

ing about the very real consequences of actions.

The content of *Beautiful Trouble* is comprehensive, with adaptable concepts and principles woven together and demonstrated with extensive case studies. Each tactic is connected to relevant theories, principles, and case studies so that the reader can clearly see the interplay between them and draw connections. If readers want to delve further into components, insights, and resources for further reading are provided. While I enjoyed the overall layout of the book, I disagreed with the order in which the three primary sections were presented: Tactics, Principles, Theories. While tactics are fun and motivating to read, I would suggest that starting with principles or theories would have better laid a foundation.

As a compilation of numerous authors, who are all community activists, *Beautiful Trouble* treats the reader to

a multitude of voices and sectors, yet the editors do a great job of keeping a consistent tone throughout the book. Overall, *Beautiful Trouble* can offer insights to those new to social activism, or re-inspire those already in the trenches. Don't count on it as the be-all end-all, but it's worth having in any organizer's repertoire.

ROMANDA SIMPSON completed her Master's in Environmental Studies at York University, specializing in environmental education. She has a BA in Sociology and Anthropology, a Diploma in Sustainable Community Development, and has worked in various non-profit organizations in community engagement, social and environmental justice, and the sharing economy. She loves the outdoors and recently was a crew member in the Clipper Round the World sailing race.

the power of the people to self-govern? Can the action be defended according to democratic values of 'common decency' and 'common good'?

The book's title is drawn from a January 1968 speech by Martin Luther King, Jr. in which he stated, "a riot is the language of the unheard." In D'Arcy's view, militant protest is the attempt of marginalized people to gain a 'hearing.' This term carries both performative and legal implications. D'Arcy envisions 'natural law'—following King's "Law of God"—as a publicly negotiated practice, rather than the exclusive realm of government. This higher sense of 'natural law' suggests a greater moral authority; to disobey unjust laws, or laws that interfere with justice, is to be true to the 'natural law.' Taking instruction from King's principle that "we ought to be more devoted to justice than to order," D'Arcy argues that maintaining 'order' is worthwhile only when and if justice has been upheld. If order is unjust, the thinking follows, it should be opposed. If militant protest helps to advance grievances in the public realm, militancy can be seen as a "particularly rigorous form of fidelity" to the democratic ideal, not a rejection of it. In this sense, justice can be regarded as a discursive public process of contestation and liberation rather than cloistered and absolute.

D'Arcy suggests that the historical importance of the riot outweighs its legal construction. The legal definition emphasizes crimes 'to person and property.' It was constructed to control crowds and discourage political and labour dissent through state violence. In D'Arcy's view, riots can be a temporary "exit" or "withdrawal from attributing authority to the legal order," through which there is hope that silenced voices will be harder to ignore. D'Arcy cites the March on Washington, Days of Rage, and Stonewall as examples of democratically significant riots that advanced the cause of justice where advocacy and debate was not enough.

In his discussion on the 1990 land defence at Kanehsatà:ke, D'Arcy gets to the heart of two of Canada's most pressing issues: environmental justice and racism. *Languages of the Unheard*

Languages of the Unheard: Why Militant Protest is Good for Democracy.

By STEPHEN D'ARCY. *Between the Lines*, 2013. \$24.95 CAD

REVIEWED BY ERIKA HENNEBURY

When is a riot helpful to democracy? When is it dangerous? Drawing a line from civil disobedience to armed struggle, Stephen D'Arcy persuasively unpacks the historically and legally loaded concept of violence and its role in militant protest.

D'Arcy, an activist and political philosopher, specializes in normative democratic theory. In *Languages of the Unheard*, D'Arcy develops a normative theory of "what militancy is like when it is done well." His conceptualization of 'autonomous democracy' is a radical, anti-capitalist variation on deliberative democracy that preferences 'voice' over 'vote' and the capacity to constructively air grievances in the public realm. D'Arcy expands upon the shared political philosophical territory of Marx and Bakunin in developing the primacy of 'agency' or 'self-emancipation' in social movements. He advances the argument

that agency is not only the means, but also the end of the struggle for democracy.

Dismissing the commonly held belief that violence is morally unjustifiable in democratic protest, D'Arcy engages the reader with thought experiments presenting scenarios of acceptable force, such as defending a child from harm. The current discourse on protest movements against anti-Black police violence (e.g. Baltimore) exemplifies the questionable assertion that violent protest is never justifiable. D'Arcy rejects the current Western cultural fixation with pacifism, offering instead a set of four principles that can be used to assess a choice of forceful militant action against a 'democratic standard': Does violence create new opportunities to resolve grievances? Do those directly affected have the agency to respond/react meaningfully? Does the action enhance

has specific resonance in recent years, in the midst of heightened police violence and injustice against Black youth in Canada (e.g. carding) and the U.S. (e.g. police shootings of unarmed black men), the release of the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Report, and the white supremacist terrorist attack on a congregation in Charleston, South Carolina. As Bill C-51 threatens to silence First Nations and environmental groups, severely limiting their right to dissent, the role of militant protest becomes even more relevant in the face of “intransigent elites and unresponsive systems of power.”

Languages of the Unheard offers a discursive theory of justice that is instructive to socio-environmental activism and scholarship. Extending the military ‘responsibility to protect (R2P)’ principle to the ‘right to rebel (R2R)’ against systemic violence, *Languages of the Unheard* encourages the reader to

embrace militant protest as a civic virtue under ‘natural law.’ D’Arcy dismantles the ‘liberal objection’ that militancy is coercive, arguing that we should be more concerned with coercion by systems of injustice than with the movements that aim to counter it. This book is recommended for anyone interested in socio-environmental justice, deliberative democracy, and radical change. It has special significance to Canadian academics and activists right now, as we struggle towards reconciliation, against the continuing violence of colonization, and to divest from fossil fuels.

ERIKA HENNEBURY is a recent graduate of York University’s Master in Environmental Studies Planning program. Erika is a Strategic Programs Grants Officer for Toronto Arts Council, and is a member Planners Network and Friends of the Green Line.

Red Skin, White Masks: Rejecting the Colonial Politics of Recognition.

By GLEN SEAN COULTHARD. *U of Minnesota P, 2014. \$22.50 USD*

REVIEWED BY DYLAN MCMAHON

When Taiaiake Alfred writes, in the forward to *Red Skin, White Masks*, that Glen Coulthard “is a leading voice of the new Indigenous Intelligentsia,” it is not an apathetic patronage to the author’s work; it signals a transformation in the discursive landscape of Indigenous politics in Canada. It is the acceptance of a new battle to be waged against the continued colonial oppression of Indigenous peoples, a battle in which the above two authors figure centrally in the vanguard.

Red Skin, White Masks can be understood as a historical mediation and a revolutionary manifesto. Coulthard characterizes the history of Indigenous politics in Canada as consisting of two colonial epochs. The first period, which lasted from the moment of European contact until the White Paper in 1969, saw Indigenous/non-Indigenous rela-

tions framed in the language of ‘the Indian Problem,’ in which “state power [was] geared around genocidal practices of forced *exclusion* and *assimilation*.” In the second era of Canadian colonialism, Coulthard argues, the language of ‘recognition’ has sought to “‘reconcile’ Indigenous assertions of nationhood with settler-state sovereignty via the accommodation of Indigenous identity claims in some form of renewed legal and political relationship with the Canadian state.” Ultimately, however, Coulthard’s argument is premised on the assertion, “that instead of ushering in an era of peaceful coexistence grounded on the ideal of *reciprocity* or *mutual* recognition, the politics of recognition in its contemporary liberal form promises to reproduce the very configurations of colonialist, racist, patriarchal state power that Indigenous peoples’ demands for

recognition have historically sought to transcend.”

The great strength of Coulthard is his ability to situate these claims in a rich theoretical body. Marx’s primitive accumulation thesis figures centrally, and the book provides an anti-colonial critique of the temporal constraints and unilinear cultural and economic developmentalism of Marx, as well as a rich discussion of the applicability of Capital to Canadian settler-colonialism. However, Coulthard’s use of Marx is not revolutionary and serves more as a theoretical lens with which to examine the role of capital, dispossession, and land in colonial hegemonies, than as a sustained critique of the German philosopher.

It is the Martiniquais author Frantz Fanon who provides the most compelling buttress to Coulthard’s discussion of liberal recognition politics in Canada. Fanon’s attentiveness to the always-multiple and corrosive ways in which the colonial authority works upon its *Other* is what so vibrantly colours *Red Skin, White Masks*. Fanon’s central contribution is, as Coulthard suggests, that he “showed how, over time, colonized populations tend to internalize the derogatory images imposed on them by their colonial ‘masters,’ and how as a result of this process, these images, along with the structural relations with which they are entwined, come to be recognized . . . as more or less natural.”

It is this imposition of a ‘psycho-affective’ attachment to colonialism onto colonial subjects that is most central to Coulthard’s discussion. When approaching the Dene Nationalist movements of the 1970s and ‘80s, Coulthard argues that Indigenous involvement in state-led land-claims processes have, through the language of capitalism, re-oriented a struggle that was once for the cultural reproduction of Indigenous ‘grounded normativity’ into a struggle that is for land “as material resource to be exploited in the capital accumulation process.” Following this, Coulthard argues that in contexts where the state is positioned as a privileged authority or mediator on social disputes—focusing particularly on legal challenges to legislative gender discrimination