

In the concluding chapter, Fainstein offers a set of urban development recommendations to promote equity, diversity, and democracy. It is hard for me to imagine planners following all these principles. Should all housing developments include units for lower-income groups? Should all megaprojects provide direct benefits to lower-income groups? Should land uses always be mixed?

The book raises two questions. First, can planning a just city only happen in a “progressive” or “social-democratic” regime, as Fainstein seems to suggest? Second, are city planners the best candidates to promote a more just city? In an age of decreasing power and influence of urban and regional planners, they may not have sufficient influence to bring the just city about; and even if they do, planners today are far less likely than 40 years ago to focus on redistribution.

Nevertheless, I recommend *The Just City* to any researcher and student intending to study planning projects and strategies from an urban justice perspective. It is a good introduction to this debate and hopefully will foster future work on tensions between equity, diversity, and democracy. Although just city planning, as Fainstein would like to see it, may be a too ambitious goal, we should at least remain critical of current planning practice, advocate ways to make planning more just based on our research evidence, and get or keep urban justice firmly on the planning research and policy agenda.

Marco Bontje
University of Amsterdam
M.A.Bontje@uva.nl

Noel A. Cazenave, *The Urban Racial State: Managing Race Relations in American Cities* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2011).

At a time when many pundits and politicians see the emergence of a colorblind, post-racial society, social science evidence continues to pile up demonstrating the centrality of race in shaping virtually all aspects of life in the United States. There has been progress to be sure. Acts of explicit, overt racism are far less common. White attitudinal support for, at least, the general principle of equal opportunity, if not the policies to realize that goal, has consistently increased.

But, by almost any measure—income, wealth, homeownership, health, educational attainment, access to credit—the opportunity structure remains infused with race. Acts of intentional prejudice and discrimination occur. Unconscious bias has been demonstrated. Structural and institutional discrimination perpetuate inequities grounded in historical forms of legal discrimination. Cazenave’s *The Urban Racial State*, extends this scholarship by illuminating the role of state agencies and related institutions in preserving white privilege.

Cazenave develops the concept of the urban racial state, by which he means “the political structure and processes of a city and its suburbs that manage race relations in ways that foster and sustain both its own immediate political interests and, ultimately white racial supremacy” (p. xi). He is focusing on the executive branch of local governments, but the urban racial state includes other actors like the “courts, city and regional commissions, school districts, private foundations, university-based research centers, various agencies of the federal racial state and of state-government-level states” (p. 25).

Specifically, he examines the role of community action programs in Syracuse, NY, and New Haven, CT, during the 1950s and 1960s. From personal interviews and archival data, he examines how various community action programs were designed primarily to offer the appearance of addressing various racial problems while basically maintaining the racial status quo. Honing in

on the mayoral administrations of William Walsh in Syracuse and Richard Lee in New Haven, he shows how the urban racial state attempted, generally successfully, to balance the demands of racial justice from the African American community with pushback from the white communities to preserve the status quo. There were occasional cracks. In some cases, insurgency on the part of some parts of the black community were able to break the hold of these administrations and achieve a semblance of justice. But, by and large, the urban racial state accomplished what he claims it was established to do, which was, preserve the racial status quo.

The strength of this book is the detailed examination of several specific community action programs and organizations, the people who worked for and ran them, and their collaborators in city hall, federal agencies, foundations, and other parts of the state. Cazenave details the lives of those who directed and opposed these organizations, their relationships with other key actors, their representations in the media, and their reputations in various communities. Many fascinating personal biographies and the anatomy of several local conflicts are laid out in ways that reveal the dynamics of race relations and racial conflicts during these years.

But these strengths also reflect the limitations of the book. Missing almost entirely is the role of the private sector and particularly the ideology of privatism—the notion that the primary role of government is to act as the junior partner in the local growth machine by nurturing the conditions that facilitate private capital accumulation on the part of entrepreneurs. (This dynamic is noted briefly in a short case study of New Orleans following Katrina in the penultimate chapter but is not central to the core analysis of the book.) As Sam Bass Warner observed, according to this perspective, the primary job of local officials is to keep the peace among individual money makers. The private sector, of course, plays a major role in shaping the opportunity structure confronting African Americans and others. Efforts to achieve racial justice or preserve white privilege involve far more than who runs various community action programs and the outcomes of those programs generally, which is virtually the exclusive focus of the Syracuse and New Haven case studies.

More problematic is an eclectic set of stories from other cities that are noted toward the end of the book. Cazenave offers brief case studies of racial conflict in New York during the Giuliani Administration and New Orleans under Ray Nagin following Katrina. He also provides even briefer comments on recent racial conflicts in Cincinnati, Philadelphia, and several cities where immigration has generated local controversies. But these discussions read more like tacked on references to various racial incidents than any elaboration of the core theses of the book.

What he might have included in place of these anecdotes is more analysis of why the urban racial state failed to maintain the status quo in the few instances he noted where local insurgency did produce some movement toward racial justice. How, and under what circumstances these few victories were achieved will, hopefully, be the focus of future research.

Still, *The Urban Racial State* provides important insights pertaining to the complexities of urban politics, racial inequality, and the development of metropolitan areas generally. It would be a useful text in a graduate or upper-level undergraduate course on cities or race. Understanding and addressing these dynamics are critical if we are to make significant progress toward a colorblind world.

Gregory D. Squires
George Washington University
squires@gwu.edu
