, this claim

also excludes the possibility that Western patriarchal notions have in any way entered into Navajo country. St. Denis and other Indigenous feminists would strongly disagree with this viewpoint.

The effects of Western patriarchy in Indian Country are not always as visible as physical violence or salary inequity. Nor are Native women the only ones to be oppressed. To reiterate, according to Indigenous feminists, Western patriarchy is a problem for Native people of all ages and genders. Helène Cixous argues in her theory on Western binary thought that patriarchal ideas and practices in Western societies are based on rigid hierarchical power structures with everything “masculine” (e.g., action, culture, rationality) valued over everything “feminine” (e.g., passivity, nature, emotion) (Eagleton 147). Paula Gunn Allen claims in *The Sacred Hoop* that part of the drive to colonize Native peoples stemmed from the scorn Western colonizers felt for “feminine” Indigenous cultures which valued peace, respect and nurturing over dominance (2-3). As Indigenous feminists such as Andrea Smith (2005), Paula Gunn Allen (1986), and Kim Anderson (2007) have asserted, prior to contact with Europeans some Native nations were matrilineal and gynocratic, and even those that were patrilineal generally espoused practices of gender equality. Though some Indigenous feminists like Emma LaRocque (2007) caution against romanticizing pre-contact Indigenous societies as devoid of oppression, it is clear that contact with *specifically* Western patriarchal ideas led to an epidemic of Native men feeling adrift because the traditional gender roles of their tribes came to be replaced with Western traditional gender roles. In Debra Earling’s *Perma Red*, examples of the debilitating effects this subversion had on Native men’s psyches

and behaviors, such as alcoholism, the perpetration of domestic violence, and feelings of emasculation, are evident in the characters of Baptiste Yellow Knife and Charlie Kicking Woman.

Anthropological records concerning the Salish of the Flathead Reservation in Montana contend that the introduction of horses around 1700 caused the Salish to shift from the fishing culture found in the Northwest to a more Plains-like culture based around hunting buffalo (Turney-High 105; Pritzker 272-273). In 1841, St. Mary's, a Jesuit Mission, was established in Bitterroot Salish land. Catholicism was not new to the Salish at that point; they had been intermarrying with Catholic Iroquois since the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. However, the Jesuit missionaries brought with them Western agricultural practices that once again shifted how the Salish acquired their food. Food acquisition was split rather evenly between hunting and planting, until around the 1880s when most of the buffalo were exterminated (Bigart 26-39). The 1855 Hellgate Treaty which reduced Salish land and bound together the Bitterroot Salish and Kootenai tribes *also* brought more European technology into the tribal community, such as the establishment of a blacksmith shop, a saw mill, and a flour mill. In addition to being either defective or primarily used to serve Americans rather than the Salish and Kootenai, they nevertheless changed the economics on the reservation by hiring tribal men and pulling them away from hunting (Bigart 35).

The introduction of white agricultural practices and industrialization coupled with the reduction of hunting lands and the destruction of the buffalo irreversibly subverted traditional Salish gender roles. Before the mid-1800s, manhood in Salish culture was

measured through hunting, fishing, fighting, horsemanship and warfare practices such as counting coup (Turney-High 63, 81, 111-113). The introduction of Western Christianity, industrialization, agriculture and environmental harm to the buffalo meant that rites of masculinity in Salish culture were nearly impossible to follow. This loss clearly would affect someone like the character of Baptiste Yellow Knife in *Perma Red*, a man who strives to follow the old ways of the Salish, but finds that the world that he lives in strongly discourages the kind of life he would have lived 100 years previously.

In the beginning of the novel, Baptiste Yellow Knife is established as being an outsider both in his tribe and among the Anglo-Americans living in the same area. Louise White Elk's grandmother, Grandma Magpie, warns her that Baptiste "is the last of our old ones, and he is dangerous'" (Earling 4). From the time he is a child, Baptiste shares a close relationship with the spirit world. He foretells death and uses medicine to manipulate others. He and his mother, Dirty Swallow, have the power to command rattlesnakes to attack their enemies. For this reason, Baptiste deeply frightens all of the Salish people on the reservation, and they strive to avoid him, even as they are drawn to the way he represents a time before colonialism changed their traditions. The Ursuline nuns who run a school on the reservation work strenuously to cast doubt on everything Baptiste believes in. Louise's sister is bitten by a rattlesnake after she refuses to marry Baptiste, but even as Louise is running for help she hears the nuns in her head telling her, "Snakes won't bite our enemies because we tell them to" (Earling 20). The nuns have the full support of the United States Government to teach the Native children that their traditional ways are backward and sinful. Baptiste is one of the only people on the

reservation that openly resists the nuns' attempts to socialize him into hating himself. As such, he does not have much support, and he becomes very isolated.

Baptiste's refusal to change his behavior to suit the desires of the white institutions on the reservation both unnerves and impresses the other Salish. Louise notes, ". . . there was a strength in him she would never have. He was not ashamed to be Indian. The nuns couldn't wash the smell of spirit smoke from his hair with all their kerosene. They couldn't soap away his Indian tongue" (Earling 131). The Ursuline nuns at his school target Baptiste specifically because of his dark skin and because he will not be swayed by their opinions about Native people. Once in particular he stares down a nun who is trying to make fun of him. She claps erasers in his face, but he still does not move. In fact, the chalk dust gives him "the face of a beautiful warrior whitened for battle" (133). In this small act of defiance, he becomes a symbol of resistance to colonial power.

As "the last" of the old ones, Baptiste does not have a place in his contemporary society, which is grappling with the intrusion of white dominance. He is adrift in his own land, left without a meaningful occupation. He becomes what Robert Dale Parker refers to as a "restless young m[a]n with nothing to do" (Parker 19). Parker points out that on the Flathead Reservation, "The options for youthful masculinity seem contracted into little more than making trouble and getting drunk . . ." (Parker 20). Although Parker is writing about D'Arcy McNickle's *The Surrounded* (1936), his description of "a restless young man with nothing to do" directly applies to Baptiste.

Baptiste has no occupation, and he chooses to handle his dissatisfaction by drinking and picking fights. His relationship with his wife, Louise, is troubled as well.

When she betrays him by running off with a white man, Harvey Stoner, he beats her and cuts open her breast. It is vital here to mention that Emma LaRocque is adamant that, while the disenfranchisement, poverty and alcoholism which are the result of Western dominance can sometimes lead Native men to feel powerless, that should *never* be accepted as an explanation or an excuse for domestic violence (LaRocque 61). In light of this, it must be said that while Baptiste's separation from traditional Salish practices of manhood cause him psychological harm, he is still responsible for the way he chooses to respond to these negative influences in his life, particularly when he chooses to take his personal frustrations out on his wife's body.

Baptiste is rarely sober, though when he is, he strongly advocates that the Salish return to the old ways. He is sober for powwows, when he performs a traditional dance that causes the other Salish to feel pride in themselves, though as Charlie Kicking Woman points out, no one has a deep understanding of the culture because white influence on the reservation has caused many of the Salish to be ignorant of their traditions and their meanings. Apart from the Ursuline nuns, the most potent symbol of white influence is Harvey Stoner, the crooked prospector who swindles Salish people out of their allotment lands. He owns so many of the allotments that some of the Salish call Flathead "The Stoner Reservation" (Earling 119). Charlie notes angrily that Harvey Stoner "slip[s] into our bedrooms with a grin on his face" to steal Salish women out from under the noses of Native men on the reservation. He does this with Baptiste's wife, as well. To Louise, Harvey Stoner symbolizes wealth, status, food, and a ride out of Perma (Earling 146-148). In the culture of Western patriarchy, wealth and coercive power are

symbols of manhood. Baptiste measures manhood differently, but his measurements do not count in Harvey Stoner's world.

Baptiste Yellow Knife's cousin, Charlie Kicking Woman, offers another example of the damaging effects white patriarchy has on Native men. Unlike Baptiste, Charlie has internalized white racist views about Native people, especially Native men like himself. Karen D. Pyke defines internalized racism as "the individual inculcation of the racist stereotypes, values, images and ideologies perpetuated by the White [sic] dominant society about one's racial group, leading to feelings of self-doubt, disgust, and disrespect for one's race and/or oneself" (Pyke 553). By becoming a police officer that enforces American laws on the reservation, Charlie is taking part in a hegemonic practice.

Hegemony is a concept described in Antonio Gramsci's *Prison Notebooks* (1929-1935). It refers to "a process of moral and intellectual leadership through which dominated or subordinate classes . . . consent to their own domination by ruling classes, as opposed to being simply forced or coerced into accepting inferior positions" (english.emory.edu). Though Gramsci was writing specifically about Western Europe around the time of World War I, the concept of a subordinated group consenting to its own domination applies to Charlie Kicking Woman. In this case, it is in part his internalized racist views that lead him to participate in his own oppression.

Proof of Charlie's internalized racism is abundant throughout the novel, but one instance in particular starkly demonstrates his identity struggles. He reflects on his memories of events on the reservation that his internalization of Western ideology leads him to define as supernatural, such as his grandmother hovering over a fire (Earling 189).



However, “When I became a police officer these stories took a backseat to small houses filled with hungry children . . . I wanted to shake the people who held to these stories when their children were waking up with the smoke of cold hissing through their wood-split homes” (Earling 189). Though Charlie has seen first-hand the evidence of spiritual forces at work on the reservation, he partly blames the continuing presence of Salish traditions and beliefs for the abject poverty tribal citizens experience on the Flathead Reservation. Implicitly he is advocating that the Salish let go of these stories and attempt to integrate into white society. At one point he says, “If the old ways are the best, the best is losing and I want to win” (Earling 24).

His job as a police officer is an example of how Charlie tries to “win.” It brings him food and money, and he knows that white people only pay attention to him when he wears the uniform. His desire for attention and respect from white people is another example of his internalized racism. His motives for becoming a police officer are not completely selfish, however. He decides to become a policeman after helping his uncle build a coffin for Annie White Elk when he is a young man, because in that moment, “I felt proud to be a man. I think that event sealed in me the desire to help others” (31). His choice of profession is directly tied to his identity as a man, though he struggles to define just what a man should be.

Charlie has two main examples of manhood in the novel—white men like his superiors on the police department and Harvey Stoner; and his cousin, Baptiste Yellow Knife. The white men epitomize patriarchal domination of Native people, while Baptiste’s violent tendencies and alcoholism represent the apparent futility of attempting

to resist adopting colonial attitudes. Charlie's identity as a man lies somewhere in between. Though Charlie emulates his white superiors on the police force, he is unable to completely let go of his Salish identity, and he even has moments where he resents white society for disenfranchising Native people. He wants to be part of his tribe, but he becomes confused about how the Salish should behave in a world where they hold virtually no political power.

Proof of Charlie's lingering connection to his Salish background can be found in his obsession with Louise. Charlie's constant introspective musings about what it means to be a man generally revolve around Louise. He is attracted to her because they are from the same tribe (28), and there is an undeniable strength and wildness to her (23). For Charlie, Louise represents the spirit of the Salish. However, Charlie's admiration of Louise's Indianness is muddled by his internalization of white attitudes and stereotypes about Native people. He frequently chases her and tries to force her to go to white schools. He does this in part because it is his job as a police officer, but he also does not want to see her "in the poorhouse, a husband like Baptiste beating her on weekends, ten squalling kids and another on the way"(Earling 22). Later on in the novel, Charlie notes, "I had heard a lot of Indian women say, as if it was going to hurt me, that they were going to marry a white man and move off the reservation. I said if that's what it took to make a better life, beat it. I carried the grudge that maybe it was true" (Earling 154). Though he is a Native man, he has strong doubts about the ability of Native men to take care of their wives properly, without spending all of their money on alcohol. His position as a tribal police officer exposes him to the worst effects of colonialism and disenfranchisement. He

acknowledges that white men were responsible for the changes in his community, but his internalization of white attitudes toward Native people sometimes leads him to believe that “Indians . . . may be as stupid as the nuns gave them credit for” (Earling 34). When Charlie thinks this way, he is usually thinking of Baptiste.

Charlie’s confusion over his identity as a Salish man is also evident in his love-hate relationship with his cousin, which is further complicated because Baptiste marries the woman Charlie desires. Baptiste constantly bests and humiliates Charlie, often in front of Louise. Charlie views Baptiste as a troublemaker, bemoaning the number of times he has had to arrest him for drunk and disorderly. Louise’s choice to marry Baptiste hurts Charlie deeply, because he wants “something different” for her—namely, he wants her to enter the white world rather than marry Baptiste. However, his respect for his cousin’s power is clear. While Charlie has to put on a uniform in order to be noticed by white people, Baptiste only needs to be himself. “He could have been walking down the street, dull sober, and those white people would have charged to the other side of the street without even the pretense that they weren’t afraid. Yellow Knife entered a bar and got served just because the bartender was afraid to kick him out” (197). Charlie is in awe of this quality Baptiste has—however, it is just this quality that Charlie believes makes him an unsuitable partner for Louise.

Charlie views Baptiste as “that one mean Indian who had hid in the shadows of [his] matinee memories, a knife pressed between tight lips, the nickel-movie Indian who frightened real Indians” (Earling 255). Though Charlie was raised in the Salish community and knows that nickel-movie Indians are not real, he cannot help but

internalize this view of Native men with respect to Baptiste. In this way, he is answering Emma LaRocque's question of "What happens to Aboriginal males who are exposed . . . to the racist/sexist view of the 'Indian' male as a violent 'savage' . . ." (qtd. in St. Denis 47). In Charlie's case, he comes to see his own cousin in the same way. In an attempt to separate himself from Baptiste, he tries instead to emulate white men, but finds that they do not respect him, either.

In the article "The Red Road to Nowhere," Louis Owens describes the relationship between white men and Native men as "paternalistic." He writes:

Within the metaphor of the father-child relationship . . . The assumption is that the child cannot and will not understand the parent's motivation and must therefore act on the principle of pure faith. The effect of such paternalism is to render the child powerless to control his own destiny, and to institutionalize dependence upon the paternal power. This might be characterized as the driving force behind Anglo-European relations with American Indians from the beginning. The Indian becomes a helpless child in need of a stern father, and it is this father he must emulate (243-244).

Particularly when he wears the uniform and is performing police duties, Charlie comes to view the reservation and its people through Anglo eyes. He has internalized dependence upon white institutions, and resolves to become part of them at the cost of his Salish identity and the respect of fellow tribal members. Like Baptiste, Charlie feels adrift, unable to find an identity he can be comfortable with. Part of his difficulty stems from the fact that, in a Western patriarchal system, he has neither the personality nor the skills necessary to inspire respect in other men, white or Native.

In his book, *The Gender Knot*, Allan Johnson describes a patriarchal society as one that is "organized around an obsession with control" (5). He adds, "Men's participation in patriarchy tends to lock them in an endless pursuit of and defense against

control, for *under patriarchy, control is both the source of and the only solution offered for their fear*. The more invested a man is the control-fear spiral, the worse he feels when he doesn't feel in control" (54-55, emphasis in the original). This quote sums up Charlie Kicking Woman, both in his relationship to Louise White Elk, and to the other men in the novel including Baptiste and Harvey Stoner. Louise shares close relationships with four men in the novel: Harvey, Baptiste, the cowboy Jules Bart, and Charlie. Of these four, Charlie is the only man with whom she does not have sexual intercourse, and Charlie feels inadequate as a result.

Inadequacy and powerlessness is a common theme in the chapters written from Charlie's perspective. In the end, Charlie tries to overcome this feeling of powerlessness by murdering Harvey Stoner. Charlie finds Stoner injured in a car accident. He finds out that Louise was also in the car accident, and Stoner orders Charlie to let her die. Charlie looks down at Stoner and says, "I can save the whole Flathead Nation" (Earling 288) before throwing a lighter into the pool of gasoline surrounding Stoner, killing Stoner and injuring himself in the process. Though he frees the Salish people from Harvey Stoner's influence, it is clear that he has not freed himself from the influence of Western patriarchy. His decision to dispense of Stoner is reflective of the patriarchal desire to defend against another man's control using the medium of violence. Also, when the Lake County Sheriff arrives on the scene and praises Charlie for trying to save Stoner, Charlie gladly notes, "He had never spoken to me with respect before" (Earling 289). This is the last time Charlie appears in the novel, and it is clear that his confusion over his identity as

a man is still very present. It seems that Western patriarchy will continue to negatively affect Charlie's psyche for years to come.

While Verna St. Denis is concerned with the direct effects Western patriarchy has on Native people, Andrea Smith expands her view to include the *indirect* effects of Western patriarchal ideologies. Namely, she makes the connection between these ideologies and the environmental harm that Western countries often perpetrate. In the chapter "Rape of the Land" in her 2005 book *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*, Smith concurs with past feminist theorists who have asserted that the same patriarchal attitudes that are behind colonialism and sexual violence also lead Western men to dominate and "rape" the natural environment (Smith 55). In this chapter, Smith is writing at the intersection of Indigenous feminism and ecofeminism, which also explores the patriarchal attitudes behind environmental damage (Glazebrook 12).

Ecofeminism grew out of French feminist theories. Simone de Beauvoir in *The Second Sex* (1952) pointed out that to men, women and nature are both "Other" (Glazebrook 12). In 1974 Françoise d'Eaubonne coined the term "ecofeminism" and invented the slogan "Feminism or death," because in her opinion "the phallic order is the source of a double threat to human beings; overpopulation, and the depletion of resources" (qtd. in Glazebrook 12). The constant attack on women's reproductive rights leads to overpopulation, which in turn leads humans (primarily men) to overtax the environment in search of natural resources to sustain human life. D'Eaubonne's use of the term "the phallic order" and de Beauvoir's use of the term "men," of course, refer to *Western* men. Their failure to specify which men they are talking about suggests a

universality of male behavior that Smith does not necessarily believe exists, given the fact that most of her environmental study is focused on the harm Western men specifically have caused to the natural environment.

That white men viewed Native men as synonymous with nature is a well-documented fact, particularly in the United States. The image of the “Noble Savage” which rose out of European Enlightenment and later American romanticism depicted Native men as docile, fair, peaceful stewards of nature (Berkhofer 77; 87). Romantic literature was based on “feminine” sentiments—emotion and intuition, which were oftentimes invoked by the landscape, including the American wilderness, with which Native people were often associated. It has been pointed out in many studies of Native stereotypes that while the Noble Savage was widely admired, he (it was always a “he”) could not long withstand the onslaught of civilization. Consider, for example, this quote from George Catlin: “Nature has nowhere presented more beautiful and lovely scenes, than those of the vast prairies of the West and of *man* and *beast* no nobler specimens than those who inhabit them—the *Indian* and the *buffalo*—joint and original tenants of the soil, and fugitives together from the approach of civilized man . . .” (qtd. in Berkhofer 89, emphasis in the original). This quote is exemplary of Western thinking, particularly patriarchal thinking. Catlin admires the beauty of nature and its inhabitants, the Indian and the buffalo, but he also views their time in nature as limited. The approach of “civilized man” (civilized women did not factor into this thinking at all) is going to bring about their demise because civilization is equated with the domination of nature, Indians, and animals.

This kind of thinking had very serious consequences not only for Native people, but the environment, as well. Smith points out, “A common complaint among colonizers was that indigenous peoples did not properly subdue the natural environment. This reasoning was behind the colonizer’s legal basis for appropriating land from Native peoples” (Smith 56). In Canada, Native people were bound to reserves, and similar practices of resource extraction have taken place in some communities. The Haisla people represented in *Monkey Beach*, for example, live on land that was attractive to Alcan Aluminum. The company began operations in the Douglas Channel in the 1940s. In addition to the aluminum smelter, the company also operates a power plant in the Kemano watershed (Moody 34-35). Since these corporations have been implemented, the environment surrounding Kitimaat Village has been negatively affected, particularly the rivers, resulting in a vast reduction of the numbers of oolichan.

Oolichan (also spelled “eulachon”) is a smelt-like fish that was found in abundance in the waters around Kitimaat Village around the time it was settled. This fish is perhaps the most vital natural element of Haisla life. Its importance was established simultaneously with the settling of the first Haisla village at Douglas Channel. According to oral tradition, the Haisla originally inhabited Port Simpson. The Douglas Channel was avoided because it was believed a monster with a giant gaping mouth lived there. A small band of warriors discovered that what they thought was a mouth was actually a flock of seagulls sitting on a sandbar and suddenly rising. The seagulls were eating oolichan, which the Haisla found delicious. Having found new land and an abundant food supply, the small band of travelers then decided to stay in that area. This is the story of how they



found their new home and the sacred oolichan (Robinson 18-19). To this day, “the Haisla use oolichan for almost everything, from food to medicine” (haisla.ca). Unfortunately, oolichan fishing has become an increasingly futile pursuit.

Oolichan numbers have dropped dramatically in the Kitimat and Kildala rivers where the Haisla traditionally fished (Moody 33-35). Beginning in 1972, pollution on the Kitimat River caused the oolichan to taste foul, which effectively closed that area off from Haisla fishers (Moody 33). In *Monkey Beach*, Lisa Hill notes that of the three reliable oolichan runs (Kitimat, Kitlope and Kemano), “The Kitimat River used to be the best one, but it has been polluted by all the industry in town, so you’d have to be pretty dense or desperate to eat anything from that river” (Robinson 92). The oolichan have a great cultural significance to the Haisla and some other First Nations people in the area, but evidence suggests that the oolichan are not as important to anyone else. For example, a 2000 report prepared by Denise Stoffels for the Eulachon Conservation Society indicates that very little is known about oolichan. They have not been widely studied. In fact, it was not until the early 1990s that the Canadian Department of Fisheries and Oceans began to investigate the depletion of oolichan and its causes at the request of some First Nations people (5). The reticence to pay attention to a fish that primarily concerns First Nations people is suggestive of a negligent attitude that is summed up in this quote from Andrea Smith: “Marginalized communities suffer the primary brunt of environmental destruction so that other communities can remain in denial about the effects of environmental degradation” (57). The depletion of the oolichan in the rivers

around Kitimaat Village has not depleted their cultural significance to the Haisla. It has, however, made the cultural practice of fishing for oolichan much more difficult.

Prior to the 20<sup>th</sup> century, oolichan were plentiful and easy to catch. Now, the Haisla have to travel off the reserve in search of them. Eden Robinson writes in *The Sasquatch at Home*:

None of this driving around would have been necessary if the oolichans [sic] were still running in Haisla territory, but they are sensitive fish and won't run if they're too stressed, or if the water is too fast or too warm. The runs near Kitimat were compromised by effluent from the town of Kitimat, Eurocan Pulp & Paper and Alcan Aluminum smelters . . . We hadn't had a decent oolichan run in five years, which was worrying many people, especially the elders. Of course the fish are a concern, but it's the traditions that go with the fish that are in real trouble (22).

Ella Soper-Jones refers to the collapse of the oolichan fishery as a form of “colonial violence” (Soper-Jones 24). An attack on the landscape is an attack on the people that have inhabited and worked with that landscape for thousands of years.

In *Monkey Beach*, Alcan Aluminum perpetrates this attack. It is a pervasive background presence in the novel. Its “distant hum (336)” is constantly heard, and its impact on the Haisla’s traditional land is devastating. Gladys Hill remarks to her daughter “the runs used to be so thick, you could walk across the river and not touch water” (92). The introduction of industrialization into the coastal region has damaged the rivers and streams so much that, in Lisa’s lifetime, in order to make precious oolichan grease, “you need a decent boat and have to be able to spend at least a few weeks [fishing]” (92). As not many Haisla people have the means for such an undertaking, the production of oolichan grease has been dangerously reduced, and with it the oolichan’s vital role in Haisla tradition. Eden Robinson laments this when she writes, “I hate to

think of thousands of years of tradition dying with my generation. If the oolichans [sic] don't return to our rivers, we lose more than a species. We lose a connection with our history, a thread of tradition that ties us to this particular piece of the Earth, that ties our ancestors to our children" (23). Based on this quote, one would assume that the Haisla Nation would be taking action against Alcan Aluminum and fighting for the protection of the oolichan. However, this does not seem to be the case.

The relationship between Alcan Aluminum and the Haisla people is murky and complicated because Alcan Aluminum is an employer of many Haisla people, even as it harms their landscape. The town of Kitimat was created by Alcan Aluminum in the 1950s specifically to house employees (kitmatbc.com). In *Monkey Beach*, Alcan Aluminum is the financial caretaker of Lisa's family because her father works for them. It is the only job he is able to get after he is passed over for promotion as an accountant at a different company, and tires of the politics on the Haisla village council. Though Robinson is not shy at all about blaming the pollution of Kitimat River on Alcan Aluminum and other corporations, she is one of a minority of voices to do so. This may be expected, as Smith notes, ". . . a patriarchal system based on violence operates by appearing 'normal' and attacking alternative systems that might challenge its legitimacy. Similarly, the effects of environmental degradation are often not questioned because they are termed 'normal'" (Smith 66). The apparent 'normalcy' of environmental degradation is evidenced on the Haisla Nation's website. Though the vital importance of the oolichan is emphasized, the great reduction in numbers of the fish is not mentioned anywhere, and in fact, on the "Economic Development" page, "Alcan Modernization" is listed first (haisla.ca).

In the spring of 2010, *Ingot*, a bi-monthly newsletter of Rio-Tinto Alcan's British Columbia Operations, reported that the Haisla Nation and Alcan Aluminum signed an agreement on March 5, 2010 for the Kitimat Modernization Project, which began in 2007. Ostensibly the project is supposed to be mutually beneficial to the Haisla and to Alcan Aluminum. Alcan's side of the bargain is to become more environmentally conscious in their efforts and to atone for past degradation of Native lands. There is no talk of the Aluminum Smelter shutting down operation, however—the two entities can only reach a compromise. According to *Ingot*:

In view of the chronically high unemployment rate in First Nation communities, the Haisla Nation -Rio Tinto Alcan Legacy Agreement is important. It provides the opportunity to build capacity in terms of business growth, education and community development. The capacity building component of the Haisla Nation-Rio Tinto Alcan Legacy Agreement will provide mechanisms to develop skills training with the intention to reduce reliance on traditional means of self-support. [This agreement] also provides opportunities for Haisla members to improve their economic performance and increase their ability to compete for business, which will assist their job creation and economic diversification efforts (9-10).

In this quote, Rio Tinto Alcan is setting itself up as a teacher and a caretaker of the Haisla Nation. The company is explicitly expressing a desire to eradicate Haisla Nations through reducing their “reliance on traditional means of self-support.” One of these traditional means would be the creation and sale of oolichan grease, which Alcan Aluminum itself has made nearly impossible for them to do. Alcan Aluminum is also vowing to “provide” for the Haisla by showing them how to compete in the Canadian market, as though the Haisla would not be able to develop that knowledge on their own. The language of this article in Alcan's own newsletter still has colonial and patriarchal undertones. The harm

brought to the Haisla through the industrial practices of Alcan Aluminum Smelters is tantamount to cultural genocide. However, because the company employs so many Indigenous people, the relationship between the company and the Nation is complicated. Alcan Aluminum is the patriarchal figure of Indigenous families, but it is an abusive and overbearing one, destroying the life-giving and culturally significant oolichan and replacing it with jobs that strip aluminum minerals from the rocks around Kitimaat Village.

### CHAPTER THREE: LESSONS IN DOMINATION, LEARNED TOO WELL

Of the countless forms of Western European colonization of Indigenous peoples in Canada and the United States, perhaps none is so devastating as the institution of Western schooling for Indigenous children in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. Native communities in both the United States and Canada often point to boarding and residential schools as one of the main catalysts for the widespread alcoholism, abuse, and depression on reservations and reserves ([bshp.org](http://bshp.org); [parl.gc.ca](http://parl.gc.ca)). Schools were residential or day, government-run or religious, but all had irreversible effects on Indigenous people and their communities. The histories of European attempts to educate Indigenous children are complicated and varied. Certainly Native students experienced Western schooling in different ways—some found their experiences to be very positive, while others suffered horrific mental, physical, and sexual abuse. In many cases, the separation of children from their parents as well as the resulting ideological shifts caused rifts in families that were never repaired. European teachers forced English on Indigenous students until they forgot their own languages, and whether or not the schools were brutally cruel, they all shared the common mission to Christianize and industrialize Native children and pull them away from their “savage” roots.

The legacy of boarding and residential schools is a vital issue for American Indian and First Nations people. Naturally, Indigenous feminists address it in their own way by identifying the influences of patriarchy in boarding and residential school legislation of the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, as well as the reverberating effects of Western schooling in contemporary Native societies. In her 2007 article “Race, Tribal Nation, and Gender,”

Renya Ramirez claims that one purpose of the boarding schools was to “insert patriarchy into tribal communities and to socialize children to believe in patriarchal gender norms” (28). She explains that these institutions “have imposed their patriarchal gender norms on Native communities, encouraging sexism and misogyny and its related potential for violence against women” (29). After the mid-1800s, Native girls in particular were desirable to white school administrators because of the “belief among Americans that women, as mothers, must be educated in order to raise virtuous male citizens” (Devens 224). The belief that Native girls would be the conduits through which Native societies would come to adhere to white values and practices led one missionary to state, “If we get the girls, we get the race” (qtd. in Devens 225). In addition to the shift in traditional gender roles, Andrea Smith (2005) cites the “state violence” of boarding schools as a starting point for some of the gender/sexual violence that became rampant in Native communities during the years following boarding school practices. She also identifies the shift in Native family behavior that resulted from the boarding schools, including the introduction of corporal punishment for children and disrespect for women’s roles in the family (Smith 126).

Dian Million (2009) claims that until the 1980s in Canada, “Residential school life and its narratives were . . . positioned with *domestic* space—quiet, obedient, and gendered passive” (Million 55). That is, the violence perpetrated against children in boarding schools was considered “private,” rather than “public.” In Hélène Cixous’ designation of Western patriarchal binary thought, “private” space is feminized, while “public” space is masculinized (Eagleton 147). Thus, the feminized “private” violence

against children was ignored in Canada until Aboriginal activist groups, particularly women's groups, brought the issue into the public sphere and forced the Canadian government to pay attention (Million 55). Million, like Ramirez, argues that the "strongly gendered training in residential schools . . . radically reorganized Indigenous familial relations to conform to a uniform patriarchal order" (Million 56). This "uniform patriarchal order" is, of course, the Western nuclear family unit with the father as the head and the wife and children in subordinate positions. Also, the place of extended family in this unit is lower than it is in most Native communities, which means that the grandmother's traditional role in the family was uprooted (Adams 164).

The first residential schools for Aboriginal children in Canada opened in the 1830s, and the last one did not close until the mid-1980s (Chrisjohn and Young 251). The goal of these institutions, which were run by various religious groups, was simple: assimilate the Native children and make them into industrialized Christians like the Euro-Canadians. The push for assimilation had various motivations. For the Canadian government, the motivation was to eliminate all legal and financial responsibility to the Indians. In 1920, then Minister of Indian Affairs Duncan Scott was famously quoted as saying, "I want to get rid of the Indian problem . . . Our objective is to continue until there is not a single Indian in Canada that has not been absorbed into the body politic, and there is no Indian question, and no Indian department" (qtd. in McKegey 28). Decades later, when the truth about the residential schools started coming out thanks to the efforts of various women's rights groups in Canada (Million 55), the Department of Indian



Affairs as well as the various churches involved issued an apology, hoping to put the matter behind Canada (Milloy xvii).

In addition to pervasive physical punishment, substandard building conditions, poor funding, poor education, disease, and hunger, Aboriginal children were subjected to sexual abuse at an alarming rate—according to survivor testimonies, in some schools the rate of victims of sexual abuse was estimated to be as high as 75 percent of the student body (Rice 2011). However, the Canadian government and the churches involved were reluctant to admit to any wrongdoing until pressured by public opinion in the late 80s and early 90s. There are now government commissions to research and document the events that took place in residential schools so that Native and non-Native Canadians can begin the process of reconciliation and healing. However, this healing will take a very long time, because it is widely acknowledged that the effects of residential schooling on the generations that experienced it first hand continued to trickle down to current and future generations (Milloy 299). A 2007 study of suicide rates among Aboriginal people in Canada, prepared for the Aboriginal Healing Foundation, cited child physical and sexual abuse as one of the leading causes of suicide. It reported that 14 percent of boys and 34 percent of girls were the victims of sexual abuse in Aboriginal communities (Kirmayer et al. 43). The report also pointed to past abuses experienced by grandparents and parents as a cause for abuse of the children, stating, “Abused children are more likely than non-abused children to be later victims of abuse or to become sexual aggressors themselves. Thus, there seems to be a transgenerational pattern of repetition of sexual abuse” (Kirmayer et al. 43).

The experience of government and religious schooling for Native children in the United States shared many similar features with Canadian residential schools, including the goals of assimilation and the common experience of abuse. In the 1800s, many schools were built on reservations with the intent to educate Native children in Euro-American values. However, some of these schools did not have the desired effect because the children were surrounded by peers from their communities and able to return home quite easily to be instructed in their Indigenous lifeways by their parents and grandparents. Thus in the late 1800s, the idea of off-reservation boarding schools was a topic of discussion in the discourse surrounding Native education (Adams 36). Many scholars ultimately deemed the acculturation process a failure. According to David Wallace Adams, “Underlying the reform program was the presupposition that the acculturation process was a relatively simple matter of exchanging one cultural skin for another,” but “. . . Indian students were anything but passive recipients of the curriculum of civilization” (336). While Native children who attended these boarding and day schools may not have been magically transformed into carbon copies of industrious, Christian Euro-Americans, there is no doubt that the experience of Indian education did have transforming effects on them, and by consequence, their communities.

The Boarding School Healing Project, an organization angling for reparations for Native people affected by boarding schools in the United States, maintains that many students were sexually abused, though they rely on personal testimony rather than statistics to make this claim. Corporal punishment was also common for Native children in boarding schools. As in Canada, this abuse was repeated in subsequent generations

(boardingschoolhealingproject.com). Western schooling changed both American Indian and Canadian Aboriginal communities. Debra Earling and Eden Robinson capture the spirit of those changes in their novels, *Perma Red* and *Monkey Beach*.

Ramirez's claim that a primary goal of boarding schools in the United States is to insert Western gender norms into Native communities is exemplified in *Perma Red*, through the changing relationship between Louise White Elk and her grandmother, Grandma Magpie, and the paternalistic behavior of Mr. Bradlock, the Bureau of Indian Affairs agent who takes a special interest in Louise. In traditional Salish culture, grandparents played a vital role in the education of grandchildren (Turney-High 56). Western schooling greatly harms this relationship in *Perma Red*. For most of her childhood, Louise attends an Ursuline school where the nuns verbally and physically abuse their Native students. In this school, Louise is taught to hate and mistrust the ways of her grandmother, that is to say, Bitterroot Salish spirituality. After Louise rebuffs Baptiste Yellow Knife's first offer of marriage, his mother Dirty Swallow sets a rattlesnake on Louise's sister, Florence. As Louise is running for help, she hears one of her teacher's voices in her head: "This isn't the Dark Ages, she could hear Sister Simon saying . . . Men are civilized . . . You Indians must understand. We can talk to wild animals until we're blue in the face, but a bird is never going to tell you how to build a nest. Snakes won't bite our enemies because we tell them to. I'm here to liberate you from the darkness of superstition (19-20)." Louise cannot help but internalize these negative ideas about her own heritage. The nuns, and indeed, the larger American society itself beat them into the Native children at her school.

The so-called “darkness of superstition” is embodied in the lessons Grandma Magpie teaches Louise through the act of storytelling. When her grandmother tells her a story of love medicine, she does so in order to instruct Louise to be wary of it and its power. Louise “used to laugh at the idea. She used to hold her sides and cross her legs when her grandmother sat stern-faced, telling her the old stories of love and desire” (Earling 129). Her grandmother is serious about the power of love medicine, but Louise finds the stories humorous. It is only when she realizes that her miserable marriage to Baptiste may be the result of love medicine that she remembers what her grandmother said: “Anyone under the spell of love medicine never believes they are” (131). By then, it is too late to heed her grandmother’s advice.

Her time in white schools serves to drive a wedge between Louise and her grandmother.

Louise had known her grandmother to pick huckleberries without staining her fingers. She was quick and limber. She was respectful. She carried the old ways in her. Louise realized she knew little of the things her grandmother had taught her and she felt ashamed. Louise had shrunk back from the stink of brain tanning, even when Grandma called for her help. She hadn’t wanted to boil tallow and pound chokecherries into meat. Lately Louise had become uncomfortable with the smell of buckskin tamarack and jerked meat (96).

Grandma Magpie tries to teach Louise the old ways, and it seems that at least part of her wants to learn them, because she feels shame for not knowing her grandmother’s ways.

This speaks to a loss of culture that stems from the institution of white education.

In her *Course of Study for Indian Schools*, Estelle Reel, the Superintendent of Indian Schools in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century, instructed teachers to impress upon Native girls the idea that just “because our grandmothers did things in a certain way is no

reason why we should do the same” (qtd. in Stout 154). Notice she does not say “mothers,” but “grandmothers.” At this point, grandmothers would be the arbiters of Native traditions, as the mothers would have already gone through white schooling. Again, white schools are teaching Louise to revile her cultural traditions, and it is working. Even the way her grandmother smells is mildly repulsive to her. The white teachers are succeeding in their goal to socialize Louise to become more like them.

While Grandma Magpie wants to teach Louise lessons about how to protect herself against malicious medicine, and to tan brains and prepare food, it is likely that the Ursuline school is preparing her for quite a different kind of life. When mission schools first began on the Flathead Reservation in Montana in the 1880s, boys and girls attended different Catholic schools. One missionary reported that at the girl’s school, “These girls are trained in all the branches of house-keeping, including the Care of Milk Cows . . . butter Making, Curd making, baking, Cooking, and Gardening. They are taught to Cut and make Garments, to Mend their own Clothing and that of the boys. And they do all the Washing and ironing required” (qtd. in Bigart 25). The training of Native girls in home economics continued into the 20<sup>th</sup> century. According to Adams, training Native girls in domestic arts was a strategy to elevate them from what colonizers perceived to be their “unequal” status in Indian communities to the status of revered Victorian women, though Adams aptly states, “Victorian America was hardly a prescription for equality” (175). Indeed, K. Tsianina Lomawaima identifies the underlying cause of domestic training for Native girls in boarding schools, “which was to train Indian girls in subservience and submission to authority” (Lomawaima 229). This desire on the part of colonizers to raise

Native girls to be subservient is evidenced by the character of Mr. Bradlock in *Perma Red*, whose ideals about proper feminine behavior, as well as his own authority as a patriarch, navigate his relationship with Louise and her grandmother.

Though Louise detests European schools, Mr. Bradlock forces her to go. In the paternalistic fashion typical of BIA workers of the time period, Mr. Bradlock sets himself up as a kind of father to Louise (Louise's biological father is absent). Each time Louise runs from white schools, Mr. Bradlock hunts her down and makes her go back. Grandma Magpie tells Louise "Mr. Bradlock want[s] to break her like a horse, make Louise a white woman. And Louise could believe this was true. She had heard Mr. Bradlock talking about her. 'She's a beautiful girl,' he had said to Charlie Kicking Woman. 'I just can't have her living like a damn Indian'" (60). Louise's wishes and those of her grandmother do not matter to Mr. Bradlock. He believes his way of life, that is, the Euro-American way, is superior to Grandma Magpie's. He even tries to appeal to Grandma Magpie, telling her "her granddaughter was wild and uncontrollable, that he'd placed her in every school from Mission to Dixon to help her, just to have her run off to Hot Springs like a floozy" (23). Grandma Magpie maintains, "I won't make Louise do anything she doesn't want to" (16). She refuses to help Mr. Bradlock control Louise, opting instead to defer to her granddaughter's wishes.

Grandma Magpie is a very traditional woman. When Mr. Bradlock declares to Charlie Kicking Woman that he is going to reason with Grandma Magpie about Louise, Charlie comments, "You may be talking to an old woman . . . but this is an Indian

grandmother you're talking to" (22). Charlie outlines his definition of an Indian grandmother after Mr. Bradlock ignores his advice:

. . . I knew he was imagining a strict woman in a high collar, an old woman who baked cookies. Louise's grandmother did wear long skirts and high-topped moccasins. She covered her braided black hair with a bright kerchief, and her hair had silvered at the temples. She was also a gambler, stayed up all night for days on end to play stick game. She still rode horses at the Kalispell horse races. She could chop wood and walk twenty miles to Mission to go to mass. She put up her own food, jerked beef, and fished in summer and winter. She stood about five feet tall but she could work like a man. She had different ideas for her granddaughter (23).

Before meeting her, Mr. Bradlock assumes he will be dealing with a feeble old woman who will defer to his patriarchal authority and follow his wishes and logic. However, it is clear that Grandma Magpie comes from a time and a society where women are not taught to be feeble or submissive, or work exclusively in the home. As previously mentioned, Mr. Bradlock wants to make Louise into a submissive white woman, while Grandma Magpie's "different ideas" undoubtedly include raising Louise to be a Salish woman, and therefore strong and independent. Grandma Magpie teaches Louise that she has choices, and though Grandma warns Louise of the dangers involved in making bad choices, she ultimately lets Louise decide for herself.

Unfortunately for Grandma Magpie and Louise, Grandma Magpie is powerless to stop Mr. Bradlock from doing whatever he wants to do to Louise, because he has the legal authority of the United States government on his side. Once he understands that he does not have Grandma Magpie's support in his plans for Louise, he forcibly removes her from her grandmother's home and takes her to "Mrs. Shelby Finger's house in downtown Thompson Falls" (60). Mrs. Finger is a white woman. Mrs. Finger's daughter, Arliss

Hebert, comes out to greet them and Mr. Bradlock says to Louise, ““Maybe she can teach you a thing or two about manners”” (60). Arliss Hebert, as it turns out, has little knowledge of manners—she relentlessly taunts Louise for being Native, and has sex with her mother’s boyfriend. However, in Mr. Bradlock’s eyes, Arliss is still a better choice to instruct Louise in how to behave than Grandma Magpie simply because she is white.

Mr. Bradlock’s influence and authority in Louise’s life is such that at times it endangers her life. At the first opportunity, Louise escapes Mrs. Finger and goes back to her grandmother’s home in Perma. On the way to her grandmother’s house, however, she is injured in a car accident. Charlie Kicking Woman saves her from the wreck and takes her home, but Louise knows it will only be a matter of time before he feels guilty for not turning her over to Mr. Bradlock and comes after her again. Once Louise is home, Grandma Magpie declares, ““I won’t let them take you again”” (94). However, the only way Grandma Magpie can possibly protect Louise from Mr. Bradlock’s influence is by hiding her in the hills. The desperation of the situation is evident, because Louise is still so injured from the car accident that she cannot walk far. When Louise’s sister Florence brings her food and water, she remarks that Charlie ““is mad at Grandma. He says you’ll die out here”” (102). Death is a very real possibility for Louise, but if Grandma Magpie wants to keep Louise from being taken away again, she has to keep her away from any place Mr. Bradlock could find her, including the hospital.

Grandma Magpie’s choices are limited, and Louise’s even more so. In order to escape Mr. Bradlock’s clutches, she places herself under Baptiste Yellow Knife’s protection by declaring that she will marry him. Mr. Bradlock is so disgusted with her



that he finally leaves her alone, lamenting “‘I’ve tried to save you . . . Not worth the time’” (109). Grandma Magpie is physically and legally unable to protect Louise from Mr. Bradlock, so in order to escape from him Louise has to make herself unworthy of saving by marrying a deeply traditional Indian man like Baptiste Yellow Knife. In short, Louise is only able to escape one man’s clutches by placing herself under the protection of another man. As a Native female teenager in 1940s Montana, Louise’s two choices are white schooling or marriage.

It is also worth noting why Louise is so attractive to Mr. Bradlock in the first place while her sister, Florence, is allowed to stay with Grandma Magpie. Both sisters are mixed-blood, but the difference in their physical appearances is obvious. Florence is “‘thick-framed but not heavy’” with “‘a delicate nose and large black eyes. She took after Great-grandma Magpie. Her skin was fine-toned and radiant and kissed with freckles. Her hair was black and usually long, but now it hung past her knees . . .’” (101). Louise, by contrast, is “‘slim-hipped and green-eyed’” (153) with “‘bronze skin and cedar-red hair’” (155). Louise’s red hair, slim hips and green eyes make her more phenotypically “‘white’” than her sister, and thus she attracts Mr. Bradlock’s attention more easily.

If the difference in appearance between the two White Elk sisters is striking, their difference in personality is even more so. Louise muses that although her sister has “‘a strength in her, in the way she smiled, in the way she moved . . . Florence was easy to frighten. Small sounds startled her’” (101). Louise, by contrast, is fearless. Charlie Kicking Woman says, “‘There was a wildness about Louise. I’d seen her outrun the fastest boys at the summer powwow. Once, on a dare, she swam the white, churning waves of

the Flathead River . . . She had jumped into the deep pond at the Magpie place to save her grandmother when she broke through the ice” (23). Florence’s appearance makes her less attractive to Mr. Bradlock, and her natural timidity renders her harmless to the institution of white patriarchy. However, because Louise has the physical features one would expect to see on European women, it is doubly detestable to Mr. Bradlock that she would act like a “damn Indian.” Her fearless ways would be a threat to white patriarchy even if she were a white woman, but her position as a Native woman makes her even more threatening, and Mr. Bradlock goes to great lengths to destroy every element of Louise that threatens his worldview. When his efforts fail, he gives up on her completely.

The sharp increase of physical violence in Aboriginal communities following the patriarchal practices of violence and domination in Aboriginal residential schools is a major theme of *Monkey Beach*. While Louise White Elk’s direct experiences with Western schooling have negative effects on her, the indirect effects of residential schooling on Lisa in *Monkey Beach* are no less devastating. Lisa witnesses the residual traumatic effects of residential schools in her own family in the dysfunctional behavior of her Uncle Mick and her Aunt Trudy, as well as the strained relationship between the Hill siblings and their mother. The effects of Canadian religious residential schooling resound in Lisa’s family, though she never went to a residential school herself, nor did her parents.

At a feast, while still a child, Lisa notices there is tension between her grandmother, Ma-ma-oo, and her aunt Trudy. Lisa’s grandmother scolds her for interrupting and being disrespectful, and Trudy bitterly retorts, “Yes, be a good girl, Lisa

...Be a fucking little lady. See what that gets you” (57). This is the first time Lisa begins to wonder about the tension between Ma-ma-oo and her children. She asks her cousin Tabitha why Trudy does not talk to Ma-ma-oo, and Tabitha answers, “Ba-ba-oo was an asshole. He beat Gran. Instead of sending him away, she sent Mick and Mom to residential school” (59). Here it is revealed that while Lisa’s father, Albert, and her Aunt Kate escaped residential schooling, Mick and Trudy were sent away. Albert did not escape a traumatic childhood, however. Because he was too young to go away, Albert was trapped at home with an abusive father, while Mick and Trudy were sent to residential schools where they suffered mental, physical, and sexual abuse.

Mick and Trudy are by far the most volatile and disturbed of the Hill siblings. Mick is an ardent activist in the American Indian Movement, and embarrasses his brother Albert by being openly and loudly proud of his Native heritage. For example, at the feast, “he’d changed into his buckskin jacket with fringe, his A.I.M. Higher—Join the American Indian Movement! T-shirt and his least ratty pair of jeans. He spotted us and let out a moose call. Mom cringed. Conversations stopped and people turned to watch my uncle as he came over to our table” (56). In contrast to Mick, who often travels and never holds down a job, Albert holds a steady job at the potlines, which are electrolytic cells used in the production of aluminum. While Mick is unapologetically angry at the institutions of colonialism and oppression, Albert is not interested in fighting them. Lisa notes, “Dad had been to school to become an accountant, but he quit the firm after they passed him up for promotion four times” (59). It is very likely that Albert was passed over for promotion because he is Native, but his response is to just quit and find another,

less prestigious job. No doubt the difference between the brothers stems from their temperament, but it is likely that it also stems from the difference in their childhood experiences. Mick's response to his traumatic childhood experiences is to become a passionate and dedicated activist, while Albert's response is to become peaceful and resigned.

Though Lisa adores Mick, she struggles to understand why he often leaves Kitamaat Village and has moments where he is deeply and uncontrollably upset. On a fishing trip, Mick explodes at Lisa's Aunt Edith when she tries to say a Christian prayer. "You look at your precious church. You look at what they did. You never went to residential school. You can't tell me what I fucking went through and what I didn't" (109). Mick's outbursts hurt and disturb Lisa. As a child, she is unable to understand what her uncle is going through, though it is evident to the reader that he has Post Traumatic Stress Disorder. While Mick's experience with residential schooling leads him to turn his anger outward at the establishment, Trudy's response is to become self-destructive.

Trudy is neglectful of both her home and her daughter. She is an alcoholic and parties all the time, bringing a string of unsavory people into her daughter's life. She is also unmarried, though she has a sometimes boyfriend, Josh, who is revealed later in the novel to be a child molester. While Mick has no children, Trudy's daughter Tabitha bears the brunt of the legacy of her mother's time in residential school. When Lisa is a child, she rather naively notes the difference between her home life and that of her cousin Tabitha. One day while over at her cousin's house, she muses:

Her house was only a few years old, but it already looked run-down. The walls had punched-out holes and the carpet was grey and cigarette-burnt. Her room was in an unfinished basement and never seemed to get warm. I liked going over to Tab's house because her mother didn't act like I was going to break something or watch me nervously like Aunt Kate when Erica had the gang over (50).

In comparison with Trudy, Erica's mother Kate seems to care deeply for her home and her possessions. In the same vein, Lisa's mother is very actively involved in her children's lives. Lisa is frequently grounded for misbehavior, and her mother comes to comfort her in the night when she has nightmares. Both of these are signs of a caring and attentive parent. Tab is much more cynical and aware than Lisa, and it is evident that she had to grow up faster than her cousin. She tells Lisa, "You're really lucky that your dad was too young to go to rez school. And Aunt Kate too, because she was married. Just Mick and my mom went, and it fucked them up" (254). When Lisa does not immediately understand why it is significant that her aunt and uncle went to residential schooling, and that her grandmother was abused, Tab scoffs, "God, you can be so dense" (59). The reason Lisa does not understand is that, unlike Trudy, Albert goes to great lengths to protect his children from the knowledge of their tragic family history.

Although Lisa does not experience the aftereffects of residential schooling in exactly the same way her cousin does, they do come to directly affect her life later in the novel. Her brother, Jimmy, goes missing on Josh's boat, *The Queen of the North*. Josh is the uncle of Jimmy's girlfriend, Karaoke. When Jimmy leaves, Karaoke becomes very upset with him. Lisa tries to find a promise ring her brother bought for Karaoke in order to placate her, but while looking through his jacket pocket, she finds something else, instead:

. . . I found an old photograph and a folded-up card. The picture was black-and-white. Josh's head was pasted over a priest's head and Karaoke's was pasted over a little boy's. I turned it over: *Dear Joshua*, it read. *I remember every day we spent together. How are you? I miss you terribly. Please write. Your friend in Christ, Archibald . . .* The folded-up note card was a birth announcement. On the front, a stork carried a baby across a blue sky with fluffy white clouds. *It's a boy!* was on the bottom of the card. Inside, in neat, careful handwriting it said, "Dear, dear Joshua. It was yours so I killed it" (365).

Josh molested Karaoke. In a companion piece to *Monkey Beach* titled "Queen of the North (1995)," it is revealed that a priest molested Josh during his time in residential school. The picture was originally of Josh and this priest. The reader discovers that Josh raped Karaoke from the time she was a child into her teens, and that she has an abortion when she discovers she is pregnant with his child. When Jimmy finds the note and the card, he resolves to kill Josh for what he did to Karaoke. However, after he kills Josh, he accidentally drowns. The legacy of violence and abuse from residential schools in *Monkey Beach* was perpetuated in the violent and abusive relationships of the victims, even as adults when they had moved beyond the boarding school system.

Healing for Indigenous communities harmed by boarding and residential schools will be a long time coming. The social ills which are an effect of the legacy of Western schooling, particularly spousal and child abuse, were not created overnight. They certainly will not disappear overnight. On a more positive note, Indigenous scholars and activists are working tirelessly to create healing systems that specifically target Native peoples' traditional beliefs and unique experiences. Programs such as the Boarding School Healing Project in the United States and the Aboriginal Healing Foundation in Canada are making positive strides in this effort. For their part, Indigenous feminists who

address the legacy of boarding and residential schools in Indigenous communities take on the task of linking spousal abuse and sexual abuse of children in Native communities with overarching systems of Western patriarchy, of which Western schools are just one part.

Dian Million asserts that it was First Nations women activists who opened the door for Aboriginal people to come forward about residential school experiences in the 1980s because, “It is these women’s acknowledgement of their actual experiences that illuminated a space for both men and women to speak one of colonialism’s nastiest ‘domestic’ secrets,” (Million 54), that is, residential school abuse. Indigenous feminists give themselves the task of pinpointing and combatting Western patriarchy within their communities, so their work and scholarship is integral to the continuing process of healing Indigenous communities of abuse, misery, and an unequal status for women. These ills do not only affect women and children, but all Indigenous people, and recognizing the root of these problems will help allow Native people to eradicate them.

## CHAPTER FOUR: THE ROOTS OF VIOLENCE AGAINST INDIGENOUS WOMEN

Though Indigenous feminists often address issues that are specific to their tribal affiliation or national origin, there is one common theme throughout all Indigenous feminist scholarship: violence against Indigenous women. In her 2005 article, “Native American Feminism, Sovereignty and Social Change,” in *Making Space for Indigenous Feminism*, Andrea Smith writes:

In my activist work, I have often heard the sentiment expressed in Indian country: we do not have time to address sexual/domestic violence in our communities because we have to work on ‘survival’ issues first. However, Indian women suffer death rates twice as high as any other women in this country because of domestic violence . . . the are clearly *not* surviving as long as issues of gender violence go unaddressed (Smith 98).

Rates of sexual and domestic violence against Indigenous women in the United States and Canada have reached epidemic proportions, and as Smith asserts, they *are* a survival issue. In the United States, one in three Indian women will be raped in their lifetimes, and 40 percent will be the victims of domestic violence. Non-Native men commit eighty-eight percent of all violent crimes against Native women (Majel-Dixon 4). Aboriginal women in Canada are five times more likely than other women to die from violence. In 2011, 582 Aboriginal women and girls nationwide were reported missing or murdered (Smith and Yellow-Quill 2). According to Shannon Brennan of Statistics Canada, Canadian Aboriginal women in Canada are three times more likely than other women to be violently victimized. Brennan defines “violent victimization” as including sexual and physical violence and robbery (Brennan 7). Almost two thirds of female Aboriginal victims of violence are under the age of 35 (Brennan 8). These statistics only measure



*reported* incidents of violence against Indigenous women, and do not include repeat offenses, so it is likely that the incidences of violence are much greater than reported.

As violence against Indigenous women is such a pervasive and pertinent issue, Indigenous feminists are actively engaged in the process of understanding the factors that lead to this violence, and what Indigenous communities can do in order to combat it. This chapter examines four claims made by Indigenous feminists about violence against Native women. Due to the activist and political nature of Indigenous feminist scholarship, these claims are unapologetically bold. They offer possible (and plausible) explanations for the high rates of violence against Native women. However, as their evidence is mostly anecdotal, these explanations are difficult to prove. This chapter seeks to test the strength of these claims by applying them to the experiences of characters in *Perma Red* and *Monkey Beach*, as well as relating them to current events in the United States and Canada.

There are some types of violence that go deeper than the surface of the skin and attack a victim's psyche. Indigenous women are not only afflicted with physical violence, but emotional violence, as well. According to the Counseling Center at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign:

Emotional abuse is like brain washing in that it systematically wears away at the victim's self-confidence, sense of self-worth, trust in their own perceptions, and self-concept. Whether it is done by constant berating and belittling, by intimidation, or under the guise of "guidance," "teaching," or "advice," the results are similar. Eventually, the recipient of the abuse loses all sense of self and remnants of personal value. Emotional abuse cuts to the very core of a person, creating scars that may be far deeper and more lasting than physical ones ([counselingcenter.illinois.edu](http://counselingcenter.illinois.edu)).

Though this information page is addressing emotional abuse in interpersonal relationships, the definition of emotional abuse on this website is similar to the relationship between Indigenous women and the overarching white patriarchal systems in the United States and Canada. In her analysis of Beatrice Culleton's novel *In Search of April Raintree*, Dian Million writes that the Métis female protagonists "inhabit an old Western colonial 'knowledge' of Indian women's immoral 'nature.' They are Indian woman versus the white patriarchal state, a state that first destroyed and then substituted itself for their family and that can then sit in paternal judgment of their 'morality.' They occupy the Canadian state's and the perpetrators shared social knowledge/imagination of their *deviance*" (Million 60). Million goes on to make the strong claim that "...the burden of 'truth' . . . on Indian women [is] to prove they are not already guilty of being what the state believes them to be" (Million 60).

The male Western belief about Native women's sexual "deviance" is as old as contact between Europeans and Indigenous people. In his popular text *Mondus Novus*, published circa 1504, Amerigo Vespucci offers a description of Brazilian Indigenous women that is at once repulsive and alluring.

The women as I have said go about naked and are very libidinous; yet they have bodies which are tolerably beautiful and cleanly. Nor are they so unsightly as one perchance might imagine; for, inasmuch as they are plump, their ugliness is the less apparent which indeed is for the most part concealed by the excellence of their bodily structure. It was to us a matter of astonishment that none was to be seen among them who had a flabby breast, and those who had borne children were not to be distinguished from virgins by the shape and shrinking of the womb; and in other parts of the body similar things were seen of which in the interest of modesty I make no mention. When they had the opportunity of copulating with Christians, urged by excessive lust, they defiled and prostituted themselves (qtd. in Berkhofer 9).

Vespucci's descriptions of Indigenous women are fraught with simultaneous disgust and desire. He and his comrades obviously took care to thoroughly examine Indigenous women's bodies. Additionally, according to Vespucci and others, when the Christian men had sexual intercourse with the Indigenous women, it was the *women* who defiled and prostituted themselves for the *opportunity* to copulate with Christians. Vespucci's description of the women first praises their physical attributes, and then denounces them as lusty prostitutes, absolving the Christian men of any responsibility for their actions and placing the blame entirely on the Indigenous women.

The stereotype of licentious Indian maidens began with contact and continues today. Take for example the 1995 Disney re-telling of the tale of *Pocahontas*, which features a buxom, scantily clad teenager who betrays her people for the chance to be with a white man, John Smith. Terrence Malick's 2005 adaptation of the Pocahontas story, *The New World*, featured a voiceover in which Pocahontas speaks worshipfully of John Smith as she rolls around with him in the grass. Most recently, James Cameron's Oscar-winning film *Avatar* has jokingly been referred to as "Pocahontas in Space" due in part to its repeating themes of a Native maiden falling in love with a white colonizer (latimes.com). Additionally, a simple Internet search for "Indian maiden costumes" immediately returns costumes such as "Sexy Pocahontas," "Temptress Indian," and "Sexy Tribal Native," with taglines like, "This Indian princess will make all of the pilgrims fall in love with the New World" and "Which explorer will capture this wild princess' heart" (halloweencostumes.com)? The website where these costumes are featured was updated in 2012, which means the idea of Indian maidens falling at the feet

of white explorers still continues. Even in modern times, Indian women are portrayed first as relics of the past, and second as constantly lusting after white men. For Indigenous women, the burden is indeed on them to constantly prove they are not sexually deviant. One could say that Indigenous women are in an emotionally abusive relationship with white Western society. They are belittled and scolded for their “deviant” behavior, both by white people and by Indigenous people who have internalized white beliefs about what constitutes sexual deviance.

In *Perma Red*, Louise White Elk suffers from the burden of disproving the belief that she is promiscuous. Mr. Bradlock, the Bureau of Indian Affairs agent who takes a special interest in Louise, sends Louise to white schools off the reservation in order to “break her like a horse, make [her] a white woman,” because he “just can’t have her living like a damn Indian” (Earling 60). He decries what he calls her “wildness,” telling Louise’s grandmother that Louise is running around like a “floozy” (Earling 23). He sends her to live with a white woman, Mrs. Finger, and her daughter Arliss Hebert, thinking that Arliss can “teach [Louise] a thing or two about manners” (Earling 60). The idea is that Arliss, as a white girl, is somehow more refined and trustworthy than Louise. However, it is revealed that Arliss is having an affair with her mother’s boyfriend, yet Louise is the one Bradlock considers as deviant because she refuses to behave like a white woman.

Everywhere she goes, Louise struggles to get respect for her body. When men refuse to respect her body, *she* is the one to be punished. For example:

From the all-white school in Dixon Louise was sent to the all-white school in Thompson Falls, because the Dixon boys had lifted the back of her skirt

to find she wore no panties. She had fought the Dixon boys, slapped their hands and scooped her skirt down tightly to her knees while the teachers stood by or clapped their hands but made no real attempt to stop the boys who were attacking her . . . She caught one weasel-faced boy in the groin with the heel of her shoe, and he had bent over wheezing, and still no one came to help her. The boys had lifted her skirt high up over their heads, a tent, a worn umbrella, and finally she had stood still and let them have their look, let them see her bare ass. And she had been the one sent away, not the hooting boys who swooned at her lean nakedness (Earling 57).

It is not until Louise gives up fighting and shows the boys her body that the teachers finally take action, and that action is to punish Louise by expelling her. Louise cannot win. When she tries to protect her body, she is ignored and when she shows her body, she is punished. It is unclear why the teachers choose not to take action, but it seems reasonable to postulate that they believe Louise deserves what she is getting.

Not only her classmates and teachers disrespect her—Louise’s lovers do, as well. She has a brief affair with Harvey Stoner, and when she tries to terminate their relationship, Harvey Stoner says to her, ““You’re nothing . . . They don’t call you Perma Red for nothing”” (Earling 237). Louise already knows that people call her Perma Red behind her back.

This was the darkest name they called her, the ranchers and the schoolboys, Mr. Malick and Eddie Taylor, the whispering Indian boys at the end of the school yard, the wet-lipped women sipping coffee at their kitchen tables. It meant all the bad names polite company could hiss. Red-light district. Slut. Louise understood the meaning of the name, a label that said she was Indian and nothing more. She came from Perma and nothing could ever change her life standing. She wouldn’t let the name claim her (Earling 237).

The name “Perma Red” does not only refer to Louise’s allegedly sexually deviant behavior. It refers to the fact that she is a Native woman who comes from a place that even the other Salish-Kootenai on the Flathead Reservation look down upon. The public

view that Louise is a slut is inextricably tied up with the circumstances she was born into, including her identity as a Native woman. Louise vows not to let the name “Perma Red” claim her, but she only has control over how she views herself. If she wants to be respected on the Flathead Reservation and in white schools, the burden *is* on her to prove that she is not already guilty of the promiscuity with which the dominant society has charged her. Harvey Stoner, like Amerigo Vespucci, is happy to make love to a Native woman, only to condemn her as a “slut” after he has taken what he wants from her.

Eden Robinson’s 1996 short story, “Queen of the North” is a prequel to *Monkey Beach*, telling the story of Jimmy Hill’s girlfriend, Karaoke, whose Uncle Josh molests her from childhood to her teenage years. The psychological toll this takes on Karaoke is devastating. She abuses alcohol and drugs, she gets into fights, and she has one-night stands. After she and Jimmy have sex for the first time and he calls her beautiful, Karaoke narrates, “I thought it was just a line, the polite thing to say after a one-night stand, so I didn’t answer” (Robinson 193). Her cynical suspicion of Jimmy’s motives hints that Karaoke’s sexual partners often do not engage in a second encounter with her. This leads her to think that she is not *worthy* of a second encounter, evidenced by the fact that she does not believe Jimmy when he pays her a genuine compliment. She also longs to tell Jimmy that her uncle is molesting her, but shies away out of fear that “He’d probably pull away from me in horror, disgusted, revolted” (Robinson 200).

Karaoke’s low self-esteem is not surprising when considering her relationship with her mother. It is made clear in the text that Karaoke’s mother is aware that her brother is abusing her child. Even so, she never misses an opportunity to insult Karaoke

in front of others. She calls her “my rotten kid,” and claims that because she “sleeps around,” she is “no damn good” (Robinson 196). When Karaoke runs away to abort her Uncle Josh’s baby, her mother tells everyone in the village that Karaoke ran away to become a prostitute in Vancouver (Robinson 212). It is reasonable to speculate that Karaoke’s mother has internalized white stereotypes about Indigenous women and is projecting these stereotypes onto her daughter. Scholar Karen Pyke explains that racial oppression can manifest in what is termed as ‘defensive othering,’ or “identity work engaged by the subordinated in an attempt to become part of the dominant group or to distance themselves from the stereotypes associated with the subordinate group” (Pyke 557). If Karaoke’s mother has frequently been exposed to the stereotypes of promiscuous Indigenous women, she may be trying to distance herself from such stereotypes by condemning her daughter for her so-called promiscuous behavior. Regardless of her motives, Karaoke’s mother’s attitude toward her is obviously not supportive or caring. Faced with the impossible task of telling her mother that she is neither worthless nor promiscuous, Karaoke chooses instead to ignore her.

Karaoke employs a similar tactic with a white man who bothers her as she is making fry bread for a charity. Just as Karaoke is closing the stand for the day, a man comes and offers her \$100 to make one more batch of fry bread. As she mixes the dough, it becomes obvious that the man is not really interested in the fry bread. He is overt in his desire for her. “I could feel him watching me, was suddenly aware of how far my shirt dipped and how short my cutoffs were. In the heat, they were necessary. I was sweating too much to wear anything more” (Robinson 200). Long after Karaoke makes it clear she

wants nothing to do with him, the man continues to watch her, asking her rude questions like “Are you Indian?” and “Why are you so pale” (207; 209)? Finally, he asks her to take off her baseball cap. “I shrugged, pulled the cap off, and let my hair loose. It hung limply down to my waist . . . ‘You should keep it down at all times,’ he said” (Robinson 209). At this point, Karaoke turns and walks away from him. She does not tell him that his behavior is inappropriate.

When Karaoke tells the man she is done working for the day, he continues to lay money on the counter until she finally relents. From his speech and actions, it appears that he feels comfortable asking her personal questions and giving her unsolicited advice about her appearance. He obviously is not taking Karaoke’s feelings into account, and the fact that his comments about her appearance are all related to her being Aboriginal, it is safe to assume that this man is approaching Karaoke armed with stereotypes about Aboriginal women. Karaoke’s self-consciousness about what she is wearing suggests that the stereotype of Native women as promiscuous is on her mind while the man is hitting on her. Again Karaoke is saddled with the burden of defending herself against this stereotype, and again, she chooses to ignore the man rather than try to prove him wrong. Likely the constant burden of disproving these false notions is too tiring.

The effects of the colonial patriarchal attitude about Native women’s supposed sexual deviance are not only psychologically damaging for Native women, they are also physical. Andrea Smith claims that most violent crimes against Native women go unpunished. She claims that in the white colonial mindset, “. . . Indian bodies are ‘dirty,’ [so] they are considered inherently violable and ‘rapable,’ and the rape of bodies that are



considered inherently impure or dirty simply does not count” (Smith 11). This is an extreme statement, and one that requires evidence to back it up. Certainly few who believe that Native women deserve to be violated do so consciously, and those who *do* consciously believe this would likely not admit to it out loud. The evidence supporting this statement can be found in the dozens of violent crimes against Native women that go unreported, or uninvestigated. Evidence can also be found in Indigenous women’s literature. Clear examples of the alleged white colonial belief in the “inherent rapability” of Native women can be found in the experiences of the characters in *Perma Red* and *Monkey Beach*.

The colonial attitude toward Native women’s bodies is exemplified in *Perma Red* via the response to the murder of Hemaucus Three Dresses, a local woman who dated Baptiste Yellow Knife. Louise finds her body and tells Charlie Kicking Woman. When Charlie and his white partner, Railer, find her body, “Railer pressed his foot to her side to rock the body over and I reached to stop him. ‘What’s the matter with you?’ he said. I swallowed hard as Railer pushed his shiny black boot to her thigh” (211). Railer’s “shiny black boots” indicate his authority as an officer of the law in Montana, and his action of pressing his boot into Hemaucus’ thigh to turn her over would be indicative of violence if Hemaucus were still alive. He treats her body as if were an object of scorn, as if she was never human. After Railer kicks her body over, “Her shirt fell open, exposing one breast” (211). There are undeniable sexual undertones to this scene in the novel. Even after her death, Hemaucus is vulnerable to men.

Charlie realizes Hemaucus was shot elsewhere and dumped in the spot where he found her. Charlie's main suspect for the murder is Baptiste Yellow Knife, but he also considers a man named Sam Plowman, who had a "thing" for Hemaucus when she worked as his maid. Charlie recalls, "Hemaucus was never pretty. She had a plain, almost handsome way about her that seemed to come from her quietness. Whatever she had, Sam Plowman desired it in the worst way . . ." (218). Charlie remembers the time that Sam

. . . beat Hemaucus up outside of school when we were fourteen. We stood in a circle, maybe fifteen of us boys, our hands in our pockets, all of us embarrassed because we did nothing but watch. His fists were grinding. When he was done with her, her eyes were small, red-rimmed as a sow's, and bleeding. Nothing was ever done that I know of. We didn't know who to tell (219).

The boys never report Sam Plowman because they understand, even as children, that violence against Native people will go unpunished.

Charlie is the only police officer actively investigating Hemaucus' murder, but his supervisor, a white "BIA bureaucrat" (219) tells Charlie that the murder investigation has been turned over to the state, because it is not Charlie's jurisdiction. As Charlie is leaving the office, his supervisor invites him to an audience with two state investigators.

It was a dead end, they said. They weren't going to be able to do much. I had heard that line before. They estimated she'd been shot in the field about ten o'clock three nights back. They'd been asking questions and all the leads were cold. They'd keep working on it, they said. The matter was in their hands now. I looked at my supervisor, knowing this was shit. When they left he grabbed my shoulder hard and said it was best to drop it (220).

Hemaucus' murder will never be solved. The investigators are simply *not trying*. For example, Charlie knows that Hemaucus was not shot in the field—her body was just

dumped there. Charlie also knows that the investigators are lying about trying to look for Hemaucus' murderer. The fact that Charlie has "heard that line before" suggests that Native people, particularly women, who have gone missing or have been murdered do not get justice. If tribal police officers like Charlie are not allowed to investigate the murders of Native women, they do not get investigated at all. If their blatant inaction is any indication, Hemaucus' murder "does not count" to the white police officers.

Eden Robinson also outlines the colonial idea about the inherent "rapability" of Native women very clearly in *Monkey Beach*. Because sexual violence is a very common experience for Indigenous women, though its commonality makes it no less devastating, it is not surprising that Lisa Hill experiences sexual harassment and assault by the time she is fourteen years old. As previously stated, the majority of violent crimes committed against Aboriginal women happen to teenage girls. In the summer between seventh and eighth grades, Lisa's friend Cheese rapes her. She had spurned his advances the week before. Cheese tries several times to approach her again, but she ignores him. In the time between Lisa's refusal of sexual relations with Cheese and his subsequent rape of her, she has a run-in with some white men and learns a hard lesson about how sexual violence against Native women is perceived by the majority of Canadians.

Lisa sees her cousin Erica walking on the street.

I noticed a car following her. A young white guy stuck his head out of the passenger's side of the car and invited her in, they'd show her a good time. All three guys in the car were wearing black baseball caps and sunglasses even though it was cloudy. I couldn't tell what colour [sic] their hair was, and there was mud all over their licence [sic] plates. One of them had a black mustache, but it was obviously fake. Erica turned on her heel and walked back towards me. They pulled a U-turn and the driver called out that he'd teach her how to fuck a white man (250).

It is important to note that these men feel very comfortable calling out sexual comments to a fourteen-year-old girl in broad daylight, in front of witnesses, because she is Native. They obviously drove out with the express intent to kidnap a Native girl and rape her. They are wearing disguises, and they have covered their license plates so they cannot be easily identified. The subtext of this passage is that these men know exactly what they are doing, and they are confident no one is going to try to stop them.

Lisa does not seem to realize the danger she is in. Although she notices that “everyone . . . on the street was completely ignoring us” (250), she begins taunting them, calling the leader, among other things, a “dickless wonder” (250). Even when one of the men gets out of the car and says “Bitch . . . you’re begging for it” (250), she replies, “We’ll see how much of a man you are when they stick you in prison for assault and battery. You remember this when you’re getting it up your flat ass. We’ll see who’s the bitch then, won’t we” (251)? The men are on the brink of kidnapping her when finally a white man intervenes. However, instead of vilifying the men for their behavior, he merely warns Lisa, “that temper of yours is going to get you killed one day” (251). None of the other witnesses on the street even look her way.

Over the next few days, Lisa is scolded for standing up to the white men. Her cousin J.J. tells her actions were “pretty stupid” (251), while her father tells her she should have gone for help rather than fight. It is her aunt Trudy, however, who gives Lisa the most brutal and devastating lecture.

‘Lisa . . . you’ve got to be more careful . . . Those guys would have killed you.’

‘It was broad daylight,’ I said. ‘And there were tons of witnesses. They wouldn’t have done anything.’

‘. . . If you were some little white girl, that would be true. But you’re a mouthy Indian, and everyone thinks we’re born sluts. Those guys would have said you were asking for it and got off scot-free . . . Facts of life, girly. There were tons of priests in the residential schools, tons of fucking matrons and helpers that ‘helped’ themselves to little kids just like you. You look at me and tell me how many of them got away scot-free.’

I didn’t understand why she was mad at me. I didn’t understand why I was the one getting blamed for assholes acting like assholes.

‘Lisa,’ she said, ‘no one would have cared. You would have been hurt or dead, and no one would have given a flying fuck . . . Except your crazy old aunt, who just about made you cry, didn’t I’ (255)?

Although Trudy’s words are harsh, they have truth to them. Lisa is still young enough to have a naïve faith that the white people on the street would have intervened if those men had truly tried to kidnap her. Trudy, on the other hand, is deeply distrustful of white people because of her experience in residential schools. The time period of the instance with the white men would be 1984 or 1985, before the last residential school was shut down in Canada, and at least ten years before the Canadian government and the religious institutions that participated in this violence admitted to or apologized for any wrongdoing whatsoever (Milloy xvii). The hard lesson Lisa learns that day affects her response to Cheese’s rape of her that occurs not long after.

At an unsupervised party, Cheese gives Lisa a drugged beer. When she tries to leave the party, he follows her and rapes her. Though she was drugged, she remembers being raped, and who did it to her. When she gets home from the party, her cousin Tab is there. Tab asks Lisa what happened, but Lisa “couldn’t think of anything. I didn’t want to talk about it” (259). She burns her clothes because “I didn’t want any witnesses. I didn’t want any reminders” (261). Lisa is making a clear choice not to report Cheese. While

denial and self-blame are common responses to rape (ndaa.org), Lisa's response has an added dimension that is specifically tied to her identity as a Native girl. It is not a coincidence that she would make the choice to keep her attack secret mere days after her Aunt Trudy told her "no one would [give] a flying fuck" (255) if she was raped or killed because she is an Indian. Rather than tell an adult, Lisa tries to handle the situation herself, but this leads her to develop a dependency on alcohol and distance herself from her family. Lisa has clearly internalized the belief that in the eyes of the law, the rape of Native people does not count. Cheese is never punished, and likely the white men who harassed Lisa and her cousin went on to harass and abuse other Native girls with no repercussions.

Even more troubling than the colonial attitude concerning the "rapability" of Native bodies is the fact that "U.S. policy has codified the 'rapability' of Native women. Indeed, the U.S. and other colonizing countries are engaged in a 'permanent social war' against the bodies of women of color and indigenous women, which threaten their legitimacy" (Smith 33). In the United States, sexual violence against women by non-Native men and Native men alike is hard to prosecute. The legal avenues to justice for Native victims of sexual abuse in the United States are winding, and have been since the Major Crimes Act was passed in 1885.

The Major Crimes Act was passed following the 1883 court case, *Ex Parte Crow Dog*, in which the courts decided that Native tribes have jurisdiction over crimes committed by Indians in Indian Country. This decision was unpopular with Congress, and their response was to place seven "Major Crimes" (murder, manslaughter, rape, assault,

arson, burglary, and larceny) committed in Indian Country under federal jurisdiction, whether the crimes were committed by Indians or non-Indians, and regardless of whether the victims were Indians or not (Canby 149-150). Native people are now dependent on the federal government to investigate rapes and murders, which often go ignored. In the 1970s, tribes that were dissatisfied with federal law enforcement of crimes committed by non-Indians in Indian Country began asserting tribal jurisdiction over non-Indian offenders. They claimed that such jurisdiction was “inherent in tribal self-government” (Canby 152). In 1978, the Supreme Court decided in *Oliphant v. Suquamish* that tribes lack criminal jurisdiction over non-Indians (Canby 152). The investigation of non-Indians who commit crimes on Indian land returned to federal or state jurisdiction.

The combined result of the Major Crimes Act and *Oliphant v. Suquamish* is what one scholar refers to as a “jurisdictional maze” (Luna-Firebaugh 131). In her article “A Jurisdictional Quandary,” Melissa Tatum sheds some light on the result of jurisdiction issues in Indian Country:

Regardless of who possesses actual jurisdiction . . . tribes repeatedly report difficulty getting federal or state prosecutors to act on the crimes in Indian Country over which they possess jurisdiction. The result has been many instances of lawless behavior, with the tribal police and prosecutors unable to directly prosecute offenders and unable to obtain enforcement from those with authority. These problems are particularly acute in domestic violence situations, which often involve both an Indian and a non-Indian . . . Tribal police are put in the situation of maintaining law and order in the face of no tribal ability to prosecute offenders (10).

Tatum has clearly defined a major issue on tribal land: tribal courts have no authority to prosecute violent crimes committed by non-Indians, and state and federal authorities refuse to investigate. Native women who are being threatened by men are able to take out

protection orders against them. However, due to the complex nature of tribal jurisdiction, tribes have had difficulty enforcing these protection orders on Indian land (Tatum 4-5). Thus Native women in the United States are still denied adequate protection from abusers.

In response to these jurisdictional issues, the 2012 Senate reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, passed in April 2012, included provisions which strengthen tribal authority over non-Indians in cases of physical and sexual abuse against Native women ([indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com](http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com)). However, the House's version of the reauthorization bill removed any mention of strengthening tribal authority. The House version drew sharp criticism from President Barack Obama, so as of this time the bill is still in review, and has yet to become law.

The decision to remove the provisions dealing with tribal authority was backed by House Republicans. The supposed justification for this decision is fear that giving tribes any authority over non-Indians will result in tribes abusing their jurisdictional power and extending it beyond cases of sexual and domestic violence against Native women. Chuck Grassley, a Republican Senator from Iowa, issued a statement criticizing the sections of S. 1925 which proposed expanding tribal authority in cases of crimes against Native women. He wrote, "I believe in tribal self-government, but I don't support Indian courts governing non-Indians . . . What would the effect be on non-Indians? Do the tribes have the resources and expertise to prosecute these additional responsibilities? Why is this being offered on this bill? What other crimes against non-Indians will be prosecuted in tribal courts if domestic violence crimes were tried in this way" ([grassley.senate.gov](http://grassley.senate.gov))?



Grassley shows his ignorance of the serious issue of violence against Native women when he writes, “Why would Congress, should it decide for the first time to [extend tribal authority over non-Indians] do so on a bill to reauthorize VAWA? Why should domestic violence cases be the first criminal cases to be treated in this way? What precedent would be created that might lead to other prosecutions of non-Indians in tribal courts” ([grassley.senate.gov](http://grassley.senate.gov))? One can only assume Grassley does not know the extent to which Native women are being murdered by non-Indians if he is asking such a question. However, later comments he makes in his statement indicate that even if he *did* know, he would not be very concerned.

Chuck Grassley’s suggested amendments to S. 1925 include striking all provisions for “underserved” populations on the grounds that

There are so many programs for underserved groups that many women will be targeted by multiple programs. That doesn’t make sense. And when you consider that men are victims of various kinds of sexual violence – as the state Attorneys General point out, 1 in 71 men outside prison is a rape victim. Those victims face a large social stigma in seeking help. Are we going to now create programs for underserved male victims as well? If every group is a priority, no group is a priority . . . If we have too many programs directed at supposedly underserved groups, we risk spreading services too thin and losing the focus on victims that VAWA was created to do. My substitute amendment authorizes a study to determine the reasons why domestic violence services aren’t provided to the individuals who don’t receive them. We need real data on this subject ([grassley.senate.gov](http://grassley.senate.gov)).

Grassley is clearly ignorant of the jurisdictional maze in place in Indian Country, and he is also flippant about the specific issues “supposedly underserved groups” like American Indian women face. At one point he demands evidence that these groups are being underserved at all, and at another point he claims that providing resources for

underserved populations takes resources away from everyone else. He justifies striking specific protection for Native women and other underserved populations by saying, “If every victim is a priority, no victim is a priority” ([grassley.senate.gov](http://grassley.senate.gov)).

Grassley’s opinions make it clear that he is comfortable allowing the rampant violence against Native women to continue unchecked if it means preventing tribal governments from prosecuting non-Indians and supposedly funding services for the most amount of victims, while ignoring the fact that underserved populations face different types of violence and discrimination than the majority of women in the United States. Evidently the House is of the same opinion as Grassley, because they passed H.R. 4970 sans the provisions specifically protecting American Indian women ([indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com](http://indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com)).

The idea of Native women as promiscuous is still the prevailing mindset in the twenty-first century, if the pervasiveness of overly sexualized images of Native women in pop culture is any indication. It is possible that the lawmakers in the House of Representatives on some level believe that Native women, being more “promiscuous,” are somehow deserving of the violence they suffer. Even in 2012, the rapability of Native women is codified in U.S. law, because if it were not, the lives and welfare of American Indian women would matter more than money, and fear that tribal governments would suddenly begin prosecuting non-Indians for every crime committed on Indian land, not just violent crimes against Native women.

Like American Indian women, Aboriginal women in Canada often do not get adequate justice for sexual and violent crimes against them. Though tribal police forces

exist on First Nations reserves in Canada, Aboriginal women often complain that they are generally ineffective in domestic violence cases (McCaslin and Boyer 75). In a 2005 study, only forty-three percent of First Nations people outside of the Province of Quebec reported being satisfied with their local police (Lithopoulos 8). As stated in the introduction, Aboriginal women in Canada are also highly at risk of being abducted and murdered. The rate of missing Aboriginal women in Canada is so high that the United Nations Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women wrote a letter to the Canadian government in 2011 requesting that they strengthen their investigation into these abductions (cbcnews.ca). As of 2012, the UN was still very concerned with the high rates of violence against Aboriginal women in Canada, as well as the high number of missing Aboriginal women (law.miami.edu).

According to a 2012 joint report submitted by the Native Women's Association of Canada, the Canadian Feminist Alliance for International Action, and the University of Miami School of Law Human Rights Clinic, the Canadian government fails Aboriginal women in two ways:

- 1) police systematically fail to protect Aboriginal women and girls from violence and to investigate promptly and thoroughly when they are missing or murdered; and 2) Aboriginal women and girls continue to experience disadvantaged social and economic conditions, which make them vulnerable to violence and unable to escape from it (law.miami.edu)

Additionally this report describes the negligent attitude of some Canadian police officers concerning Aboriginal women. Officers sometimes view Aboriginal women as “transient,” living a “risky lifestyle,” and believe that missing Aboriginal women will “show up when they want to (law.miami.edu).” This negligent attitude makes

Aboriginal women even more vulnerable to violence. The frequent inaction of police, combined with the lackadaisical efforts of the Canadian government to prevent violence against Aboriginal women, suggests that in Canada, as well as the United States, the belief in the “rapability” of Aboriginal women is still very present in mainstream Canadian society.

Dian Million claims that Native women are constantly expected to disprove colonial theories about their promiscuity, while Andrea Smith postulates that this idea about Native women’s inherent “dirtiness” makes it easy for white men to get away with raping them. But what are the reasons underlying domestic violence and sexual assault between Native people? Domestic and sexual violence is a pervasive problem on Native reservations, both in the U.S. and Canada. According to a 2008 Center for Disease Control Study, thirty-nine percent of American Indian women surveyed reported intimate partner violence ([futureswithoutviolence.org](http://futureswithoutviolence.org)). Similarly, in 2005 twenty-one percent of Aboriginal women reported spousal abuse, compared with only six percent of non-Aboriginal women ([gov.nl.ca](http://gov.nl.ca)). Yet, as many Indigenous scholars contend, violence against women was not common in pre-contact Indigenous societies, and when there *was* violence, it was heavily condemned and the perpetrators punished according to tribal law (Deloria 1988; Allen 1986; Mihesuah 2005). In modern times, however, some tribes are claiming that a subordinate status for women is “traditional” (Crow Dog 1990). Even more disturbing, there is a push for Native women to keep silent about their experiences with domestic or sexual violence on Native land so as not to air a tribe’s dirty laundry in public (Mihesuah 2005; Ross 2009; Million 2009). Domestic and sexual violence are

supposedly relatively recent developments in Native communities, and the growing pervasiveness of these behaviors can be linked to European colonialism in the Americas. After all, Native men's conversion to Christianity "included them accepting the concept of the male God and thus reinforcing the superiority of males. Females were (and in many Christian traditions still are) expected to submit to the will and authority of men" (Mihesuah 48). Some scholars claim that equality between the sexes was the norm in pre-contact Indigenous societies, while patriarchy has been and continues to be a Western European value. The adoption of Western values has had harmful effects on the relationship between Native men and women.

Devon Mihesuah, in her book *Indigenous American Women*, writes:

Perhaps it is frustration and confusion over the loss of traditional gender roles and the adoption of white society's values that has contributed to spousal abuse and tension between the sexes among Natives today. For example, bison was a main source of food for many of the Plains tribes and tribes peripheral to the Plains. With the near extermination of the buffalo during the late 1800s came the disintegration of many tribes' cultures, including the distortion of gender roles. Males, who were the hunters, no longer had bison to hunt and, according to many Natives, their frustration had led to alcoholism, spousal abuse, and "woman hating" (Mihesuah 57).

This explanation for Native male violence is common among Native scholars (Allen 1986; Poupart 2003; St. Denis 2007). In the novels *Perma Red* and *Monkey Beach*, dissatisfaction with the inability to successfully act out traditional gender roles is cited as an explanation for Baptiste Yellow-Knife's and Albert Hill's abuse of their wives.

In chapter two of this thesis, Baptiste Yellow Knife's troublemaking and alcoholism have already been linked to the loss of traditional gender roles in the Salish-Kootenai community. However, the depth of his "woman hating" and its devastating

effects on Louise White Elk has not yet been touched upon. The very first lines of *Perma Red* foreshadow the violent relationship between Baptiste and Louise: “When Louise White Elk was nine, Baptiste Yellow Knife blew a fine powder in her face and told her she would disappear. She sneezed until her nose bled . . . She had to lie down on the school floor and tilt back her head and even then it wouldn’t stop. She felt he had opened the river to her heart” (Earling 3). Throughout the novel, Louise and Baptiste are locked in a game of cat and mouse, where Baptiste is usually the pursuer. Their relationship is based on Baptiste’s power over Louise, and her attempts to escape it. The first time he asks her to marry him and she refuses, his mother sets a rattlesnake on her sister (Earling 19). Baptiste is not always cruel to Louise, but he seems to enjoy the power he has over her.

Louise is sent all over the state to different white schools under Mr. Bradlock’s orders, and every time she runs away Baptiste somehow finds her. Once, he finds her when she is hiding in the fields behind her grandmother’s house after being injured in a car accident. When she notices him, “He looked like he had a rough time reaching her, and he was drunk . . . He had traveled miles from his mother’s house to find her. She felt uneasy. Baptiste Yellow Knife was another man when was drinking . . . he was mean. His teeth looked big” (Earling 97). Louise tries not to show that she is afraid.

Baptiste sits down by her in the grass for a moment, and when she ignores him he

stood up over Louise. She was dwarfed by his standing, his strong, lean legs. He stepped around her slowly, almost carefully. She let go of her thoughts and felt the brutal toe of his boot barely touching her buttocks. He turned his back to her and she heard him unzip his pants. She kept quiet. She did not want Baptiste to know she was afraid of him just as she didn’t want him to know she was drawn to him. She heard the low sound

of Baptiste's voice as he pulled back from her. 'Don't worry,' he said. 'Your luck has run out.' She wondered what he meant . . . She heard the dense patter of urine and she tightened her arms around her legs. Baptiste walked slowly, circling her, peeing like a dog marking territory . . . She looked down the highway and wished she could make a run for it, yet there was no running from Baptiste . . . he could jump her like a cougar if she tried to run from him—and would. Her grandmother had told her to back slowly away from him if she was frightened of him. She had run from him before and her sister had been bitten by the rattler (Earling 99).

Baptiste's behavior toward Louise is consistent with legal definitions of stalking.

According to Mindy Mechanic, stalking is defined as "the willful, malicious, and repeated following and harassing of another person that threatens his or her safety" (muscedu). Another common practice of stalkers is to threaten to harm loved ones of their victims (ohiolegalservices.org), and Baptiste attacks Florence using his mother's rattlesnake power.

Baptiste's behavior toward Louise is not indicative of love. It is closer to a narcissistic form of hatred, where Baptiste demands Louise's attention but offers nothing in return. After he is done "marking his territory," Baptiste bites her and she fights him off, after which he claims, "I'll have you yet, Sweetheart . . . Someday...you'll be mine" (Earling 100-101). Even the term of endearment is dripping with disdain, and Baptiste does not care about wooing Louise. He only cares about owning her like a possession, which strongly indicates a lack of respect for her as she really is. He has no trouble hurting Louise when she will not do what he wants her to.

Though she is frightened of him, Louise marries Baptiste anyway, at least in part to escape Mr. Bradlock's clutches. Right after their wedding, Baptiste leaves Louise alone to go speak with his mother. Louise notes the difference between her marriage and

others she has heard about. When Baptiste comes into their room to have sex with Louise for the first time, Louise realizes, “There would be no shivaree for this marriage, no short sheets and rice, no music and dancing, no pranks and no laughter. He did not smile . . . He did not whisper that he loved her” (Earling 137). It quickly becomes clear that now that he has possession of Louise, Baptiste is going to be indifferent to her.

Three days after they are married, Baptiste leaves Louise in the middle of the night to go be with his ex-girlfriend Hemaucus Three Dresses, “not because he cared for Hemaucus over her, but because Baptiste liked to catch Louise up in her insecurities to bolster himself” (Earling 141). Louise’s response to Baptiste’s infidelity is to leave him and begin an affair with Harvey Stoner, a wealthy white man who owns most of the Flathead Reservation. Baptiste generally ignores her until one day he catches her with Harvey Stoner and beats and cuts her so badly she has to go to the hospital. He is drunk when he does this, but when he is sober he is also unkind to her, even if he does not come to violence. Baptiste does not love Louise. Rather, he believes he owns her and that she should be grateful for his attention. Charlie Kicking Woman also notes the damage Baptiste does to her: “I remembered seeing Louise on the floor of her grandmother’s house, beaten . . . Yellow Knife had beaten her again in the worst way, in the hidden way a man can beat a woman, so there are no bruises, no true signs, only the light in her begins to die” (Earling 247). Though Charlie is far from a reliable narrator when it comes to Louise, in this instance he is correct. Louise never leaves Baptiste after he beats her. The novel ends with the two of them reconciling their marriage.



It is difficult to imagine why Louise would stay with Baptiste, with whom she shares such a violent past. However, there are several reasons women stay with abusive husbands. For example, lack of self-esteem that leads her to believe she deserves the abuse, or that no one else will ever love her ([domesticabuseshelter.org](http://domesticabuseshelter.org)). At different points in the novel, Louise demonstrates this kind of thinking. She believes that “No one would ever love her . . . like Baptiste Yellow Knife” (Earling 260), and when Baptiste makes her wait at the marriage bed she muses that while most new brides smell like roses, “she smelled like tobacco smoke, a hundred swigs of beer. The perfume at her wrists had sharpened” (Earling 127).

Louise also believes that Baptiste is at heart a person whose circumstances have made him what he is. When Charlie remarks that Baptiste’s lifestyle is bound to get him killed, Louise retorts, “He’s not what you think he is” (Earling 254). Louise often makes excuses for Baptiste, which is another common behavior of battered women who choose to stay in abusive relationships ([domesticabuseshelter.org](http://domesticabuseshelter.org)). However, Louise’s excuses for Baptiste are specifically tied to his identity as a Native man. Throughout the novel, Louise notes how Baptiste holds on to traditional beliefs the way no one else does. Once when he comes to the bar to find her, she notes that he has ringworm and is starving, and while she notes “there could be hundred reasons to leave Baptiste Yellow Knife,” (Earling 230), when he leaves she feels lonely as the only Indian in a bar full of white people. She believes that “Baptiste is another man” when he is drunk, (Earling 97), and when he is sober he is someone to be admired for holding on to traditions the other Salish have long lapsed. Because he is “the last of [the] old ones,” (Earling 4) Louise knows

Baptiste has no place in the modern world, and she is inclined to feel compassion rather than anger for him. She attributes Baptiste's violent behavior to alcoholism and loss of culture, and she stays with him because she believes she knows him in a way no one else does.

It is important to note, however, that even in the "old days" that Baptiste is supposed to represent, other Salish would have considered Baptiste and his mother to be dangerous. Grandma Magpie comes from a time that is more traditional than Louise's, yet she does not exhibit any of the violence and malice that Baptiste does. In traditional Salish culture, Baptiste's behavior would have resulted in a rebuke from the community, either through ridicule, or a more serious judicial reprimand (Turney-High 44-48). The loss of culture that is making Baptiste suffer is also what allows him to get away with his abusive behavior.

In *Monkey Beach*, Lisa Hill discovers that her grandfather was abusive to her grandmother after he returned from World War II. The reasons for his frustration are explained:

Ba-ba-oo had lost his arm in the Second World War, at Verrières Ridge. When he came home, he couldn't get a job or get the money he thought he should get from Veterans Affairs because they said Indian Affairs was taking care of him. Indian Affairs said if he wanted the same benefits as a white vet, he should move off reserve and give up his status. If he did that, they'd lose their house and by this time, they had three children and my dad, Albert, was on the way (81).

Ba-ba-oo is trapped by his circumstances. Not only is he disabled, the Canadian government is discriminating against him by trying to force him to give up his status as a Haisla man. Mick explains to Lisa, "My father worked hard all his life, and now he

would say things like, ‘Agnes, I’m useless.’ She didn’t know what to do” (81). One of the many expectations placed on men in European cultures is that they should be good providers for their families (Kroska 168). If Ba-ba-oo has internalized this expectation, it is not surprising that he would feel useless and frustrated. In turn, he chooses to take out his frustration on his wife and children.

Physically Ma-ma-oo does not have the strength to stand up to her husband. She is free from him only when he slips in the bathtub and dies. Toward the end of the novel, Lisa has a dream about the day her grandfather died:

. . . I had a dream about Ma-Ma-oo. I saw her sitting at her kitchen table. She had a dark purple bruise covering her left cheek and smaller bruises on her arms. Ba-ba-oo was singing the shower. A thud came from the bathroom and then there was silence. But instead of moving or asking if everything was all right, she sat and gripped her mug of tea tightly between her hands. I heard the sound of water hitting the tub and the shower curtain. ‘Nothing’s wrong,’ she whispered, even when the water seeped under the door. ‘Nothing’s wrong” (356).

Ma-ma-oo’s course of action in this instance is inaction. Her difficulty with the decision not to help her husband is indicated in the way she tightens her grip on her mug and forcibly denies to herself that anything is wrong. Her choice to let her husband die is further complicated by the fact that he means something to her, if her frequent visits to his grave with her granddaughter Lisa and the fond way she speaks of him are any indication. Unlike Louise, Ma-ma-oo does not make the choice to stay with her abusive husband once she gets the opportunity to be free from him. Understanding the reasons why her husband is frustrated does not change Ma-ma-oo’s decision to free herself from an abusive relationship. She did not have the courage to make the conscious decision to leave him, but she displayed a different sort of courage in letting him die.

Louise's and Ma-ma-oo's experiences with abusive men are highly disturbing for themselves and for those around them. Their husbands' powerless relationships with white society are described at length, and are a cause for sympathy. However, when these men choose to channel their frustration into violence against their wives, the result is only destruction. The introductory manual for the Sacred Hoop Technical Assistance Project describing batterer education in Native communities states that batterers who are given diagnoses of mental conditions will often use those diagnoses as an excuse to continue battering (Gilberg et al 99). It is not hard to imagine that a diagnosis of "frustration from cultural loss" gives them a similar opportunity, particularly when this explanation is so often cited in Native communities as the source of violence. Understanding the reasons that men choose to batter their wives is important, but Native men who become abusers must still take responsibility for their actions. If batterers do not take responsibility for their actions and change their behavior, the effects will be negative, as they are for Louise, who stays with a dangerous man who has put her in the hospital once already, and for Agnes Hill, who lets her husband die in order to escape him.

If violent Native men's behavior continues to be excused on the grounds that they, too, are victims of colonial patriarchy, then real change cannot happen. Thus the last point to be explored in this chapter is Emma LaRocque's claim that

neither colonization nor poverty explains everything about why or how Native men (and societies) may assume sexist attitudes or behaviors. This point has to be emphasized because male violence continues to be much tolerated, explained or virtually absolved by many women of colour [sic], including Aboriginal women, usually in defence [sic] of cultural difference, community loyalties or nationalist agendas, or out of reaction to white feminist critiques (LaRocque 61).

There is something else *besides* colonialism that drives violent Native men to abuse others. Furthermore, abuse is *never* acceptable, and the sooner tribes that excuse this abuse realize that, the sooner they can begin making abusers accountable for their behavior.

Researchers who study domestic or intimate partner violence overwhelmingly find that it is a “learned behavior reinforced by society, family, . . . and the batterers’ successful control of intimate relationships” (Tilley et al. 28). Generally, batterers share traits such as depression, low self-esteem, alcohol and other substance abuse, lower socio-economic status, and childhood exposure to domestic violence (Tilley et al. 28). In Indian Country, these traits are exacerbated by culturally specific factors such as inter-generational trauma caused by the loss of culture and the history of state violence against Native people, isolation, lack of financial and legal resources to investigate domestic violence, and low access to education (Harper and Entekin 3-12). These factors are also present in Aboriginal Canadian communities.

In a report titled “Aboriginal Domestic Violence in Canada,” family violence is described as “a cancer within the living body of Aboriginal communities” with some “specific dynamics and conditions . . . that make it possible for the cancer to develop and thrive” (Bopp et al. 51). In addition to those already stated, factors which make it possible for family violence to “thrive” in Indigenous communities include immunity for offenders, sexist attitudes toward women, low community morale, lack of adequate professional support services, and lack of community awareness (Bopp et al. 52-62). Clearly, the roots of domestic and intimate partner violence in Indigenous communities

are buried deeper than individual abusers. This does not excuse the behavior of individual abusers, however.

In her 1994 report “Violence in Aboriginal Communities,” Emma LaRocque is adamant in her position that domestic violence has always been present in Indigenous families, despite the popular belief that it was virtually nonexistent in pre-contact societies. She does concede, however, that exposure to European patriarchy and misogyny and the “internalization of racist/macho views of Aboriginal men and women” have added to the incidents of domestic violence among Aboriginal people in Canada (76). Even understanding the factors which sometimes lead to domestic violence in Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities alike, LaRocque is insistent that “we should expend our energies in showing categorical disapproval appropriate to the crime and seeking solutions to what is an intolerable situation” (76). She expresses disgust with the apathy of Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal communities toward dealing with domestic violence. She also takes the strong stance that “Political oppression does not preclude the mandate to live with personal and moral responsibility within human communities. And if individuals are not capable of personal responsibility and moral choices (the things that make us human), then they are not fit for normal societal engagement and should be treated accordingly” (77). Her report comes down squarely on the side of the female victims of sexual violence. She is against the idea of rehabilitating abusers, and instead advocates jailing or otherwise separating them from the rest of society.

The question of whether to jail or cure abusers is a complicated one. In a report titled “Aboriginal Domestic Violence in Canada,” the authors quote a past victim of family violence who makes a convincing statement about abusers:

Why is it that the same man who repeatedly violates and physically abuses the woman he lives with because “she made me mad” doesn’t attack or even confront the three-hundred-pound bouncer who threatens to throw him out of the bar or any other man who happens to annoy him? The reason he attacks the woman is because he can. He is physically stronger than she is. The other guys would beat the crap out of him. He knows this, so he doesn’t dare resort to violence, or even open aggression. The man in this example who cannot “manage his anger” at home seems to have no problem managing his anger when he is faced with consequences. In other words, this man is not “out of control.” He is very well in control of himself, and he is making choices (qtd. in Bopp et al., 52).

This statement makes it clear that abusers are *always* in control of their actions, no matter what their past influences may be. However, this ignores the fact that, *because* of their past influences, some abusers may not see anything wrong with their behavior. If the abusive man believes that women are inferior to men, he may feel he has the right to hit her, but not another man.

According to Indigenous feminists, many Indigenous communities are guilty of the kind of patriarchal and misogynistic thinking that fosters domestic and interpersonal violence (though these same communities may also actively try to circumvent this kind of thinking), proving that this belief system does not begin with individuals. This does not and should not mean that abusers have a free pass to continue abusing because their tendencies are “not their fault.” It *does* mean that steps should be taken to eradicate this kind of thinking from Indigenous communities so that it does not continue into the next

generations. Rates of domestic violence are so high in Indigenous communities that treating the symptoms (i.e., putting all abusers in jail) is not enough to cure the disease.

In “Returning Men to Honor: A Guidebook for Developing Intervention and Education Programs for Men Who Batter in Native Communities,” the authors state:

Batterer intervention must be directed at the established beliefs systems which give men the perceived right to use abusive, offensive and/or violent words and behavior. Interventions geared towards simply stopping the behavior are shortsighted and will not produce long-term change. In addition, offenders need to be able to self-examine: identify and hold up to scrutiny the belief system that promotes/upholds the use of violence, articulate the effects of their behavior on themselves, their partners, children and the community . . . and through changing beliefs, change the behavior (Nevilles-Sorrel et al. 6).

Changing beliefs includes bringing batterers together to “find their honor,” in the words of the Oneida Tribe’s Men’s Program (qtd. in Nevilles-Sorrel et al. 7), through Batterer Intervention Programs. Tribally specific, spiritually-based programs are designed to make Native batterers realize that the belief system which supports their abuse of women and children is not their own. A return to tradition is meant to help Native batterers build respect for women and children, not just inside themselves, but within the community as well. In order for Batterer Intervention Programs to work, men must be held responsible for their actions, women must feel safe, and the community must change its attitude regarding domestic violence (Nevilles-Sorrel et al. 9).

Programs such as these, though well intentioned, struggle because they do not receive adequate funding. An assessment of the effectiveness of such programs in “Domestic Violence in Aboriginal Communities” found that, due to funding issues, Indigenous communities are seldom able to accomplish much beyond protecting



Indigenous women and children who are fleeing dangerous family situations, and sometimes they cannot even accomplish that (Bopp et al. 78). Finding concrete solutions to these types of problems is an ongoing struggle, and beyond the scope of this thesis.

Ultimately, Emma LaRocque and those who think like her are not wrong in saying that abusers' behavior should not be excused on the grounds that it is learned behavior, or influenced by outside circumstances. However, it is also vitally important to realize that domestic violence in Indigenous communities does not only affect a few individuals, but is a pervasive problem for all Indigenous peoples. Putting offenders in jail without even trying to understand *why* there are so many offenders does not seem to be the correct solution, either. If future generations of Indigenous children and women are to be protected from domestic and interpersonal violence, then the roots of this violence must be discovered and eradicated once and for all.

Indigenous feminists are taking steps in the right direction by identifying the influences of Western patriarchy in encouraging violence against Indigenous women, by Indigenous and non-Indigenous men alike. The lives of Indigenous women and children have been threatened by violence for so long that it has become commonplace, and virtually ignored. Tribes that are trying desperately to circumvent the violence within their own communities are often met with inadequate resources and apathetic responses from the United States or the Canadian Federal governments. Racist attitudes and assumptions about Indigenous women cause the courts of these governments to look the other way when non-Indigenous men harm Indigenous women. The Western attitudes and practices identified in this chapter must be recognized by many more people than a

handful of Indigenous female scholars and Indigenous communities before real change for Indigenous women can take place.

However, Indigenous feminists are calling for change at the tops of their voices. Some Indigenous communities are trying to eradicate patriarchal attitudes and violent tendencies. The 2012 Senate reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act included a provision meant to strengthen tribal governments in the United States, even if this provision was removed in the House. These are all signs of better days to come for Indigenous women. Real positive change is still a difficult goal to manage, but there are more and more people who are willing to fight to bring this change about. Indigenous women have cause to hope.

## CONCLUSION

The roots of Western patriarchy are buried deep in Indigenous communities. Indigenous feminists have identified these roots, and are asking other Indigenous peoples for help in digging them up. Unfortunately, Indigenous feminists are often met with skepticism, and sometimes hostility, from other Indigenous men and women. These skeptics view feminist theories as unnecessary, or worse, anathema to the realities of Indigenous peoples' lives, and they sometimes view Indigenous feminists as traitors for falling in line with Western ideologies. This cloud of suspicion makes it difficult for Indigenous feminists to be taken seriously, which is a detriment to Indigenous communities because Indigenous feminists have valuable ideas to contribute to the betterment of Native communities and individual lives. The first, and most valuable contribution they make is to point out the patriarchal ideologies that are harming Native Nations at a fundamental level. The Western patriarchal belief in the inferiority of women has led to misogyny, sexism, and violence against women among the Native peoples who have internalized this belief. Indigenous women are often the victims of sexual and physical abuse at the hands of non-Indigenous and Indigenous men alike. Violence against women is so frequent that Andrea Smith has declared it a survival issue (Smith 98). The time to resist Western patriarchy in Indigenous communities is now, and Indigenous feminists are on the frontlines of the resistance movement.

This poses a difficult question, however. How can Indigenous feminists gain respect for their theories? How can skeptics be persuaded to take Indigenous feminisms seriously? One way to show that Indigenous feminist theories can stand up to scrutiny is

to apply them to Indigenous women's literature. *Perma Red* and *Monkey Beach* feature several of the issues Indigenous feminists identify as being rooted in Western patriarchy. Louise White Elk in *Perma Red* and Lisa Hill in *Monkey Beach* have little in common besides the fact that they are Indigenous women. They are raised in different communities, different countries, in different time periods, yet they are both affected by physical and sexual violence, and the residual effects of boarding and residential schools, which were designed in part to insert Western patriarchy into Indigenous communities (Ramirez 28). The fact that both of these Indigenous novels with female protagonists include so many of the themes and issues common in Indigenous feminist theories suggests that these theories are reliable.

Verna St. Denis asserts that Western patriarchy is a problem for all Indigenous peoples, including men (St. Denis 44). In *Perma Red*, the deeply traditional Baptiste Yellow Knife struggles to express his identity as a Salish man in a culture that expects him to adhere to Western definitions of masculinity. His cousin, Charlie Kicking Woman, tries and fails to gain respect as both a Salish and a Western man by becoming a police officer. Both men feel out of place and adrift. Baptiste chooses to deal with his restlessness by drinking, fighting, and hitting his wife, which hurts both himself and other people. Charlie isolates himself from his community by trying to make himself a representative of Western culture, but finds that neither his community nor his colleagues take him seriously. Eventually, he asserts his masculinity by murdering Harvey Stoner. Allan Johnson claims that patriarchy pulls men into cycles of domination and violence (Johnson 54-55), and this is certainly true for Baptiste and Charlie.

Andrea Smith claims that the same ideology that led Western men to colonialize and dominate Indigenous peoples leads them to dominate Indigenous lands (Smith 55). In the waters around the Haisla reserve in Kitimaat Village, British Columbia, pollution caused by Alcan Aluminum Smelters has caused a vast reduction in the number of oolichan, a small fish that is a vital part of Haisla traditional culture. In the novel *Monkey Beach*, Lisa describes the lengths Haisla people must go to in order to maintain the practice of oolichan fishing. They must widen their search for these fish, taking time and equipment that is not affordable for most Haisla people. Some scientists who have studied this reduction in oolichan point to pollution as a cause. The Haisla people still claim the oolichan as central to their cultural identity, yet nowhere on the tribe's website is Alcan Aluminum blamed for their trouble fishing. In fact, Alcan Aluminum is listed as one of the sources of economic development in the Haisla community. In 2007, Alcan Aluminum and the Haisla tribe struck a deal: Alcan Aluminum continues production, while trying to be more environmentally friendly, and in exchange the company employs Haisla people and teaches them to reduce reliance on traditional means of self-support, such as oolichan fishing. The language of this agreement patronizes Haisla people by claiming that Alcan Aluminum will "teach" them to provide for themselves, and "provide" opportunities for economic growth, as though the Haisla are not capable of providing for themselves. In true patriarchal fashion, Alcan Aluminum first takes what they want from the environment, harming oolichan in the process, then vows to "care" for the Haisla and "teach" them to find other ways to earn money.

Western patriarchal thinking led white people to set themselves up as “fathers” to Indigenous peoples. One way that white leaders tried to father Indigenous children in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries was by forcing them to go to residential or boarding schools. Renya Ramirez claims that one purpose of the boarding schools was to “insert patriarchy into tribal communities and to socialize children to believe in patriarchal gender norms” (Ramirez 28). The internalization of patriarchal ideologies increased sexism and misogyny in Indigenous communities. Furthermore, the sexual and physical abuses Native children suffered at the hands of the state were later emulated in Native communities (Smith 126). In *Perma Red*, Western paternalism is represented in the character of Mr. Bradlock, the white Bureau of Indian Affairs agent who forces Louise to go to white schools. He has set ideas of femininity to which Louise does not adhere. Grandma Magpie tries to protect Louise, but she cannot stand up to the legal force of the United States government. In the end, in order to escape Mr. Bradlock, Louise places herself under the protection of another man when she marries Baptiste Yellow Knife.

The internalization and continuation of the state violence Native children suffered in residential schools is a major element of *Monkey Beach*. Lisa’s entire community is affected by sexual and family violence and incest. Her aunt Trudy both verbally abuses and neglects her daughter. Lisa’s brother Jimmy dies avenging his girlfriend, Karaoke, whose uncle Josh molests her and her cousins. Josh in turn was molested by a priest at residential school. Western patriarchal ideologies based on dominance and control are sometimes expressed through violence, and the violence some Native children learned in residential schools and came to repeat in their home communities has led to a sickness

among Indigenous peoples. These communities must be healed, and the first step toward healing is to recognize where they learned the behavior that is now causing so much pain.

Statistics suggest that every Indigenous woman is likely to experience violence at some point in their lives. Indigenous feminists have different theories about why rates of violence are so high, and each theory is related to Western patriarchal ideologies. Dian Million claims that Indigenous women are thought of as promiscuous by mainstream Western society, and the burden is on the Indigenous women to prove that they are *not* what Western society believes them to be (Million 60). The stereotype of Indigenous women as promiscuous began with contact, and continues today. In *Perma Red*, others in her community give Louise White Elk the cruel nickname Perma Red, that is, slut. Additionally, when she is sexually harassed in white schools, the teachers do not intervene until she loses patience and shows her body to the boys who have been harassing her. In “Queen of the North,” a companion piece to *Monkey Beach* about Jimmy’s girlfriend Karaoke, Karaoke’s mother calls her a slut and a prostitute, while a white man at a charity event brazenly hits on Karaoke and tells her to wear her hair down. The burden is on Louise and Karaoke to assert that they are not sluts, and that their bodies are worthy of respect, and it is a heavy burden.

In a similar vein, Andrea Smith explains that in Western society, Indigenous women are considered inherently “rapable,” and that this rapability is codified in United States law (Smith 11, 33). In *Perma Red*, when Hemaucus Three Dresses is murdered, Charlie’s white partner kicks her body over with his boot. Charlie is the only police officer who actively wants to investigate her murder, and his white colleagues order him

to give up. Lisa learns a hard lesson about the mainstream Canadian mindset toward violence against Indigenous women in *Monkey Beach*. Her cousin Erica is harassed by some white men who have the obvious intent to kidnap and rape her. Though the street is full of white witnesses, Lisa is the only person who comes to her cousin's defense. She is scolded by her family for standing up to the white men. Her aunt Trudy especially is adamant when she tells Lisa if she were attacked and raped by white men, no one would care because she is an Indian. Lisa learns this lesson perhaps too well, because when her friend Cheese rapes her the next week, she tells no one.

There is a legal maze in the United States that often prevents Indigenous women from getting the protection they need, and the justice they deserve, from violent crimes. The Major Crimes Act and *Oliphant v. Suquamish* make it very difficult for American Indian courts to prosecute the perpetrators of violent crimes against Native women, particularly when the offenders are non-Native. Recently, the United States Senate attempted to make it easier for tribal governments to protect women by adding a provision that strengthened tribal legal authority in the 2012 reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. However, House Republicans passed the House version of the VAWA without these provisions because they fear that resources will be stretched too thin if American Indian are specially protected, and they fear the repercussions of giving tribal governments authority over non-Natives. In Canada, the government and law enforcement is slow to investigate when Aboriginal women go missing. Sometimes Canadian police officers do not take action because they believe the Aboriginal women



were bound to go missing anyway, based on what they believe to be the type of lifestyle Aboriginal women typically lead.

In an attempt to explain the high rates of Native-on-Native violence, Devon Mihesuah suggests that the loss of traditional culture has led some Native men to turn to violence and “woman hating” (Mihesuah 57). In *Perma Red*, Louise believes this is the reason her husband Baptiste Yellow Knife is so unhappy, so she sometimes excuses his violent behavior toward her. In *Monkey Beach*, Lisa’s Ba-ba-oo feels similarly dispossessed by the Canadian government and chooses to hit his wife and children. Ba-ba-oo’s feelings of powerless are pitiable, but his choice to be violent only causes pain and suffering for his wife and children. His wife eventually lets him die when he slips in the shower, a decision she must live with for the rest of her life.

Emma LaRocque is adamant in her assertion that there is never an acceptable reason for Native men to abuse their families, not even cultural dispossession (LaRocque 61). She is not wrong to say that, but there is a certain amount of healing that must take place in Indigenous communities if family violence is ever to be eradicated. Violence is a learned behavior, and sexism is a learned ideology. Native men who abuse their wives must take responsibility for their actions. First, they must learn that their actions are wrong, and try to actively combat the ideas that influence their behavior. It is also important to remember that family violence in Indigenous communities is a problem for the entire community, not just individual families. As such, the ideologies at the source of violent behavior must be eradicated.

Western patriarchy is harmful in that it sets up a top-down hierarchy with men at the top, and women and children in subordinate positions. Not all Indigenous communities were egalitarian prior to contact, but most of them were certainly more egalitarian than they are now. The domination and control at the heart of Western patriarchal ideology breed violence in Indigenous communities. Indigenous women and children are the most vulnerable to this violence. Patriarchal control also leads to the subjugation of nature, and the reduction of the natural resources that are vital to the cultural survival of Native Nations. Indigenous feminists are actively taking stock of the issues in Indigenous communities that stem from Western patriarchy. They are building resistance to these ideologies, but so far their numbers are small because they are sometimes not taken seriously. This thesis supports Indigenous feminisms. It is my hope that it will be a call to arms for all who read it to recognize and resist Western patriarchy, particularly in Indigenous Nations.

## WORKS CITED

- Adams, David Wallace. *Education for Extinction: American Indians and the Boarding School Experience, 1875-1928*. Kansas: University Press of Kansas, 1995. Print.
- Allen, Paula Gunn. *The Sacred Hoop: Recovering the Feminine in American Indian Traditions*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Boston: Beacon Press, 1992. Print.
- Avatar*. Dir. James Cameron. 20<sup>th</sup> Century Fox, 2009. DVD.
- Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2002. Print.
- Bélanger, Claude. "History of Women Suffrage in Canada." *The Québec History Encyclopedia*. marionapolis.edu. 2005. Web. 27 November 2012.
- Berkhofer, Jr., Robert. *The White Man's Indian: Images of the American Indian From Columbus To Present*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979. Print.
- Bigart, Robert J. *Getting Good Crops: Economic and Diplomatic Survival Strategies of the Montana Bitterroot Salish Indians, 1870-1891*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2010. Print.
- "\_\_\_\_\_" ed. *Zealous in All Virtues: Documents of Worship and Culture Change, St. Ignatius Mission, Montana, 1890-1894*. Pablo: Salish Kootenai College Press, 2007. Print.
- The Boarding School Healing Project. "Indigenous People and Boarding Schools." [boardingschoolhealingproject.com](http://boardingschoolhealingproject.com). Web. 27 August, 2012.
- Bopp, Michael, Judy Bopp and Phil Lane, Jr. "Aboriginal Domestic Violence in Canada." *The Aboriginal Healing Foundation Research Series*. Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation, 2003. Print.
- Boucher, Geoff. "James Cameron: Yes, 'Avatar' is 'Dances With Wolves in Space' ...Sorta." *Los Angeles Times: Hero Complex*. [latimes.com](http://latimes.com) 14 August 2009. Web. 26 November 2012.
- Brennan, Shannon. "Violent victimization of Aboriginal women in the Canadian provinces, 2009." [statcan.gc.ca](http://statcan.gc.ca) Statistics Canada, 2009. Web. 7 April 2012.
- Canby, Jr., William C. *American Indian Law in a Nutshell*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Minnesota: Thomson Reuters, 2009. Print.

- Capriccioso, Ron. "VAWA Passes House Sans Tribal Court Provisions." *Indian Country Today*. Indiancountrytodaymedianetwork.com 16 May 2012. Web. 31 July 2012.
- Chilisa, Bagele. *Indigenous Research Methodologies*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications, Inc., 2012. Print.
- Chrisjohn, Roland, Sherri Young and Michael Maraun. 1997. *The Circle Game: Shadows and Substance in the Indian Residential School Experience in Canada*. British Columbia: Theytus Books, Ltd., 2006. Print.
- "Community." *haisla.ca*. Haisla Nation, n.d. Web. 30 Jan. 2012.
- Crawford, Bridget J. "Toward a Third-Wave Feminist Legal Theory: Young Women, Pornography and the Praxis of Pleasure." *Pace Law Faculty Communications* (2007): 1-63. Print.
- Crow Dog, Mary and Richard Erdoes. *Lakota Woman*. New York: Harper Perennial, 1991. Print.
- Deloria, Ella Cara. *Waterlily*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1988. Print.
- Devens, Carol. "If We Get the Girls, We Get the Race: Missionary Education of Native American Girls." *Journal of World History* 3.2 (Fall 1992): 219-237. Print.
- Eagleton, Mary. *Working with Feminist Criticism*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers, Inc., 1996. Print.
- Earling, Debra Magpie. *Perma Red*. New York: Blue Hen Books, 2002. Print.
- "Economic Development." *haisla.ca*. Haisla Nation, n.d. Web. 30 Jan. 2012.
- "Emotional Abuse." *counselingcenter.illinois.edu*. Counseling Center at University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. 2007. Web. 31 July 2012.
- "The Facts on Violence Against American Indian/Alaskan Native Women." Futures Without Violence. [futureswithoutviolence.org](http://futureswithoutviolence.org) Web. 1<sup>st</sup> August 2012.
- Fanflik, Patricia L. "Victim Responses to Sexual Assault: Counterintuitive or Simply Adaptive?" *ndaa.org*. National District Attorneys Association, 2007. Web. 5 Jan. 2012.

- Gilberg, Jenny et al. "Addressing Domestic Violence in Indian Country Introductory Manual." Mending the Sacred Hoop Technical Assistance Project. vaw.umn.edu 2003. Web. 1 August 2012.
- Glazebrook, Trish. "Karen Warren's Ecofeminism." *Ethics & the Environment* 7.2 (Autumn 2002): 12-26. Print.
- Grande, Sandy. "Whitestream Feminism and the Colonialist Project: A Review of Contemporary Feminist Pedagogy and Praxis." *Educational Theory* 53.3 (Summer 2003): 329-346. Print.
- Grassley, Chuck. "Consideration of the Violence Against Women Act." grassley.senate.gov. Feb. 2 2012. Web. 31 July 2012.
- Green, Joyce. "Taking Account of Aboriginal Feminism." *Making Space for Indigenous Feminism*. Green, Joyce, ed. Canada: Fernwood Publishing, 2007. 20-32. Print.
- Harper, Shelby Settles and Christina Marie Entrekin. "Violence Against Native Women: A Guide for Practitioner Action." Office on Violence Against Women, National Center on Full Faith and Credit. vaw.umn.edu. 2006. Web. 8 October 2012.
- Huhndorf, Shari M. and Cheryl Suzack. "Indigenous Feminism: Theorizing the Issues." *Indigenous Women: Politics, Activism, Culture*. Suzack, Cheryl et al., eds. Vancouver : UBC Press, 2010. 1-17. Print.
- "Indian Costumes." halloweencostumes.com. 2012. Web. 31 July 2012.
- "Information on Domestic Violence." Domestic Abuse Shelter of the Florida Keys. domesticabuseshelter.org. Web. 1 August 2012.
- Jackel, Susan. "Women's Suffrage." *The Canadian Encyclopedia*. Historica-Dominion. thecanadianencyclopedia.com. 2012. Web. 27 November 2012.
- Jaimes-Guerrero, M.A. "Exemplars of Indigenism." *Women Transforming Politics: An Alternative Reader*. Cohen, Cathy J., Kathleen B. Jones and Joan C. Tronto, eds. New York: New York University Press, 1997. 205-222. Print.
- Johnson, Allan G. *The Gender Knot: Unraveling Our Patriarchal Legacy*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2005. Print.

- Kirmayer, Laurence J. et al. "Suicide Among Aboriginal People in Canada." *The Aboriginal Healing Foundation Research Series* (2007). ahf.ca Web. 27 August, 2012.
- "Kitimat." *kitimatbc.com*. Sojourn Vacation Properties. 1998-2012. Web. 20 Feb. 2012.
- Kroska, Amy. "Investigating Gender Differences in the Meaning of Household Chores and Child Care." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 65.2 (May 2003): 456-473. Print.
- LaRocque, Emma. "Métis and Feminist: Ethical Reflections on Feminism, Human Rights and Decolonization." *Making Space for Indigenous Feminism*. Green, Joyce, ed. Canada: Fernwood Publishing, 2007. 53-71. Print.
- "\_\_\_\_\_." "Violence in Aboriginal Communities." Health Canada. publications.gc.ca. 1994. Web. 8 October 2012.
- Lithopoulous, Savvas. "International Comparison of Indigenous Policing Models." *Public Safety Canada* (2007). Print.
- Lomawaima, K. Tsianina. "Domesticity in the Federal Indian Schools: The Power of Authority Over Mind and Body." *American Ethnologist* 20.2 (May 1993): 227-240. Print.
- Luna-Firebaugh, Eileen. "Violence Against American Indian Women and the Services Training-Officers-Prosecutors Violence Against Indian Women (STOP VAIW) Program." *Violence Against Women* 12.2 (Feb 2006): 125-136. Print.
- Mack-Canty, Colleen. "Third-Wave Feminism and the Need to Reweave the Nature/Culture Duality." *NWSA Journal* 16.3 (Autumn 2004): 154-179. Print.
- Magee, Dwight, ed. "The Haisla Nation-Rio Tinto Alcan Legacy Agreement." *Ingot* 56.2 (March-April 2010): 7-10. Rio Tinto Alcan BC Operations, Inc.
- Majel-Dixon, Juana. "A Critical Time to Protect Native Women and Advance Tribal Jurisdiction." *Restoration of Native Sovereignty and Safety for Native Women* 16 (May 2011): 4-5. Print.
- Maracle, Lee. *I Am Woman: A Native Perspective on Sociology and Feminism*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Vancouver: Press Gang Publishers, 1996. Print.

- Mastroianni, Dominic. "Hegemony in Antonio Gramsci." english.emory.edu. Emory University. 2002. Web. 6 Mar. 2012.
- McCaslin, Wanda D. and Yvonne Boyer. "First Nations Communities at Risk and in Crisis: Justice and Security." *Journal of Aboriginal Health* (2009): 61-87. Print.
- McKegney, Sam. *Magic Weapons: Aboriginal Writers Remaking Community after Residential School*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2007. Print.
- Mechanic, Mindy. "Fact Sheet on Stalking." National Violence Against Women Prevention Research Center, University of Missouri. musc.edu 2000. Web. 31 July 2012.
- Mihesuah, Devon Abbot. *Indigenous American Women: Decolonization, Empowerment, Activism*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2003. Print.
- Million, Dian. "Felt Theory: An Indigenous Feminist Approach to Affect and History." *Wicazo Sa Review* (Fall 2009): 53-73. Print.
- Milloy, John S. *A National Crime: The Canadian Government and the Residential School System, 1879-1986*. Canada: University of Manitoba Press, 1999. Print.
- "Missing Aboriginal Women Prompt UN Letter." Canada British Columbia News. cbcnews.ca 13 December 2011. Web. 7 October 2012.
- "Missing and Murdered Aboriginal Women and Girls in British Columbia, Canada." University of Miami School of Law Human Rights Clinic. law.miami.edu. 28 March 2012. Web. 7 October 2012.
- Moody, Megan Felicity. "Eulachon past and present." Thesis University of Victoria, 2000. Web. 20 Feb. 2012.
- Nevilles-Sorrel, Jeremy, Holly Oden and Tina Olson. "Returning Men to Honor: A Guidebook for Developing Intervention and Education Programs for Men Who Batter in Native Communities." Mending the Sacred Hoop Technical Assistance Project. Duluth: Mending the Sacred Hoop, 2009. Print.
- The New World*. Dir. Terrence Malick. New Line Cinema, 2005. DVD.
- Owens, Louis. "The Red Road to Nowhere: D'Arcy McNickle's *The Surrounded* and *The Hungry Generations*. *American Indian Quarterly* 13.3 (Summer, 1989): 239-248. Print.

- Parker, Robert Dale. *The Invention of Native American Literature*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003. Print.
- Pocahontas*. Dir. Mike Gabriel and Eric Goldberg. Disney, 1995. DVD.
- Poupart, Lisa M. "The Familiar Face of Genocide: Internalized Oppression among American Indians." *Hypatia* 18.2 (Spring 2003): 86-100. Print.
- Pritzker, Barry M. *A Native American Encyclopedia: History, Culture, and Peoples*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000. Print.
- Pyke, Karen D. "What is Internalized Racial Oppression and Why Don't We Study it? Acknowledging Racism's Hidden Injuries." *Sociological Perspectives* 53.4 (Winter 2010): 551-572. Print.
- Ramirez, Renya. "Race, Tribal Nation, and Gender: A Native Feminist Approach to Belonging." *Meridians* 7.2 (2007): 22-40. Print.
- Rampton, Martha. "The Three Waves of Feminism." *Pacific: The Magazine of Pacific University*. Fall 2008. Web. 5 Feb. 2012.
- Rice, Joanna. "Indian Residential School Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada." *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 35.1 (Spring 2011). Web. 15 Jan 2012.
- Rivkin, Julie and Michael Ryan, eds. *Literary Theory: An Anthology*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishing, 2004. Print.
- Robinson, Eden. *Monkey Beach*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Company, 2000. Print.
- "\_\_\_\_\_". "Queen of the North." *Traplines*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. London: Abacus, 1999. 183-215. Print.
- "\_\_\_\_\_". *The Sasquatch at Home: Traditional Protocols and Storytelling*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 2011. Print.
- Ross, Luana. "From the 'F' Word to Indigenous Feminisms." *Wicazo Sa Review* 24.2 (2009): 39-52. Print.
- Shanley, Kate. "Thoughts on Indian Feminism." *A Gathering of Spirit: Writing and Art by North American Indian Women*. Brant, Beth, ed. Ithaca: Sinister Wisdom Books, 1984. 213-215. Print.



Showalter, Elaine, ed. *The New Feminist Criticism: Essays on Women, Literature, and Theory*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1985. Print.

Smith, Andrea. *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*. Cambridge: South End Press, 2005. Print.

“\_\_\_\_\_.” “Native American Feminism, Sovereignty, and Social Change.” *Feminist Studies* 31.1 (Spring 2005): 116-132. Print.

“\_\_\_\_\_.” “Native American Feminism, Sovereignty and Social Change.” *Making Space For Indigenous Feminism*. Green, Joyce, ed. Canada: Fernwood Publishing, 2007. 93-107. Print.

“\_\_\_\_\_” and J. Khaulani Kauanui. “Native Feminisms Engage American Studies.” *American Quarterly* 60.2 (June 2008): 241-249.

“\_\_\_\_\_.” “Not an Indian Tradition: The Sexual Colonization of Native Peoples.” *Hypatia* 18.2 (Spring 2003): 70-85. Print.

“\_\_\_\_\_.” “Rape and the War Against Native Women.” *Reading Native American Women: Critical/Creative Representations*. Hernández-Avila, Inés, ed. Lanham: Altamira Press, 2005. 63-76. Print.

Smith, Fran and Lisa Yellow-Quill. “Royal Commission on Violence Against Aboriginal Women.” bwss.org Battered Women’s Support Services, 2011. Web. 7 April 2012.

Soper-Jones, Ella. “The Fate of the Oolichan: Prospects of Eco-Cultural Restoration in Eden Robinson’s *Monkey Beach*.” *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 44.2 (May 2009): 15-33. Print.

“Stalking: Unlawful Stalking Behavior.” Ohio Legal Services. ohiolegalservices.org Web. 31 July 2012.

St. Denis, Verna. “Feminism is for Everybody: Aboriginal Women, Feminism and Diversity.” *Making Space for Indigenous Feminism*. Green, Joyce, ed. Canada: Fernwood Publishing, 2007. 33-52. Print.

Stoffels, Denise. *Background Report: Eulachon in the North Coast*. A study prepared at the North Coast LRMP. British Columbia: North Coast LRMP, 2001. Print.

- Stout, Mary A. *Native American Boarding Schools*. Santa Barbara: Greenwood, 2012. Print.
- Suzack, Cheryl, Shari M. Huhndorf, Jeanne Perreault, and Jean Barman, eds. *Indigenous Women and Feminism: Politics, Activism, Culture*. Vancouver: UBC Press, 2010. Print.
- Tatum, Melissa L. "A Jurisdictional Quandary: Challenges Facing Tribal Governments in Implementing the Full Faith and Credit Provisions of the Violence Against Women Acts." *Kentucky Law Journal* (Fall 2001/2002): 1-83. Print.
- Tilley, Donna Scott, Susan M. Rugari and Charles A. Walker. "Development of Violence in Men Who Batter Intimate Partners: A Case Study." *The Journal Of Theory Construction and Testing* 12.1 (2008): 28-33. Print.
- Tohe, Laura. "There is No Word for Feminism in My Language." *Wicazo Sa Review* 15.2 (Autumn 2000): 103-110. Print.
- Turney-High, Harry Holbert. "The Flathead Indians of Montana." *Memoirs of the American Anthropological Association* 48 (1937). Menasha: American Anthropological Association, 1937. Print.
- Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today: A User-Friendly Guide*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Routledge, 2006. Print.
- "Violence Against Aboriginal Women Fact Sheet." Newfoundland Labrador. gov.nl.ca Web. 1 August 2012.
- Wagner, Sally Roesch. *Sisters in Spirit: Haudenosaunee Influence on Early American Feminists*. Summertown: Native Voices Book Publishing Company, 2001. Print.
- Walker, Rebecca. "Becoming the 3rd Wave." *Ms.* 12.2 (Jan/Feb 1992): 86-87. Print.
- "Were Men and Women Equal in Victorian Britain?" The British National Archives. nationalarchives.gov.uk. Web. 26 November 2012.