<INSERT FIRST PAGE HEADER AND COPYRIGHT LINE>
<ON SUBSEQUENT PAGES INSERT RUNNING HEADLINE: LH = BOOK REVIEWS RH = BOOK REVIEWS>

<INSERT SECTION HEADING: BOOK REVIEWS>

<REVIEW 1>
<H1>Neil Brenner 2019: *New Urban Spaces: Urban Theory and the Scale Question*. New York: Oxford University Press</H1>

I distinctly recall purchasing R.E.M.'s *1991/2001 Unplugged* sessions album in 2014 and listening to it with a slight sense of confused amazement: alongside packing in a third of previously unaired performances—including some sudden bits of Bob Dylan in the midst of a hitherto unknown track—the album simply re-played, in partly different keys, some of the 'best of' I was expecting. In a way this was a treat, but it also stripped away R.E.M.'s work and recast some of their classics in different forms, even going against the group's original ethos to some extent. Without trying to draw too many parallels here, Neil Brenner's *New Urban Spaces* left me with something of the same feeling. While it reinterprets some well-established tenets of urban political writing, it does so with the author presenting a new version of familiar arguments alongside another, stronger argument—which, a little like *Unplugged*, proves that theory is never really fixed in time and is always subject to change.

By that metric, Brenner's most recent monograph is a challenging, dense and surprising read that will likely reshape our understanding of the long-established scholarship of one of the world's finest contemporary urban theorists. Conveniently summarized in a table on page 10, the book is pretty much a 'Brenner Reader' put together by Brenner himself. It follows his 2016 *Critique of Urbanization*—which already argued in part against 'locking in' scholarship—and moves towards a very explicit re-examination of his scholarship over the last two decades. This entails on the one hand collecting together a series of classic chapters from Neil Brenner's scholarship for re-publication—some of which are at the heart of previously published popular

books and journal articles—and on the other re-editing those chapters and articles and, even more importantly, re-reading their relevance into contemporary urban theorizing.

The book hence proceeds near chronologically by taking us through various stages of Brenner's thinking about how the 'urban question' can (or not) be framed as a scale question, including more explicit discussion on the value and challenges of scalar thinking (ch. 3) and its application to global city formation (ch. 4), which revisits his work of the late 1990s and early 2000s. This excursus traces the 'threads', as Brenner notes, of what he believes is a complex 'problematique' in regard to the mobilization of scalar narratives in depicting the current urban condition. With nods to his later 2000s work, this includes his critique of urban growth regimes (ch. 7) and also critical pieces on the complexity of thinking about scale in a context of uneven development and multilayered governance (ch. 8).

As Brenner argues at the book's outset, urban researchers need to start from a more specific discussion of Castell's urban question as a scale question and explore applying a 'scale-attuned' ethos to a deeper engagement with the 'scalar imaginaries' that underpin contemporary urban restructuring. The book finishes, unsurprisingly, with Brenner's more recent focus since 2010 on planetary urbanization—even advocating for stepping beyond 'scale centrism' and methodological 'city-ism' (ch. 9)—and it concludes with a further move towards what Brenner calls a 'polymorphic theorization': challenging the purpose and positionality of urban theory in an age where even 'urbanization' has become an 'intellectually imperialistic' master concept. As Brenner argues in conclusion to this wide-ranging and mentally taxing examination of his threads of the scalar urban problematique, critical urban theorists have a fundamental role to play in terms of the collective imagination and widespread 'city effect' that has brought the 'urban age' to the fore in many fields and stages. It is a role which demands continuous reflexivity and a propensity for constant theoretical re-examination, open to changing theoretical bases and against universalist logics.

This proposed theoretical 'renovation' is built around Brenner's (and to a degree Christian Schmid's) theorization of extended urbanization and the 'implosions/explosions' of the contemporary urban condition underpinned by capitalist processes. Those who have yet to

engage with Neil Brenner will find in this book a dense and deep read into nearly three decades of complex spatial-political thinking about urban theory. Those well attuned to Brenner's scholarship will recognize a continuous effort towards recasting Castells and Lefebvre in dialogue with 'new' urban questions and changing conditions of planetary urbanism: symptomatic of this, for instance, is the reading and re-reading of figures 10.1 and 10.12 (p. 387) calling for a careful consideration of decades-old statements and stances. We are still going back to Andrew Sayer's 'what is the urban' question, yet *New Urban Spaces* also offers something quite surprising: ultimately the book calls for going beyond the planetary urbanization debate.

The heavily theoretical approach taken by Brenner can of course lead to some degree of scepticism. As Jean-Paul Addie succinctly put it in another review of the book in *Regional Studies*, much of *New Urban Spaces* offers a pretty limited engagement with the everyday materiality of the urban processes at stake. Perhaps we should not expect any new empirical material though, given that the real value of *New Urban Spaces* lies very much in a quite unique approach to autocritique instead. Indeed, it might be misleading to read Brenner's admirable effort on any terms other than its own. This is essentially, as Brenner puts it himself, a 'second order' tome discussing the logic of urban theorizing and the role of scale in it.

Brenner's intervention comes in after bitter peer-review and social media debates on the value of 'planetary' thinking about the contemporary urban condition. Yet perhaps those who expect *New Urban Spaces* to take an even firmer stance might be disappointed—or pleasantly surprised. Brenner is advocating here for a conscious stance on the way we theorize the urban: one that is against finding a single ontological foundation that settles the urban question 'once and for all' and is open to critically examining not just the object of our studies, but our own studies in themselves. In fact, Brenner's call might even be contra theory, read monistically as a firm entity, and pro relentless theor*izing* and continuous reflexivity.

In that, *New Urban Spaces*—and its last chapter and afterword in particular—offers in my view a fundamental contribution, both to recent and current debates focusing on the nature of urban theory per se, and more generally to a broader conceptualization of our role as urban scholars. It raises key questions around the changing positionality of urban scholars, and about

whether we should lay our previous work to rest within its historical framing or instead constantly revisit it whilst we grapple with the changing (and unequal) realities around us. Against a backdrop of the contradictions and perversions of current capitalist modes of urbanization, Brenner highlights clearly the urgency of this conversation. In his view, it is a matter of taking a clearer stance vis-à-vis critical theorizing, 'or else bust' (p. 329). The onus is now on urban scholars to respond to this challenge and to prove that the urban theory debate is alive and well, because it is certainly very much needed.

<REVIEWER TAG LINE (END-OF-TEXT)/AFFILIATION>
Michele Acuto, University of Melbourne

<REVIEW 2>
<H1>Andy Pike, Peter O'Brien, Tom Strickland, Graham Thrower and John Tomaney 2019: *Financialising City Statecraft and Infrastructure*. Cheltenham and Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar</H1>

Fiscally and institutionally, neoliberalism strains local governments. Its minimalist ideology combines severe spending restrictions with the downward devolution of service responsibility. How has this venture, now decades long, reshaped the institution of local government? This is the key research concern of Andy Pike *et al.*'s *Financialising City Statecraft and Infrastructure*. More specifically, they respond to the question: what impact has this devolution had on the character of local infrastructure?

The short answer, according to the authors, is that local governments are not faring well. The research they report on in this volume comprises an in-depth report on the ways that local governments in England have adapted to this new reality. Because local governments are encouraged to seek out private investment for infrastructure projects, they are constrained in their policy choices. To attract private capital, projects have to be attractive to private investors, and that effectively means they potentially have to yield enough revenue—through either direct user charges and/or government supplementation—to create sufficient returns to satisfy the

expectations of global capital markets. Given that reality, the most favoured infrastructure investments are not the ones with the largest social yields—which, as a matter of principle, should always be prime for public investments. Instead, the criterion of promising private returns becomes the tail which wags the dog.

Moreover, given that the English economy is heavily spatially skewed towards the Greater London Region, the devolution behind this change in investment policy is itself not equitable. Despite official statements to the contrary about an even-handed policy, Pike *et al*. point out that the central government is compelled to afford special and favourable treatment to this critical region. It is the prime engine of the English—and by extension, UK—economy. This further distorts the spread of development towards the national capital. Absent a larger external economic driver miraculously appearing in the outlying locales, local control and local public sector entrepreneurship—no matter how excellent—is constrained in its investment choices. In general, these therefore tend to reduce down to infrastructure investments which are intended (hopefully) to revive activity in older stagnant central commercial core areas.

The investor appeal of the public private partnerships (PPPs) that neoliberal ideology promotes is straightforward. It holds out the promise of safe and high rates of return. Safe, because the sources of cash flow come from the government and hence there are virtual (if not explicit) protections for the invested capital. And while high rates of return are of course always a relative matter, in the current era of low to negative interest rates, the positive returns promised by PPPs are especially alluring.

Where does all the investment capital come from? Over the last four decades neoliberal tax cutting and deregulation have facilitated an upward redistribution of global income and wealth. The large piles of accumulated cash sitting in sovereign wealth funds and various structures of private equity and pension funds are attracted by the promise of large rewards via infrastructure PPPs. It is these piles of cash that form the background against which the financialization analysed in this volume occurs.

Given this reality, the authors conclude that the results aggravate rather than ameliorate the regional inequality inherent in the neoliberal project. Given that history cannot be undone,

the importance of this volume lies in the authors' desire to begin the process of repair. Hence the value of this book is twofold: the authors provide an in-depth and extensive literature review of the larger subject matter—financialization—and along with this they present the empirical results of their own studies.

Pike *et al*. recognize the dilemmas these financial arrangements are creating for local governments. The worst of it is that the financialization into which local governments have been forced effectively locks them into long-term payment obligations. Many of these obligations can only become more burdensome and increasingly untenable as time passes. Absent renegotiation, this situation is placing severe constraints on the ability of local governments to address urgent and ever-changing social problems. The authors see their research not as the final word on the issue but rather as an important work in progress. They provide guide posts for future action: principally, finding ways to increase citizen engagement and depoliticize the management which is inherent when private investors are actively interested in local outcomes. These proposals have the virtue of being a bit of a reach politically but nonetheless attainable. They are the radical but reasonable kinds of ideas that can move the political climate in a more progressive direction.

The work in this volume is the next step in a field of scholarship which extends back over three decades of excellent comparative cost studies on the futility of much of the privatization which has occurred. More often than not, privatization costs government significantly more than direct provision. This is in part due to the uniqueness of needed products, and in part to the age-old reality of the political economics of public contracting. The latter phenomenon predictably emerges whenever there is but a small coterie of bidders and government is the single buyer. It is this complexity that provides the context for attempts by local government to deploy value capture mechanisms entrepreneurially in order to leverage inventive market-oriented solutions to the governance problems thrust upon them.

The volume can be viewed at once as excellent research and a frustratingly difficult read. The excellence derives from the thoroughness of the literature reviewed and the research conducted. The frustration is the lack of tight editing and the vagueness of the

recommendations. The second of these two issues is understandable, given the authors' view on how much more we still need to know. The first is another matter, for there is a great deal of repetition throughout the chapters of this book. As it stands, *Financialising City Statecraft and Infrastructure* is a research report containing much repetition which could easily be removed without degrading the important findings. Nonetheless, the book represents substantial scholarship of import for academic and policy experts alike.

<REVIEWER TAG LINE (END-OF-TEXT)/AFFILIATION>
Elliott Sclar, Columbia University

<REVIEW 3>
<H1>Vincent Mosco 2019: *The Smart City in a Digital World*. Bingley: Emerald Publishing</H1>

This is a book that challenges the current excitement about 'smart cities', a buzzword that Vincent Mosco critically dissects as another of the 'sublime visions', like 'garden cities' and 'postmodern cities', that continually resurface as urban mythologies. The book is divided into eight chapters that tie together his earlier critical work on big data, cloud computing, the 'internet of things' and 'the next Internet', with a primary focus on the high-tech corporations that are managing the physical, social and governing transformations of the urban built environment. As a trained sociologist and New York City (Little Italy) native, Mosco is attuned to the values espoused by Jane Jacobs about the organic character and development of cities. Little Italy—once one of the many thriving ethnic communities made up of 50 square blocks in the City—is now little more than a kitschy mini theme-park of less than three.

At the same time that he fears for the diminishing quality of urban life for most American citizens and denizens, Mosco also provides a discussion on how particular cities such as Barcelona and Amsterdam stand out for putting the digital turn in urban planning into the hands of citizens. This had made a significant difference in determining whom such new technology-mediated cities are serving; what Mosco calls 'democracy by design'. At the other end is

Singapore (actually a city-state) that is under strict government control and run by a de facto single party, the PAP, that crushes any oppositional challenges. The government obsessively monitors the behaviour of the citizenry with sensors, cameras, GPS devices ubiquitously attached to public transportation, taxis, parks, buildings, parking lots and highways, and spies on the public's internet use. Its technical planners call it 'E3A'—'Everyone, Everything, Everywhere, All the Time'. Singapore also collects communication data on Malaysia, which it shares with other countries, including the US. This is a model that US government planners may want to emulate if they can keep the likes of Edward Snowden, Julian Assange and whistle-blowers in general under control or locked up.

Mosco broadly outlines the history of the US urban market and the government networks and supply chains that prepared the forces of production and the state to break down the barriers of space and time as part of a national and later global hegemonic quest. Today, he notes, San Francisco—the hub of Silicon Valley's electronic industries—is tied to other high-tech centres including Shenzhen, Shanghai, London and Mumbai, just as New York, Hong Kong, London, Shanghai and Tokyo are linked as financial hubs. But impressive as these stronghold world cities may be, it is not their technological power that brings about 'smart cities', Mosco argues, but rather the dialectics of preceding patterns of accumulation in the world capitalist system challenged by the collective intelligence and experiences of their denizens and visitors.

This is an important point, as too many technology enthusiasts bind their imaginations to technology devoid of any embedded politics or political economy. The threat to urban life is that cities provide the economies and populations of scale that enable and attract cable companies, internet providers, smart phone manufacturers, associated industries and social media companies like Google and Facebook to penetrate and commodify every nook and cranny of the human personality, behaviour and movement. The notion of 'smart' technology can only be properly understood if we ask: smart for whom?

Mosco critiques the massive corporate building sprees like 'Zucktown', adjacent to Facebook's complex in Menlo Park, California, and Disney's 'Next Internet' cruise ships and its Orlando smart city resort and nearby simulacrum 'New Urbanism' suburb, Celebration. The

latter at least partly inspired the film 'The Truman Show', which was made in nearby Seaside, Florida, another lily-white master-planned community. Cities planned from above are unlikely to resolve the pressing problems that most American cities face: homelessness, broken infrastructure, school underfunding, overcrowded classrooms and high tuition fees, large pockets of poverty, the lack of affordable day-care, underemployment, environmental crises, violence, discrimination and other social problems—none of which is fixable simply by way of technological innovation.

The smart city literature has paid little attention to climate change. And indeed, as Mosco points out, far from being a clean technology, data transmissions require enormous amounts of energy which has profound implications for environmental protection. The internet system already has the same CO_2 footprint as global air travel, and that doesn't include the energy consumed in manufacturing and disposing (e-waste) of the billions of digital devices. The increased use of digital technology is expected to account for 8% of all electricity usage worldwide. And quite apart from this kind of violence against the environment is the violence directed at citizens' rights to privacy and political autonomy through mass surveillance. The Chinese 'social credit' system has become a dystopian model of population command-and-control where an all-seeing state and corporate institutions reward or punish citizens by controlling access to aspirational achievements (e.g. housing, schooling, work) based on their reputational scores collected via facial recognition and big data analysis technology. Meanwhile, China is closing in on the US in the development of advanced surveillance technology using artificial intelligence (AI) and may already be ahead in using AI applications in housing, hotels, higher education and factories.

Mosco argues that technology should be put to use not for smart cities but for just and culturally, ethnically and racially diverse cities based on citizen-led commons thinking. What is being rendered as the 'smart city' should perhaps be called the 'panoptic city', he says, governed by all-seeing state and corporate entities of the type already exposed in the NSA and Google scandals. The rhetorical and technological-determinist language which associates 'revolution' with technological change has little to do with the real meaning of that term, as people are just

as likely to be oppressed by technology (e.g. through the automation of industry that has displaced millions of skilled and semi-skilled workers) and the algorithms of repression as to be emancipated by it. There are pockets of resistance throughout the world, a few examples being New York City's rejection of an Amazon headquarters construction, growing restrictions on automobile use in many cities, organized struggles against the Canadian government-Google smart city development project in the Quayside section of Toronto, bans on facial recognition software in many cities, and numerous other examples.

This latest book by Mosco is an important source for urban studies and communications scholars as well as urban planners, technology students, sociologists and political economists and others concerned about the future of cities as spaces for people and not just for private profit.

<REVIEWER TAG LINE (END-OF-TEXT)/AFFILIATION>
Gerald Sussman, Portland State University

<REVIEW 4>
<H1>Brett Story 2019: *Prison Land: Mapping Carceral Power Across Neoliberal America.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press</H1>

Prison Land excavates the expansive logics of the prison across the United States, understanding the dynamics of carcerality through an investigation of commercial real-estate markets, gentrifying neighbourhoods, extractive landscapes and other spaces previously seen as beyond the frame of human confinement. Interpreting the prison not simply as a structure of captivity but as a set of relationships, Brett Story methodically argues for how the logic of carcerality is deeply intertwined with the agendas of capitalism, enrolled to restructure social life hand-in-glove with widespread processes of neoliberalization. Understood relationally and located within and beyond the site of the prison, carcerality is found within the circuits of finance, labour, state governance and land in heavily racialized and exploitative forms.

One of Story's main contributions is to emphasize the interdependent relationship between urban restructuring and carceral power. Not only does the expansion of the carceral state depend upon neoliberal urban restructuring, but urban restructuring depends upon the carceral state. This is best evidenced in the book's first two chapters and most persuasively argued in chapter 1. Here, Story explores how Detroit, a city recovering from decades of deindustrialization and decline, is increasingly governed by capital. The relationships between the large-scale real-estate buy-ups by a local billionaire and the subsequent implementation of a significant private surveillance apparatus in conjunction with heightened policing of the poor throw the deep connections between urban restructuring and the carceral state into sharp relief.

In chapter 2, Story's emphasis on this connection between the strategies of policing and capital accumulation reappears as she turns her focus onto community-based programmes including 'alternatives-to-incarceration' in Brownsville, Brooklyn. One dimension of Story's argument—that community programmes assume and reproduce an individualization of responsibility for crime—is well-supported by quotes from community leaders and proponents of alternatives to incarceration programmes. As Story convincingly argues, this ideology neglects the social and structural conditions that help to construct the problem of 'crime' and therefore widens the scope for police intervention.

Story's corollary argument that these police strategies 'securitize real-estate investment capital searching for profit through the gentrification of systematically disinvested neighbourhoods' (p. 73) seems more speculative. She critically analyses a statement by a supporter of a public education campaign who is hopeful that the initiative will change perceptions of Brownsville as being excessively violent: she interprets this account as revealing 'the conflicting agendas ['real-estate pressures and obstructions to gentrification'] underlying and *perhaps* underwriting these interventions on the ground' (p. 67; emphasis added). Similarly, Story conjectures that another community-based programme's 'effect *may* also be to ameliorate investment anxieties and calm would-be property buyers' (p. 74; emphasis added). It is unclear whether private property and profit is 'underwriting' these programmes as well as indirectly benefiting from them. More evidence is needed to support Story's concluding

theoretical statement made at the end of chapter 2 that the imperatives of profit and private property 'underwrite much of the state intervention in low-income neighborhoods of colour' (p. 75).

In the following three case studies, Story locates carcerality in the deindustrialized coalfields of eastern Kentucky (Ch. 3), the 'liminal' space of a prison bus in New York (Ch. 4), and policing tactics in the homes, neighbourhoods and communities of Los Angeles (Ch. 5). *Prison Land* is a book about 'neoliberal America', and she incorporates key processes of neoliberalization into her reading of carcerality. Her accounts reference the devolution of responsibility, rolling back of social provisions and production of surplus labour populations as important drivers in the construction of prisons, expanded expenditure on policing and incarceration (despite state-welfare shrinkage) and offloading of labour onto the families of the incarcerated. The 'carceral turn' is viewed as a spatial fix, and brings with it racialization, criminalization and violence upon the already marginalized.

Story's conception of neoliberalism is at times ambiguous. The tentacles of 'neoliberalism' are found in buses, electronic monitoring devices, small post-industrial towns, parks and a variegated array of other localities and objects. It is a spectre which frames the entire account. Indeed, it is treated as an all-encompassing driver: Story's account operates '[b]y geographically excavating the relationships that render the prison system productive for neoliberalism in particular...' (p. 10). She finds instantiations of carceral power—working in conjunction with neoliberalism—right across America, and it is worth asking why she selected these particular cases. Are there places in the United States where the carceral state has not extended its reach? In constructing neoliberalism more robustly, Story's chosen locations of carcerality may assume a more persuasive footing. Nevertheless, her empirical work is novel and invites questions about the interrelationships between the carceral state and neoliberalism.

Aside from these minor critiques, *Prison Land* is theoretically and empirically rich and it makes a strong normative contribution. The book is closely written as a constructive critique of the prison reform movement, with Story advocating for wider structural transformations in line with an abolitionist position. This abolitionism is most forcefully captured in a quote from Moten

and Harney in the book's conclusion: that the goal of an abolitionist movement is 'not so much the abolition of prisons but the abolition of a society that could have prisons' (p. 167). Her position is that abolishing prisons 'will fail so long as the terms we use to describe or even denounce imprisonment hinge on the assumption that prisons emerge out of a logic of punishment, rather than vice versa' (p. 170). Story advocates for struggles against systemic unemployment, precarious low wages and a race-making carceral state apparatus, and asks us to see these struggles as one and the same.

Yet we were left wondering why imprisonment and punishment remain a fact of life in places where strong wages, collective representation and cultures of community cohesion and trust (i.e. in Scandinavia) have retained some coherence under neoliberalism—all things which Story considers essential for rebuilding a society free from carceral power. The book, perhaps strategically, omits engagement with the role of punishment in society, leaving space for a normative debate about what kind of system should replace the American carceral regime. Does abolitionism entail eventually abolishing all forms of punishment and incarceration?

Prison Land is an ambitious narration of carceral power in the contemporary moment. The book arrives at a particularly critical juncture where the mainstream reform movement of which Story is critical is itself experiencing a serious challenge from the administration of Donald Trump, intent on re-invoking a law-and-order society that harks back to bygone days of more explicit carcerality. It will not only appeal to anyone interested in new developments in the study of carcerality but also to those who wish to observe a productive study in how perspectives from geography are utilized to reveal truths about social dynamics and political economic change.

<REVIEWER TAG LINE (END-OF-TEXT)/AFFILIATION>
Brandon Hillier and Max Cohen, The University of British Columbia

<REVIEW 5>
<H1>Amita Bhide and Himanshu Burte (eds.) 2018: *Urban Parallax: Policy and the City in Contemporary India*. Delhi: Yoda Press<H1>

Urban Parallax offers a powerful critique of major urban policies that are shaping the future of cities in India. As suggested by the title keyword 'parallax' (different views of the same object when seen from different positions), a Delhi-centric view of urban conditions in India differs from the perspectives of, for example, municipal governments or local communities. Instead of imposing standard policy packages in top-down fashion, the book argues that urban policymaking in India should be more imaginative and sensitive to regional variations and historical power structures in local communities. By assessing urban policies across sectors (housing, land and infrastructure) and cities (Delhi, Mumbai, Chennai, Hyderabad and Mizoram), this book contributes to the current scholarship on urban India that often focuses on single sectors or individual cities.

The chapters range from comprehensive assessments of urban policies to detailed ethnographic studies, but invariably they address three themes: the nature and extent of urbanization in India, the adequacy of current urban policies, and the prospects for the country's urban future.

First, the book challenges the narrative that India is rapidly urbanizing as people move from the countryside to cities, and that urbanization is driving economic growth. The opening chapters, based on census and survey data, show that urbanization in India has been neither fast nor driven by migration, and that the link between urbanization and economic growth is weak. India's urbanization rate is only 33% according to the national census, which uses a stringent definition of what is urban. But even with more relaxed definitions of the urban, India's urbanization rate trails far behind that of many other developing countries. Urban population growth is driven not by migration, but by the growing number of census-towns: urbanizing small towns that, despite still being governed by rural village councils, are counted as urban in the census. Moreover, Indian cities are far from being engines of economic growth, as commonly assumed. The potential of Indian cities is not fully tapped because municipal institutions are weak, the urban workforce is poorly trained, and the caste system stifles creativity. If cities elsewhere are engines of economic growth, then cities in India are 'driverless engines' (see the chapter by Mukhopadhyay).

Second, the book critiques Delhi-centric policy prescriptions and argues for policies flexible enough to address local problems. One example is the centrally funded Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURM), which aimed to improve infrastructure and governance in large cities but ignored smaller urban centres. To access funding allocated through this programme, some localities rushed to form brand-new municipal governments that clashed with existing village councils and led to poor coordination and the fragmentation of power across state agencies. Another example is the affordable housing programme (Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana, 2015–2022) that aims to provide housing for all in urban areas by 2022. In this case, the 'affordable housing' is priced beyond the reach of the urban poor and many projects are constructed on the urban periphery with poor access to public transit. The affordable housing programme does not address those citizens who lack tenure (home and land ownership)—a large proportion of residents in Indian cities. Because of the lack of consideration of local specificities, many of the central and state urban policies are resisted, subverted or adapted by cities and communities. For example, the Municipal Corporation of Greater Mumbai did not implement a poverty-alleviation programme mandated by Delhi since the programme required significant effort and offered few returns, and homeowners and local officials in Maharashtra resisted a state policy to demolish and regularize illegal sub-divisions (i.e. *gunthewari*).

Third, the book paints a sombre picture of India's urban future: a country of fragmented metropolises inhabited by the haves and have-nots. The information technology (IT) sector has been driving India's economic growth, but it has limited potential for job generation since only those with higher education can get a job in the IT industry. The manufacturing sector does not yet offer many secure and well-paid jobs. On Chennai's periphery, rural families pool resources for their children's education, but their children graduate from local training schools and find only temporary low-paid factory jobs. In sprawling Hyderabad (India's IT capital), many neighbourhoods house poor migrants who do not benefit from the high-tech boom. In Mumbai, the top one per cent reside in luxury villas designed by starchitects, while nearly half of the city's population live in slums. Ignoring these stark inequalities, policymakers in Delhi make policy

prescriptions—e.g. JNNURM, low-income housing, the Smart Cities initiative—that distribute resources unevenly and only further exacerbate the existing disparities.

The book's contributors—leading India-based urban experts—make concrete suggestions on how to make policymaking more democratic, transparent and flexible to meet local needs. Examples include decentralization (devolving more power and resources to municipal governments); opening up the policymaking process to ideas and voices from local communities; better integration of spatial planning with economic development plans and empowering municipal planners; and challenging the existing assumptions behind certain policies—such as the notion of property ownership—which do not apply to a large Indian urban population. Such measures would improve coordination between different levels of the state as well as between the state and the communities. The book is essential reading for students interested in urban policies, politics and comparative urbanization.

<REVIEWER TAG LINE (END-OF-TEXT)/AFFILIATION>
Xuefei Ren, Michigan State University

<REVIEW 6>
<H1>Guillermo Jajamovich 2018: *Puerto Madero in Motion* [*Puerto Madero en Movimiento*]. Buenos Aires: Teseo</H1>

Policy mobility—the relational and constructivist process by which cities, experts and everyday actors circulate urban policy models—is a sprawling field. Guillermo Jajamovich's *Puerto Madero in Motion* seeks to tame this bundle of concepts and assess its value in a prominent city of the global South. In so doing, Jajamovich injects needed historicism into patterns of transatlantic policy influence that span decades, if not centuries. Adopting the analytic lens of Large Urban Projects (*grandes proyectos urbanos*), *Puerto Madero in Motion* sheds light on the breakneck global adoption of sprawling riverfronts, stadia and entertainment districts that inhere intricate webs of infrastructure and ecologies and also, increasingly, celebrity architects, global design idioms and iconic city images built for travel.

Buenos Aires' redesigned port, Puerto Madero, starkly illustrates this process. Conceived during the country's neoliberal restructuring in the late 1980s and 90s, its original Catalan architects plied the well-known waters of uneven exchange between Spain and Latin America. But that is where straightforward geopolitical narratives end. The Buenos Aires case demonstrates the multidirectional character of this exchange, the many kinds of ideological, political and economic programmes that 'best practices' are called upon to sustain, and the way sites of transnational learning can become dominant models themselves, while reshaping North-South influence.

Puerto Madero in Motion is broken up into seven chapters, with the first two laying out a conceptual vision and historical background. Jajamovich situates the book within debates around postcolonial urbanism, policy mobility and an older literature on Latin American dependency. Chapter 3 examines how Argentina's market-friendly national government solicited a Catalan plan to convert the abandoned downtown port into high-end residential and office space. Prominent Argentine architects, however, successfully pushed back against this model, torpedoing the brazenly market-centric logic of Barcelona's famed planners and architects. A revised vision included less intensive land use and incorporated ideas developed through Argentina's Central Society of Architects, challenging models of policy circulation that suggest the unencumbered power of Northern experts to reshape Southern cities.

Nonetheless, the public entity that oversaw the port's redevelopment (CAPMSA) maintained the Catalan model of public sale of the port's land in exchange for private investments. Jajamovich traces the trajectories of important CAPMSA figures in this chapter, demonstrating the need for historical perspectives that take existing networks seriously. By looking at prominent Spanish architects such as Jordi Borja and their longstanding relationships with local professionals, the book situates Catalan influence within a broader historical relationship. Jajamovich suggests that the policy mobility literature tends towards a type of presentism that leaves unexamined these erstwhile historical linkages and forms of influence.

The following chapter details how Puerto Madero has itself become a global model. The CAPMSA leveraged Puerto Madero's redevelopment into international consulting and

architectural competitions in both the global North and South, while promoting its distinctive public-private model of land sale and ownership. This reality upends straightforward views of global design mimicry, which would suggest that southern laggards take up bespoke versions of northern planning paradigms. Instead, Jajamovich shows how Puerto Madero has become a touchstone for adaptive reuse in cities across the globe.

Jajamovich is on firm ground in elaborating these multidirectional travels and the messy process by which urban designs become celebrated in the most dominant expert circles. The analysis becomes more slippery, however, when we examine *the degree to which* certain models gain influence transnationally, even if their origins are in the global South and their afterlives pop up in design competitions in cities like Memphis or Rio (as is the case for Puerto Madero). To a large degree, the Puerto Madero model remained tethered to national and regional networks of professionals, bridged through prominent Buenos Aires planners and their private consulting firms, and occasionally orbiting through transnational experts such as Borja. The Byzantine multidirectionality of these travels, however, can obscure the conditions under which Puerto Madero became mobile.

In the end, the density and reach of local networks seem to show that models from the global South do travel, but they may be positioned outside the most dominant (and dominating) nodes of global urbanism. A challenge for the literature more generally is to account for the relative power of brokers (such as Borja) who generate multidirectional exchange but are often looped through expert networks integrated with the most high-flying cities of the global North (such as Barcelona). Implicitly, then, this chapter points to the unequal travels of expertise, shot through with both network hierarchy and directionality; an empirical point that could be further elucidated in future research.

Chapter 5 provides a compelling study of the efforts of the CAPMSA to consult on a former rail mega-project in the Argentine city of Mendoza. The 'Mendoza-Madero' development was eventually scuttled, yet the national prestige of Puerto Madero and the professional networks of CAPMSA served to bring Buenos Aires and Mendoza officials together. Jajamovich uses this case to draw out a fascinating story about subnational knowledge

exchange, local politics (the project met with fierce resistance), and the reasons certain case studies are called on to facilitate urban mega-projects. The case demonstrates the complexity of policy mobilities beyond Manichean narratives of North and South and the role for state actors to emerge as 'suppliers' (versus 'demanders') of urban models. Indeed, the nationally linked experts who envisioned the Mendoza project drew upon professional networks within Argentina and at times used the model's national prominence as a form of legitimation.

The final empirical chapter documents the local and transnational promotion of Puerto Madero and the way CAPMSA officials distilled its relevance for different publics. In the end, the Puerto Madero case points to a politically contingent process of policy circulation in which models are selected to sustain larger political programmes, forms of recognition and acclaim. Jajamovich's rich contribution points us towards this central insight while providing a powerful set of methodological tools that future scholars should take up with the same historicism, breadth of interdisciplinarity and expertise that Jajamovich has brought to bear in *Puerto Madero in Motion*.

<REVIEWER TAG LINE (END-OF-TEXT)/AFFILIATION>
Jacob Lederman, University of Michigan-Flint