

Maureen M. Donaghy 2018: *Democratizing Urban Development: Community Organizations for Housing across the United States and Brazil*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press

Democratizing Urban Development is a welcome and timely intervention in the literature on comparative urbanism. Maureen Donaghy compares community organizing in four cities: two in Brazil (Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo) and two in the United States (Atlanta and Washington, DC). The purpose is to specify the mechanisms through which community organizing strategies do or do not change the politics of development in each city. The book therefore speaks to work on social movements and the politics of urban collective action, particularly the idea of 'urban regimes'. This idea is most commonly associated with Clarence Stone and his 1989 monograph *Regime Politics: Governing Atlanta, 1946–1988*.

Donaghy seeks to evaluate the varying strategies of community organizations. This approach takes the 'urban regime' concept seriously, adopting a cross-country comparative lens. Stone's original theory of 'urban regimes' focused on the formal and informal mechanisms through which state and non-state actors make change happen in the city. Empirically, the research programme that followed *Regime Politics* tended to focus on examples where the primary outcome was oriented towards economic growth and social exclusion. More 'progressive' outcomes were theoretically possible, but empirically rare.

The first two chapters of Donaghy's book are devoted to a discussion of the comparative stakes and theory of the study. In chapter 1, she conducts a convincing enumeration of the similarities which allow her to compare two countries that are rarely seen as policy and political analogues in terms of housing policy and urban theory. Significant cost burdens characterize the urban rental market in both countries, especially amongst the poor, making housing a critical dimension of structural poverty. While informal dwellings are more prevalent in Brazil than in the United States, we see a surprisingly similar range and scale of tenure insecurity in both countries. Large federal agencies for urban development oversee fiscal transfers to states and municipalities for housing in both Brazil and the United States. Even the geography of contemporary urban life has become more similar. Inner-city areas in both countries are increasingly subject to similar pressures of market-led gentrification, along with the peripheralization of poverty.

Chapter 2 elaborates some theoretical propositions for understanding variation across community organization strategies. Organizations can pursue strategies that are 'direct'—influencing policy from within government institutions—or 'indirect'—exerting influence through external persuasion. Furthermore, goals can be categorized as seeking 'overhaul'—new leadership of existing institutions—or 'exit'—autonomous solutions outside existing institutions. Donaghy then suggests two explanatory factors for the choice of organizational strategy: an organization's ideology and its relationship with the state. Ideology provides the frames for the demands that community organizations make. The relationship with the state provides the avenues through which community organizations can make these demands. This leads to the predictions that a strong relationship with the state and a rights-based ideology will lead to direct strategies, while a strong relationship with the state and a conservative ideology will lead to more indirect strategies. Community, Donaghy argues, varies considerably at the level of ideology.

Each of the four subsequent chapters is devoted to a study of each case. Donaghy's original and well-researched case studies take the general approach of 'urban regimes' seriously, and her focus on variation in the cases helps build her theoretical argument. In Rio de Janeiro, an informal settlement at risk of eviction in the lead-up to the soccer World Cup and the Olympic Games organizes to use international pressure to shame the municipal leadership into upgrading the settlement. The strategy of 'exit'

produces a limited form of government action, although no wider policy is developed for similar settlements in the city.

In Atlanta, community groups representing populations at risk of market-led displacement in gentrifying neighbourhoods rely on conservative mobilizing frames and a limited relationship with the municipal bureaucracy. The case provides a not-so-surprising epilogue for any reader of Stone's work on Atlanta, in which he first developed the concept of 'urban regimes'. In São Paulo, social movements comprised of residents of inner-city building occupations draw on rights-based frames and connections to local bureaucrats and politicians to realize policy change. This produces significant policy gains, although implementation remains only partial. And in Washington, DC, housing movements that achieved important protections for tenants in prior decades today struggle to marshal new policy gains through close ties to local government but without a rights-based ideological frame.

In a fragmented landscape of urban scholarship, where different regions of the world are subject to quite different theoretical preoccupations, Donaghy makes excellent use of the comparative method. She does so by forcing mostly western theoretical frames to expand to incorporate a novel universe of cases. The approach yields what may strike many observers as a surprising but convincing empirical finding: the strategies in São Paulo appear to carry with them the most promise for transformation.

The book has three shortcomings. First, the basis for evaluating outcomes is not entirely clear. While Donaghy does note changes in policy and implemented projects in individual neighbourhoods, the reader does not have a sense of how we might evaluate outcomes at the city-wide scale. Second, the historical context of each city is given short shrift. Donaghy is parsimonious in her exposition of each city, mostly to the book's credit. But a historical perspective is required in order to understand better the critical relationships between race, class and institutional power. Finally, while the book's theoretical framework accounts for significant variation in the capacities and functioning of community organizations, it assumes that state capacities are relatively uniform. Yet the case studies imply variations in state capacity for implementation even within the two countries, let alone between them.

Even so, the book is an important contribution to the literature on comparative urbanism that crosses disciplinary boundaries. Donaghy's focus on the relationship between formal and informal institutions suggests that theories of power in collective action, like Stone's 'regime theory', have much to say about our contemporary world. First, though, as Donaghy makes clear, we need to decentre the United States as a site for new theory-building. In a world where political challenges to democracy thrive on the growing inequalities between and within cities, placing a focus on the varying strategies for coordinating political power at the heart of comparative urban theory could not be more urgent.

Benjamin H. Bradlow, Brown University

Rosalind Fredericks 2018: *Garbage Citizenship: Vital Infrastructures of Labor in Dakar, Senegal*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press

Infrastructure has become one of the central foci of critical research on cities, particularly in relation to the global South. So much so that it is becoming difficult to understand the city outside of infrastructure. Infrastructures are now understood, to use Ash Amin's phrase, as 'lively', animating all kinds of social, political, economic and ecological questions of the city. It was not always so. Go back to, say, the early 1990s, and outside of a few pockets of work, infrastructure was not at all an obvious starting point or object of investigation for understanding cities. Now, in book after book, paper after