

demonstrates a lack of conceptual ambition. Stating that associated rights, like freedom from torture or political killings, do not belong to the core concept of democracy (p. 33) and are “only” parts of liberal civil liberties represents a missed opportunity to consider the real impact of various indicators on the core concept of electoral democracy. Under the threat of arbitrary torture or political killings, freedom of expression and freedom of association might perish, and the conditions of polyarchy are objectively not met.

It also would have been more ambitious to consider that the liberal component of democracy is still far more essential to the stable functioning of the core electoral concept than are the other principles, but that would have required the introduction of a more hierarchical relationship among the principles and, indeed, could have invited heavy criticism. This initial conceptual convenience is somewhat compensated for by the fact that in its annual democracy reports V-Dem uses the liberal democracy index (LDI) to determine regime characteristics and the extent of autocratization or democratization, which can be seen as a practical recognition of the outstanding importance of the liberal concept of democracy.

Independently from the conceptual debates, during the past several years V-Dem has definitely emerged as the most important provider of quantitative democracy data for scholarly research. For all who contemplate the use of V-Dem data in their work, this book is an essential introduction and guide to the most ambitious, methodologically advanced contemporary democracy-measurement project in the world.

How Party Activism Survives: Uruguay's *Frente Amplio*.

By Verónica Pérez Bentancur, Rafael Piñeiro Rodríguez, and Fernando Rosenblatt. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2020. 216p. \$99.99 cloth.
doi:10.1017/S1537592720003096

— Brandon Van Dyck , Lafayette College
vandyckb@lafayette.edu

How Party Activism Survives: Uruguay's Frente Amplio, by Verónica Pérez Bentancur, Rafael Piñeiro Rodríguez, and Fernando Rosenblatt, is a superb book and a must-read for scholars interested in parties and democracy. Its virtues are many. The writing is concise and plain. The authors pose a clear, important question: Why has grassroots activism persisted in the *Frente Amplio* (FA), unlike in so many other parties? They provide a plausible, interesting answer: that formal rules established at the FA's founding led party activists to reproduce themselves over decades. The book is well organized: the authors effectively introduce the question, argument, and methods; provide necessary context regarding Uruguayan politics and the FA in government; thoroughly describe their dependent variable; elaborate the multiple levels of their argument; and, finally, place the

FA in comparative perspective. Throughout, they make superb use of qualitative methods; indeed, the book is a shining example of transparent, rigorous qualitative research.

The labor-based FA (est. 1971) is the most electorally potent force in Uruguay. Since the country's 1984 transition from military dictatorship to democracy, it has achieved and maintained remarkable electoral success, holding the presidency from 2005 until 2020 and a plurality or majority of seats in the legislative lower house from 2000 to the present. What makes the FA unique, however, is the persistence of its activists. Many successful parties depend on activists in their early years, but after the initial period of party development, party activism usually dwindles. Elites wrest control from the base; volunteer labor gives way to paid work, social action to electoralism. Clientelistic linkages may supplant (or at least come to supplement) programmatic ones. Remarkably, the FA, despite its electoral success, has avoided these outcomes. It remains mass-organic rather than electoral-professional, and programmatic rather than clientelistic.

To this day, thousands of local FA activists meet on a weekly basis to discuss current affairs and party strategy and policy. They monitor voting booths at elections. A large fraction pay dues. They are not clientelistic brokers, in contrast to the Peronist foot soldiers (called *punteros*) who channel services to loyal voters in Argentina. They are not functionaries or officials; only 1 or 2% hold paid positions within the FA apparatus, and fewer than one-quarter hold or have held public office.

Importantly, they constrain the FA-in-government. In 2006, FA activists pressured President Tabaré Vázquez (2005–10) not to sign a free trade agreement with the United States. In 2008, they blocked his attempt to grant amnesty to former officials of the military dictatorship. In general, they reduce the “likelihood of...dramatic policy [switches]” to the center or right (p. 125), helping prevent brand dilution.

The reproduction of activism over decades makes the FA a “deviant case.” Even programmatic, historically mass-based parties such as the Chilean Socialists (PS) and Brazilian Workers' Party (PT) have oligarchized and become electoral-professional since their countries democratized. What made the FA different? Why has it maintained a vibrant, influential activist base, in contrast to more typical cases like the PS and PT? That is the authors' central question. What is their answer?

The authors highlight that grassroots activists were central in founding the FA and that, from the beginning, they demanded a role in internal decision making. The FA leadership acceded, developing two separate structures that remain in place to this day. FA members with political aspirations would join “the coalition”—any of the member organizations that contest for local, regional, and national office under the FA label. Members who wished to engage in activism, but who did not aspire to office, would

join “the movement”: territorial or functional base-level committees.

In 1986, shortly after Uruguay’s transition to democracy, the FA granted one-third of the seats in its highest organs—most importantly, the National Plenary—to delegates from the movement. (Later, the movement’s seat share rose to one-half.) The Plenary is the FA’s supreme decision-making body: it generates the party’s internal statutes, including its official program, and selects its presidential candidates. Any action by the Plenary requires a nearly unanimous vote. Thus, since 1986, the movement has been able to veto any platform proposal or presidential nominee and to block any attempt to change the rules that empower it.

As the authors show, the coalition and movement cannot interfere with each other by design. The movement does not participate in the selection or recruitment of candidates and public officials (except, as noted, at the presidential level). The coalition does not distribute patronage or other resources through the movement, nor does it have a role in the selection of movement delegates. These arrangements ensure that the movement remains autonomous from the party-in-government, preventing the FA as a whole from oligarchizing or shifting too far in the direction of electoral-professionalism.

Notably, there is little incentive for the FA-in-government to maintain the movement; the FA “has enough resources...to operate without volunteers” (p. 106). But the movement’s power provides committed adherents with individual and collective incentives to become or remain activists, as well as to recruit new ones. FA activists believe, with reason, that they significantly shape the FA’s identity, program, and policies. Because they value their efficacy, they have a vested interest in surviving.

A simple theoretical question lies at the book’s heart: Under what conditions does party activism survive? The authors’ broad theoretical contribution is to highlight the role of institutional design and path dependence. Party activism can survive, they suggest, if leaders establish the right rules at the party’s founding. From the beginning, FA leaders chose to share power with activists; they insulated them from elite pressure and inducements, and they gave them the capacity to veto reforms that would erode activist influence. As a result, FA activists, over the decades, have had incentives to reproduce themselves and the capacity to maintain power within the party; in addition, there is no elite interference that might erode their commitment to policy and program.

We might ask *why* these rules became institutionalized in the FA. Designing rules that insulate and empower activists provides no guarantee that elites will adhere to them for decades on end. Indeed, relatively few parties attain high levels of internal routinization. Why is the FA different? What explains the compliance of its elites? This line of inquiry, I submit, might lead to a fuller account of how party activism survives. Perhaps the authors, or other scholars, could pursue it in the future.

Verónica Pérez, Rafael Piñeiro, and Fernando Rosenblatt have written a stellar book. It is empirically rich, theoretically interesting, and methodologically exemplary. Regarding method, the authors expertly apply cutting-edge qualitative tools—thick description, systematic process tracing, a large online survey—to support their central descriptive and causal claims. The effect is an impressive, persuasive piece of scholarship. Party and democracy scholars would do well to read it.

Resisting Redevelopment: Protest in Aspiring Global Cities. By Eleonora Pasotti. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2020. 388p. \$99.99 cloth, \$39.99 paper.
doi:10.1017/S1537592720003102

— Valesca Lima , *Maynooth University*
valesca.lima@mu.ie

Over the past few years, a significant body of research has offered insights into the politics of urban development. Most notably, government-led redevelopment has received a great deal of attention, because many local and national governments shifted from their position of *facilitator* to *initiator* of redevelopment. In response to a new political economy at subnational levels in which cities were in pursuit of “global city” status, urban redevelopment became associated not only with development and prosperity but also with displacement and inequality. In this field, a series of studies examining urban redevelopment under neoliberalism in cities competing for economic status have been conducted in the past 20 years. Eleonora Pasotti is one of the emerging scholars on this subject, recognizing the role of political city branding in transforming poor neighborhoods in culturally rich areas, thereby making them ready for middle- and high-class consumption. In this important new work, *Resisting Redevelopment: Protest in Aspiring Global Cities*, Pasotti examines the politics behind urban competition, confronted by insurgent practices of urban redevelopment resistance, in an empirical, comparative study that presents the elements of successful mobilizations and describes their policy impact.

As the title suggests, this work focuses on protest campaigns against redevelopment in aspiring global cities. The author is particularly concerned about successful contentious practices that involve “experiential tools.” These are instruments of protest that draw on emotional personal experiences and symbolic resources and have a grassroots orientation, “aimed at building a sense of collective identity” (p. 124). This book tackles two main questions: How have citizens adapted to redevelopment resistance, and under what conditions does resistance take place? Its objective is to provide a comprehensive examination of the reasons why local residents protest against gentrification, the residents’ perspective on redevelopment, and the factors behind variance in protest. To reach this goal, Pasotti implements a productive engagement