

which one reaction was Bodin's notion of indivisible sovereignty and another was Grotius's model of the composite polity, according to which "he differentiated between 'the common Subject of Supreme Power [which] is the State (*civitas*)' and the 'proper subject,' which could be one person or an assembly, potentially ruling over multiple States" (p. 266).

*Reformation, Resistance, and Reason of State* is, to be sure, a book of great learning, discrimination, and nuance, and to that justice cannot be done in a short review. Nonetheless, it is, in my view, insufficiently argumentative. The reader must work rather too hard to glean such lines of argument as those outlined in the preceding text. Its subject is given an almost wholly nominalist treatment, one writer after another, and I longed for more explicit comparison, as well as a more centripetal analysis, coming back to a thesis, even if this had to be to a thesis about a set of developments that were still underway at any single juncture. The best-established surveys, such as those written by Annabel Brett, Francis Oakley, Quentin Skinner, and Richard Tuck, all have a stronger thread of argumentation running through them.

Relatedly but separately, nearly all the discussion is at the level of ideas. Although Mortimer recognizes that so much of the political theory of her period was motivated by "the impact of social and economic change" and involved "increasingly detailed analyses of structures and institutions" (p. 4), there is too little anchoring of her own account in infrastructural and technological developments. For instance, the mirror-for-princes literature, with which Mortimer's history commences, only became possible thanks to the invention of the Venetian mirror as a technology of reflection that spurred thinking about the potential that might exist in the actual. Oddly, Mortimer does not mention the "formal principle" of the Reformation, namely the doctrine of *sola scriptura*; but this revolutionary individualist creed, which entailed that faith was only mediated through the written word and not by priests and sacraments, was only conceivable thanks to the invention of the printing press. Mortimer uses the terms "economy" and "economic" a number of times in her introduction, but the only chapter in which they recur thereafter with any frequency is that on Islamic political thought. It is a significant contribution of the book that it takes a much less Eurocentric perspective on political theory than is usual; but the slightly more sociological approach of the chapter suggests the necessity, especially in a comparative study, of detailing the material underpinnings of political thought, and these are somewhat lacking throughout much of the analysis.

These shortcomings notwithstanding, Mortimer has written an impressive volume. It is lucidly written, concise but comprehensive, well-organized, and remarkably erudite. Everybody will be able to learn something from it, but it will be an excellent resource particularly for graduate

students seeking to situate a discrete research project on a map of the variegated terrain of political thinking in a crucial period.

**The Cambridge Companion to Civil Disobedience.** Edited by William E. Scheuerman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021. 440p. \$99.99 cloth, \$29.29 paper.  
doi:10.1017/S1537592722002250

— Çiğdem Çıdam , Union College  
cidamc@union.edu

*The Cambridge Companion to Civil Disobedience* is a timely, comprehensive, and thought-provoking edited volume that brings together an impressive array of scholars to "reconsider main competing theoretical accounts of civil disobedience" and "reexamine their core components" (p. 3). Revisiting the theory and practice of civil disobedience in this manner, the editor William Scheuerman argues, has become a necessity given the changing political circumstances characterized by the proliferation of, and concomitant backlash against, protest movements and new forms of activism that pursue controversial and, at times, outright "illegal" political action. The insightful and diverse contributions to the volume confirm the prescience of this observation.

One of the most stimulating aspects of this collection of essays on civil disobedience is its systematic approach to, and careful organization of, the rich and conflicting material at hand. Scheuerman, who draws on W. B. Gallie's notion of an "essentially contested concept" (p. 5), emphasizes that disagreements on the meaning of an evaluative and internally complex concept like civil disobedience are not shortcomings but rather potential starting points for a fruitful intellectual and political exchange. As an essentially contested concept, civil disobedience is defined with reference to certain core components, including "*civility, conscientiousness, non-violence, and a willingness to accept legal sanctions*" (p. 6, emphasis in the original). Competing theoretical positions interpret these components differently and offer alternative accounts as to how much weight should be given to each. Rival theoretical positions thus formed are not closed to revisions. Quite the opposite, the interpretive debates surrounding civil disobedience constantly respond to "changing circumstances" (p. 6).

Using these insights as an organizational rubric, Scheuerman divides the book into three parts. The essays in the first part explore the competing theoretical and political approaches to civil disobedience. Part II showcases the current interpretive debates on each core component listed in the paragraph above, and the contributions in the final section engage with the challenges posed for existing conceptions of civil disobedience by globalization and digitalization. For Scheuerman, what guides this project of multisided intellectual exchange is

the conviction that, when taken seriously, disagreements surrounding civil disobedience can pave the way to “some modest conceptual (and normative) gains and perhaps even something such as theoretical progress” (p. 9), bringing to light previously neglected elements of the concept.

Whether such a “fuller” (p. 8) understanding of civil disobedience is possible, or even desirable, is, of course, a matter of debate. One can, for instance, argue that due to its—in James Ingram’s words—“enormous prestige, even hegemony, in contemporary political discourse” (p. 194) the ongoing preoccupation with civil disobedience may lead to a lack of appreciation for other modes of oppositional practices. Even worse, when people engage in such forms of resistance, their actions may be deemed “illegitimate” by politicians, pundits, and theorists, who “hold them to standards derived from theories of civil disobedience ... that may not be appropriate to their situations or aims” (p. 195). With these concerns in mind, the three essays that bookend the first part offer fascinating readings of the works of civil disobedience’s canonical practitioner-theorists that demonstrate how their radical ideas have been “domesticated” through a series of political appropriations and reinterpretations by various theories of civil disobedience. Russell Hanson highlights Henry David Thoreau’s “willingness to consider violent forms of resistance to unjust laws” (p. 40). Erin Pineda powerfully argues that Martin Luther King provides “less a theory of *civil disobedience* than an expansive politics of *disobedient civility*” (p. 70, emphasis in the original) that rests on the transformative and risky proposition that “individuals could remake themselves—and the world around them—*anew*, through non-violent collective action” (p. 73). And by “pulling on the anarchist threads of Thoreau’s and Mohandas K. Gandhi’s thought and practice” (p. 194), Ingram shows how their works can offer alternative visions of politics that are not limited by “the statism and legalism” (p. 195) of the liberal and democratic accounts of civil disobedience.

Other contributors suggest that rather than an indication of a problem with civil disobedience per se, the limits of contemporary discussions are an effect of how the term is theorized by rival approaches. Writing from a radical democratic perspective, Robin Celikates convincingly argues that once we transcend the liberal/deliberative models that “underestimate the transformative effects of civil disobedience” (p. 142), it becomes clear that civil disobedience can take “much more radical forms” (p. 143). Andrew Sabl’s realist vision of civil disobedience opens up space for disobeying the law for strategic reasons that are readily dismissed by nonrealist accounts. Alexander Kaufman and William Smith deftly defend the liberal and deliberative democratic approaches to civil disobedience, respectively, arguing that such accounts offer more expansive conceptualizations of civil disobedience than they are given credit for by their critics.

The contributions in the second part rethink the core components of civil disobedience to develop a conceptual account that can accommodate contemporary political realities. Candice Delmas argues against Celikates’s and Kimberley Brownlee’s attempts to broaden the notion of civility and instead makes a persuasive case for the importance of identifying justifiable forms of *uncivil* disobedience. As an antidote to the fruitless violent/nonviolent dichotomy, Alexander Livingston offers a sophisticated understanding of nonviolence as “a different way of wielding coercion to bind communication with confrontation” (p. 255) to account for the disruptive aspects of civil disobedience. Maeve Cooke expands the ethical dimensions of civil disobedience beyond “considerations of conscience and duty” (p. 248) to include “radical transformation of individual and collective identities” (p. 232) through political action. Finally, Christopher Bennett and Brownlee address the question of whether civil disobedients should face punishment and argue that justifiable acts of civil disobedience can involve illegal action whose punishment may be unjustifiable.

The final part of the book brings together different attempts to think civil disobedience anew in the face of changing circumstances and concludes with Kurt Schöck’s broad survey on how to assess the “consequences” of civil disobedience. Addressing the political changes introduced by globalization, Luis Cabrera broadens the scope of civil disobedience to account for morally permissible legal violations of nonstate actors such as nongovernmental organizations, migrants, and asylum seekers. More controversially, imputing political intentionality to migrants’ actions, Cabrera argues that unauthorized border crossings can be “characterized as a form of principled resistance” (p. 330). David Lefkowitz asks if states can engage in civil disobedience and answers with a qualified “yes.” Finally, Theresa Züger’s and Scheuerman’s insightful essays turn to politically motivated digital activism and whistleblowing, respectively, to explore if such practices can be understood as reinventions of civil obedience. Both scholars agree that while expanding the conceptual boundaries of civil disobedience to include emerging digital tactics/whistleblowing runs the risk of undermining the specificity of civil disobedience, it is important to pay attention to activists’ claims to have modeled their actions on the principled law breaking of iconic figures such as Gandhi and King to sustain a fruitful dialogical relation between theory and practice.

This emphasis on the importance of a dialogical relation between theory and practice takes me to my only criticism of the volume. If there is one thing that is missing in this encyclopedic project, it is an account of how civil disobedience is currently being practiced by political actors in different localities in the Global South. Surely, some of the contributors mention cases such as the most recent uprisings in Turkey and Hong Kong (Celikates), the Pussy

Riot's protests in Russia (Delmas), India's National Campaign on Dalit Human Rights (Cabrera), and the Burmese democratic movement (Sabl) for illustrative purposes. Yet, when people in Hong Kong, Myanmar, South Korea, India, Russia, Turkey, Chile, and Argentina, to name a few, engage in protest movements, they borrow resistance practices from one another, adapt those practices to their own political realities, and innovatively use the language of civil disobedience, thereby offering insights into the limits *and* untapped potentials of civil disobedience. The absence of such a global perspective is especially conspicuous in a volume that opens with a compelling conceptual history of civil disobedience documenting how the concept traveled from one country to another, taking a different form each step of the way. According to Hanson's riveting account, civil disobedience was first introduced in the United States in sermons against the Fugitive Slave Law and appropriated by the editors who posthumously used it to title Thoreau's essay "Civil Disobedience"; the term was then taken up in the United Kingdom as Thoreau's work was reissued by those with Tolstoy-inspired Christian Pacifist leanings. Finding its way to South Africa through those UK-based publications, it was appropriated by Gandhi whose unique conceptualization of civil disobedience was then reinterpreted by King. Can we find the traces of a similar iterative interpretive process today, whereby civil disobedience is being reinvented by activists in different parts of the world? While *The Cambridge Companion to Civil Disobedience* does not address this question, it offers a brilliant and illuminating overview of the contemporary debates on civil disobedience and for that it will no doubt become an invaluable resource for anyone who is interested in politics of protest.

**Political Mourning: Identity and Responsibility in the Wake of Tragedy.** By Heather Pool. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press, 2021. 260p. \$110.50 cloth, \$34.95 paper. doi:10.1017/S1537592722002535

— Alexander Keller Hirsch , University of Alaska Fairbanks  
ahirsch@alaska.edu

Heather Pool's brilliant and wide-ranging new book, *Political Mourning: Identity and Responsibility in the Wake of Tragedy*, is a profound contribution to an emergent literature that focuses on how mourning becomes political. In particular, the book focuses on instances when the tragic deaths of ordinary citizens generate transformative political change. The book is timely, dynamic, and ultimately epiphanic.

Mourning is typically cast as an experience individuals undergo as they cope with personal loss. What is often neglected, however, is a sustained discussion of the *politics* of mourning. If John Dewey is right that politics is the process by which a public comes to understand itself as a public, then politics is distinctly the realm in which

collectivities mobilize into various forms of empowered action. As such, political mourning appears to be an oxymoron, given that the political regards rich experiences of mutual active witnessing while mourning concerns the world-emptying grief of a private individual.

And yet, as Pool points out, this intuition is belied by some of the most resonant expressions of public mourning. The Gettysburg Address was a wartime funerary elegy that mourned the sacrifice of the dead, but also exhorted the living on their behalf by sublimating the experience of violent death into the rebirth of the republic. Similarly, the September 11 Memorial in Lower Manhattan bears testimony not only to the individuals who lost their lives at the World Trade Center in 2001 but also to the narratives of national remembrance, grieving, and commemoration that manifested in the aftermath of the attacks in ways clearly intended to marshal a politics of patriotism and group loyalty.

Key to Pool's analysis are the twin themes of identity and responsibility. Questions of identity and responsibility have been interlinked at least since Thomas Hobbes's seventeenth-century founding of the social contract tradition. Hobbes famously conceived citizens' civic responsibilities as a *quid pro quo*: I forfeit my natural liberty over to the state, which in turn exercises a monopoly over violence and the right to punish, and in exchange I receive the security afforded by its law. This reciprocal obligation depends of course on the coherence of collective identity's borderlands. A people can only enter into a social contract, and thus be bound, both to themselves as well as to their sovereign, insofar as they are indeed a people. And yet, as Pool points out, the borders of collective identity are protean. As those who are historically marginalized stake a claim to be included within the polity the borders of collective identity contract or expand. As a result, "as the borders of identity shift," Pool argues, "the depth or breadth of our responsibilities to one another do too" (p. 30).

For Pool, "mournable moments" are "singularly powerful" catalysts for scrambling the coordinates of who belongs to the polis and on what basis. This is because the tragic loss of life, in particular when it manifests within a public sphere, presents an occasion for reflecting upon the *a priori* terms of grievability. If, for instance, George Floyd's life matters to the polity, that is to say, if his death is affirmed as grievable, what should this acknowledgment portend for a broader set of urgent policy questions concerning criminal justice and race in the United States? Pool's book attests to this politics of grievability and demonstrates how mourning involves not only retrospective reckoning (what ought to have been?) but also aspirations about what could be for the future in light of a theory of justice that is renewed after tragic loss.

One of *Political Mourning's* great strengths lies in the way it illuminates the feedback loop between events and identities. Pool's chapters include case studies that range