

discusses the loss in status that accompanies flight when Pandits must live in one-room houses within camps, but the reader needs more evidence of how these camps differ from the IDPs' previous homes or imagined homes and how homes within the camps differ from one another. There are differences in privilege and status within displacement camps as well. He also argues that displacement is gendered, but it is unclear how he, as a South Asian man in a gender-biased society, had access to women's accounts of their lives. Many accounts in the book seem to be from men, or if women are also interviewed, they are interviewed in the presence of men.

Despite these imperfections, this book is a very good contribution to the literature on forced migration and a useful case study of a population about which little is known. The focus on a population that has endured a protracted displacement is also important, as more people around the world are in this very situation. Datta's influence is important in moving the anthropological literature on forced migrants to examine more carefully the role of the state and power and changes in class and status. Let's hope that we see more sociologists taking up these issues in the future as well.

Democratizing Urban Development: Community Organizations for Housing across the United States and Brazil. By Maureen M. Donaghy. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2018. Pp. x+219. \$99.50 (cloth); \$35.95 (paper).

Corina Graif
Pennsylvania State University

Inequality in housing access and affordability has contributed to close to a billion city dwellers living in inadequate housing across the world—a number projected to double by 2030. Rising housing costs, demolition of public housing, and rapid urban development and gentrification have displaced low-income residents in developing and developed countries alike. In response, international institutions like the United Nations Habitat and the World Bank have called for integrating slum dwellers and low-income residents into the city as a priority for inclusive governance.

Motivated by such calls, Maureen Donaghy's book, *Democratizing Urban Development*, addresses three important questions: What strategies do community organizations (COs) use to avoid displacement among low-income residents and to provide affordable housing? What drives such strategies? And how successful have these strategies been in improving democracy in urban development? Donaghy conducts a case study of Atlanta and Washington, D.C., in the United States and Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo in Brazil that enables unique cross-national as well as cross-city comparisons. Despite important differences, these cities share common challenges regarding low-income housing and the political will and governmental capacity to address inequality. Donaghy conducted impressive fieldwork for this study during

2012–16. She interviewed leaders from COs, other NGOs, the media, private sector associations, and government agencies related to housing as well as attended community and citywide meetings, identifying specific organizations that illustrated local efforts to improve housing access and affordability.

The central argument of the book is that while the activities of COs vary, the broader strategies can be grouped under four categories, each motivated by the interaction between the COs' relationship with the state and their ideology. Donaghy advances an insightful theoretical model that a strong relationship with the state (e.g., insider access to the city administration and trust that the judges are not biased or that the city will deliver on its promises), when combined with a rights-based ideology (beliefs in people's right to live in the city or right to housing), leads to direct, inclusionary strategies (e.g., relying on judicial institutions, seeking to influence decisions directly from the inside, and shaping structural change that empowers civil society and keeps local government accountable). These strategies contribute to a transformational outcome for democracy, such as more direct participation by civil society in local government decisions. When strong ties to the state are combined with a conservative ideology, it leads to indirect strategies (e.g., through advocacy for additional resources and for improving existing programs rather than new interventions)—maintaining the status quo.

In turn, a weak relationship with the state combined with a rights-based ideology leads to exit strategies (e.g., appealing to higher level authorities or engaging in solutions independent of the local city administration and the justice system)—increasing independence from local politics. Weak ties to the state combined with a conservative ideology are expected to lead to strategies of overhauling the administration (e.g., when the COs are rejected as legitimate partners in governance by the current system they seek to elect allies into public office), ultimately bringing about political change, although not long-term structural change in participation.

Indeed, a rights-based ideology, without strong ties to the state, was not sufficient for organizations to engage in inclusionary strategies, as demonstrated in Rio. Even with strong ties to the state, as in Sao Paulo, inclusionary and indirect strategies were often intermixed. Moreover, strategies were less successful over the long run because of financial constraints and shifting politics. Generally, in the United States, COs did not adopt a strong rights-based ideology or seek much inclusive governance—perhaps because strong beliefs in representative democracy reduce public support for formally institutionalizing an unelected civil society. In contrast, Brazil has a long history of participation of civil society (especially unions) within the state, and its participatory institutions often elect members, increasing their legitimacy.

Broadly, the study found that COs' strategies led to a host of positive outcomes, like improved inclusionary zoning laws in Atlanta and São Paulo and provision of nearby housing and market rate indemnity payments in Rio. In all cases but Atlanta, organizations protected residents against displacement through the use of judicial institutions and mobilized the media and public support around their cases. In Washington, D.C., the strategies were suc-

cessful in influencing local politicians but led to insufficient institutional inclusion over the long run. Notably, the study did not find much evidence for the overhaul of the administration strategy.

The study found important roles for networks and networking strategies. In Atlanta, the small size of the network of housing advocates did not help in mobilizing large-scale action, persuading politicians, or influencing elections. In contrast, both São Paulo and Washington, D.C., had organizations embedded in larger networks, but the ties were mobilized differently, according to ideological and political contexts—thus using more participatory action (both cooperative and contentious) in São Paulo than in D.C.

The book contributes important insights to the literature on social movements, moving beyond a standard focus on tactics to one on broader strategies. The book also contributes to the literature on governance by documenting how collective actors often seek influence not just from inside the state but also from outside. The findings inform the literature on social capital, as organizations and participation are core dimensions of such capital for communities and individuals. They also advance ongoing debates related to political economy, spatial inclusion, and social inclusion. Furthermore, the study informs the public control literature by highlighting how low-income communities in precarious housing benefit from COs' extralocal connections to city administration and judicial institutions—in contrast to the predominant focus of neighborhood studies on within-area ties and control.

Overall, this is a fascinating book that illustrates how COs make a difference for increasing the city's inclusivity through strategies that enhance the democratic character of a society. However, the richness of its account from the perspective of COs is also a weakness. Future research should integrate the perspectives of the low-income residents, public officials, and private interests fueling the "growth machine." Democracy and legitimacy of the state require inclusivity, but persistent patterns of income segregation in both countries indicate the existence of entrenched systematic forces that contribute to exclusion. The extent to which COs can bring long-term solutions to this problem is an open question. Still, even when the COs' outcomes are temporary or partial, their actions may change the minds of local voters over the long term toward more support for affordable homes.

Broke and Patriotic: Why Poor Americans Love Their Country. By Francesco Duina. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2018. Pp. 227. \$30.00 (cloth); \$19.95 (paper).

Mark R. Rank

Washington University in St. Louis

There exists a fundamental paradox among America's poor—despite the fact of living in harsh economic conditions, they display surprisingly high levels