

UC Berkeley

IURD Working Paper Series

Title

GENDER: A New Planning Agenda for Planning Theory

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3491d93v>

Authors

Sandercock, Leonie

Forsyth, Ann

Publication Date

1990-07-01

Peer reviewed

Working Paper 521

**GENDER:
A New Agenda for
Planning Theory**

Leonie Sandercock
&
Ann Forsyth

July 1990

University of California at Berkeley

THE AUTHORS

LEONIE SANDERCOCK was Professor and Head of the graduate Urban Studies program at Macquarie University in Sydney from 1981-1986. Since then she has been a Visiting Professor, part-time, in the Urban Planning program at UCLA, 1986-1989, and at UC Berkeley, 1990. She is the author of Cities for Sale (1975), The Land Racket (1979), Urban Political Economy: the Australian Case (1983) with Mike Berry, and Property, Politics and Urban Planning: a history of Australian City Planning, 1890-1990 (1990).

ANN FORSYTH has degrees in Architecture from the University of Sydney and in Urban Planning from UCLA. She worked for two years as a social planning consultant in Australia. She is currently a doctoral student in the planning program at Cornell.

ABSTRACT

Over the past two decades the importance of gender as a focus of planning practice has been acknowledged. The crucial connections between theory and practice are, however, still rare and tentative. Of all of the sub-fields within planning, that of theory remains arguably the most male-dominated, the least influenced by any awareness of the importance of gender. In this paper we begin the process of restoring the balance. If gender can no longer be ignored in planning practice, how can the theoretical debates continue to be silent on the subject?

The paper first delineates three levels of planning theory, which we call theories of planning practice, political economy theories in planning, and meta-theory. Then we look at how writers at each level have treated or ignored the question of gender. Responding to the omissions which we find in the current literature, we ask what feminist theorizing can contribute to planning theory.

We acknowledge the diversity of feminist theory, and the diversity of women's experiences relative to questions of class, race, ethnicity, and sexual preference. But from this broad field and experience we suggest seven areas in which feminist theorizing has much to contribute to theorizing about planning: the organization of space; economics and the production and maintenance of life; difference and social relationships; language and communication; epistemology and methodology; ethics; and the nature of the public domain.

We conclude with a gender research agenda for planning theory composed of, first, those areas we think are theoretically most underdeveloped, and, second, our best judgement about the areas which are theoretically most important to a gender-conscious planning practice. We identify six areas for future research: case studies of planning practice; practical and strategic gender interests; gender in the internal culture of planners; the balance between multiple differences and equality; the production and maintenance of life; and a gender-conscious reform of planning education.

GENDER: A New Agenda for Planning Theory

Leonie Sandercock and Ann Forsyth

For we have to ask ourselves, here and now, do we wish to join that procession, or don't we? On what terms shall we join that procession? Above all, where is it leading us, the procession of educated men? ... Let us never cease from thinking, - What is this "civilisation" in which we find ourselves? What are these ceremonies and why should we take part in them? What are these professions and why should we make money out of them? Where in short is it leading us, the procession of the sons of educated men?

Virginia Woolf Three Guineas

Women face problems of such significance in cities and society that gender can no longer be ignored in planning practice.

Jacqueline Leavitt (1986:181)

For feminists, it is moral and political, rather than scientific discussion that has served as the paradigm--though a problematic one--of rational discourse.

Sandra Harding (1986a:251)

In her essay "Toward a Woman-Centered University," Adrienne Rich speaks of the need to change the center of gravity within academia to encompass women's knowledge and experience (Rich 1979). In this paper we argue that planners must work to change the center of gravity within their field. Leavitt (above), and others (Wekerle 1980; Hayden 1981, 1984; Cooper Marcus and Sarkissian 1986; Stimpson et al. 1981) have written of the importance of gender as a focus in planning practice. The crucial connections between theory and practice are,

however, still rare and tentative. We make these links here in the spirit of exploration, acknowledging numerous areas of controversy, and aware, as Virginia Woolf wrote in Three Guineas, that in the process of being loyal to our own visions, at times we need to be "disloyal to civilisation," disloyal at least to the intellectual culture of our largely male-dominated profession.

This paper explores the relationship between gender and planning theory. Two brief explanations of our method need to be announced. First, when we discuss feminist literature we are not talking about women authors, as women can do work which is not feminist or gender-conscious, just as men can do feminist work (see Connell 1987, 1990). Rather, we are talking about a particular set of theoretical perspectives which try to explain why people are gendered in particular ways, what that means for their ability to live full and productive lives, and what practical strategies are needed to overcome oppressive roles and relationships. Women have been a focus of feminist writing (as well as activism), at least partly to correct an imbalance of scholarly attention which has left us with a good idea of men's lives (regarded as the prototypes for human existence) but only fragments about women. Both women and men are gendered, however, and so feminist writing focuses attention on the construction of male gender as well as female. The neglect of gender as an issue ought not to be a concern solely of women. Second, we are writing about feminist concerns. In a few cases there are books by non-feminists which touch on these or similar issues, or whose themes are compatible with a feminist agenda. This paper, while mentioning some of them, does not systematically discuss these contributions as they are not a part of the feminist literature.

With the new wave of feminist thinking in the 1970s came a spate of research on women and the urban environment but, as Wekerle noted in 1980, the integration of that rapidly growing body of work with the development of theory

and paradigms to explain women's urban experience was "still far in the future." While the 1980s have witnessed a relative flourishing of attention on gender in relation to policy questions, or what we might call the "Women and..." literature (women and housing, women and transportation, women and economic development...), there has not been a corresponding focus on gender in the planning theory literature, at least in the developed countries. Of all of the sub-fields within planning, that of theory remains arguably the most male-dominated, the least influenced by any awareness of the importance of gender. It would be interesting to speculate as to why this is so, but that is not our main purpose here. Rather, we want to begin the process of restoring the balance. If gender can no longer be ignored in planning practice, how can the theoretical debates continue to be silent on the subject?

Of course, much depends on how we define planning theory, and that will be our starting point. There is about as much agreement, within planning, as to what constitutes planning theory, as there is within feminism as to what constitutes feminist theory. It is not simply a semantic difficulty of definition. It is a question of contested terrain. It is a political question. Just as there are competing theories (marxist, liberal, psychoanalytic, semiotic, etc.) used by feminists to understand or explain the oppression and subordination of women, so also are there competing theories that planners use to explain the role, the practice, the effects of planning. More fundamentally, there is disagreement as to what constitutes the theoretical object of planning theory.

We delineate three levels of planning theory; we call these levels theories of planning practice, political economy theories in planning, and meta-theory. Then we look at how writers at each level have treated or ignored the question of gender. Areas where the analysis of gender in planning is relevant are diverse: the economic status of women, how women are located in and move through

space, the connection between capitalist production and patriarchal relationships and between "public" and "domestic" life, how women know about the world and about what is good, what forms of communication women are most comfortable with or most threatened by, and more. In the first part of this paper it is an awareness of at least some of these issues which we search for, and find lacking, in the current planning theory literature. Responding to these omissions, the second part of the paper treats these topics in more detail, drawing on those aspects of feminist theory which seem to have the most to offer planning. We ask what have and what could feminist perspectives contribute? We cannot dispute the diversity of feminist theory, or the diversity of women's experiences relative to questions of race, class, ethnicity, and sexual preference. But from this broad field and experience we suggest seven areas in which feminist theorizing has much to contribute to theorizing about planning: the organization of space; economics and reproduction; difference and social relationships; language and communication; epistemology and methodology; ethics; and the nature of the public domain.

*

Theory, so the Random House College Dictionary tells us, is

1. a coherent group of general propositions used as principles of explanation for a class of phenomena.
2. a proposed explanation whose status is still conjectural...
3. that department of a science or art which deals with its principles or methods, as distinguished from the practice of it.

All of the above senses of theory are present in that diverse and sometimes confusing body of literature that we think of as constituting planning

theory. The order that we see behind this apparent confusion stems from the fact that different authors set themselves quite different tasks within the field. We categorize this as three different levels or approaches to the subject. At one level are those authors who are theorizing about planning practice, both its processes and outcomes. In general, theories of planning practice involve analysis of the procedures, actions, and behavior of planners. They may also include an analysis of the context, or concrete situation, in which the planners are working. A second level consists of those authors who are theorizing about the nature and meaning of urban planning in capitalist society, speculating about the relationships between, say, capitalism, democracy, and reform, using the arena of planning as a case study, but without any specific or apparent commitment to planning practice. Usually this work begins with a general theory, most commonly some kind of marxism or liberal pluralism, and uses case studies to illustrate the pre-chosen theory. Finally, by meta-theory we mean that work which asks the fundamental epistemological and methodological questions about planning, and also that work which takes as its theoretical object a more abstracted, general notion of planning as a rational human activity which involves the translation of knowledge into action. At this level, authors are no longer necessarily talking specifically about urban or regional planning, but about planning as a generic activity and as a historical legacy of the Enlightenment. We can now elaborate on these three levels of theory and ask of each of them, how have they dealt with the question of gender.

Theoretical writings about the practice of planning.

Theories of urban planning practice are usually empirically based, concerned with what planners do in their day-to-day work, or with what they have done, historically, and what its effects have been. This includes writing

about planning methods, and theories derived from planning history or from case studies of planning practice. The literature on planning methods draws strongly from related fields of policy analysis, organizational development, administration, and neo-classical economics. Theories developed from and about the history of planning come in at least two varieties. Those which seek primarily to draw lessons about the practice of planning, of relevance to the continuing work of planners, comfortably fit as theories of planning practice (Sandercock 1977, 1990; Hall 1988). But those whose emphasis is more on what planning tells us about theories of capitalism or democracy or social control, for example, perhaps belong in the political economy category (Boyer 1983; Fogelson 1986).

Case studies of particular projects or planning institutions or procedures form the heart of this group of theories of practice. The first major case study theorizing from U.S. urban planning practice was Meyerson and Banfield's (1955) study of public housing site selection in Chicago, which reflected on the weaknesses of comprehensive planning. Several other important studies followed in this vein (Altschuler 1965; Rabinowitz 1969; Rothblatt 1971). Marris and Rein's (1973, orig. 1967) case study of community action in the U.S. deals with the issues of a slow-moving bureaucracy, conflict within various parts of the state, innovation and cooption, and the situation of the poor clients of reform programs. They draw lessons, but resist grand theorizing.

Advocacy planning, proposed by Davidoff (1965), has spawned several theoretical evaluations and explanations (Peattie 1968; Arnstein 1969; Heskin 1980), as have community participation processes (Sandercock 1978; Sarkissian and Perlmutt 1986). Peter Marris' (1982, 1987) analysis of the British Community Development Projects and the London Docklands redevelopment is one of the more sophisticated theoretical examinations of planning practice available, dealing with two major issues. The first is the mismatch of the massive scale

of the mobilization of economic resources and the small scale of social and political organization. The second is an analysis of the ways in which theories and ideological interpretations of a situation (paradigms, metaphors, and social meanings) can both shape and limit action.

Forester (1989), in a recent addition to the literature, draws on critical theory and a series of case studies to explore the nature of communicative action in planning. His is an intimate view of planning, one which analyzes how relationships of power are constructed, modified, and reproduced in day-to-day planning situations. Unlike most authors, Forester repeatedly acknowledges the existence of inequalities based on class, race, and gender. Thus his work is potentially open to feminist concerns. However, like the other authors mentioned, he does not build that awareness into his analysis. This is unfortunate given that plans and planning policies are implemented through planning agencies, which are organizations with their own cultures, and these may or may not replicate the wider patriarchal culture. Gender relations within these organizations, the gendering of roles like "professional" and "citizen," and gendered styles of discourse and argument need to be studied, along with the gender-differentiated consequences of the policy implementation of such agencies. How have planning agencies functioned in reproducing inequalities in the relations between the sexes, both through their role in the production of the built environment, and through their own internal cultures?

What is striking about all of the literature noted above is its silence on these crucial gender-related issues. Up until the 1970s, with the outstanding exception of Jane Jacobs (1961), the literature on planning practice proceeded on the assumption that both the intentions and the outcomes of planning are gender-neutral, as though women are affected in exactly the same ways as men by the planning process, as though women's experience of the city is the

same as that of men. And although a number of women were contributing to this case study literature (Peattie, Rabinowitz, Arnstein, Needleman, Sandercock, Piven), and probably all thought of themselves as feminists, none of them asked gender-specific questions about planning practice.

What did emerge in the 1970s, however, as a result of the women's movement, were "women and environment" critiques which attacked the final product of the planning process. The built environment came to be seen, with fresh eyes, as an agent in the role-stereotyping and oppression of women (Stimpson et al. 1981; Wekerle et al. 1980; Hayden 1981, 1984; McDowell 1983; Markusen 1980; Sarkissian 1978; Andrew and Milroy 1988; Keller 1981; Matrix 1984). Although feminist critiques of architecture and urban design and of city spatial structure have swelled over the last decade, and begun to illuminate the gender-blindness of the field, much of this work has not gone beyond a "blaming the men" and/or blaming-capitalism type of analysis. But there are now many more women in planning than in most related professions, such as architecture and engineering (although few of them as yet occupy positions of power). The problem of gender inequality is now present in the theories, standards, and ideologies used to guide planners' work--that is, in the internal culture of planners, rather than simply in the dominance of planning by men, or in the general scope of planners' professional responsibilities. If we want to do something to correct this gender inequality in the outcomes of planning, then it is very important that in the education of planners there are not only feminist critiques available, but also theories of feminist planning practice. Here the works of Hayden (1981, 1984), Moser and Levi (1986), and Leavitt and Saegert (1989) are path-breaking and inspirational (see also Mackenzie 1984, 1988; Watson 1986, 1988; Moser, 1989).

Arguably we also need to rewrite the history of city planning, incorporating gender as a category of analysis. Feminist historiography has disabused us of the notion that the history of women is always the same as the history of men, and that significant turning points in history have the same impact for one sex as for the other (Lerner 1979; Kelly 1984; Scott 1986). A gender-conscious approach to the writing of history produces a new set of questions about the history of city planning ideas and practice (Sandercock 1990) and develops a different sense of historical change itself. This awareness is critical if we believe that planning should have a role in future social transformation, a transformation which must include changes in the relation of the sexes.

In this section we have argued that theories of planning practice have, until the last decade, been gender-blind, thereby failing to provide us with a full understanding of either the process or the outcomes of planning. This literature, while still relevant for its general understanding of the day-to-day workings and effects of planning, needs to be complemented by the flourishing field of feminist critiques of the built environment as it affects women's lives, and also by the integration of new work by feminists who are constructing accounts and theories of a feminist planning practice and developing gender-conscious approaches to planning history.

★

Liberal and Political Economy Theories of Planning

In some planning schools, theories of planning practice constitute the entire subject matter of courses in Planning Theory. Such schools tend to be rather narrowly focussed on the profession of planning and on providing a "pro-

fessional education." They are not very receptive to theoretical developments in related disciplines such as geography, sociology, political science, even less to the interdisciplinary field of women's studies. But, since the 1970s, it has been increasingly difficult for planning schools to insulate themselves from the theoretical trends and challenges within neighboring disciplines, since so many of our students come from those disciplines and are concerned to relate the latest debates to the field of planning.

Thus we identify a second level in the planning theory literature in which broader theoretical debates occur about the state and its role in relation to politics and economics. These theories were mostly generated outside the field of planning, then imported and applied to the planning process. In the post-war period and up until the past decade and a half, these theories were often versions of liberal pluralism or interest-group politics. The corresponding theories of planning ranged from rational-comprehensive and policy analysis to incrementalism and then to advocacy. Starting in the mid-seventies, however, another group of theories gained ascendancy, with the promise of a more sophisticated analysis of inequality and an explanation for the failure of reformist planning. These are the debates about class and power, about capitalism and democracy, which came to the fore when English translations became available of European (mostly French and German) work which revived and adapted marxist theory. When applied to the field of planning, this new theoretical literature asked questions about the role, the meaning, the limitations of urban planning in capitalist society.

Drawing on the works of Poulantzas and Althusser, Manuel Castells was for a time the leading exponent of this new school of urban inquiry which quickly infiltrated the disciplines of sociology, political science, and geography. For almost ten years, the dynamics of capital constituted the single totalizing

framework for analyzing contemporary life. All social relations were subsumed within this dynamic and a whole new language emerged to explain urban problems, which were no longer really urban problems at all (for a while, the city did not constitute a valid theoretical object) but rather problems of a capitalist economy. Theories of fiscal crisis, of legitimation crisis, of the dual state, of relative autonomy, of collective consumption, of urban social movements, entered the planning literature, overpowering in their apparent determinacy and generative of considerable gloom about the future prospects of planning.

Poulantzas had argued that the activities of the capitalist state could not be explained by referring to real human agents. Rather, the capitalist state was the "condensation" of the structure of capitalist society and had "relative autonomy." (The latter concept enabled structuralist marxist theory to overcome the theoretical problem that the capitalist state does sometimes do things which do not appear to be in the interests of the capitalist ruling class.)

Political scientists and political sociologists became preoccupied with theories of the capitalist state, some embracing pure marxist analyses, others attempting a reconciliation of marxist and weberian arguments about political structure and action within contemporary capitalist societies (Miliband 1969, 1973; Poulantzas 1973; Habermas 1973; Offe 1984; O'Connor 1973; Gough 1979; Carnoy 1984; Alford & Friedland 1985; Clark & Dear 1985). Accounts of the capitalist state moved from the structuralist theories of the late 1960s and 1970s to the "legitimation" and state-centered versions of the 1970s and 1980s, but they all shared a highly abstract quality. More recent work attempts some empirical understanding of what the state actually does (Evans, Rueschemeyer & Skocpol 1985; Skocpol 1979).

Debates within urban sociology and geography have gone through a similar trajectory, from the marxist structuralist ascendancy of the 1970s to the neo-

marxist and neo-weberian theoretical eclecticism of the 1980s. In the 1970s, Castells and David Harvey "urbanized" marxism. Castells (1977) constructed a "collective consumption" theory of capitalist urbanization. Harvey advocated a marxist alternative to liberal theory, based on concepts of use, exchange, and surplus value, and modes of production and economic integration (Harvey 1973, 1978a, 1978b). But by the early 1980s, many of the original adherents to the marxist structuralist position had begun to question it. Castells (1980) now argued that it was counterproductive to continue to allow irrelevant and detached theory to guide and dominate empirical work. Theoretical geographers drew on Giddens' (1979, 1982) "theory of structuration" to outline a post-structuralist and postmodern geography (Thrift 1983; Soja 1989), and urban sociologists began to write of post-structuralism.

During this period of theoretical upheaval, since the mid-seventies, all energy was seemingly focussed on such abstract questions as the status of "space" and "urban" as theoretical and causal categories within social theory, and the theoretical and political significance of consumption-sector cleavages within the capitalist democracies. Writing about urban and regional planning, under the influence of these new theoretical debates, was always a gloomy story of the dynamics of the world capitalist system dictating what happened at national, regional, and local levels. There was apparently no room for human agency, and no need to consider gender as a category of analysis. To the extent that women were participating in these theoretical debates, it was usually at the expense of any theoretical consideration of gender-related issues (Sandercock 1978, 1979; Piven and Cloward 1979; Boyer 1983; Massey 1977; Massey and Catalano 1978).

Ultimately there have been at least two kinds of reactions from feminists to this positivist theorizing, which privileges capitalist production in the

official economy over all other human activities. One response, still within the positivist tradition, has been to try to develop feminist marxist urban theory, a holistic theory of the gendered production and use of the built environment, paying attention to the patterns of the daily lives of women in the city and the "straightjackets imposed on them by the nexus forged between urbanization, capitalism and patriarchy" (Harman 1983:129). This relatively recent literature focuses on class, gender, and urban spatial form, the household and the sexual division of labor (Markusen 1980; Huxley 1988; Women and Geography Study Group of the Institute of British Geographers 1984; Mackenzie, 1989; Bowlby et al. 1989). They argue about "strategies for transformation" rather than proposing feminist planning policies for immediate implementation. Huxley (1988:42) for example, observes that "...neighborhood houses and the design of communal kitchens will not, in and of themselves, change the social relations of patriarchy and capitalism."

A second response from feminists who experienced the marxist theorizing of the last decade or so as deadening or tautological rather than liberating, has been to reject the positivist marxist search for all-encompassing, holistic, or totalizing theory in favor of a more subjectivist position (Christopherson 1989), or a more openly ethical/political approach with communitarian emphasis (Leavitt and Saegert 1989), or to explore hermeneutics, with its emphasis on interpretation and theoretical tolerance (see Sandercock 1990). Much of the energy generated by feminist responses hostile to the effects of structuralist marxism has been channelled into developing feminist approaches to epistemology (how people know) and methodology. These we discuss later.

The emergence of this new literature has presented a challenge to planning schools. While some eager, theoretically-oriented graduate students and younger faculty from disciplinary backgrounds like geography, sociology, and

political science have sought to import this new work into the planning field, plenty of older or more practice-oriented professors have resisted the incorporation of this work into the curriculum, failing to see its relevance to planning practice. To the extent that this neo-marxist and political economy theorizing has become a part of the planning theory literature (Paris 1983; Cenzatti 1987), it has been a troublesome part, and this for at least two reasons. First, the rather reductionist, overly determinist basis of much of this work, and the refusal of the structuralists to take politics seriously, seemed to leave little room for planners to maneuver to effect social change. Too much of this kind of theorizing began to have a paralyzing effect on policy debates. And second, for feminists there was not much satisfaction in theoretical work in which the dynamics of capital subsumed all social relations and gender was not a relevant consideration.

The main value of this level of theorizing within the field of planning theory has been to draw attention to context; to locate planning as an inherently political activity within a capitalist state which is itself part of a world capitalist system; and to help in the ongoing assessment of the viability of social democratic politics in the capitalist democracies. However, the gender-blindness of this work could be said to have delayed the emergence of debates about gender inequalities within the field of planning theory and slowed the acceptance of a feminist perspective within that field. Some feminists, male and female, continue to search for a holistic, gender- and political-economy-based urban theory with which to inform their approach to planning. The task is monumental, and perhaps fatally flawed by its very quest for totality.

Overall, this literature has not given much space to feminist concerns and, although that has been changing in the late 1980s, the danger seems to be

that if feminists become too absorbed in renovating this house they may not notice that an eight-lane freeway is pointing directly at their property.

*

Meta-theories of Planning

We introduce this third level of planning theory to deal with two distinct literatures. The first inquires at a more philosophical and generic level about the origins and nature of planning as a rational human activity, rather than specifically addressing urban or regional or any other branch of planning. The idiosyncratic work of Friedmann (1987) is perhaps the best example of this kind of literature. The second consists of those writers whose main concerns are epistemological or methodological. Given that the planning field sees itself as part of the social sciences, the relevant literature here is broader than planning, relating to the social sciences as a whole (Polanyi 1958; Kuhn 1962; Harding and Hintikka 1983; Harding 1986; Belenky et al. 1986).

John Friedmann's Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowledge to Action is in some senses unique, in its breadth (mapping out such a broad field for planning theory) and in its potential influence. Although there are other recent intellectual histories (Hall 1988), and works of planning theory which touch on meta-theoretical issues (Marris 1987; Forester 1989), Friedmann shares with these works common problems in terms of a feminist analysis, as well as some unique possibilities. For the sake of clarity we use his work as a starting point from which to discuss these issues.

Planning in the Public Domain has two main objectives. The first is to provide a taxonomy of the intellectual lineages of modern planning. The second

is to outline the elements of a radical planning. In arriving at his taxonomy, the four traditions in planning (Social Reform, Policy Analysis, Social Learning, and Social Mobilization), Friedmann first defines his theoretical object. This he devises as the linkage of knowledge to action in the public domain. This focus allows him to give priority to action (which he defines in Hannah Arendt's sense of "setting something new into the world") and, according to Friedmann, this sets planning apart from all the related human sciences. Emphasizing knowledge and action means that he investigates problems of belief and inquiry, problems of practice, and the linkages between them. In choosing this approach Friedmann then necessarily bypasses the specific theories that inform particular planning fields such as land-use, housing, or transportation.

Friedmann's pantheon of planning's ancestors runs from the macro-sociological tradition (from Bentham to Comte to Etzioni) to institutional economics (from Veblen to Perloff), from scientific management to public administration and systems theory, from welfare economics to pragmatic philosophy, and to an amalgam of thinkers under the Social Mobilization umbrella, from utopians and anarchists to revolutionary marxists and feminists. This taxonomy has been criticized, primarily for its omission of the city planning tradition. The final section, Friedmann's meditations on a radical planning practice, has been criticized from both left and right (Hoch 1990; Faludi 1990). Most readers coming from the city planning tradition find it hard to imagine that any planning outside the state can be called planning. Faludi (1990) fails to see the need for any kind of counter-hegemonic practice. Most planners today are uncomfortable with talk of social reconstruction or transformation. They are more comfortable with the language of economic development planning, public/private partnerships, and "negotiation skills." The Thatcher/Reagan/Bush era has left its mark on a once socially conscious profession.

This reaction is important in our discussion of feminist planning theory in that it gives us some insight into the fate of other "radical" forms of planning, including planning which is emancipatory for women. Based as feminism is in a social movement, it will sometimes involve planning outside the state, or with groups outside it. It is counter-hegemonic and socially reconstructive, involving unfamiliar ways of thinking and acting.

The book has not yet but should be criticized and appraised by feminists. There are two main problems for feminists with Friedmann's work, but also something promising. The problems concern, first, the omissions, and, second, his approach to epistemology, to what constitutes valid knowledge in planning.

One vein of feminist scholarship has as its project the mission of redressing the absence of women in the historical record. One way of doing this has been to focus on the oppression of women, to describe how women have suffered and been discriminated against because men/patriarchal capitalism have controlled their lives. While this is a very important aspect of women's history, it is by no means the full story. Women have not simply been victims, subjects acted upon. They too have been actors, and recent work has begun to uncover their contributions. Dolores Hayden, in The Grand Domestic Revolution, (1981) unearths the existence of a feminist tradition of home design and community planning. Her "material feminists" advocated socialized domestic work; raised fundamental questions about "women's sphere"; and challenged two characteristics of industrial capitalism, the physical separation of household space from public space, and the economic separation of the domestic economy from the political economy. They proposed and designed ideal feminist households and neighborhoods, and their ideas influenced such well-known male figures as Ebenezer Howard, Lewis Mumford, and Rudolph Schindler.

Birch (1983) documents the role of women in the development of the planning profession, from their earliest contributions as civic activists to their gradual moving into the "profession." Davis's (1983) article on "Playgrounds, Housing and City Planning" gives legitimacy to the inclusion of women social reformers in the history of city planning. Hall (1988) briefly acknowledges the importance of Jane Addams and the Settlement House movement, and of Catherine Bauer and Edith Elmer Wood's leadership of the public housing movement, in his intellectual history of city planning.

Wirka (1989) gives us a much more detailed treatment of the contributions of Mary Simkhovitch and others in the Settlement House movement, as well as an argument about the centrality of women in turn of the century urban social reform, their contribution as the conceptualizers of the tradition of neighborhood planning, and their marginality once planning became institutionalized (masculinized) as a profession after the first world war. There is a substantial literature dealing with feminist utopias, and some utopian thinking which has incorporated a feminist perspective (Rohrlich and Baruch, 1984).

Women have been important as actors and as thinkers and theorists in three of Friedmann's four traditions, those of social reform, social learning, and social mobilization. (Arguably, Jane Addams was the most important influence on the thinking of John Dewey, who was a regular visitor to Hull House at the time he was formulating his "learning by doing" philosophy. She was not only an activist and advocate but also a writer. Reading her work would have given Friedmann a different story than only reading John Dewey.) Which raises the important question, why have none of these women found their way into Friedmann's pantheon, with the exception of Dolores Hayden?

Friedmann's account is biased in its omission of the contribution of women to planning theory as he defines it, and as such helps to perpetuate/

reproduce a distorted intellectual legacy. But there is more to this bias than just the omission of a few women's names and contributions. Like other recent contributors to planning theory already mentioned, Friedmann's bias is systematic in that he has not evaluated members of his pantheon in terms of how they treat a gendered public, and not just humans-in-general.

A second criticism of this work, from a feminist perspective, revolves around Friedmann's treatment of epistemology. The problem begins with the definition of the theoretical object as the linking of scientific and technical knowledge to action in the public domain. Why is "scientific and technical" a problem? Because it privileges one kind of knowledge and dismisses the validity, and the importance for planning, of other kinds of knowledge. In thinking about epistemology in Parts One and Two of his book, Friedmann falls into the kind of dualism of which feminists are increasingly critical, a dualism in which reason is pitted against passion, rationality against politics, as though one cannot be reasonable and also passionate, as though politics, by definition, is irrational.

The tendency in the social sciences since the Enlightenment has been to make these separations, and to elevate scientific method as the only way of knowing. All else is mere subjectivity. Feminists on the other hand argue for "connected knowing" (Belenky et al. 1986) and for discussion of the politics of theory and method and of the origins and implications of our theoretical hierarchies. This is what Christopherson (1989) is getting at in the title of a paper criticizing theory and method in geography, "On Being Outside The Project." She notes recent work, by feminists and other critical theorists in jurisprudence, history, philosophy, and aesthetics, which is directly concerned with the problem of theory construction and its relation to the construction of power, work which requires identification of one's own position relative to the theoretical object. Feminists are not the only ones associated with critiques

of positivist epistemology (see Kuhn 1962; Polanyi 1958; Feyerabend 1975), but their work originates in response to an alienation from the methods of research and definitions of knowledge that denigrate or ignore women's experiences and which refuse to consider the political content of knowledge creation.

In Part Three of his book, Friedmann returns to a discussion of ways of knowing, raising questions about the validity of personal or experiential knowledge and whether scientific and technical knowledge should be privileged over other forms. While he does not discuss or cite feminist critiques of positivist epistemology or new feminist perspectives [such as Millman and Kanter (1975), Harding (1986a), Harding and Hintikka (1983), Belenky et al. (1986), Keller (1983), Pateman and Gross (1986), Caine, Grosz, and de Lepervanche (1988), Jaggar and Rothenberg (1984), Cook and Fonow (1986)], he does in fact turn away from technocratic planning, embracing subjective knowledge as the foundation of a radical planning (Friedmann 1987: 413-415).

While the issue of a distinctively feminist epistemology remains a controversial one, we suggest that a feminist perspective would discuss the relevance of the following ways of knowing (in addition to scientific and technical knowledge) in the practice of planning. First, talking, but especially the importance of oral traditions and of "gossip," which Belenky et al. define as conversations among intimates, talk about feelings, about the personal, the particular, the "petty," but not necessarily the trivial. "Gossip, like poetry and fiction, penetrates to the truth of things." People exchange small shared truths. It is a "special mode of knowing" which moves back and forth between large and small, between particular and general (Belenky et al. 1986:116; Spacks 1985). Second, listening, which Forester (1989) insightfully describes as "the social policy of everyday life," and indispensable to those working in planning. (Also dealt with by Friedmann (1973) in his discussion of mutual

learning.) Third, tacit or intuitive knowledge. Outstanding microbiologist Barbara McLintock has argued that "reason is not by itself adequate to describe and understand the vast complexity, indeed mystery, of living forms" (Keller 1983). Einstein said the same thing: "Only intuition, resting on sympathetic understanding, can lead to discovery" (Keller 1983). Polanyi (1958) distinguished tacit from explicit knowledge, advancing "a logic of personal knowledge" to combat the dominant emphasis on "strict objectivism." Fourth, creating symbolic forms (painting, music, poetry...) is an important way of knowing, and may be a more important way of communicating than planners have yet been prepared to contemplate. And finally, acting. By acting and reflecting on the meaning of action we come to know the world in a way that is not available to us through books full of scientific and technical knowledge.

All of these ways of knowing are subject-related (it is we who do the listening, talking, acting...), which reminds us of the essentially autobiographical, and thus gendered, nature of knowledge. More than this, though, knowledge is a social construction. Different knowledges must be shared, through communication, to construct meaning. The construction of knowledge involves communication, politics, passion. It is an unfinished business.

We want to make a third point about Friedmann's work before we leave this section. Feminists ought to acknowledge the essentially feminist message of the third section of Planning in the Public Domain, in which Friedmann delineates the elements of a radical or oppositional planning practice. This, he argues, must begin with a recentering of political community on the household economy. This would allow planners to deal with the "whole" economy--that is, with both market and non-market relations, and with the sexual division of labor. It would bring a discussion of women's roles directly into the purview of planning. It would shift the focus from collective consumption to the production

of life. And it would emphasize the need for freeing available time from the domain of privacy for the public domain.

In discussing radical practice with regard to the household economy, Friedmann specifies three tasks. First, decolonization: a turning away from consumerism. Second, democratization: meaning equal rights among adults in household decisions. Third, collective self-empowerment: meaning that it is only through interaction with other households, especially but not only at the neighborhood level, that the self-empowerment of households is at all possible. Radical planners, he argues, cannot work with disarticulated individuals. They must work with families or households within organized political communities.

In this discussion Friedmann is very much in tune with feminist theorizing. Susan Moller Okin's Justice, Gender and the Family (1989) focuses on this second point of democratization and equal rights for adults within the household. Okin is critical both of liberal theorists who ignore the household or accept its inequalities, and of communitarians who naively idealize it as beyond justice. Okin points out that it is within the household that children learn about justice (and other basic values), and if the household is a place where inequality is accepted as natural, then justice and equality will be impossible to achieve in society at large. In this analysis, Friedmann's proposal of household democracy is an advance over other non-feminist theories. So, while a feminist perspective has much to criticize in and contribute to Friedmann's work, and to this level of theorizing about planning, it should also be recognized that Planning in the Public Domain is engaged here in a task parallel to that of contemporary feminist theorizing about social reconstruction.

*

Having surveyed the varieties of planning theory available, noted their blindness to questions of gender, and outlined some of the possible feminist critiques of this literature, we devote the second part of this essay to a summary of the substantive areas in which a feminist perspective has or could contribute to planning theory, especially to theories of practice.

The Organization of Space: Economics and Reproduction: Social Relationships

Spatial, economic, and social relationships are often linked in the empirical literature on women and environments, a reaction to the spatial separation of social and economic spheres in real cities (Bowlby et al. 1989:157). Contemporary Western feminism emerged from a particular urban form, the mid-twentieth century city, "which expressed and reinforced differentiated gender roles" (Mackenzie 1989:110). As women have become more visible as wage earners, whether living alone, in two-income or single-parent families, the physical constraints of this type of city have become apparent. Child care is rarely close to paid workplaces. Its non-provision severely constrains women's life choices, forcing the hard options of not having children, giving up paid work, paying most of their wages in private child care, or rigid time-tabling with other family members (Leavitt 1986:182). Similarly, transit is planned for rational commutes to work rather than the erratic movements of women still responsible for domestic duties as well as paid work (Palm and Pred 1976; Pickup 1984). Pickup theorized that women's transport patterns and mobility are shaped more by gender roles than any more "rational" considerations. For example, in her British study, women in some communities were expected to cook an evening meal at a certain time each day, and to accompany small children on

trips, but as head of the family men were generally given first option of car use (Pickup 1984). Theoretical accounts of these issues and the links between them are still infrequent, only recently emerging in the field of urban planning. This parallels the situation in geography (Bowlby et al. 1989:163).

The connection between city spatial structure, women's household work, and national urban policy was the focus of an article by Ann Markusen in 1980. She argued that women's household work had generally been ignored (by marxist and neo-classical economists alike) even though this work had a large impact on the use of cities, and she tried to theorize this in relation to capitalism and patriarchy. Other feminist scholars are working on theorizing the relationship between capitalist urbanization, the built environment, and gender (see Huxley 1988; Mackenzie 1989), or between household, community, and city (Leavitt and Saegert 1989; Mackenzie 1988). When the object of this work is creating new theories with which to better understand the context of planning, then it fits into the middle level of our three-tiered categorization of planning theory. But when the primary object is to generate visions and strategies and programs for change, then it belongs with theories of (feminist) planning practice.

Dolores Hayden's (1980) article, "What would a non-sexist city be like?," and her subsequent book, Redesigning the American Dream, is the best known and broadest in scope of available theories and visions of feminist planning practice in developed nations. (Moser [1989] provides a useful overview of Third World "gender planning.") By "broad in scope" we mean theories which link different activities and scales of planning--home and transport, household sexual politics, work places and the environment, for example--rather than just concentrating on one activity. Hayden's work does not look for either a "dream home or ideal city" but instead weaves backwards and forwards between many places and spaces.

Hayden describes a diversity of women--single parents, poor women, battered wives, and so forth--with different ideas about their needs. This sense of women being at the same time a whole, and also a collection of smaller populations, has been growing through the 1980s as women from specific (non-Anglo) racial and ethnic groups spoke out on women's issues (reviewed in King 1988). The internationalized economy and continuing vulnerability of women situated in low-wage work and unorganized informal markets while undertaking the bulk of unpaid domestic work means that women are linked more than ever in an international network of decisions. Yet women are also divided by geographical, political, religious, class, and cultural boundaries. Feminist theory is currently grappling with differences among women, reacting to the situation summarized in the book title: All Women Are White, All Blacks Are Men, But Some of us Are Brave (Hull et al. 1982). There is a vigorous exchange about whether feminist theory is "ethnocentric," grounded only in the experience of white women, and whether "adding in" women of color is enough. Perhaps theoretical categories need to be reformed in the light of the different experiences of non-Anglo women (see Barrett and McIntosh 1985; reply by Bhavani and Coulson 1986; also Lugones and Spelman 1983; Hooks 1984).

Theorizing within this multiplicity of voices is a complex task, but not doing so can make "woman" as oppressive a category as "man" (Harding 1986b). Although some "class and ..." work has been done, very little in planning theory literature deals with multiple oppressions, including race or culture and gender. Leavitt and Saegert's (1989) work on gender, race, and age among poor people is a notable exception. Outside planning, there are more attempts. Examples include: Phillips (1987) on the "divided loyalties of women in Britain; a growing literature, mostly written by women of color, on the multiple oppressions of race, class, and gender (see King 1988); and a group of

"oppositional" legal scholars working particularly on issues of race but also on gender (e.g. Bell 1987; Matsuda 1989; Williams 1988, 1989; Delgado 1989).

Language and communication

Given that language is such an influential force in shaping our world, it is obvious that those who have the power to make the symbols and their meanings are in a privileged and highly advantageous position.... The group which has the power to ordain the structure of language, thought and reality has the potential to create a world in which they are central figures, while those who are not of their group are peripheral and therefore may be exploited. (Spender 1985:142-143)

Currently, language and communication are the subject of some discussion in planning theory. Dominant debates cover the types and uses of rational communication, the use of language as a method for empowerment and the construction of meaning (Marris 1987), and micro-scale analyses of communication as action and as listening (Forester 1989). This work is important, and recent feminist scholarship can extend its scope into areas such as the gendered use of language and argument.

Feminist theories of language often start by showing how language forms our reality, our sense of order, our place in the community of humans, and in doing this it can be limiting as well as empowering (Spender 1985; Collins 1987). Feminists have pointed to this inequality on a number of levels. There is now a large literature on how men interrupt women more often than vice versa and how men listen less intently to women than vice versa (Spender 1985:41-50, 121-129). Black writer Patricia Williams (1988) weaves stories to describe the link between difference and inequality in language, in looking at speakers, in meaning, in ways of making a point, and in the experiences of Williams and other African Americans. Important empirical work is being done on how women come to know their world differently, to each other and to men, partly through

language (Belenky et al. 1986). It is obvious too, that education shapes the use of language, and in places where education is unequally distributed, the inequalities will be accentuated. All this leads to a conclusion that on many levels language is a realm of inequality.

Feminists have shown that women are far more ambivalent than men about authority in the use of language and in the use of (the dominant) instrumentally rational, scientific modes of thought (Okin 1989:72). This becomes a vital issue in such areas as citizen participation, where there can be enormous inequalities which are reinforced in the use of language. Professional jargon, argumentative speaking styles, can all alienate, confuse, or render women speechless in reply.

Even for women prominent in, say, residents' movements, speaking to professionals is likely to be an exercise in translation. Although in practice residents and planners are likely to be to some extent "multi-lingual" (many planners are women after all, and many men are sensitive to these issues), this issue needs to be incorporated at the level of theory. As Leavitt and Saegert (1989) show, it can take a long time before real communication occurs between a professional and a woman resident: before the woman feels confident enough in her sensible use of words to articulate her ideas, demands, or needs.

One example of an area where more theoretical consideration is needed is the assumption that, if given the chance, all interest groups can articulate their demands in a roughly equivalent manner. Given the current socialization of women, particularly women who suffer multiple disadvantages (class, race, educational, health, self-esteem), this simply may not be so. Hooks (1984:55-57) describes teaching a class on "Third World Women in the United States" where students from multiple ethnic backgrounds, in order to communicate sensitively with each other, learned to explain and acknowledge their own culturally dif-

ferent speaking styles and assumptions about such things as silences and loud speech. It was a task which required energy and attention.

A feminist planner experienced in neighborhood consultation and participatory planning described her difficulties in trying to get people at public meetings to contribute on an equal basis, particularly when many women are socialized to believe they have nothing valuable to say. She responded, in one community, by asking people sitting in small groups at a large meeting to tell a story or anecdote about their neighborhood. People then had no trouble speaking out about their lives and their community. Previously silent or hesitant participants found that they too possessed knowledge. For example, women who were stuck in the suburb all day talked about the problems of public transport for themselves and their family. The format of storytelling proved accessible to a variety of people and gave courage for more involvement (Sarkissian 1990).

We need to talk about these complex inequalities in planning, to develop theories of professional communication and citizen representation and participation which can bring women out of silence. Balancing equality and special treatment is always a complicated task, but ignoring gender is a false equality.

Methodology and Epistemology

We have already talked at some length about the contribution of feminist perspectives on epistemology in our critique of Friedmann. Most importantly, we want to challenge the exclusive emphasis in planning education on scientific and technical ways of knowing, and to introduce other ways of knowing. Once we begin to think this way about ways of knowing, we have to rethink other methodological issues, such as how we go about research in planning. Again the feminist literature across the social sciences can help us to think through these issues with respect to the planning field. Sociologists Judith Cook and Mary Fonow (1986)

have provided a useful discussion of the concept of a feminist methodology and outlined what they see as the five basic principles of such a methodology.

First, there is the need to continuously and reflexively attend to the significance of gender and gender asymmetry as a basic feature of all social life, including the conduct of research. Second is the centrality of consciousness-raising as a specific methodological tool and as a general orientation, or way of seeing. Third, there is the need to challenge the norm of objectivity that assumes that the subject and object of research can be separated from one another and that personal and/or grounded experiences are unscientific. Fourth is the concern for the ethical implications of feminist research, and recognition of the exploitation of women as objects of knowledge. And finally, there is an emphasis on the empowerment of women and transformation of patriarchal social institutions through research (Cook and Fonow 1986).

Such titles as "Passionate scholarship: notes on values, knowing and method in feminist social science" (Du Bois, in Bowles and Duelli Klein, 1984) and "On Being Outside the Project" (Christopherson 1989) summarize the thrust of the feminist debate as it could contribute to both theories of planning practice and meta-theories of planning which are concerned with epistemological questions.

Morality in Planning

Recently quite a lot of feminist attention has focussed on morality (Kittay and Meyers 1987). This focus is partly a response to the influential and controversial work of Carol Gilligan (1982) on moral psychology (see Flanagan and Jackson 1987; Blum 1988; Benhabib 1987). Building on the theories of psychoanalyst Nancy Chodorow (1978), and reacting to studies by Lawrence Kohlberg which equated moral development with male moral development and placed

women in inferior positions, Gilligan conducted and analyzed interviews with men and women, and formulated an alternative moral outlook or orientation. Some people, most often women, showed a morality of responsibility and care linked with an identity formed through relationships with particular others. This was contrasted with a morality of rights and abstract justice, more often held by people who saw themselves in terms of autonomy.

Recent work by Tronto (1987), Jack and Jack (1989) on the moral orientation of women and men lawyers, and Smith and Valenze (1988) on these orientations in nineteenth century British working class women, have confirmed, modified, and extended Gilligan's findings, grounding them in particular social and historical circumstances. These studies, carried out in liberal democratic societies, show that significant groups of the population have a sense of their own individuality which is quite different to the self-interested rational actor of liberal political theory, which forms the basis for much rational and advocacy planning. Several writers draw parallels between this ethic of care and moral life in other places or communities, such as African Americans in the United States (see Tronto 1987; Collins 1987:30). Like gender, ideas of self, morality, and community are products of particular places and times, and are formed in particular relationships. Although most obviously a critique of liberal theorists, marxian writers also need to rethink their universal categories.

Although Gilligan's original work implied that the moral orientation is more or less exclusive, other studies show that people use both, although generally one is dominant (Flanagan and Jackson 1987:624; Gilligan et al. 1988). A recent study by Johnson (1988) shows that when asked to find the "best" solution to a moral problem, a significant minority of both sexes (10 to 20 percent in her study) choose to combine orientations. That is, care and rights, particularity and universality, are used in complex patterns. The important

contribution made by Gilligan and other writers on feminist morality is to enlarge our moral vocabulary, and give legitimacy to practices like caring, which have been marginalized in academic debates. It is important to see these ethics not merely as strategies formed by oppressed groups but as vital for the maintenance of life itself. It seems likely that this vocabulary could be further extended to moral practices based on ideas like integrity, perfection, liberation, moderation, and so forth (see Flanagan and Jackson 1987:629).

For planners, this work gives insight into the debate about the public interest as it is carried out in neighborhoods and cities, rather than in professional discussions. Identity politics, and the fight to preserve neighborhoods with particular histories, both make more sense in this view. It provides a companion, although sometimes an uneasy one, to the idea of "community" used in many planning theories and visions. The unease results from the complacency with which many proponents of community have dealt with relations of dominance and oppression. Even the new communitarian theorists, who are beginning to influence liberal and left planning theories, are open to this critique (see Sandel 1982; MacIntyre 1981). Although offering sophisticated critiques of liberalism and proposing communitarian alternatives with obvious links to feminist theories of care, their examples of communities are almost always exclusively the family or nation, traditionally institutions that are hierarchically organized and oppressive to women. As Friedman (1989:283) points out, "Where [among these examples of community are]... the International Ladies Garment Workers Union, the Teamsters, the Democratic Party, Alcoholics Anonymous, or the Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador."

In planning theory there have been sensitive analyses of community, often including a critique of romantic views (see Jane Jacobs 1961; Bell and Newby 1976; Heskin 1990; Marris 1987), although they are reactions to a not so sensi-

tive past. Leavitt and Saegert's (1989) study of the residents of landlord abandoned buildings in Harlem, a population predominantly black and female, is a pioneering, empirically-based work theorizing about gender and community in planning. They discovered that many of these residents had formed "community households" which shared economic and administrative burdens and which drew on reciprocal social relations and attachment to place and the historical community of Harlem. Those communities, based on a morality of responsibility and care, formed the most successful of the tenant-run buildings. Saegert and Leavitt describe the sensitivity required by planners to respect this sense of connection and attachment, rather than rely solely on economic criteria and formal democratic processes. Future theorizing could build on these debates about the balance of care, justice, and other moral systems, to lead to a gender-sensitive and practice-oriented planning morality.

The Public Domain

Private life and public life, private space and public space are bound together, despite all the cultural pressures to separate them. Privacy is indeed a crucial element in our personal lives. At the same time, a much richer and more complex set of transitional spaces and activities is required to connect private life and public life effectively. Then home is no longer seen as "women's place" and women in public places are not asked, "What's a nice girl like you doing in a place like this?" (Hayden 1984:227)

The definition of the public domain is a complex issue in planning. Hayden (1981) has shown how early feminists wanted to domesticate public space, extending home life out into the municipality. Recently, feminists have questioned the exact nature and extent of the public domain in liberal theory, and its separation from private, domestic, or economic spheres (Pateman 1983; Okin 1989). They have shown contradictions and ambiguities in the division between public and private or domestic arenas. Pointing to the "political" nature of

personal life, the interconnections between gender relations in the family and the paid workplace, and the fact that socialization for citizenship occurs in the domestic realm, they have shown how all this is ignored in political theory (Okin 1989).

This has led to a variety of activist responses. One feminist stance is to say that the personal is political and that issues like domestic violence, which are traditionally seen as private issues, are actually public. A second strategy is to make a "private" issue, like sexuality or abortion, public until oppressive policies, programs, and plans are eliminated. A third aim, often held by these same feminists, is to make private some actions and behaviors which have traditionally been seen as part of the public domain of planning. These include the family structure of households in residential areas, or the sexual life of public housing tenants (made public in the criteria for housing allocation and rental payments).

The thrust of all these strategies, however, is to redefine public and private, questioning the need for this division, and showing how in the arena of urban planning the line between public and private or domestic life has been drawn to men's advantage. The issue of public and private pervades the other areas where we have suggested future research--in space, reproduction, and relationships, in epistemology, language, and morality. As Carole Pateman (1983:281) has written:

The dichotomy between the private and the public is central to almost two centuries of feminist writing and political struggle; it is, ultimately, what the feminist movement is about.

One area where feminist theorizing can productively interact with planning theory is in an analysis of the state and the current trend toward privatization. State resources have been a target for feminist strategizing,

although the state is often characterized in theory as a kind of public patriarchy. Unquestionably a gender division of labor exists among its employees, with women concentrated in secretarial and clerical work and, at the senior level, in human services. Its policies, about everything from marriage, the family, and legitimate violence, to industrial subsidies and schools, reproduce and even form gender roles and relationships (Connell 1990). Planners assist in this process when they create zoning where only related individuals can live in a dwelling together, forcing gay couples, communal households, and so on to live elsewhere or apart (see Ritzdorf 1989), or by attracting industries with gender-segmented workforces to enterprise zones, thereby helping to constitute the differences in job options for each gender.

Gender roles are, however, not fixed. For example, child custody in the past 150 years has passed from fathers to the joint custody of both parents, although women are more likely to retain custody when parents are apart (Brown 1981). In the same period, children have changed from being an economic asset to a burden. Part of raising children is public cost (schools, child care, child health) and part private (the low-paid work of attention, feeding, clothing). A struggle is currently going on over who will bear which costs, the struggle over privatization and the role of government. Women often receive public assistance, as single parents, as the dominant section of the elderly population, as residents in public housing, as the majority users of public transport, and so forth. This assistance has given women more choices, relieving them from some of the responsibilities formerly considered private or domestic (like caring for children or older relatives), or giving them enough material resources to achieve some measure of independence. Of course, in America this "independence" often means poverty. However, in a nation like Sweden with much higher levels of service, independence is far more real.

The privatization of public services thus directly affects women, but in complex ways. The form privatization takes--whether a corporation or a community-based non-profit group takes over, whether resources are maintained or cut--all affect the impact of this trend. A limited-equity housing cooperative (like the ones studied by Leavitt and Saegert) is far different from an absentee corporate landlord or sale into unrestricted individual ownership. Feminists and planners need to consider this issue in all its complexity, which will mean dealing realistically and at many levels with issues of power and control in women's lives.

Conclusion

In 1975 Lyn Lofland published her essay "The 'Thereness' of Women: A Selective Review of Urban Sociology." She pointed to the framework of empirical and theoretical urban sociology, where women were part of the scene but not part of the action.

[Women] are part of the locale or neighborhood or area described like other important aspects of the setting such as income, ecology or demography--but largely irrelevant to the analytic action. They reflect a group's social organization and culture, but they never seem to be in the process of creating it (Lofland 1975: 145).

In mainstream planning theory women have scarcely even been "there" as subjects of theory. Why is this important? Our argument in this paper is two-fold. First, the subject matter of planning theory, at all three of the levels we have identified, has been gender-blind and therefore presents a distorted view. The field needs to be redefined and reconceptualized. The problem is far more subtle and complex than a simple tradition of exclusion. The paradigms on which planning and theorizing have been based are informed by characteristics traditionally associated with the masculine in our society. So there is a need

to rethink the foundations of the discipline, its epistemology, and its various methodologies.

Second, there are now feminist critiques of some of this traditional subject matter, and there is a feminist literature (our survey here is certainly not meant to be exhaustive) which needs to be incorporated into the debates within planning theory. Beyond that, where do we go?

A Gender-Research Agenda

We conclude with a proposal for a gender-research agenda for planning theory composed of, first, those areas we think are theoretically most underdeveloped and, second, our best judgement about the areas which are theoretically most important to a gender-conscious planning practice. Given these criteria, we identify six areas for future research: case studies of planning practice; practical and strategic gender interests; gender in the internal culture of planners; the balance between multiple differences and equality; the production and maintenance of life; and a gender-conscious reform of planning education. The above will need to go beyond much of the current research on gender in planning, which restricts itself to drawing a few lessons or making a plea for considering gender in future work.

Studies of Planning Practice

Feminist theory, unlike more academic theories, is related to and grows out of feminist practice. Studies of both feminist planning practice and the relationship of feminist activism to planning are needed. There are also very few case studies of traditional planning which consider gender issues. More are needed if adequate gender-conscious planning theories are to be developed. These studies could focus on the seven topical categories we examined in the previous section.

Practical and Strategic Gender Interests

Feminist planners working in developing countries have drawn a distinction between practical and strategic gender interests (Molyneux 1985; Moser 1989). Practical gender interests are derived directly from women's experiences in their gender relations and their direct interest in survival, given that context. They do not challenge current gender relations. Strategic gender interests are derived from a more theoretical or feminist analysis of women's subordination to men, and aim to alter those relationships toward something more equal (Moser 1989:1803). This theoretical construction seems worth exploring for its usefulness in planning in developed countries. It may provide a framework for linking the descriptive "women and ..." literature with explanations of why gender oppression occurs and with programs for fundamental change.

Gender and the Culture of Planners

We argued earlier that the problem of gender inequality in planning is present in the theories, standards, and ideologies used to guide planners' work--that is, in the internal culture of planners rather than merely in the dominance of planning by men. While it is true that, by the late 1980s, most planning schools were admitting roughly equal proportions of male and female students, there nevertheless remain considerable structural inequalities between men and women in the planning profession. There are very few women running or even in the senior ranks of planning agencies. Women are concentrated in the human services and social planning areas of the profession, areas with small and vulnerable budgets and relatively little prestige and power compared with, say, the areas of development control, metropolitan strategy, or transportation planning. In essence, despite their growing numbers, women are still on the periphery rather than at the center of the practice of planning. Should we

assume that this will change over time, as women move up through the ranks in the next decade, or are there structural impediments embedded in the culture of planners which need to be addressed (as indeed there are for women in other professional fields)? Are women treated differently (from and by men) in the planning workplace? Do they experience difficulties in being heard, in being taken seriously, in being drawn into the confidences or information-sharing that constitute the informal web of daily life in a planning office? Are women planners "punished" by their male peers if they speak out on "women's issues"? Do women planners simply not speak out on such issues from fear, from a perception that they would be marginalized in some way for so doing? In other words, is there a dominant male definition of the key issues in the planning workplace, a definition which could, for example, be at once progressive in class terms and yet quite gender-blind?

Three anecdotes will suffice. We recently asked a group of women planners in an Australian capital city whether they thought that the notion that planning policies are not gender-neutral had percolated through the male ranks of the profession and become built-in to their day-to-day practice and discussion. The women simply laughed (at the apparent naiveté of the question; at the hopelessness of the situation; perhaps, too, at their own tendency to avoid the issue because of the discomfort it inevitably causes).

Working as an advisor, in the same city, on a long-range metropolitan strategy review, one of the authors requested a meeting with women community development planners in the outer suburbs. She was told that the male supervisors of these women would not approve their staff attending such a meeting unless they themselves were present. There are two issues here. First, it is almost exclusively women who are working "at the coal-face," at the point of impact of planning policies. Second, senior men supervising these women are

uncomfortable about letting the women speak for themselves about their perception of the problems in these fringe estates. They are controlling women's voices.

A feminist planner colleague of ours once became the Manager of Community Services for a large suburban municipality in Australia. The managers of all the other planning departments within that council were male. She knew that they all drank together at the local pub at the end of the week. She suspected that important informal information exchange and power play took place at these gatherings. She was not invited. Women traditionally have not been part of pub culture in Australian life. Our colleague was not a drinker and didn't like the pub atmosphere. Yet she felt excluded and debated raising the matter with "the boys." The issue likely has no solution, since if she raised it and was invited to join them, their conversation would no doubt be constrained by her presence. We present it here as a problem, as an example of how the internal culture of planners reflects the biases of the wider culture of masculinity, and the dilemmas this poses for professional women about whether to adjust their behavior accordingly, or whether to try to introduce more female ways of socializing into the workplace.

A wealth of revealing (in-depth interview-type) research could be done about the experience of women in the planning workplace to assess whether and to what extent it is reinforcing or beginning to challenge the gender inequalities and biases of the wider society. (This is an omission in Forester's [1989] otherwise very perceptive work on the internal culture of planners.) It is also possible that roles like "professional," "planner," and "citizen" are constructed as gendered roles relying, for example, on traditionally gendered modes of argument and reasoning, as well as the practical care of a wife. This may system-

atically devalue or ignore other skills used by both men and women, and also create barriers to change locked into the very definition of the professional.

Difference and Equality

Woman is not a universal category but is composed of overlapping groups of people. This kind of unity and diversity in analytical categories is not unusual: capital is at once a whole and composed of various fractions: the state is made up of competing interest and functional groupings. Like the social role "woman," capital and state have also changed through time. It is important to treat this diversity seriously (Hooks 1984), while simultaneously figuring out where more specific or more general categories are analytically most powerful. This is done with the state and capital and can be done with gender as well.

The Production and Maintenance of Life

We need theoretical work about planning which starts from the need for the production and maintenance of life rather than the production and consumption of goods and services. Life-sustaining work by women is labor-intensive and not rewarded economically; it fits badly in materially-based theories, including much economics, which ignore or devalue it. And yet it is important work, and a theory which does not encompass it is extremely narrow. There is potential for developing theories of planning and good city form where the traditional women's work of the maintenance of life is made central. "Productive" work could be recast as supporting or complementing that, rather than being supported by it. There is already some important work on this in planning (Stretton 1974; Friedmann 1987, 1988), which feminist theories could help extend. Such an approach would incorporate issues ranging from ecological sustainability and security (from crime prevention to adequate housing tenure) to meaning.

Reform of Planning Education

Working as an advisor to an Australian state government reviewing metropolitan strategy in 1990, one of the authors met with a group of women planners and asked them about the level of consciousness of gender issues in the local planning scene. The response was "very low, verging on non-existent," followed by a rider that recent women graduates of the local planning program were actively anti-feminist. These new graduates, it seems, are afraid of being stereotyped and dismissed by male colleagues as "one of those noisy feminists." Further questioning revealed that the planning school from which they are graduating has not one woman on its faculty and that gender issues do not feature in the syllabus.

Experience teaching an introductory undergraduate planning course at Berkeley (85 students, roughly equal male/female split) in 1990 was revealing in a different way. Three of thirty lectures dealt specifically with the question of gender and planning (history, theory, and practice), while the importance of gender as a perspective and as an issue was mentioned in passing in perhaps ten more lectures. In student evaluations of the course at the end of the semester, some 10 percent of students (presumably mostly male), when asked "What was the worst thing about this class?," replied "The emphasis on gender." One student complained that the course should have been advertised as "Feminist City Planning." This group ranked the instructor and the course on the lowest possible grade. On the other hand, some 30 percent (presumably mostly female) noted the exploration of gender issues as one of the best things about the class, and ranked both course and instructor at the highest possible grade. This dramatic polarization reveals both the need for and the resistance to a gender-conscious approach to the teaching of planning.

It seems almost banal to conclude this theoretical piece with a plea for a more gender-sensitive planning curriculum, even if the need for this is self-evident. Educational change, by itself, is not enough. The problem begins and ends elsewhere than in planning school. But, as Edmund Burke said, quite aptly for the male-focussed area of planning theory, "Nobody made a greater mistake than he who did nothing because he could only do a little."

References

- Alford, Roger, and Roger Friedland. 1985. Powers of Theory: Capitalism, the State and Democracy. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Altshuler, Alan. 1965. The City Planning Process: A Political Analysis. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- Andrew, Caroline, and Beth Moore Milroy, eds. 1988. Life Spaces: Gender, Household, Employment. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Arnstein, Sherry. 1969. "A Ladder of Citizen Participation." Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 35, 4: 216-224.
- Barrett, Michele, and Mary McIntosh. 1985. "Ethnocentrism and Socialist Feminist Theory." Feminist Review, 20: 23-48.
- Belenky, Mary, Blythe Clinchy, Nancy Goldberger, and Jill Tarule. 1986. Women's Ways of Knowing: The Development of Self, Voice, and Mind. New York: Basic Books.
- Bell, Colin, and Howard Newby. 1976. "Community, Communion, Class and Community Action: The Social Sources of the New Urban Politics." In Social Areas in Cities, Volume II: Spatial Perspectives on Problems and Policies. D.T. Herbert and R.J. Johnson, eds. London: John Wiley.
- Bell, Derrick. 1985. And We Are Not Saved: The Elusive Request for Racial Justice. New York: Basic Books.
- Benhabib, Seyla. 1987. "The Generalized and the Concrete Other: The Kohlberg-Gilligan Controversy and Feminist Theory." In Feminism as Critique: On the Politics of Gender. Seyla Benhabib and Drucilla Cornell, eds. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bhavnani, Kum-Kum, and Margaret Coulson. 1986. "Transforming Socialist Feminism: The Challenge of Racism." Feminist Review, 23: 81-92.
- Birch, Eugenie. 1983. "From Civic Worker to City Planner: Women and Planning, 1890-1980." In The American Planner: Biographies and Reflections. Donald Krueckeberg, ed. New York: Methuen.
- Blum, Lawrence. 1988. "Gilligan and Kohlberg: Implications for Moral Theory." Ethics, 98, 3: 472-491.
- Bowlby, Sophie, Jane Lewis, Linda McDowell, and Jo Foord. 1989. "The Geography of Gender." In New Models in Geography, Volume 2. Richard Peet and Nigel Thrift, eds. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Boyer, Christine. 1983. Dreaming the Rational City: The Myth of American City Planning. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

- Brown, Carol. 1981. "Mothers, Fathers and Children: from Private to Public Patriarchy." In Women and Revolution: A Discussion of the Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism. Lydia Sargent, ed. Boston: South End Press.
- Caine, Barbara, E.A. Grosz, and Marie de Lepervanche. 1988. Crossing Boundaries: Feminisms and the Critique of Knowledges. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Carnoy, Martin. 1984. The State and Political Theory. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Castells, Manuel. 1977. The Urban Question. London: Edward Arnold.
- Castells, Manuel. 1980. "Cities and Regions Beyond the Crisis: Invitation to Debate." International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 4, 1: 127-129.
- Genzatti, Marco. 1987. "Appendix C: Marxism and Planning Theory." In Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowledge to Action, by John Friedmann. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Chodorow, Nancy. 1978. The Reproduction of Mothering. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Christopherson, Susan. 1989. "On Being Outside 'the Project'." Antipode, 21, 2: 83-89.
- Clark, Gordon, and Michael Dear. 1985. State Apparatus: Structures and Language of Legitimacy. Boston: Allen and Unwin.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1987. "The Social Construction of Black Feminist Thought: An Essay in the Sociology of Black Knowledge." Mimeo. Cincinnati, Ohio: Department of Afro-American Studies, University of Cincinnati.
- Connell, R.W. 1987. Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Connell, R.W. (1990 forthcoming.) "The State, Gender and Sexual Politics: Theory and Appraisal." Theory and Society.
- Cook, Judith, and Mary Fonow. 1986. "Knowledge and Women's Interests: Issues of Epistemology and Methodology in Feminist Sociological Research." Sociological Inquiry, 56, 1: 2-29.
- Cooper Marcus, Clare, and Wendy Sarkissian. 1986. Housing as If People Mattered: Site Design Guidelines for Medium-Density Family Housing. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Davidoff, Paul. 1965. "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning." Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 31: 331-338.
- Davis, Allan. 1983. "Playgrounds, Housing and City Planning." In Introduction to Planning History in the United States. Donald Krueckeberg, ed. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University.

- Delgado, Richard. 1989. "Story Telling for Oppositionists and Others: A Plea for Narrative." Michigan Law Review, 87: 2410-2441.
- Du Bois, Barbara. 1984. "Passionate Scholarship: Notes on Values, Knowing and Method in Feminist Social Science." In Theories of Women's Studies. Gloria Bowles and Renate Duelli Klein, eds. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Evans, Peter, Dietrich Rueschemeyer, and Theda Skocpol, eds. 1985. Bringing the State Back In. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Faludi, Andreas. (1990 forthcoming.) Review Symposium. Journal of Planning Education and Research.
- Flanagan, Owen, and Kathryn Jackson. 1987. "Justice, Care and Gender: The Kohlberg-Gilligan Debate Revisited." Ethics, 97, 3: 622-637.
- Fogelson, Richard. 1986. Planning the Capitalist City: The Colonial Era to the 1920s. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Forester, John. 1989. Planning in the Face of Power. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Friedman, Marilyn. 1989. "Feminism and Modern Friendship: Dislocating the Community." Ethics, 99, 1: 275-290.
- Friedmann, John. 1973. Retracking America. New York: Anchor.
- Friedmann, John. 1987. Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowledge to Action. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Friedmann, John. 1988. Life Space and Economic Space: Essays in Third World Planning. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Press.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1979. Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1982. Classes, Power and Conflict: Classical and Contemporary Debates. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gilligan, Carol. 1982. In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Gilligan, Carol, Janie Ward, and Jill Taylor eds. 1988. Mapping the Moral Domain: A Contribution of Women's thinking to Psychological Theory and Education. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Center for the Study of Gender, Education and Human Development, Harvard University.
- Gough, Ian. 1979. The Political Economy of the Welfare State. London: Macmillan.
- Habermas, Jurgen. 1973. Legitimation Crisis. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Hall, Peter. 1988. Cities of Tomorrow: An Intellectual History of Urban Planning. London: Basil Blackwell.

- Harding, Sandra. 1986a. The Science Question in Feminism. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Harding, Sandra. 1986b. "The Instability of the Analytical Categories of Feminist Theory." Signs, 11, 4: 645-664.
- Harding, Sandra, and Merrill Hintikka, eds. 1983. Discovering Reality: Feminist Perspectives on Epistemology, Metaphysics, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel.
- Harman, Elizabeth. 1983. "Capitalism, Patriarchy and the City." In Women, Social Welfare and the State in Australia. Cora Baldock and Bettina Cass, eds. Sydney: George Allen and Unwin.
- Harvey, David. 1973. Social Justice and the City. London: Edward Arnold.
- Harvey, David. 1978a. "The Urban Process Under Capitalism: A Framework for Analysis." International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 2, 1: 101-131.
- Harvey, David. 1978b. "Labour, Capital and Class Struggle Around the Built Environment in Advanced Capitalist Societies." In Urbanization and Conflict in Market Societies. Kevin Cox, ed. London: Methuen.
- Hayden, Dolores. 1980. "What Would a Non-Sexist City Be Like? Speculations on Housing, Urban Design, and Human Work." Signs, 5, 3 Supplement: s170-s187.
- Hayden, Dolores. 1981. The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Designs for American Homes, Neighborhoods and Cities. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Hayden, Dolores. 1984. Redesigning the American Dream: The Future of Housing, Work, and Family Life. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Heskin, Allan. 1980. "Crisis and Response: A Historical Perspective on Advocacy Planning." Journal of the American Planning Association, 46, 1: 50-63.
- Heskin, Allan. 1990. The Struggle for Community. Unpublished Manuscript.
- Hoch, Charles. (1990 forthcoming.) Review Symposium. Journal of Planning Education and Research.
- Hooks, Bell. 1984. Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center. Boston: Southend Press.
- Hull, Gloria, Patricia Bell Scott, and Barbara Smith, eds. 1982. All the Women Are White, All the Blacks Are Men, But Some of Us Are Brave: Black Women's Studies. New York: Feminist Press.
- Huxley, Margo. 1988. "Feminist Urban Theory: Gender, Class and the Built Environment." Transition, Winter: 39-43.

- Jack, Rand, and Dana Crowley Jack. 1989. Moral Visions and Professional Decisions: The Changing Values of Women and Men Lawyers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacobs, Jane. 1961. The Death and Life of Great American Cities. New York: Random House.
- Jaggar, Alison, and Paula Rothenberg, eds. 1984. Feminist Frameworks: Alternative Theoretical Accounts of the Relations Between Women and Men. Second Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Johnson, D. Kay. 1988. "Adolescents' Solutions to Dilemmas in Fables: Two Moral Orientations--Two Problem Solving Strategies." In Mapping the Moral Domain: A Contribution of Women's thinking to Psychological Theory and Education. Carol Gilligan, Janie Ward, and Jill Taylor, eds. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Center for the Study of Gender, Education and Human Development, Harvard University.
- Keller, Suzanne, ed. 1981. Building for Women. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books.
- Keller, Evelyn Fox. 1983. A Feeling for the Organism: The Life and Work of Barbara McClintock. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman.
- Kelly, Joan Gadol. 1984. Woman, History and Theory: The Essays of Joan Kelly. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- King, Deborah. 1988. "Multiple Jeopardy, Multiple Consciousness: The Context of a Black Feminist Ideology." Signs, 14, 1: 42-72.
- Kittay, Eva, and Diana Meyers, eds. 1987. Women and Moral Theory. Totawa, New Jersey: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Kuhn, Thomas. 1962. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Leavitt, Jacqueline. 1986. Feminist Advocacy Planning in the 1980s. In Strategic Perspectives in Planning Practice. Barry Checkoway, ed. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books.
- Leavitt, Jacqueline, and Susan Saegert. 1989. From Abandonment to Hope: Community-Households in Harlem. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lerner, Gerda. 1979. The Majority Finds its Past: Placing Women in History. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lofland, Lyn. 1975. The 'Thereness' of Women: A Selective Review of Urban Sociology. In Another Voice: Feminist Perspectives on Social Life and Social Science. Marcia Millman and Rosabeth Moss Kanter, eds. New York: Anchor Books.
- Lugones, Maria, and Elizabeth Spelman. 1983. "Have We Got Theory For You: Feminist Theory, Cultural Imperialism and the Demand for 'the Woman's Voice'." Women's Studies International Forum, 6, 6: 573-581.

- Mackenzie, Suzanne. 1984. "Catching Up With Ourselves: Ideas on Developing Gender Sensitive Theory in the Environmental Disciplines." Women and Environments, 5, 3: 16-18.
- Mackenzie, Suzanne. 1988. "Building Women, Building Cities: Toward Gender Sensitive Theory in Environmental Disciplines." In Life Spaces: Gender, Household, Employment. Carolyn Andrew and Beth Moore Milroy, eds. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Mackenzie, Suzanne. 1989. "Women in the City." In New Models in Geography, Volume 2. Richard Peet and Nigel Thrift, ed. London: Unwin Hyman.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. 1981. After Virtue: A Study in Moral Theory. London: Duckworth.
- Markusen, Ann. 1980. "City Spatial Structure, Women's Household Work, and National Urban Policy." Signs, 5, 3 Supplement: s23-s44.
- Marris, Peter, and Martin Rein. 1973. Dilemmas of Social Reform: Poverty and Community Action in the United States. Second Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Originally 1967.)
- Marris, Peter. 1987. Meaning and Action: Community Planning and Conceptions of Change. Second Edition. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. (Originally 1982.)
- Massey, Doreen, and Alejandrina Catalano. 1978. Capital and Land: Landownership by Capital in Great Britain. London: Edward Arnold.
- Matrix. 1984. Making Space: Women in the Man-Made Environment. London: Pluto Press.
- Matsuda, Mari. 1989. "Public Response to Racist Speech: Considering the Victim's Story." Michigan Law Review, 87: 2320-2381.
- Meyerson, Martin, and Edward Banfield. 1955. Politics, Planning and the Public Interest: The Case of Public Housing in Chicago. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.
- Milliband, Ralph. 1969. The State in Capitalist Society. London: Quartet Books.
- Milliband, Ralph. 1973. "Poulantzas and the Capitalist State." New Left Review, 82: 83-92.
- Millman, Marcia, and Rosabeth Moss Kanter, eds. 1975. Another Voice: Feminist Perspectives on Social Life and Social Science. New York: Anchor Books.
- Molyneux, Maxine. 1985. "Mobilization Without Emancipation? Women's Interests, State, and Revolution in Nicaragua." Feminist Studies, 11, 2: 227-254.
- Moser, Carolyn. 1989. "Gender Planning in the Third World: Meeting Practical and Strategic Gender Needs." World Development, 17, 11: 1799-1825.

- Moser, Carolyn, and C. Levi. 1986. A Theory and Methodology of Gender Planning: Meeting Practical and Strategic Gender Needs. Gender and Planning Working Paper, 11. London: Development Planning Unit, University College, London.
- Needleman, Martin, and Carolyn Needleman. 1974. Guerrillas in the Bureaucracy: The Community Planning Experiment in the United States. New York: John Wiley.
- Offe, Claus. 1984. Contradictions of the Welfare State. London: Hutchinson.
- O'Connor, James. 1973. The Fiscal Crisis and the State. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Okin, Susan Moller. 1989. Justice, Gender and the Family. New York: Basic Books.
- Palm, Risa, and Alan Pred. 1976. A Time-Geographic Perspective on the Problems of Inequality for Women. Working Paper Number 236. Berkeley: Institute of Urban and Regional Development, University of California.
- Paris, Chris, ed. 1983. Critical Readings in Planning Theory. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Pateman, Carole. 1983. "Feminist Critiques of the Public/Private Dichotomy." In Public and Private in Social Life. S.I.Benn and G.F.Gauss, eds. London: Croom Helm.
- Pateman, Carole, and Elizabeth Gross. 1986. Feminist Challenges: Social and Political Theory. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Peattie, Lisa. 1987. Planning: Rethinking Ciudad Guyana. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Peattie, Lisa. 1968. Reflections on Advocacy Planning. Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 34, 2: 80-88.
- Phillips, Anne. 1987. Divided Loyalties: Dilemmas of Sex and Class. London: Virago.
- Pickup, Laurie. 1984. "Women's Gender-Role and its Influence on Travel Behavior." Built Environment, 10, 1: 61-8.
- Piven, Francis Fox, and Richard Cloward. 1979. Poor People's Movements: Why They Succeed, How They Fail. New York: Vintage Press. (Originally 1977.)
- Polanyi, Michael. 1958. Personal Knowledge: Towards a Post-Critical Philosophy. New York: Harper and Row.
- Poulantzas, Nicos. 1973. Political Power and Social Classes. London: Verso.
- Rabinovitz, Francine. 1969. City Politics and Planning. New York: Atherton Press.

- Rich, Adrienne. 1979. "Toward a Woman-Centered University." In On Lies, Secrets and Silence. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Ritzdorf, Marsha. 1989. Regulating Separate Spheres: Municipal Land-Use Planning and the Changing Lives of Women. Paper presented at the Conference of the Society for American City and Regional Planning History, November 29.
- Rohrlich, Ruby, and Elaine Hoffman Baruch, eds. 1984. Women in Search of Utopia. New York: Schocken.
- Rothblatt, Donald. 1971. Regional Planning: The Appalachian Experience. Lexington, Massachusetts: Heath Lexington.
- Sandel, Michael. 1982. Liberalism and the Limits of Justice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sandercock, Leonie. 1977. Cities for Sale: Property, Politics and Urban Planning in Australia. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Sandercock, Leonie. 1978. "A Socialist City in a Capitalist Society? Property Ownership and Urban Reform in Australia." Journal of Australian Political Economy, 3: 66-79.
- Sandercock, Leonie. 1979. Urban Policy. In From Whitlam to Fraser: Reform and Reaction in Australian Politics. Allan Patience and Brian Head, eds. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Sandercock, Leonie. 1990. Property, Politics and Urban Planning: a Political History of Australian City Planning 1890-1990. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Press.
- Sarkissian, Wendy. 1978. "Planning as If Women Mattered: The Story of Brown Hills." Mimeo.
- Sarkissian, Wendy, and Donald Perlgut. 1986. The Community Participation Handbook: Resources for Public Involvement in the Planning Process. Roseville, Australia: Impacts Press.
- Sarkissian, Wendy. 1990. Personal Communication.
- Scott, Joan. 1986. "Gender: A Useful Category in Historical Analysis." American Historical Review, December: 1053-1075.
- Skocpol, Theda. 1979. States and Social Revolutions: Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, Ruth, and Deborah Valenze. 1988. "Mutuality and Marginality: Liberal Moral Theory and Working-Class Women in Nineteenth-Century England." Signs, 13, 2: 277-298.
- Soja, Edward. 1989. Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory. New York: Verso.
- Spacks, Patricia Meyer. 1985. Gossip. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Spender, Dale. 1985. Man Made Language. Second Edition. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Stimpson, Catherine, Elsa Dixler, Martha Nelson, and Kathryn Yatrakis, eds. 1981. Women and the American City. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Originally published in 1980 as a supplement to Signs, 5, 3.)
- Stretton, Hugh. 1974. Housing and Government. Sydney: The Australian Broadcasting Commission.
- Thrift, N. 1983. On the Determination of Social Action in Space and Time. Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 1, 1:23- 57.
- Tronto, Joan. 1987. "Beyond Gender Difference to a Theory of Care." Signs, 12, 4: 644-663.
- Watson, Sophie. 1986. "Women and Housing or Feminist Housing Analysis?" Housing Studies, 1, 1: 1-10.
- Watson, Sophie. 1988. Accommodating Inequality: Gender and Housing. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Wekerle, Gerda. 1980. Women in the Urban Environment. Signs, 5, 3: s188-s214.
- Wekerle, Gerda, Rebecca Peterson, and David Morley, eds. 1980. New Space For Women, Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Williams, Patricia. 1988. "On Being the Object of Property." Signs, 14, 1: 5-24.
- Williams, Patricia. 1989. "The Obliging Shell: An Informal Essay on Formal Equal Opportunity." Michigan Law Review, 87: 2128-2159.
- Wirka, Susan. 1989. Mary Kingsbury Simkhovitch and Neighborhood Planning in New York City, 1897-1909. Unpublished Masters thesis. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles.
- Women and Geography Study Group of the Institute of British Geographers. 1984. Geography and Gender: An Introduction to Feminist Geography. London: Hutchinson.
- Woolf, Virginia. 1966. Three Guineas. New York: Harcourt Brace.

