References

Breux, Sandra and Jérôme Couture, eds. 2018. *Accountability and Responsiveness at the Municipal Level: Views from Canada*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Couture, Jérôme, Sandra Breux and Laurence Bherer. 2014. "Analyse écologique des déterminants de la participation électorale municipale au Québec." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 47 (4): 787–812.

Lucas, Jack and R. Michael McGregor, eds. 2021. *Big City Elections in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Taylor, Zack and Gabriel Eidelman. 2010. "Canadian Political Science and the City: A Limited Engagement." *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 43 (4): 961–81.

Response to James Ankers' review of *Electing a Mega-Mayor: Toronto 2014*

R. Michael McGregor[1], Aaron A. Moore[2] and Laura B. Stephenson[3]

[1]Ryerson University (mmcgregor@ryerson.ca), [2]University of Winnipeg (aa.moore@uwinnipeg.ca) and [3]Western University (laura.stephenson@uwo.ca)

James Ankers has provided both some kind words and some thoughtful critique of our recent work, *Electing a Mega-Mayor: Toronto 2014*. This journal has graciously offered us the opportunity to engage with this review, and we are happy to take this chance to discuss both this particular work and the field of Canadian local political behaviour more generally.

After noting that the book makes positive contributions to topics specific to Toronto, as well as to the field more broadly, Ankers expresses some concern about the generalizability of some of the book's findings. Much of the book is devoted to the specifics of the Toronto election in 2014, but it does indeed attempt to generalize at points, including when making statements about elector orientations toward local politics. We understand Ankers' concern. The 2014 mayoral election was very atypical when compared either to other Toronto elections or to mayoral races elsewhere in the country. The exceptionally high-profile nature of the election makes it a challenging case with which to generalize to other places and times. However, although we agree that generalizing from any election has its challenges, regardless of the level of government, we do think that Toronto 2014 provides some important lessons for municipal political behaviour elsewhere in the country. Certainly, one can always go further to convince the reader of important points such as this, and Ankers' doubts in this respect may mirror those of some other readers as well. To those who share this concern about our claims of generalizability, then, we wish to offer two responses.

First, we agree that the unique nature of this particular contest means that the election is not at all representative of municipal elections. Cases need not be typical, however, to make generalizations. In this instance, the high-profile nature of the candidates and the race, which no doubt contributed to the record high level of turnout, actually make this a good case to draw directional conclusions about other cases, where races are lower in profile and turnout. If, for example, Torontonians in 2014 were not as interested in local politics as they were in politics at the provincial and/or federal level, or if residents of the largest city in the country (both in terms of population and budget) feel that municipalities have relatively little impact upon their lives, we expect that these findings will travel well to smaller cities. Though not all of the lessons from this election are applicable to elsewhere, due to the "extreme" nature of this case, we are nevertheless confident in making some generalizations.

Second, Toronto 2014 is hardly unique in its uniqueness. There is an astonishing amount of variation in Canadian local elections. This can be both a blessing (in that there are an immense

number of new research questions to ask and answer) and a curse (in that external validity is always a question). The absence or presence of political parties, the multitiered nature of some local governments, variations in the district magnitude and electoral formula of electoral systems, and difference in voting methods (online, telephone, in-person) represent but a fraction of the features that vary across municipalities in Canada. Even within the same city, differences across time can be profound. The constellation of candidates in the 2014 Toronto election was very different from both 2010 and 2018, as were the issues facing voters, and even the number of seats on city council. Each unique feature adds another element of contextualizing that needs to be taken into account when understanding election outcomes, but it does not mean that the core act of voting is fundamentally different. Observations and analyses of voter behaviour, across a variety of elections and contexts, build a body of knowledge that can better illuminate whether findings can be taken *en tout* or whether specific features of elections bring specific modifications. As our study is the first book-length treatment of a municipal election in Canada, we think it is a good place to start developing expectations that can be tested with future research in other cities.

Variation, both in space and across time, makes generalization at the local level more challenging than with higher-order elections. Each election is unique for the specific configuration of context, candidates and issues. At the same time, lessons learned from each contest about the behaviour of voters contribute to a greater understanding of elector attitudes and behaviour, and thus election outcomes. All of these insights, as limited as they might be, are important pieces in the broader puzzle of understanding voter behaviour.

The Sleeping Giant Awakens: Genocide, Indian Residential Schools, and the Challenge of Conciliation

David B. MacDonald, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2019, pp. 256.

Andrew R. Basso, Wilfrid Laurier University (abasso@wlu.ca)

Why did Canada commit genocide against Indigenous peoples? What are the meanings of this violence for the pursuit of justice and the achievement of conciliation between Indigenous peoples and settler populations? These fundamental questions are critically addressed in David B. MacDonald's study of intentional, genocidal settler-colonial violence against Indigenous peoples.

The Sleeping Giant Awakens guides readers through complex histories of Indigenous–settler relationships and asymmetric violence. MacDonald poignantly paints a vivid story of escalating and contingent settler-colonial atrocity that is path dependent, interconnected, ongoing and genocidal in genesis and operation. Relying on extensive archival research, interviews with Indigenous peoples and settlers, governmental and religious policies, legal and nonlegal perspectives, and academic insights, MacDonald ties violent events and processes together into a cohesive framework, highlighting linkages and legacies in anti-Indigenous policies that vary across temporal and spatial boundaries. This cohesive view of imposed colonial violence helps to illuminate socio-political hegemonies that settlers have created to gain and retain control over lands and Indigenous lives.

MacDonald powerfully constructs a charge of genocide in relation to the Indian Residential School (IRS) system and Sixties and Seventies Scoop era, demonstrating that Canada's pathologies of genocide fixated on the elimination and erasure of Indigenous peoples and Indigeneity.