principle in this unequal process. Women are more likely to provide family care, and many of the medical care workers involved in the system tend to be women as well. Normative expectations for family caregivers are intimately wrapped up with larger gender role expectations, but the boundaries between these roles become unclear for many caregivers. For instance, reflecting on her own lived experience as a caregiver, Mong notes "Surely this process—whatever it was—was way beyond mothering" (p. 3). Future research should further explore these boundaries and how a caregiver's sense of self and wanting to be perceived as a "good" caregiver may tie into phenomena such as "intensive mothering."

Overall, Mong lays important groundwork that I hope others will build on. *Taking Care* provides a sweeping view of the experiences of family caregivers providing medical care and the structural limits that often work against them. Future work could also explore the experience of receiving medical care from the care recipients' side, potentially providing dyadic analyses comparing the two sides of the experience. As acknowledged by Mong in the appendix, the study's sample is mostly white. Future research could benefit from examining the experiences of family caregivers among a more diverse sample. Mong's book contributes to a growing set of studies that show that making families responsible for care but providing few supports exacerbates inequalities. Care should be understood and regarded as critical social infrastructure.

Governing the Urban in China and India: Land Grabs, Slum Clearance, and the War on Air Pollution, by **Xuefei Ren.** Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2020. 208 pp. $29.95 paper. ISBN: 9780691203393.

Zachary Levenson
University of California-Berkeley
Zachary.Levenson@gmail.com

Xuefei Ren begins her latest book by challenging a stubborn exceptionalism that characterizes Chinese urban studies. "Urban development in China," she insists, "is not as unique and incomparable as experts maintain" (p. 7). *Governing the Urban in China and India: Land Grabs, Slum Clearance, and the War on Air Pollution* is Ren's attempt to deprovincialize through comparison, situating both Chinese and Indian cities—arguably the most exceptionalized anywhere on the planet—against the backdrop of the growing interdisciplinary field of global urban studies.

The literature on urban governance in both national contexts is characterized by a narrow focus on either state capacity or regime type, both of which tend to yield reductive binaries: strong or weak states, democratic or authoritarian regimes. Against these prevailing perspectives, Ren introduces a novel thesis: urban governance in China is territorial, whereas in India it is associational. A set of territorial institutions in China renders political decision-making fairly straightforward, leaving little room for contestation and transforming Chinese cities into "relatively autonomous political economic units" (p. 10). But in Indian cities, there are no such territorial institutions, leaving room for maneuver, which means that political outcomes depend on alliance-building among all sorts of actors, state-related and otherwise.

After a brilliant second chapter in which Ren shows how both governments use urban-rural demarcation as a technology of social control, she turns to the meat of the book: three case studies across which she demonstrates the explanatory power of her territorial/associational opposition. In a chapter on protests against land grabs, she compares the notorious Wukan uprising to the peasant struggle against Left Front-led dispossession in Singur. In the former case, villagers fought back against their council's attempt to appropriate land in order to facilitate investment. Their strategy was to appeal to the central government, demonstrating their allegiance to state and party, and to invoke the unambiguous legitimacy of their claim to collectively own the land the local government hoped to seize. The territorial institution of the *hukou* made this quite clear. But the lack of such institutions in the Singur case generated indeterminacy. This opened up space for an upstart social movement-cum-political party to challenge the government,

building alliances with other parties and NGOs. This was, in other words, an associational form of mobilization.

Ren's second case study on slum clearance advances a similar line of argument. In Guangzhou in the early 2000s, the municipal government attempted to clear a number of ''urban villages,'' urban informal settlements in which residents often paradoxically have the status of rural collective landowners. Again, residents' claim to their homes was clear-cut in accordance with territorial institutions: those without *hukou* and village membership lacked any legitimate claim to their housing. Territorial institutions ''divided residents into different groups with unequal rights and entitlement to compensation'' (p. 65). This much was clear. But in Mumbai, when the state government attempted to evict shack residents from an informal settlement next to the airport, there were no clear-cut criteria for eligibility. Who would be relocated? In the absence of strong territorial institutions, it was uncertain. ''Actors from the state, the private sector, and civil society'' (p. 76) formed contending coalitions, the lifeblood of associational politics, and negotiated over eligibility for compensation. After reaching a stalemate, the relocation project fell apart.

Finally, Ren thinks about these divergent paradigms of urban governance in relation to air pollution control efforts in Beijing and Delhi. In the former case, it is clear who is ultimately responsible for air quality: a series of territorial authorities—municipal, district, town, and township—whose leaders are worried about retaining their own jobs. Meanwhile, there is little room for NGOs to pressure the government, since their activity ''can still be construed as subverting state power, spreading rumors, and damaging national interests'' (p. 104). In Delhi, by contrast, there is no such designated territorial authority, meaning that multi-sectoral coalitions cobbled together by NGOs tend to set the agenda. Through public interest litigation campaigns and mobilization of the media, NGOs rather than the municipal government ''drafted the city's clean air action plan.'' Ren goes to great pains to show that this opposition cannot be read as simply state-led development in China as opposed to market-led development in India. No market actors were even involved in the latter case. Instead, it was characterized by associational politics in the absence of strong territorial institutions.

While I found Ren's analysis compelling and well substantiated throughout, I was curious about the applicability of her key concepts elsewhere. If Chinese cities are not truly exceptional, then territorial politics must exist in other urban regimes. By contrast, I wondered whether associational politics was too broad a concept for comparative purposes. If, as Ren argues in a penultimate historical chapter, ''[a]ssociational life is not unique to India and can be identified in all industrial democracies'' (p. 130), we wind up where we started: China as the exception to the remainder of the global South. I also wondered about the relationship between the two concepts, territorial and associational. Are they poles on a spectrum, or are they two among countless possible ideal types? Do associational politics always emerge in the absence of strong territorial institutions? By extending the concepts to additional national contexts, even if only in passing, we might get a fuller sense of their usefulness.

Likewise, it was periodically unclear to me that the territorial-associational opposition was distinct from what Ren characterizes as the prevailing views on urban governance: state capacity and regime type. For example, in the case of slum clearance in India, isn't the ''fragmentation of state power'' (p. 90) she identifies precisely an argument about state capacity (or lack thereof)? Or in the case of the struggle over air quality in Beijing, wasn't regime type everything? Insofar as ''the role of nonstate actors has been confined to information disclosure'' (p. 102), I wondered whether the presence of strong territorial institutions was not in fact synonymous with authoritarian regimes. Are there cases of territorial politics in non-authoritarian contexts?

From my critical remarks above, it should be clear that I find Ren's opposition particularly generative, and her book is a compelling call for refusing exceptionalism in all its forms. The comparisons she sets up across diverse urban contexts condense an enormous amount of research into a slim volume,

and my primary complaint is that the book isn't longer. But just as Ren develops her concepts both with and against existing theoretical frameworks, it falls on other urban sociologists of the global South to extend, develop, and ultimately modify her hypothesis. Her call to comparison is long overdue, and this ambitious book will be of interest to all scholars of urban politics.

Coming Out to the Streets: LGBTQ Youth Experiencing Homelessness, by **Brandon Andrew Robinson.** Oakland: University of California Press, 2020. 250 pp. $29.95 paper. ISBN: 9780520299276.

William G. Tierney
University of Southern California
wgtiern@usc.edu

Homelessness is a major social issue in the United States in the twenty-first century. The causes of homelessness are endlessly debated, and solutions remain elusive. Young people are particularly challenged by being unhoused. The lack of permanent housing causes disruptions to emotional well-being and education. The result is that homeless youth have among the highest dropout rates from high school and the lowest college-going rate.

Federal legislation, such as the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, and state policies such as those that exist in California, have tried to ameliorate the disadvantages unhoused students face; but they are band-aids rather than solutions. Part of McKinney-Vento, for example, provides bus fare for students so they might remain in the same school even when they move to a different shelter across town. The funding is well-intentioned; but in large cities such as Los Angeles and Houston, the assumption that students will benefit from bus rides that might take close to two hours is flawed. The legislation also requires states to report the number of unhoused students in their schools. Again, the requirement is on target, but in research I conducted most principals in the schools we visited did not know how many students they had who were homeless. The stigma of homelessness keeps students from asking for help. All sorts of clubs exist in high schools, but who wants to join the homeless club?

Enter Brandon Andrew Robinson, an assistant professor of gender and sexuality studies at the University of California-Riverside. His book *Coming Out to the Streets: LGBTQ Youth Experiencing Homelessness* is a welcome addition that sheds light on an understudied group. LGBTQ youth are the largest group of homeless youth on the streets. They are frequently kicked out of their homes by families who reject their sexual orientation, and they all too frequently end up on the streets. They often do not have the wherewithal to navigate the social service bureaucracy to receive services, or they have learned that living on the streets is actually preferable to foster care or group homes.

Robinson's book is a brisk walk through the challenges they face and the resilience they exhibit. The book has a traditional structure of five chapters with an introduction and conclusion. There is also a thoughtful methodological narrative in the appendix pertaining to Robinson's positionality and the challenges of interviewing LGBTQ homeless youth.

The rigor of the qualitative methodological design is admirable. Robinson conducted eighteen months of ethnographic fieldwork from January 2015 to June 2016. In total, he had 700 hours of fieldwork. Most, but not all, of his time was spent at a drop-in center in Austin and an LGBTQ center in San Antonio where he volunteered. He conducted 40 one-hour semi-structured interviews. He also held additional interviews with people who worked with LGBTQ youth.

The first-person narrative is an easy read on an important topic. Robinson provides useful background that positions the challenges LGBTQ youth face before he launches into the interviews and observations. For someone not well-versed in queer or transgender youth or the problems of homelessness, the book serves as a helpful primer.

The book is largely void of a nuanced discussion of federal and state legislation and policies that in part frame queer homeless lives. On one level, the lack of such a discussion is perfectly fine insofar as no book can cover all topics as if it were an encyclopedia