Urban Planning and Its Feminist Histories

by

Bri Gauger

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Urban and Regional Planning)
in the University of Michigan
2020

Doctoral Committee:
Associate Professor Scott Campbell, Chair
Associate Professor Joseph Grengs
Professor Matthew Lassiter
Professor Emeritus June Manning Thomas
Professor Valerie Traub

Bri Gauger

bgauger@umich.edu

ORCID iD: 0000-0002-5571-1964

Acknowledgements

I am deeply indebted to many people who made it possible for me to imagine, develop, and complete this dissertation. First, I am humbled by the caliber of advisors I was able to assemble into a committee. Each of my committee members has provided me with invaluable support. Scott Campbell, my chair, has been my biggest cheerleader since my first day at Michigan and has patiently and thoughtfully supported me as I muddled through. Joe Grengs provided me with structured space to grow this project, extended boundless kindness and empathy, and I could always count on him to keep me on track. Matt Lassiter encouraged me as I learned how to conduct historical research, and his urban and suburban history course in the fall of 2015 introduced me not only to formative intellectual material but also to the friends who would become my steadfast support network at UM. June Manning Thomas taught me most of what I know about planning history and pedagogy, trusted me with her personal contacts, and has provided true inspiration by setting a wonderful example of a passionate, caring professor. Last but not least, I want to thank Valerie Traub, who took a chance on me and has gone above and beyond for me ever since, a true advocate who has been my feminist compass and has helped me see what I am capable of.

I would not be here without the women (and a few men) who agreed to be interviewed for this project. They not only gave generously of their time, but in many cases welcomed me into their homes, tracked down primary documents for me, and provided encouragement and enthusiasm for the research. Above all, I am grateful that they trusted me with their stories and hope I have done them justice. Their narratives gave me strength to continue this work whenever the going was tough.

Several sources of financial support ensured I was able to fulfill the ambitious travel schedule required to gather interviews and archival materials. With the help of Scott Campbell and Ana Paula Pimentel Walker, I secured a 2016 Research through Planning grant (sponsored by Alan and Cynthia Berkshire) from Taubman College at UM that made my first round of interviews possible. Rackham Graduate School's student research grants funded subsequent

travel. I am also grateful for support from the Center for Education of Women +, the Rackham Predoctoral Fellowship, and the Rackham Summer Fellowship, which paid the bills while I worked on this project. The Community of Scholars Program at UM's Institute for Research on Women and Gender provided both monetary support and a fantastic interdisciplinary workshopping space.

My faculty, Ph.D. colleagues, master's students, and friends in the planning and architecture programs at Taubman College have consistently bolstered me. My radical planner co-conspirators in the Spaces of Struggle collective (particularly Carla Kayanan, Sarah Gelbard, and Raksha Vasudevan) continue to challenge me, inspire me, and give me hope. I am grateful to my union, the Graduate Employees Organization (GEO) at UM, for ensuring graduate students have access to health insurance, decent pay, and safe and just working conditions. GEO re-invigorated my activist spirit after several years away from organizing and taught me so much in the process. UM works because we do!

I cannot adequately express my gratitude for my incredible support network in Michigan, Nebraska, and Los Angeles. My Michigan besties (aka the Bear Grotto) sustained me intellectually and emotionally through the long, dark Michigan winters, and always let me cook for them. And I'm thankful for Tinate Zebadayo, my newest soul sister, who always cooked for me. I owe so much to my Jills – to Haveman, at whose desk I wrote the majority of this during the pandemic, and to Francke, who always keeps me grounded. Though I've been gone for over six years, my heart still lives in L.A. with my chosen family, the JLAB crew, who mean more than the world to me. Alison Spindler performed a true labor of love by reading my entire dissertation at the eleventh hour and I can always count on Alicen Bartle to keep me from working too hard! I love you all.

I want to thank my siblings – my forever best friends – and my parents for instilling in me an intellectual curiosity and love of learning that has kept me in school for most of my life!

My beloved partner and number one tall guy, Brett Smith, deserves most of the credit for the completion of this project. His sacrifices, large and small, over the last eight and a half years of graduate school are the only reason that I made it through. I am so thankful for his kind spirit, his caretaking abilities, and his willingness to stand by me. We did it together.

This dissertation is dedicated to my grandmother, who first encouraged me to study urban planning and who always has my back. I'm for Jan Gauger!

Table of Contents

Abstract

Urban Planning and its Feminist Histories identifies and amplifies women's roles in shaping the institutions, ideas, and educational practices that comprised the field of planning in North America throughout the twentieth century, with a particular focus on the United States in the 1960s through the 1990s. My narrative of the relationships between feminist activism, spatial practice, higher education, and the politics of knowledge production reveals feminism's contradictory legacy in shaping contemporary approaches to planning practice, theory, and education. Based on forty-two interviews with planning scholars in the U.S. and Canada, my cross-generational oral history research is read in light of feminist scholarship and archival documents from planning schools and organizations, women's interest groups, collectives, and task forces, and community-based organizations and collectives. An interdisciplinary project, this dissertation draws from and contributes to the history of social movements, planning education and practice, and related fields such as architecture, geography, urban history, and women's and gender studies.

Beginning in the late 1960s, an emerging social and political focus in the field of planning attracted women participating in a long tradition of female-headed housing and community development activism. Bolstered by equal opportunity legislation and increased federal funding for research on women's and urban issues, the first substantial group of women to become planning scholars began their academic careers in the 1970s. These women produced feminist knowledge about gender, race, class, and the city by forming educational collectives and lobbying groups, convening conferences, and creating publishing outlets alongside members of the nascent Women's Studies movement. The activist and community-engaged roots of the first generation of feminist planning academics equipped them to develop new paradigms for planning theory and epistemology that centered participation and everyday experience, as well as spearheading community studio learning models in planning classrooms. At the same time, these feminist planners, architects, designers, and community development and housing advocates

staked a claim in both activist and academic spaces for the important role of space, place, and the urban environment in feminist thought and practice.

In the late 1980s and early 90s, women shaped the landscape of the planning academy by moving into leadership roles and founding the Faculty Women's Interest Group (FWIG) within the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP). Through FWIG and various ACSP initiatives and committees, they built a professional support network and led efforts for gender and racial diversity among planning faculty, students, and research. While this dissertation demonstrates how the first feminist scholars carved out discursive and institutional space in the planning academy, it also reveals that this is not an entirely victorious story. I also examine the theoretical and practical consequences of women's early activism in the academy through the experiences of scholars who struggled in academia, were denied tenure, and/or were pushed out of planning to a different discipline. In contrast to the initial group, comprised mostly of white women, this pool of interviewees consists primarily of BIPOC women whose stories provide a crucial intergenerational and intersectional perspective on shifting barriers and priorities that parallel broader trends in feminist movements. I present their perspectives on how these women were largely alienated from institutional gains in the 1990s, how their scholarship was marginalized, and how they have helped each other survive and thrive.

Introduction

Project goals and scope

This dissertation provides an account of the impacts of women's activism and feminist thought in the planning field. While a substantial amount of planning research has studied women's experiences and engaged the concept of gender over the last fifty years, no systematic account of planning's relationship with feminism exists. I focus on the 1960s through the 1990s, the period leading up to and directly following the women's movement in North America, though my study also addresses the longer arc of women's involvement in planning thought and practice from before the Progressive Era. I trace the lineage of feminist perspectives in planning by following individual and institutional actors engaged in sharing their ideas in both formal and informal contexts. While I primarily engage with the American context, I also include Canadian perspectives because of the substantial intellectual and institutional overlap occurring during the period of study.

The project addresses two primary goals: first, I document the roles of women in a male-dominated field which has too often obscured their experiences and perspectives. What was it like to be a female planning scholar when there were only a few in the discipline? How have women impacted planning research and education? How did women's priorities and strategies emerge in the particular historical and cultural moments in which they developed? My research uncovers, solicits, collects, and reflects on women's contributions to the interdisciplinary field of planning.

My second goal is to define feminist planning in historically and experientially grounded terms. Attentive to the fact that the term "feminist" occupies contested terrain accompanied by a fraught set of meanings, associations, and reactions, my project investigates the stakes involved in viewing or defining one's work (or self) as "feminist." For this reason, I designed this dissertation to extend beyond the understandings of feminism that emerge from planning literature and to examine unexpected forces, actors, and connections, and incongruities. This project attempts to trace the lineage of feminism in the academy in its complexity and

multiplicity, while acknowledging power relations and histories of exclusion and marginalization.

It is difficult to reconcile the experiences of women in the workplace of academia with gender as a subject of research or scholarly work on feminist planning. Some women worked explicitly on gender planning, for example, while others personally identified as feminists but did not foreground women in their research. In order to navigate this complexity, I looked at three overlapping modes of feminism: feminism as an activist practice, feminism as a set of institutional demands, and feminism as a critical theoretical lens that interrogates power through the concept of gender. This framework allows me to untangle the complex relationships between women's research and actions, on the one hand, and their associations with a set of social movements or theoretical frames on the other. My methods, which combine oral history, archival research, and critical analysis, ground the links between feminism and planning in both institutional practices and personal experiences. Overall, the project seeks to uncover the ideas and practices that constitute feminism in planning in order to assess the meanings, limitations, and possibilities of feminist planning.

Another challenge involved finding the appropriate balance between celebration and contention in the narrative. While it is crucial to honor individual women's contributions and the gains that groups of women have made since the 1960s, including increased demographic representation in the profession and academy, it would be a mistake to give in to a triumphant impulse when reflecting on the achievements of women. Too much focus on accomplishments can obscure the many struggles, costs, and trauma experienced by female planners, borne particularly by non-white academic women who are historically (and currently) underrepresented in the planning academy. My analysis revealed, for example, that while circumstances improved for women planners overall over the last fifty years, those benefits were not evenly distributed and, in many aspects, benefited primarily white women.

How can we assess academic women's experiences and feminist achievements in the field of planning? The project is driven by my interviews with forty-two planning scholars (five of whom are men), which allowed me to document, contextualize, and analyze both positive trends and negative consequences. Rather than diagnosing progress definitively, I took advantage of the range of perspectives presented to me to narrate the tensions and complexity present in this

history.[1] My project seeks to question and reconstruct the notion of feminism in planning in order to push the field towards a liberatory feminism that leads with the voices and needs of the most marginalized.

My analysis distinguishes between several spheres of influence: planning practice, policy, and the built environment (the "profession" of planning); and planning research, scholarship, and education (the "planning academy"). While it is important to acknowledge the interconnections between these realms, particularly during the 1960s and 1970s when the academic institutions of planning were still emerging, my study focuses on the planning academy for three reasons. First, feminist planning research has already extensively documented gendered problems with design, policy, and the workplaces of professional planners,[2] while recent scholarship looks at racial dynamics in planning education but does not focus particularly on women.[3] Secondly, the relatively few women in the planning academy during the 1970s made it plausible to record a reasonably representative number of members of the first generation of feminist planning scholars. Finally, enough time has passed since women's entry into the planning academy that I could gather and compare the perspectives of several generations.

Study Design & Methodology

In the remainder of this introduction, I lay out the design of the study, identify the main actors and sources in the narrative, and describe my methods of analysis. I gathered data from interviews with planning scholars, archival documents from planning groups and organizations, and published scholarship. My analysis of the relationships between the various components of this historical narrative employed the methods of oral history, ethnography, and discourse analysis.

---

[1] John Forester, "Learning from Practice Stories: The Priority of Practical Judgment," in *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*, ed. Frank Fischer and John Forester (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1993), 186–209.

[2] This research is outlined in chapters 3 and 4.

[3] C. Aujean Lee et al., "Beyond Recruitment: Comparing Experiences of Climate and Diversity between International Students and Domestic Students of Color in U.S. Urban Planning Programs," *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, March 12, 2020, http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0739456X20902241; Ivis García et al., "'Like a Fish out of Water': The Experience of African American and Latinx Planning Students," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, July 1, 2020, 1–15, https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2020.1777184; April Jackson et al., "All Talk No Walk: Student Perceptions on Integration of Diversity and Practice in Planning Programs," *Planning Practice & Research* 33, no. 5 (October 20, 2018): 574–95; Willow Lung-Amam et al., "Teaching Equity and Advocacy Planning in a Multicultural 'Post-Racial' World," *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 35, no. 3 (September 1, 2015).

Interviews

Because knowledge is partially biographical and therefore gender-based,[4] a history of feminist ideas and practices would not be complete without the women themselves. Interviews allowed me to construct a narrative of a feminist planning movement with the perspectives of the women who were a part of it and experienced it in positive, negative, and sometimes ambivalent ways. Experience is also constituted through discourse.[5] My project interprets personal experiences alongside organizational archives that contextualize planning discourse, in order to consider contested and transformative discourses in addition to hegemonic ones.[6] I highlight planning ideas and strategies that emerged from grassroots-level activism as well as those published in academic journals.

I recorded oral histories to provide rich biographical accounts of personal experiences and viewpoints. I adhere to Anderson and Jack's assertion that "realizing the possibilities of the oral history interview demands a shift in methodology from information gathering, where the focus is on the right questions, to interaction, where the focus is on process, on the dynamic unfolding of the subject's viewpoint."[7] Unlike traditional interviewing practices that center the positionality and responses of the person being interviewed, the method of oral history recognizes that both the narrator and the interviewer influence the process of collecting and analyzing data. Oral history is therefore a self-reflexive and intersubjective practice, which considers the multiple subjectivities at work in the interview setting.[8] One aspect of this intersubjective model that impacted my project concerns the power dynamics between me and my narrators; I used two types of permission protocols with those power dynamics in mind.[9]

I developed a traditional oral history consent form that gave me far-reaching permissions with the interview data, including use of the interviewee's name and copyright of the audio and transcript. However, I realized that people at different stages of their careers had differing stakes

---

[4] Leonie Sandercock and Ann Forsyth, "Feminist Theory and Planning Theory: The Epistemological Linkages," *Planning Theory*, no. 7/8 (1992): 45–49.
[5] Joan W. Scott, "The Evidence of Experience," *Critical Inquiry* 17, no. 4 (July 1991): 773–97.
[6] Kathleen Canning, "Feminist History after the Linguistic Turn: Historicizing Discourse and Experience," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 19, no. 2 (January 1994): 368–404.
[7] Kathryn Anderson and Dana C. Jack, "Learning to Listen: Interview Techniques and Analyses," in *Women's Words: The Feminist Practice of Oral History*, ed. Sherna Berger. Gluck and Daphne Patai (New York: Routledge, 1991), 11–26.
[8] Sherna Berger. Gluck and Daphne Patai, eds., *Women's Words: The Feminist Practice of Oral History* (New York: Routledge, 1991).
[9] See Appendix for consent forms

in sharing experiences with me, and I wanted them to share as freely as they felt comfortable with. I developed another consent form that limited the circulation of the raw transcript and specified that I would only make it public with written permission after the interviewee had reviewed it. The second form also allowed interviewees to review any portion of the interview that I attributed to them in publication form, including this finalized dissertation product. In both cases, I allowed interviewees to redact any portion of the material, both during the interview and from the transcript. Regardless of which form the interviewee signed, I refer to all of them as oral histories because of the methods I used to record and analyze them.

When constructing my interview pool for the project, I began with the authors of mainstream planning literature that explicitly engages with feminism and/or women as research subjects. However, wanting to avoid a fixed structure narrative that attributes agency only to a small number of privileged actors,[10] I identified two more loosely defined groups from interview referrals and archival documents: those who played key roles in institutional organizing for the equal treatment of women in the planning academy (but did not necessarily foreground gender in their own research), and women who rarely published in mainstream planning journals.[11] I sought out women who joined the planning academy at different times, started by recording the most senior women, and proceeded through several age cohorts.

The decision to expand beyond identifiably key feminist figures is also about racial representation in the planning academy, where a small and elite (albeit marginalized in the broader planning academy) group of mostly white women drove much of the initial discourse about feminism in planning. I sought out interviewees who are women of color and members of other marginalized identity groups; of the forty-two individuals I interviewed, nine self-identified as women of color. Five were men who were particularly sympathetic to feminist planning and/or who played key supportive roles to women in the planning academy. I also spoke with people from across several academic "generations" (the most senior interviewee completed her Ph.D. in 1971 and the most junior in 2009).

For several reasons, I ended up including direct quotes from just under half of the total interviewees. First, I chose not to include men's perspectives because they already have more

[10] Linda K. Kerber, *Toward an Intellectual History of Women*, Gender and American Culture (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997).
[11] Chapter 3 addresses the latter group in detail.

visibility as a group. The interviews with men were primarily used for background context, for locating women I might not have otherwise come into contact with, and to gain insights into institutional climate. Secondly, I did not include many of the voices of white women who I interviewed from among the younger generations of scholars. While their stories are rich and their experiences are present, both in the activities and scholarship I describe, I chose to privilege women of color's perspectives from among the newest cohorts.

I recorded the forty-two interviews by traveling to over twenty cities in the U.S. and Canada over a period of three years (2016-2019). We most often spoke in the interviewee's home or office, though a few interviews were conducted in coffee shops and conference hotel hallways. One took place over the telephone and one on Zoom. Though the longest contains four and a half hours of tape recorded over two days, each interview typically lasted about an hour. No one objected to being audio recorded, though several chose to remain anonymous. I transcribed each interview and provided the narrator with the transcript by email at a later date.

I conducted the interviews in an open-ended fashion to elicit stories of life experiences, while allowing the narrator to define herself and her experience in her own words and on her own terms. To elicit narratives that speak to my main research questions, I formed a questionnaire focused on three broad topics: personal and career background; research, scholarship, and teaching; and institutional involvement.[12] I kept questions general so that participants would "be able to reflect upon their experience and choose for themselves which experiences and feelings are central to their sense of their past,"[13] though I at times probed for further reflections. I prepared for each interview by compiling biographical information and reviewing each narrator's C.V. and published works so that I would be somewhat familiar with them before we sat down together.

I employed methods from oral history and ethnography to analyze and interpret the interview data. First, while the act of listening is typically thought of as a research practice, listening for gaps or silences during the interview process is also an analytic practice. Listening for gaps means thinking about the interviewee's positionality and about various ways that she might be adjusting based on what she feels expected to say or exclude.[14] Overall, analyzing

[12] See Appendix for questionnaire
[13] Anderson and Jack, "Learning to Listen: Interview Techniques and Analyses."
[14] Anderson and Jack.

transcripts and field notes for what people said *as well as* for what they did not or could not say provided insights particularly into narrators' relationships to feminism, gender studies, and cultural norms. In other words, while conducting interviews and in subsequent analysis, I both accepted what people told me at face value and also listened for coded language or for elided topics. These impressions are recorded in my field notes and incorporated into my analysis; they became particularly relevant for interpreting the ways in which women spoke about each other.

I analyzed interview data in conjunction with my field notes through an iterative process of coding and writing ethnographic memos. This method employs a grounded theory approach that generates analytic categories in order to develop theory.[15] First, I "open coded" transcripts and field notes, which involved noting in a code memo key terms, contexts, contradictions, feelings, and whatever else struck me about the data. In addition to writing about "core processes that characterize talk and interaction in a particular setting,"[16] I noted silences, contrasting accounts, and variation among and between narrators. I repeated this open coding process until themes emerged from the data that I could use for analytic categories. Finally, I continued to "elaborate, extend, and integrate the properties and dimensions of my categories by writing theoretical memos" that explored the implications of those categories.[17]

Archival Documents

While interviews provided experiential data, archival records and reports provided much of the institutional context for this project. I verified, problematized, and deepened the oral history accounts by simultaneously collecting and analyzing records from planning organizations and affiliated interest groups and committees. I also analyzed scholarship (including monographs, edited volumes, dissertations, and journal articles) written by my interviewees as well as others publishing about gender in planning whom I did not have the opportunity to interview.

I examined archival documents from the two main planning organizations in the U.S.: the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP) and the American Planning Association

[15] Kathy Charmaz, *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis* (London ; Thousand Oaks: SAGE, 2006).
[16] Robert M. Emerson, Rachel I. Fretz, and Linda L. Shaw, *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011).
[17] Emerson, Fretz, and Shaw. Page 172

(APA). ACSP convenes an annual conference, coordinates communications among planning faculty, and participates in planning school accreditation, among other academic-focused activities. Though the APA focuses more on the profession and practice of planning, cross-pollination between the two organizations is common. ACSP's Faculty Women's Interest Group (FWIG), People of Color Interest Group (POCIG), and the APA's Women in Planning Division are particularly relevant to this project. Their archives contain documents such as conference materials, board meeting minutes, and committee reports and recommendations.

I drew from internal correspondence and educational materials produced by several short-lived but influential planning and design organizations such as the Women's School of Planning and Architecture (WSPA) and Planners for Equal Opportunity (PEO). I also integrated a variety of primary sources gathered from personal collections of interviewees, including posters and proceedings from feminist planning conferences, bibliographies circulated among feminist scholars, and syllabi from planning courses on women and gender. This combination of primary sources pointed me to formal and informal sites and networks whereby women shared and produced feminist knowledge.

I entered archives with specific questions that spoke to my larger research aims for the project. When analyzing special interest group records, for example, I looked at how the group interacted with the larger organizational body, which kinds of topics were prioritized, and in what ways the group advocated for these topics. What impact did this group have on the experiences of women? On the circulation of feminist ideas? Which tactics did they use to promote women's needs in the academy? How did they define those needs? What were the tensions or disagreements within the interest group and across different groups?

I examined ACSP meeting minutes from governing board meetings and organizational communications to gauge when and in what ways female and feminist faculty's demands entered the agendas, and to track when relevant committees and task forces were formed and by whom. As with oral history interviews, archival work involves "interpreting and deriving meaning from other people's representations of various sets of circumstances,"[18] so I cross-referenced accounts to understand the point of view that the records expressed.

I engaged with several levels of discourse in these interviews, primary documents, and scholarship in order to reveal and analyze connections, context, and the logics of repressive

[18] Stephen Ward, "Archival Research," in *Researching the City*, ed. Kevin Ward (Los Angeles: Sage, 2014), 24–37.

structures (rather than simply drawing attention to them).[19] Primary discourse is concerned with the specific details that a record documents, such as who was present when the ACSP governing board passed a resolution on a particular date. Secondary discourse encompasses several layers of context, both the immediate context that explains who the board members were and what prior viewpoints they brought to the meeting, as well as wider context that addresses "how far were the actions they were taking being shaped by individuals or forces that were not directly recorded."[20] I analyzed the discursive categories "woman," "women," "gender," and "feminist" the most carefully, but also attended to categories of racial and class difference and the concept of diversity.

Chapter Summary

Although there are many possible ways to organize this work, I chose to structure the dissertation chronologically to highlight several important eras while also comparing themes that cut across periods. I made strategic choices based on what emerged as relevant from my interviews and archives in order to evaluate what each period contributes to our understanding of feminism's relationship to planning.

While the core focus of this dissertation is academic women, a group not present in until the 1970s, I begin with the Progressive and New Deal Eras because they represent a critical period in the development of the planning profession that feminist historians chose to revisit. Chapter 1 draws on the few accounts that chronicle women's roles during this period to introduce a theme – women's attention to social aspects of planning – that I extend and problematize through the rest of the dissertation.

Because women were largely absent from planning after the 1930s, the narrative resumes in the 1960s, when social movements impacted urban development and planning practice. When I asked interviewees how they ended up in the planning field, most mentioned the disciplinary context that emerged during this period of intense social activism as the primary appealing factor. Chapter 2 highlights the previously unexplored history of women's involvement from 1960 to 1970, documenting the skills they gained and would bring to the academy once gendered barriers to entry were eased (particularly for white women).

[19] Stephen Ward.
[20] Stephen Ward.

Between 1970 to 1985, women began entering the academy in substantial numbers and engaging planning with ideas and practices from the women's movement. These women produced feminist knowledge about gender, race, class, and the city, and planning scholarship began to acknowledge the concept of gender and to prioritize women as research subjects. Chapter 3 shows how this first group of feminist planning scholars built on expertise in housing and community development to re-insert those endeavors as a crucial part of planning and to develop new paradigms for planning theory and epistemology.

The formation of the Faculty Women's Interest Group in 1986 marks a turning point from piecemeal feminist interventions to a national institutionalized network for supporting women in academic careers. Chapter 4 outlines the ways in which women shaped the institutional landscape of the planning academy by moving into leadership positions and leading ACSP efforts for gender and racial diversity in planning research and the academy. It also evaluates the actions of the first generations of women in planning through the experiences of academic women of color in the 1990s and 2000s. I present their perspectives on marginalized scholarship, outline some of the personal and professional costs they have borne, and introduce women of color's institutional responses.

Finally, the conclusion reflects on broader lessons from the history of women's activism and feminist scholarship in planning. I offer a way forward for feminist planning that prioritizes intersectional analysis and presents emancipatory possibilities.

Chapter 1: Women Shape City Planning in the Early Twentieth Century

Over two days in the late spring of 1909, the first National Conference on City Planning (NCCP) held in the U.S. took place in Washington, D.C. The theme of the conference, "using planning to deal with social problems,"[21] brought together urban planners and progressive social reformers, particularly those interested in housing. The primary objective of the conference was "to validate the study of city planning from 'hygienic, economic and social' perspectives," which for the organizers meant reorienting urban planning based on economic and sociological perspectives, directly pushing back against City Beautiful proponents' focus on aesthetics.[22] In fact, conference participants in 1909 inverted City Beautiful's aesthetic aim, claiming that addressing social and economic issues would result in a "genuinely and completely beautiful city."

Among the slate of speakers invited to address the assembly was a single woman. Mary Simkhovitch, a settlement house pioneer in New York City, "argued for links between housing and social services in neighborhood planning and presented both short- and long-term planning strategies for creating more livable urban environments through neighborhood regeneration."[23] She urged attendees to think about planning not only from a civic, but also from a social, point of view and her address outlined a vision of city life that reflected the work of women and their unique position in a sphere of social life too often ignored or excluded from design practice.

[21] Susan Marie Wirka, "The City Social Movement: Progressive Women Reformers and Early Social Planning," in *Planning the Twentieth-Century American City*, ed. Mary Corbin Sies and Christopher Silver (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996), 55–75.
[22] Wirka, 70.
[23] Wirka, 60.

Benjamin Marsh, a social worker and the author of the first book dedicated to urban planning,[24] is often credited with organizing the NCCP.[25] However, a team of progressive women reformers also shared responsibility for convening the conference, shaping its agenda and goals, and directing messaging for the effort.[26] Marsh was the executive secretary of the conference's sponsoring organization, the New York Committee on Congestion of the Population (CCP). Simkhovitch served as the CCP's chairperson, while two other women, Florence Kelley and Lillian Wald, were among the founding members of the CCP. These women created "A distinctly female support network… [which] enable[d] politically and professionally active women to function independently and intensively" to shape a national city planning agenda.[27]

Formed in 1907, the CCP emphasized housing reform as integral to solving overcrowded urban conditions and directly linked their approach to planning interventions.[28] Led by Simkhovitch, one of CCP's main functions was to collect data on problems resulting from overpopulation and to present its findings to the public in a compelling fashion that would spur change. Leading up to the national conference, CCP's most visible accomplishment was sponsoring a public exhibition that ran March 9-28, 1908 at the Museum of Natural History in New York City. This public relations strategy helped the CCP gain traction in order to begin developing a national program for city planning that included amenities and social infrastructure like transportation and decent shelter. Not only did CCP leadership make their case compelling, they directly linked it to urban planning as an emerging profession and exerted pressure on planners to pay attention to housing and other social issues instead of focusing entirely on urban form.

By 1911, however, the attempt to connect housing reformers, many of whom were women, with professional city planners, who were all male, faltered. Architects and landscape architects such as Frederick Law Olmsted dominated the second NCCP and many of the housing

---

[24] Benjamin C. Marsh, *An Introduction to City Planning: Democracy's Challenge and the American City* (New York, 1909).
[25] Peter Marcuse, "Housing in Early City Planning," *Journal of Urban History* 6, no. 2 (February 1980): 153–76; Harvey A. Kantor, "Benjamin C. Marsh and the Fight over Population Congestion," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 40, no. 6 (November 1, 1974): 422–29.
[26] Susan Marie Wirka, "Housing: Mary Kingsbury Simkhovitch," in *The American Planner: Biographies and Recollections*, ed. Donald A. Krueckeberg, 2nd ed. (New Brunswick, N.J.: Center for Urban Policy Research, 1994), 85–112.
[27] Wirka, "The City Social Movement: Progressive Women Reformers and Early Social Planning," 64.
[28] Wirka, "Housing: Mary Kingsbury Simkhovitch," 91.

advocates absconded to the newly formed National Housing Association (NHA), which began holding its own separate conference.[29] The NCCP continued to serve as the primary national professional organization in the U.S. until 1935, but largely without addressing housing.[30] In effect, city planning sidelined housing and other social concerns from its professional agenda for several decades, even as reformers like Simkhovitch continued to advocate for inclusion.

This chapter explores the planning implications of women's involvement in a variety of reform movements during the Progressive and New Deal Eras. Through movements for housing reform, civic engagement and community building, domestic reform, and campaigns for public housing, women sustained a call for attention to social issues in the development of modern city planning. Their efforts around housing, in particular, influenced the profession of planning even though the male-dominated profession repeatedly sidelined housing as a planning issue. I address these topics thematically, since they took place simultaneously during the period under consideration here, roughly the first half of the twentieth century.

Few accounts of women's roles in the development of early city planning exist. Several feminists who became planning scholars in the 1970s and 1980s produced most of the research that we do have, and these key texts are my object of study in this chapter. The scholars are white women writing about white historical actors, with a few exceptions. I present a close reading of this historical scholarship, outlining how women contributed to planning from the margins of the profession. I also present insights from oral histories with the authors, highlighting why early feminist planning historians studied this era. The scholars viewed city planning history through the lens of gender and related concepts like domesticity and rationality, though they offered divergent views on the ideological work that progressive women reformers performed.

Although there are multiple forces at play in the first half of the twentieth century, I focus on three broad movements that feminist planning historians chose to highlight: housing movements, civic reform, and domestic reform. Through these movements, women sustained a call for attention to social issues in the development of modern city planning. Their efforts around housing were particularly influential; though not immediately successful, as the male-

[29] Daphne Spain, "Octavia Hill's Philosophy of Housing Reform: From British Roots to American Soil," *Journal of Planning History* 5, no. 2 (May 1, 2006): 106–25; Marcuse, "Housing in Early City Planning."
[30] Donald A. Krueckeberg, ed., *Introduction to Planning History in the United States* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University, 1983).

dominate profession repeatedly sidelined housing as a planning issue, they bore fruit in the late 1930s when the U.S. adopted its first public housing program.

Women-Led Housing Movements

The movement for housing reform in the U.S. and U.K. in the grew from the efforts of several intertwined groups of reformers, including the tenement house movement and the settlement house movement in the second half of the 19th century.[31] The overcrowded and polluted conditions of the industrial city posed many public health concerns, prompting public indictments of unsanitary tenement conditions, such as the photographs produced and circulated by journalist and housing reformer Jacob Riis.[32] Around the time that city planning was forming as a profession, wide public attention to problems in cities, and in particular those related to housing conditions, forced municipal reformers to pay attention to housing.[33]

The American housing reform movement is commonly traced to Lawrence Veiller, a colleague of Riis from College Settlement in New York City, who would successfully lobby for passage of regulatory measures on tenements. Veiller organized the Tenement House Exhibition in New York in 1899 to raise awareness of adverse conditions, to convince the public of the "evils" of the tenement system, and to drum up support for regulatory measures. The exhibition made use of photographs and maps showing spatial correlations between poverty, disease, and crowding, such as those popularized by pioneering social scientist Charles Booth in England.[34] Veiller's lobbying effort paid off in 1901 when Congress passed the Tenement House Act, which both regulated new construction and mandated updates on existing tenements.

While the influence of Veiller and Riis on early housing reform is well-known, the feminist planning scholar Daphne Spain noted in 2006 that a British reformer named Octavia Hill was particularly influential on Veiller and on the style of tenement reform that spread to the United States.[35] Spain, a member of the urban planning faculty at the University of Virginia since 1985, spent the first decade of her career researching residential segregation, race, gender, and demography. Her foray into women's history in planning was spurred by her own memories

[31] Spain, "Octavia Hill's Philosophy of Housing Reform."
[32] Marcuse, "Housing in Early City Planning."
[33] Marcuse.
[34] Spain, "Octavia Hill's Philosophy of Housing Reform."
[35] Spain.

of being denied credit for academic work while she revisited accounts of the City Beautiful movement and industrialization. She told me, "I remember thinking, Okay, what were women doing in this era when they couldn't vote, and they weren't professionals? And what did they do that they never got credit for? So that… whole idea pretty much came out of my own personal aggravation."[36] She continued, "My research trajectory was driven mainly by… my personal politics." In addition to her work on Octavia Hill, Spain wrote two historical monographs on women as planners and place-makers.[37]

Spain describes how Hill moved away from the dominant philanthropic model of housing reform. Hill proposed solving poverty through "work instead of alms" and promoted the idea that it was "far better to give work than either money or goods."[38] Hill garnered the attention and financial support of John Ruskin, an art critic and advocate of housing reform, who helped her realize her vision of being a landlord for a model tenement system grounded in a philosophy of moral and individual uplift. Hill was dedicated to market provision of solutions for poor tenement conditions and opposed public ownership; part of what made her model unique for its time is that it generated a modest profit. Between 1864 and 1887, Hill's holdings grew from nine tenements to hundreds of properties housing 5,000 tenants.[39]

Hill's model tenement system relied on four principles: "collect weekly rents in person, evict tenants who fail to pay promptly, generate a modest profit, and reinvest excess profits in maintenance."[40] She believed she could improve both morals and housing simultaneously, building a vast network of primarily middle-class women volunteers to serve as rent collectors and ambassadors for her moral uplift campaign. This philosophy regarding personal influence (and what she considered the unique position of women to be "effective emissaries to the poor"[41]) was widely accepted in the American tenement reform movement: as Lawrence Veiller said, "The model tenement is the best kind of social settlement. There is no other way in which so much personal influence can be exerted as in managing such a tenement."[42] Veiller worked

[36] Daphne Spain, In Person, January 31, 2017.
[37] Daphne Spain, *How Women Saved the City* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001); Daphne Spain, *Constructive Feminism: Women's Spaces and Women's Rights in the American City* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2016).
[38] Quoted in Spain, "Octavia Hill's Philosophy of Housing Reform," 107.
[39] Spain, "Octavia Hill's Philosophy of Housing Reform."
[40] Spain, 109.
[41] Spain, 121.
[42] Quoted in Spain, 118.

for the Octavia Hill Foundation, a Philadelphia-based housing reform group linking moral and physical health,[43] for several years after the passage of the Tenement House Act, and when he founded the National Housing Association (NHA) in 1909, the group's guidelines echoed Hill's rejection of municipal ownership or operation of tenements.

Hill's extensive network included Samuel and Henrietta Barnett, former rent collectors in Hill's model system who founded the Toynbee Hall settlement house in London in 1884. Three years later in 1887, Hill helped Henrietta Barnett establish the Women's University Settlement, with the express purpose of training women to become rent collectors in Hill's system.[44] The Barnett's transnational circle of housing reformers included founders of some of the first settlement houses in the U.S., including Jane Addams and Vida Scudder.

With the opening of University Settlement in New York City in 1886, the emerging "settlement house" movement highlighted a departure from several planks of the tenement house model. First, unlike Hill's rent collectors who brought moral influence from outside tenement neighborhoods, settlement house workers lived in the communities in which they worked. Instead of simply pushing for regulation of properties and tenants, settlement house leaders advocated for the provision of decent housing and social services together (and for some, like Simkhovitch, advocated for government provision to supplement the market).

In order to bring "sociological talents and perspectives to bear on the social problems of the industrial city,"[45] settlement house workers participated in massive data collection projects and used their findings to lobby for legislative reform. Many adopted the "learn by doing" theory of social action ascribed to Jane Addams and John Dewey, himself a settlement resident.[46]

Vida Scudder adapted the Toynbee Hall model when she opened the second settlement house in America in 1889, the all-female College Settlement on New York City's Lower East Side.[47] College Settlement was where many influential housing reformers began their careers, including Riis, Veiller, and Simkhovitch (who resided there from 1897-1898 directly after returning from college abroad).[48] Relying on an intricate network of reformers in Boston, New

[43] "Clean housing was worth nothing ... without the salutary influence of the rent collector's frequent visits." Spain, 120.
[44] Spain, "Octavia Hill's Philosophy of Housing Reform."
[45] Wirka, "Housing: Mary Kingsbury Simkhovitch."
[46] Wirka.
[47] Spain, "Octavia Hill's Philosophy of Housing Reform."
[48] Wirka, "Housing: Mary Kingsbury Simkhovitch."

York, Philadelphia, and Chicago, settlement house models proliferated over the next few decades.

The mainstream settlement house movement was criticized at the time for paternalizing its residents rather than empowering them. In moving from philanthropic provision to a self-help model (implemented through the assumed moral influence of white, middle class, Protestant women), settlement house reformers disguised paternalistic class and racial politics when referring to "moral and physical health," for example. These terms were erroneously accepted as neutral by many reformers and the general public, and to a certain extent by the feminist planning historians writing about them in the 1970s and 80s.

In contrast, a more radical branch on the East Coast focused around principles of collective effort and cooperation.[49] This primarily socialist wing of the settlement house movement, which included Mary Simkhovitch, Florence Kelley, and Lillian Wald, had the most direct impact on the development of city planning. "In moving beyond the mainstream charity approach toward a demand for social change, this branch of the settlement house movement took the first steps toward social planning in the United States."[50]

Simkhovitch pushed back against the moralistic tone of the more mainstream settlement house movement. She left her position as Head Resident at the Friendly Aid House in New York City after several years, for example, because she disagreed with its umbrella group the Friend Aid Society's (FAS) adherence to a "moralistic mode of reform."[51] This ideological position had already spurred her to organize the New York Association of Neighborhood Workers (ANW) as a place to explore alternative philosophies with ten other like-minded settlement workers, intended to "challenge the charity approach to reform for treating the symptoms and not the causes of poverty and for treating poverty as an individual, rather than societal, problem."[52] She ultimately broke ties with the FAS in 1901, leaving to form the Cooperative Social Settlement Society (CSSS) of the City of New York with colleagues from ANW.

The next year, Simkhovitch founded Greenwich House, the first cooperative social settlement in New York City. Greenwich House essentially functioned as a social planning agency, focusing on provision of social services such as child care, health care, education, and

[49] Wirka, "The City Social Movement: Progressive Women Reformers and Early Social Planning."
[50] Wirka, 61.
[51] Wirka, "Housing: Mary Kingsbury Simkhovitch," 89.
[52] Wirka, 89.

recreation.[53] It was also a site for activist research that combined economic and sociological approaches through social surveys.

To Simkhovitch, for whom the neighborhood scale was most important, community organization was key to reform. Simkhovitch believed that neighborhoods had three basic needs: social services, a center to provide those services, and local community involvement.[54] She saw the work of settlements and planning as the same endeavor, viewing settlements as "natural vehicles for neighborhood planning - to articulate neighborhood residents' need for shelter, food, and access to resources."[55] Greenwich House instilled Simkhovitch with the conviction that "planning *was* the process by which to articulate and provide for the various needs of the neighborhood" [56] (emphasis in original). Planning allowed for the level of state involvement that she saw as necessary to correct the failures of market provision of housing. Simkhovitch urged people to consider houses as "more than just buildings in which people live"[57] and to think about "Housing with a Capital H,"[58] that is, as an issue instead of just a commodity.

Simkhovitch, Kelley, Wald, and their network of progressive reformers in New York City developed and promoted "a conception of city planning based on their reform experiences and their conviction that social and physical planning should not be separated from one another."[59] The "City Social" movement, as Wirka termed it, challenged prevalent ideas that physical and social issues were disconnected by linking housing and social services to neighborhood planning.

Simkhovitch may have been the de facto spokesperson of the City Social movement, but her colleagues Florence Kelley and Lillian Wald were also influential in the development of the network and organizations that would lead to the formation of the Committee on the Congestion of Population (CCP) and result in the convening of the first NCCP in 1909. Wald was head of the Henry Street Settlement, which she founded in 1893 as a social service agency to provide nursing care and access to education for immigrants in New York City's Lower East Side.

---

[53] Wirka, "Housing: Mary Kingsbury Simkhovitch."
[54] Wirka.
[55] Wirka, 90.
[56] Wirka, 92.
[57] Wirka, "The City Social Movement: Progressive Women Reformers and Early Social Planning."
[58] Mary Kingsbury Simkhovitch, *Here Is God's Plenty: Reflections on American Social Advance* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949), 25.
[59] Wirka, "The City Social Movement: Progressive Women Reformers and Early Social Planning," 60.

Florence Kelley lived at Henry Street after moving from Hull House in Chicago, where she relocated with her three children in 1891 after divorcing her husband.

Kelley rose to the forefront of child and women's labor issues in New York City, participating in minimum wage campaigns and in developing labor accountability practices through the National Consumers' League (NCL), which served the mostly female workforce of the garment industry. As secretary of the NCL, Kelley worked to "improve working conditions for women by harnessing the 'boycott' power of the consumer at the national level."[60] Kelley and Wald served together on the New York Child Labor Committee beginning in 1902 and would eventually establish the committee at a national scale. Together these three women fostered an intellectual and practical network to insert social welfare issues as key concerns of the nascent city planning profession.

When a feminist planning scholar named Susie Wirka began researching Simkhovitch and her colleagues in the early 1990s, she was a doctoral student in urban planning and women's history at the University of California, Los Angeles. She noted that, "Not only have women been left out of most planning history literature, but their vision of planning – linking housing and social services to neighborhood planning- has been altogether ignored by traditional planning historiography."[61] Wirka's priority for writing women's history into planning was to not only include women, but to recover and communicate the ideas that they presented and show how these ideas shaped the field. In this instance, Wirka stressed that inserting "the social" into planning meant not only addressing housing concerns, but also shifting blame for problems and responsibility for solutions from the individual to the collective.

Women's Civic Participation

Between 1890 and 1920, women's participation in civic affairs at a variety of scales increased dramatically. One of the first national efforts organized by women was at the Chicago World's Fair of 1893, for which women successfully lobbied for a 115-member Board of Lady Managers that designed and coordinated a Women's Building to disseminate resources, host

[60] Wirka, 65.
[61] Wirka, "The City Social Movement: Progressive Women Reformers and Early Social Planning."

lectures and demonstrations, and provide child care.[62] In cities across the U.S., women in the Civic Movement raised money for and provided volunteer labor for neighborhood cleanup campaigns and park projects, efforts that proved synergistic with professional city planners' civic beautification schemes.

Planning scholar Eugenie Birch argued that this collection of voluntary women's associations succeeded in breaking through because of dynamic personal leadership, strong organization, and deliberate framing of voluntary work in terms of women's accepted domestic functions and as secondary "leisure time" activities for which women had time because of advances in housework technology.[63] National networks of women's clubs and organizations like the League of Women Voters capitalized on an expanding pool of college-educated white women to advance the idea that gendered expertise in the home uniquely qualified women to be involved in civic affairs. Birch identifies this as an example of women first increasing involvement and then moving into leadership roles of the organizations once their legitimacy as a group of women had been established.

Birch started researching women's history in planning while doing her doctoral work at Columbia University in the 1970s. She told me, "My mission at that time was to place some recognition among women in the field, who contributed to the field, at times when they weren't accepted in the field."[64] She continued,

> I mean when I went to planning school as a master's [student] there were three women in the class and thirty men, and there were quotas. And so the women that I was looking at were even two or three generations back, and so they participated in ways that the societal role allowed them to participate. And I wanted to demonstrate that they made contributions even though they weren't professional planners… So there were a number of women who had long careers, who were in supportive roles basically in these organizations but were important, had substantive things to contribute and I didn't think those histories had been told.

---

[62] Eugenie Ladner Birch, "From Civic Worker to City Planner: Women and Planning, 1890-1980," in *The American Planner: Biographies and Recollections*, ed. Donald A. Krueckeberg, 2nd ed. (1983; repr., New Brunswick, N.J.: Center for Urban Policy Research, 1994), 469–506.
[63] Birch.
[64] Eugenie Ladner Birch, In Person, April 15, 2018.

Like Daphne Spain, Birch had a personal investment in reclaiming women's roles that stemmed from being one of only a handful of women in planning academia in the mid-1970s.

Some women's organizations focused on creating what Spain termed "redemptive places,"[65] relatively small spaces created by local institutions with volunteer labor in the neighborhood sphere. Spain argues that this "parochial territory" in the world of the neighborhood[66] (as opposed to the private world of the household but also not completely the public realm of strangers) was key to maintaining social order in American cities between the Civil War and World War I. Organizations formed in the last half of the 19th century, such as the YWCA, Salvation Army, National Association of Colored Women, and the College Settlements Association, created public baths, playgrounds, kindergartens, and settlement houses – "actual places in which the processes of assimilation occurred."[67]

These services and physical spaces, which today are largely provided by the public sector (ostensibly to serve all citizens, not just the urban poor), "contributed to social order as the nation constructed its urban identity."[68] In Spain's analysis, four groups in transition during this period in the northern U.S. benefited from redemptive spaces: single working women, European immigrants, black migrants from the South, and female volunteers from among the growing ranks of white middle-class educated women. The ideologies of the Social Gospel and municipal housekeeping were complex; they "justified women's public activities by clothing them in relatively conservative religious and domestic vocabularies when some of their consequences were quite radical."[69] Between 1887 and 1910, several new professions provided increased career opportunities for educated white women as well. Home economics (tied to public kitchens and scientific management) and social work (growing out of social settlements like Hull House that fought for decent housing and labor protections) funneled women into Progressive Era reform movements.[70] Although Spain's analysis reclaims the agency of women in space and

[65] Spain, *How Women Saved the City*.
[66] Spain, 6.
[67] Spain, 18.
[68] Spain, 248.
[69] Spain, 18.
[70] Hayden 1981 notes that increasing professionalization in these fields in the early 1900s, de-emphasized cooperative aspects of the endeavors (as resident experience became devalued as "untrained," for example) and the professions lost the strong class focus at their origins. Professionalization also shifted from direct service provision to policy development, which made them more cautious.

place-making, it does not reckon with questions of whose interests are upheld when the "social order" is maintained through assimilation.

Material Feminists and the Domestic Reform Movement

Other activists in the domestic reform movement made gendered economic and spatial arguments about oppression by raising questions about what defined the "woman's sphere" and "woman's work." Women whom Dolores Hayden, an influential architecture and planning historian, termed "material feminists" demanded wages for unpaid household labor, advocated for communal solutions to free women from domestic tasks, and proposed transformations to domestic spatial design.[71] Beginning with "pay for housework" campaigns in 1868 and lasting through the 1920s, material feminists launched two main challenges to industrial capitalism as it was inscribed in cities and social order. First, they argued that housework was unpaid labor resulting from the perceived separation of the domestic and political economies. Second, they critiqued the home as isolated and inefficient (which only exacerbated domestic work's invisibility in the formal economy).

Though she did her graduate work in architecture, Hayden taught in UCLA's planning department from 1978 to 1991. She told me that by the time she published *Grand Domestic Revolution*,

> I was known as a feminist urban historian concentrating on the American built environment. I was still looking at architecture, but I brought the physical evidence from vernacular buildings and landscapes into the study of larger urban political questions. I investigated the material importance of housing and infrastructure. And while it might have seemed challenging when I was a grad student, ten years later I had demonstrated how to do built environment research. Many youngers scholars followed my lead.[72]

Hayden viewed the contributions of domestic reformers in design through the lens of her own experience merging architecture and planning with feminist history and theory.

More than being interested in architectural or technological aspects of economic and social changes occurring at the time, material feminists insisted that changes should take place

[71] Dolores Hayden, *The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Designs for American Homes, Neighborhoods, and Cities* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1981).
[72] Dolores Hayden, In Person, January 13, 2017.

under women's control. Material feminists sought to socialize domestic work by adhering to the idea "that women must create feminist homes with socialized housework and child care before they could become truly equal members of society."[73] They highlighted connections between social norms and the built environment and asserted urban space as a social and economic product long before this idea was popularized by Henri Lefebvre in the 1960s.

At the end of the Civil War, a Cambridge, Massachusetts activist named Melusina Fay Pierce advanced this view of economic cooperation as key to women's self-determination, "attack[ing] the interlocked oppression of gender and class in a new way,"[74] through "womanhood suffrage" that encompassed economic and political life. She disseminated her ideas through a series of *Atlantic* articles published in 1868 and through the Cambridge Cooperative Housekeeping Society (CCHS), which she founded in 1869. She sought to take cooperation to a "new extreme"[75] by encouraging women to secede from the normative domestic world.

Peirce's ideas about cooperative housekeeping were disseminated in the 1880s by Mary Livermore, who spread the message of cooperative housekeeping to suffragists, philanthropists, and temperance workers. She relied on arguments about efficiency through industrial training to move housework out of the home in order to allow women to become better wives and mothers. This familial rhetorical appeal can be traced to Livermore's involvement with the Women's Christian Temperance Movement (WCTU), whose founder, Frances E. Willard, espoused the idea of "municipal housekeeping," breaking down the barrier between the domestic and the political "based on women's ability to make municipal government and urban life 'clean' again."[76] Scores of educated women volunteers from the WCTU and other organizations tied issues like sanitation, housing, health, and temperance to social purity, in line with Willard's command to "make the whole world homelike."[77] These notions of womanhood, cleanliness, and purity dominated the discourse without being marked as distinctly white and Protestant.

Ideas about cooperative housekeeping were also explored and disseminated outside a distinctly religious sphere, though they retained a doctrine of cleanliness and uplift. Fabian utopian socialist Charlotte Perkins Gilmore, a writer who as a "popularizer"[78] greatly broadened

[73] Hayden, *The Grand Domestic Revolution*, 3.
[74] Hayden, 89.
[75] Hayden, *The Grand Domestic Revolution*.
[76] Hayden, 175.
[77] Quoted in Hayden, 153.
[78] Hayden, 183.

the constituencies for domestic reform and influenced architecture and planning projects in London, Los Angeles, and New York City.[79] Between 1900 and 1930, experiments proliferated across the United States which made cooperative housekeeping a reality in at least thirty-three sites, including community kitchens and cooked food services.

Between 1926 and 1931, the Institute for the Coordination of Women's Interest (ICWI) served as the institutional home for a concerted campaign in favor of socialized domestic work. Leading the charge was ICWI founder Ethel Puffer Howes, an academic pioneer and experienced administrator from the American Association of University Women (AAUW), who achieved wide visibility through publishing in popular circulars. Howes tied domestic reform programs to women's higher education at Smith College, working to broaden the scope of "male" career possibilities for married women, whom she believed should not have to choose between raising children and having a career. In Howes' view, domestic revolution was essential to lend support "for the legitimate career goals of women."[80]

In the 1920s, however, an anti-feminist backlash endangered the spread of women-led progressive reform movements.[81] Furthermore, as Hayden notes, divisions over the role of female domestic workers of color splintered the groups, as some challenged the mainstream assumption that only white middle class women had a "housework problem" that Black women as domestic servants could help them solve.[82] The Red Scare of 1919-20 targeted moderate women's organizations like the WCTU, YWCA, AAUW, and LWV, with anti-communist smear campaigns disbanding or greatly limiting their activities. The Taylorization of housework likewise squashed many of the material feminists' experiments. Household consumption as "patriotic duty" was on the rise and coincided with a national policy shift towards subsidized suburban home mortgages for white middle class men. The normative couple of the period emerged in popular culture and public policy as "Mr. Homeowner and Mrs. Consumer."[83] Furthermore, housing issues had all but dropped off the radar of the city planning profession, which by the late 1920s had shifted from its origins as a private-sector effort to "a legitimate exercise of local government power"[84] while embracing City Technical principles of efficiency

[79] Hayden, *The Grand Domestic Revolution*.
[80] Hayden, 269.
[81] Hayden, *The Grand Domestic Revolution*.
[82] Black women's own housework problem, the compounded burden they bore, was made further invisible
[83] Christine Frederick, quoted in Hayden, *The Grand Domestic Revolution*, 284. See also Wright 1980.
[84] Birch, "From Civic Worker to City Planner: Women and Planning, 1890-1980," 472.

and expertise. Following the split between early city planners and housers in 1911, women and issues considered to be relevant to them ("social" issues) continued to be sidelined from planning. In the attempt to uncover women's efforts and make them relevant to planning, however, scholarship written by feminist historians after the 1970s did not always mark the ways in which progressive women reformers upheld problematic notions of domesticity.

Public Housing Gains Ground

Despite major setbacks, the collective efforts of these decades of reform movements began to bear fruit in the New Deal Era. Several women at the Regional Planning Association of America (RPAA) played significant roles in changing both the public policy conversation and the reality of housing provision in the U.S.; their efforts moved in the direction of public provision of housing for those in need while making the unpopular case that housing was a planning issue.

Formed in 1923 by a group of visionary planners and reformers including Clarence Stein and Lewis Mumford, the RPAA "had a profound influence upon housing thought because it served as a meeting ground for leading reformers,"[85] providing an intellectual network through which to continue advocating for housing and social reform as a legitimate exercise for planners.[86] The RPAA "included the most brilliant planners of the period, concerned with creating good housing for wage workers and conserving land for recreation."[87] In direct opposition to Veiller's regulation-only strategy, the RPAA provided a "more communitarian vision that focused on community as the basis of society and on housing construction in planning communities."[88] The architects of the group put their energies into developing model projects based on Garden City principles. Yet, despite a grand visionary impulse, while the "avant-garde architects and planners of the RPAA discussed many ideas [, they] limited their innovations to child care facilities when they developed actual projects."[89]

---

[85] Eugenie Ladner Birch, "Woman-Made America The Case of Early Public Housing Policy," *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 44, no. 2 (April 1978): 136.
[86] Birch, "Woman-Made America The Case of Early Public Housing Policy"; June Manning Thomas, "Josephine Gomon Plans for Detroit's Rehabilitation," *Journal of Planning History* 17, no. 2 (May 2018): 97–117.
[87] Hayden, *The Grand Domestic Revolution*, 251.
[88] Thomas, "Josephine Gomon Plans for Detroit's Rehabilitation," 98.
[89] Hayden, *The Grand Domestic Revolution*, 263.

One of the RPAA's most concrete accomplishments stems from the lobbying efforts of its most influential female members, Edith Elmer Wood and Catherine Bauer, for government financing for low-cost housing. While Wood and Bauer focused most specifically on "the housing question," they kept in their sights the direct implications for (and belief in the importance of) planning. Wood wrote in 1931, "it is regrettable from every point of view that housing and city planning should be divorced to the extent that they have always been in the United States."[90] These two women dedicated their careers to remedying that disconnect.

Wood and Bauer were both involved with the formation and activities of three lobbying groups that would be prove critical for the passage of New Deal housing legislation: The National Public Housing Conference (NPHC, founded 1931) focused on organizing support among tenement dwellers; the National Association of Housing Officials (NAHO, founded 1933); and the Labor Housing Conference (LHC, founded 1934).[91] Wood was among the founding members of NAHO and Wurster served as executive secretary for the LCH.

Edith Elmer Wood was a suffragist who earned a doctorate in political economy from Columbia University in 1919 and took a social sciences approach to housing reform that was comprehensive in scope. She focused on implementation of minimum standards, tenant practices, and financial aspects of housing implementation,[92] but departed with the mainstream tenement movement over the issue of public provision. Lawrence Veiller's regulatory approach had spread across the U.S. between 1900 and 1920 in the form of women-dominated civic groups introducing housing codes into their communities out of a "wish to exert social control over the slum dwellers."[93] Wood had conducted an extensive survey of slum dwellers in 1913 and concluded that the plight of residents was not due to moral deficiency, but that they had no alternative. She undertook a campaign to shift blame from the individual level to a systemic one, expressed in her 1919 book *The Housing of the Unskilled Wage Worker*, and set about working to convince housing reformers that government provision was necessary for a change in housing conditions.[94]

---

[90] Quoted in Marcuse, "Housing in Early City Planning," 155.
[91] Birch, "Woman-Made America The Case of Early Public Housing Policy."
[92] Birch.
[93] Birch, 131.
[94] Birch (1978) notes that Veiller would end up refusing to acknowledge Wood's work because he disagreed so strongly over government provision of housing.

Wood's two priorities in housing reform – women and labor – reflected her suffragist experience in the American Association of University Women (AAUW). In 1914, she convinced the Washington branch to form a housing committee that became a national program by 1916. The AAUW housing committee provided a "nationwide network of city-based supporters" which boasted fifty-two local groups by 1921, a platform from which to "articulate goals and programs," and a political base from which to promote these initiatives.[95]

Catherine Bauer was a generation younger but had similar strong ties to the labor movement that she used to advance Wood's strategy of "college women organizing support for housing among women and labor" that would finally bear fruit in the late 1930s.[96] Bauer took an architectural and planning approach to housing reform, supporting designs that promoted community and family life. Much like Mary Simkhovitch had been the national spokesperson for the City Social movement among settlement house reformers, Bauer was a masterful public relations strategist and lobbyist who "begged, bullied, and convinced"[97] the nation to provide public housing.

Bauer was a freelance writer about housing and organized labor who met the influential urbanist Lewis Mumford at the publishing house Harcourt Brace in 1930, where they formed a long-standing relationship united "by shared belief in regional planning based on garden city principles."[98] Bauer's philosophy was based in an "acceptance of amended capitalistic system, understanding of modern economics and sociology as directed to the metropolis, an appreciation of the use of technological advances in architecture in helping to solve human problems, and a sensitivity to social indicators pointing to impending changes in urban life. This vision called for the deployment of public resources to promote the balanced development of neighborhoods, cities, and metropolitan regions."[99] One of her primary areas of interest was exploring how planners could incorporate social questions into their approaches.[100]

Bauer served as executive secretary for the Public Works Administration's Housing Division beginning in 1932 and worked from that platform to get a national permanent housing

---

[95] Birch, "Woman-Made America The Case of Early Public Housing Policy," 136.
[96] Birch, 141.
[97] Birch, 140.
[98] Eugenie Ladner Birch, "An Urban View: Catherine Bauer's Five Questions," in *The American Planner: Biographies and Recollections*, ed. Donald A. Krueckeberg, 2nd ed. (1989; repr., New Brunswick, N.J.: Center for Urban Policy Research, 1994), 314.
[99] Birch, 321.
[100] Birch, "An Urban View: Catherine Bauer's Five Questions."

program in place. While the lobbying groups (the NPHC, NAHO, and LHC) were responsible for drafting legislation, Bauer's role was to drum up grassroots support. Relying heavily on her labor connections, she ultimately convinced the American Federation of Labor (AFL) to take a strong stand on public housing in a 1935 resolution that included a "minimum standard of decency" requirement."[101]

Wood and Bauer work finally paid off in the summer of 1937 when Congress passed the Warner-Steagall Act, the first public housing legislation passed in the U.S. Wood and Wurster successfully called attention to the failures of private sector provision, securing measures for public construction of new housing as well as codifying a goal of supporting "decent family life" instead of just minimal shelter provision.[102] According to Birch, they also "created a new profession, that of houser, as they moved from well-meaning volunteers to executive directorships of housing lobbying groups to some positions in government."[103] Women successfully shifted the housing reform conversation from regulation to construction, while steadfastly maintaining the direct relevance of housing to planning.

Conclusion

Hayden's analysis in *Grand Domestic Revolution* includes a claim about the stakes of historical elision:

> When a new generation of [second wave] feminists appeared, most of them the children of those families [who moved to the suburbs in late 1940s through 60s], they had one powerful demand to make, an end to the sexual division of domestic labor. But the new feminists, who tried to share child care and housework with men, did not understand the history behind the domestic environments they inhabited.[104]

Hayden went on to claim that feminists of the 1960s and 70s took their history for granted. In contrast, she and the other feminist planning scholars referenced in this chapter shared a goal of recognizing their forbears in order to learn from and build on their contributions and ideas.

These scholars identified closely with their subjects, as women entering the planning academy in the 1970s and 1980s were in similar positions of being pioneers in male-dominated

[101] AFL resolution quoted in Birch, "Woman-Made America The Case of Early Public Housing Policy," 140.
[102] Birch, "Woman-Made America The Case of Early Public Housing Policy."
[103] Birch.
[104] Hayden, *The Grand Domestic Revolution*. 289.

fields. It is possible, then, that they ended up representing primarily other women like them – white, middle class, educated women active in civic life. For the most part, they did not address the problems created by white Protestant progressive reformers invested in controlling the "morals" or sexuality of Black or immigrant women, or of keeping white women out of the city and integrated racial spaces. Centering white middle class progressive reformers in early planning history is an important step, but if those are the only women reclaimed, such work unfortunately contributes to planning's legacy of overlooking or silencing people of color.

A notable exception is the coverage given to African American's civic improvement of their communities in *Urban Planning and the African American Community: In the Shadows.* Co-editors Marsha Ritzdorf and June Manning Thomas wrote, "While [African American women], like White women, had no legal or voting rights in the public world of politics, they were very active. Yet they, like their African American brothers, are invisible from the records of their time that planning historians commonly consult."[105] In an effort to rectify this problem, the editors included a chapter providing a rare counterexample to the norm.[106]

More recent scholars have expanded the subjects of early planning history. Angel Nieves describes how racial uplift ideologies critically influenced community building strategies and the built environment in the Jim Crow South. African American women "inscribed a social and political ideology of race uplift onto the very bricks of the industrial and normal schools they worked to found in 'the Age of Washington and DuBois' some thirty years after the Civil War."[107] Leaders such as Elizabeth Evelyn Wright, who founded Voorhees College in South Carolina in 1897, and Jennie Dean, who established the Manassas Industrial School in Virginia in 1893, ensured that "the intellectual project of race uplift as a social movement included the built environment as a primary vehicle for race-based advancement."[108]

In both the North and the South, women led benevolent organizations when there was little or no government provision of services. Andrea Roberts' scholarship describes how between 1890 and 1930, mutual aid groups in the South were forming the foundations for

---

[105] June Manning Thomas and Marsha Ritzdorf, eds., *Urban Planning and the African American Community: In the Shadows* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997), 11.
[106] Jacqueline Leavitt, "Charlotta A. Bass, the California Eagle, and Black Settlement in Los Angeles," in *Urban Planning and the African American Community: In the Shadows*, ed. June Manning Thomas and Marsha Ritzdorf (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997), 167–86.
[107] Angel David Nieves, *An Architecture of Education: African American Women Design the New South* (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2018), 1.
[108] Nieves, 1.

African American community development and capacity building.[109] In Texas, the Farmers' Improvement Society (FIS) directly targeted the oppressive crop mortgage system, working to provide a safety net and economic development for rural communities by creating freedom colonies. FIS founder R.L. Smith's approach combined moral uplift ideas with physical beautification and economic self-sufficiency, but his model also provided institutional and physical space for rural blacks' agency. The Women's Barnyard Auxiliary of the FIS, for example, accommodated "various interpretations of respectability,"[110] which emphasized land ownership and financial literacy over its members strictly adhering to gender norms.

Importantly, Roberts' analysis shows that, in contrast to the narrative of assimilationist racial uplift among African American women, women of the Barnyard Auxiliary subverted respectability politics when shaping community development strategies. This argument reveals a different perspective on legitimacy than that of early feminist planning scholars, who tended to emphasize assimilation and acceptance. One of Birch's main arguments in *From Civic Worker to City Planner* is that women first participated in order to gain legitimacy before moving into leadership roles: "Using a conservative definition of female roles, they brought their interests into the public view under the cloak of domesticity: in addition to examples of women's crafts, they also provided demonstrations about women's suffrage and the entry of women into the professions."[111] This strategy, as I will demonstrate in chapter four, became the dominant model for women trying to achieve equal status with men in the planning academy.

Women's activities in the Progressive and New Deal Eras kept social issues like housing in the view of early city planning, even if they did not succeed in getting them accepted into the profession until the second half of the twentieth century. In the postwar period, physical planning prevailed and social planning (and to a large extent, women representing that perspective) was relegated to the margins of the profession. Modernist ideals of rationality and efficiency characterized technical planning, which became increasingly professionalized after Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1949 made provisions for federal funds to be distributed for local planning efforts for the first time.[112] Zoning and land use regulation were the primary tools of planners and trends towards suburbanization revolutionized urban form in the U.S., as well as solidified racial segregation and the disenfranchisement of Black citizens. There is little written about women in planning during this time, perhaps in part because women were assumed to be subjects

[109] Andrea R. Roberts, "The Farmers' Improvement Society and the Women's Barnyard Auxiliary of Texas: African American Community Building in the Progressive Era," *Journal of Planning History* 16, no. 3 (August 2017): 222–45.
[110] Roberts, 233.
[111] Birch, "From Civic Worker to City Planner: Women and Planning, 1890-1980."
[112] Carl Feiss, "The Foundations of Federal Planning Assistance A Personal Account of the 701 Program," *Journal of the American Planning Association* 51, no. 2 (1985): 175–84.

of suburban transformation rather than actors in it. As the next chapter shows, however, reactions to urban renewal would revitalize social planning again in the 1960s.

Chapter 2: Social Movements and the Profession of Planning, 1960-1970

Gerda Wekerle, a Canadian feminist planning scholar who moved to Chicago in 1968 to complete her doctoral work at Northwestern University, studied housing projects. She told me how the situation in Chicago provided a stark contrast to her native Toronto:

> HUD had condemned this whole neighborhood practically on behalf of the developers and major builders and said it was a slum and actually it wasn't. And they just leveled this huge area adjacent to the downtown and near the lake and built something like eight or ten tall buildings that were owned by a private developer who was a major real estate company and a major contributor to the Democrats in power. It wasn't a scandal at all. It was [viewed as] a good thing. It was urban renewal. And in Toronto it was this major scandal. Developers were bad. People were refusing to leave the houses that they bought… It was this whole kind of social uprising.[113]

Wekerle's recollection of the dynamics involved with urban renewal projects demonstrates two types of responses from opponents. Resident opposition to so-called slum clearance sweeping cities across the U.S. in the 1950s and 60s was frequently bitter and public. But though Wekerle did not witness visible resistance in Chicago, there were in fact many American planners challenging the capitalist and racist logics of their profession's most notorious tool during this period. Fierce and widespread resistance to urban renewal provided a catalyst for social movements in planning.

In these social movements, as in the planning profession itself, women were present on the front lines of these battles, even if they were not the visible "leaders" of the movement. This chapter explores the roles of women in redefining and expanding planning goals, issues, and scales at a critical period in the development of the planning field. While this narrative predates the women's movement of the 1970s, the high correlation between planning activism in the

[113] Gerda R. Wekerle, In Person, February 9, 2017.

1960s and the skills that early feminist planning scholars gained during this time warrant analysis. Just as it is necessary to integrate Black history into planning history,[114] I argue that women's involvement in social and progressive planning movements is critical for understanding the feminist planning paradigms that would emerge in the 1970s and 80s. Describing the social, political, and educational context for planning, I show how social movements, reactions to urban policies, and planning interventions shaped each other and the strategies feminist planners would employ in the next decade. Highlighting several interrelated efforts to involve planning (and to *use* planning) in the fight for social change during the 1960s, I describe the factors that shaped the field into a context that would attract feminist activists in the decades following.

Urban Renewal and Urban Activism

In the postwar period, city planning was characterized by grand scale physical planning and design, technocratic measures of expertise, and top-down decision making. Modernist planning's reliance on rationalism and efficiency left little room in the profession for attention to social issues or political processes, particularly at the neighborhood or community scale. During the 1960s, however, social movement pressure expanded the field beyond a singular focus on physical land use to include political activism for oppressed groups.[115]

Urban renewal policies created deleterious effects on many disadvantaged neighborhoods, but especially African American and immigrant communities. The destruction of entire neighborhoods traumatized generations of thriving Black business owners and residents, while plans to relocate the displaced fell far short of the promises made by the federal housing program. Worse yet, urban renewal strategies were the primary mechanism for creating low-income public housing, threatening the important strides women made during the Progressive and New Deal eras towards viewing public housing as a collective social responsibility of planners.

The intertwined histories of urban renewal and public housing are too large and complex to summarize here, but it is undeniable that urban renewal defined planning discourse in the

[114] June Manning Thomas, "Planning History and the Black Urban Experience: Linkages and Contemporary Implications," *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 14, no. 1 (1994): 1–11.
[115] Marsha Ritzdorf, "Family Values, Municipal Zoning, and African American Family Life," in *Urban Planning and the African American Community: In the Shadows*, ed. June Manning Thomas and Marsha Ritzdorf (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997), 75–89; Marisa A. Zapata and Lisa K. Bates, "Equity Planning Revisited," *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 35, no. 3 (September 1, 2015): 245–48.

postwar era.[116] The most familiar debate took place between Jane Jacobs, a journalist and urban activist, and Robert Moses, one of the primary architects of urban renewal in New York City, over urban renewal plans for Greenwich Village in the 1950s and 60s. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* presented a fine-grained, contextualized view of urban life that was completely different than mainstream postwar planning (though not completely new, as the visions outlined in chapter 1 suggest). Not all of Jacobs' legacy has been positive,[117] but in the 1960s she epitomized a social view of neighborhood design and an attention to urban residents that was unreconcilable with mainstream planning policies. In part due to Jacobs' critiques of planners, urban renewal failures cast a long shadow over the planning profession in the 1960s. The popular appeal of her book and the notoriety of her battle with Moses meant that Jacobs exerted enormous influence over several generations of planners and urbanists. In particular, the fact that the most well-known critic of the massively unpopular urban renewal programs was a woman inspired many of my interviewees to consider planning; for them, she presented a different vision of what planning could look like and what it could accomplish.

Urban renewal conflicts took place against the backdrop of social movements enacted in urban and suburban spaces during this period. By the early 1960s, Martin Luther King, Jr. and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference had expanded the Civil Rights struggle to urban protest sites not only in the South but in major cities in the North and Midwest, and had broadened its scope from voting rights to addressing planning-related issues like housing access. Civil rights direct action took place in urban neighborhoods across the country. By the late 1960s, urban rebellions over racial oppression exploded in the streets of cities such as Los Angeles and Detroit. Black Power responses included provision of community-based services where the state was not providing them. The group of planners described in this chapter were influenced by the fight against racial repression, as well as the anti-war, labor, environmental,

---

[116] John F. Bauman, *Public Housing, Race, and Renewal: Urban Planning in Philadelphia, 1920-1974* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1987); June Manning Thomas, *Redevelopment and Race: Planning a Finer City in Postwar Detroit* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997); Rhonda Y. Williams, *The Politics of Public Housing: Black Women's Struggles against Urban Inequality* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004); Lawrence J. Vale, *After the Projects: Public Housing Redevelopment and the Governance of the Poorest Americans* (Oxford University Press, 2018); Mindy Thompson Fullilove, *Root Shock: How Tearing Up City Neighborhoods Hurts America, and What We Can Do About It* (New York: Ballantine, 2004); Lance Freeman, *A Haven and a Hell: The Ghetto in Black America* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2019).

[117] Brian Tochterman, "Theorizing Neoliberal Urban Development: A Genealogy from Richard Florida to Jane Jacobs," *Radical History Review*, no. 112 (2012): 65–87.

and gay liberation movements. In each of these, they gained first-hand experience with grassroots organizing and insights into the spatialized nature of struggles for justice.

The political demands of social movements spurred federal policy changes, beginning with legislation like the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 1965 Voting Rights Act. Many of the policies implemented during this period were particularly urban, such as the creation of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development in 1964. As part of War on Poverty legislation, the 1964 Economic Opportunity Act included the Community Action Program, which created thousands of non-profit agencies for low-income communities and provided federal funding to run them through Community Services Block Grants.

The Model Cities initiative is a prime example. Model Cities was launched in 1966 as a centerpiece of President Johnson's Great Society Program, with the aim of relieving urban blight and poverty in inner cities. Over the next eight years, the initiative ran more than 150 experiments in anti-poverty programs and citizen engagement, many of which particularly affected African American inner-city residents.[118] Many federal policies enacted in the 1960s acknowledged the importance of the neighborhood scale and of community-based work for "empowering the poor." Additionally, lawmakers acknowledged that the substandard living conditions these programs intended to fix were a direct result of prior planning and urban renewal. These policies explicitly linked social movement demands to planning practice, often by creating opportunities for citizen participation.

Advocacy Planning Models

As a result of these forces, a "duality" within the planning profession emerged.[119] In the 1960s, some saw technical expertise and rational planning as primarily benefiting underserved urban residents, while some (residents, but also professional planners, as I will show) saw planning as perpetuating oppression instead of easing it. The latter group of professional planners began to embrace the deeply political nature of their work and call for broader recognition of the power dynamics and structures that intersect in local neighborhoods. Several noted feminist

[118] June Manning Thomas, "Model Cities Revisited: Issues of Race and Empowerment," in *Urban Planning and the African American Community: In the Shadows*, ed. June Manning Thomas and Marsha Ritzdorf (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997), 143–63; Lily M. Hoffman, *The Politics of Knowledge: Activist Movements in Medicine and Planning* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989).
[119] June Manning Thomas, "Socially Responsible Practice: The Battle to Reshape the American Institute of Planners," *Journal of Planning History*, September 27, 2018, 1–24.

planning scholars played key roles in an activist movement in planning that grew out of New Left organizing and community planning on the East Coast. In response to technocratic postwar planning, they animated new models that espoused redistributive visions of planning as a way to achieve social equity. Activist planners in the 1960s leveraged social movement pressure at the crisis point of urban renewal to challenge a fundamental assumption of city planning: that the profession serves the public interest. Although advocacy planning has received some attention as a force that altered planners' orientation towards a social policy view of planning, little has been documented about the women who served as leaders in these campaigns and incorporated feminist perspectives into their activist frameworks.

In 1965, Paul Davidoff published the seminal article on advocacy planning. Davidoff took planners to task for thinking about planning "in the public interest." He argued that because "the welfare of all and the welfare of minorities are both deserving of support… planning must be so structured and so practiced as to account for [an] unavoidable bifurcation of the public interest."[120] This inherently adversarial nature of planning puts planners in the position of providing "professional support for competing claims about how the community should develop." In other words, assuming a unitary public interest leads planners to perpetuate existing power imbalances. Instead of taking the default position of the oppressors, planners, Davidoff argued, must be able to identify a plural public interest and be advocates for communities.

The advocacy planning model defined a new "clientele" for planning: underserved populations. Advocacy planning asserted that planners work with disadvantaged groups to improve conditions by enhancing participatory democracy. For some, "disadvantaged groups" applied to women. A feminist advocacy planning, for example, would ensure that women would be "not just planning targets or objects, but their needs and strengths become an integral part of the planning process."[121] By enhancing participatory democracy, planners would not only give visibility to a particular group, but could also work to transform structures of inequality.

City planning drew the interest of New Left organizers focused on activism in the professions. The Radical Education Project (REP) was founded in 1966 in Ann Arbor, Michigan, as part of the Movement for a Democratic Society (MDS). Planning activist and theorist Lisa

[120] Paul Davidoff, "Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning," in *Readings in Planning Theory*, ed. Susan S. Fainstein and Scott Campbell, 3rd ed. (1965; repr., Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 544–55.
[121] Jacqueline Leavitt, "Feminist Advocacy Planning in the 1980s," in *Strategic Perspectives on Planning Practice*, ed. Barry Checkoway (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1986), 181–94.

Peattie played a role in organizing several REP conferences on radicals in the professions in the late 1960s. REP's primary focus was publishing; they disseminated pamphlets from across the spectrum of New Left organizing, including reprinting literature from women's liberation groups and others. From 1967-1971, REP published a newsletter called "Radicals in the Professions," with the purpose of serving the organizing efforts of the post-student Left.[122] The newsletter covered issues such as imperialism, women's roles in the radical movement, tenants' rights and tenants' unions, and exposing problems with the War on Poverty. It addressed all of this through the lens of what a professional can do to affect social change; city planning was among the highlighted professions.

One piece from a 1968 edition, entitled "Letting the Cat Out of the City Planning Bag," notes the proliferation of planning jobs and of professional education programs. It highlights a trend in reaction to urban renewal policies: that planning was beginning to encompass social concerns instead of focusing primarily on the physical environment. The primary takeaway in this article, however, notes the frustration of planners at being powerless to carry out their ideas. The article presents a tongue-in-cheek listing of planner responsibilities, including "to provide a relatively harmless agency with a highly marketable image of progressivism and efficiency used in state/national politics."[123] The piece went on to describe a planning commission that

> Function[ed] primarily to protect the land values of the high-valued areas in the county, not functioning as an advisor on local government problems, and therefore did not, for example, set up an advisory service to help particularly poor communities to apply for state and federal financial aid. Nor did it provide any organizing or educational services that might have encouraged self-help anti-poverty efforts in poor communities. Even such anti-poverty ideas as hiring Job Corps members to do the simple tasks of the planning interns were not considered possible.

Because the powerlessness of planners in bureaucratic roles was a hallmark of advocacy planners' complaints, they turned to agitation and organizing to push the field towards action.

One of the contributors to "Letting the Cat out of the City Planning Bag" was Jacqueline Leavitt, who had worked in advocacy planning and on women's housing issues and advancing

[122] Radical Education Project, "What White Response to Black Rebellions?," *Radicals in the Professions Newsletter*, May 1968, University of Michigan Special Collections.
[123] Radical Education Project, "Letting the Cat out of the City Planning Bag," *Radicals in the Professions Newsletter*, August 1968, University of Michigan Special Collections.

the Model Cities Initiative in New York and New Jersey. Leavitt and Walter Thabit, a planning consultant and community activist, organized the first chapter of a group they called the Urban Underground in New York City. Although the Urban Underground operated until 1973, its most active period was from its founding in 1967 to 1970, when as many as 70-100 planners would attend meetings.[124] As part of MDS, it is no surprise that the problems they highlighted and the rhetoric they used stressed class relations and posited "community-worker-student alliances" as the only solution.[125]

The Urban Underground was particularly oriented towards giving professional planners an opportunity to be heard in dissent alongside the communities whose complaints were beginning to garner attention. One of their main activities was to testify at public meetings, in their roles as professional planners, and to leverage their expertise for social transformation through community activism in that way. For example, Leavitt gave testimony on behalf of Lower East Side residents at a 1970 public hearing of the NYC Planning commission about a rezoning effort, in which she repeatedly compares planning to the war in Vietnam, including that widespread outcry didn't seem to make a difference. She testified, "We do not consider this procedure, this hearing, anything more than a farce; in that in fact decisions are not made openly, and the commissioners do not listen to the people."[126] She called out the hypocrisy in the situation: planners were gaining input from communities while real estate business proceeded unabated, beholden only to the goal of capitalizing on land prices.

Perhaps the most large-scale exemplar of advocacy planning was Urban Planning Aid (UPA), a Boston-area community organizing group founded in 1965 by Chester Hartman, a radical planning scholar teaching at Harvard's Graduate School of Design (GSD). UPA sent planners directly into communities fighting against urban renewal. The goal was for professional planners to use their training and technical skills to help communities in their quests to stymie urban renewal projects. UPA received federal funds from the federal Office of Economic Activity in 1969 as an advocacy demonstration project.

It became apparent to at least some of those involved, however, that UPA's advocacy planning model carried problematic assumptions about representation. Eventually, as low-

[124] Hoffman, *The Politics of Knowledge: Activist Movements in Medicine and Planning*.
[125] Hoffman.
[126] Jacqueline Leavitt, "The Urban Underground Resurfaces: Statement Prepared for the People at a Public Hearing of the New York City Planning Commission, May 13, 1970" (New York, NY, May 13, 1970).

income communities started to organize themselves in a way critical of both urban renewal agencies and advocacy planners, UPA shifted its focus "toward getting the community, not the advocates, into direct contact with the urban renewal agency."[127] Lisa Peattie was an outspoken critic of the brand of benevolent paternalism that she saw advocacy planning perpetuating, claiming that in the context of urban renewal projects, "the planner as local advocate functioned as a pacifier to a system in need of more basic change."[128] Internal debates such as this caused the group to shift towards community education and skill-building.

Marie Kennedy, an activist and feminist planner, went to work for UPA as a housing advocate organizing against urban renewal in Boston's South End in 1969. She participated in public education campaigns, helping UPA develop and disseminate booklets about modernization funds, about lease agreements and procedures, and about the 1969 Brooke Amendment, which capped rent in public housing projects at twenty-five percent of tenants' income. Kennedy also helped to start the first public housing union in the state of Massachusetts during this period. Her work in tenants' unions led her to decry the rise of Community Development Corporations as a mere pacification technique, a stance which sometimes put her at odds with planning colleagues, but nonetheless pushed her to author an educational pamphlet called *CDC's: The Empty Promise*.

UPA functioned as a community partner to the Urban Field Service (UFS) at Harvard, a program with direct implications for planning education that Hartman started in 1967. The UFS model extended advocacy planning to the university, where students were encouraged to employ a critical perspective by participating in community-based studios that provided, among other services, technical assistance for groups fighting Harvard's campus expansion.[129] Marie Kennedy set up and managed all the field projects for UFS while completing her master's degree in architecture at the GSD. Dolores Hayden, a feminist architect and historian, was a master's student in architecture at Harvard in 1970 with an interest in housing when a city planning course with Hartman led her to the UFS. Hayden told me,

---

[127] Hoffman, *The Politics of Knowledge: Activist Movements in Medicine and Planning*.
[128] Lisa Peattie, "Reflections on Advocacy Planning" (Conference on Radicals in the Professions, Ann Arbor, MI, 1967).
[129] Similar efforts to tie architecture and planning education to local activist struggles over a campus expansion took place at Columbia University. See Sutton, Sharon E. 2017. *When Ivory Towers Were Black: A Story about Race in America's Cities and Universities*. New York: Fordham University Press.

> I was having trouble imagining that what I wanted to do was design individual buildings for wealthy clients, but I was very interested in the whole question about space and the built environment and how that might be something that was important to larger populations. So even while I was in architecture school I was … really moving toward urban social and political questions and housing issues.[130]

Hartman was denied tenure in 1969 over clashes between the program's objectives and planning's professionalist identity, but the program provided valuable experience and perspective to some of the women who would shape feminist planning scholarship in the years to come.

Kennedy eventually took her organizing skills back to an educational setting when she and Michael E. Stone developed the community planning program within the College of Public and Community Service (CPCS), a progressive college founded in 1972 at the University of Massachusetts, Boston, with the explicit aim of reaching students from underserved backgrounds. Knowing of her extensive experience with UFS and UPA, the college initially approached Kennedy with a one-year contract to set up their field programs. In contrast with the elite students she had worked with at Harvard, Kennedy said the average entering student at CPCS was in their mid-30s, low-income, and from nearby the school. She described the CPCS field programs she designed as "Not just internships but … possibilities for people to work in their own community."[131] Kennedy described the community planning program as

> Explicitly directed toward people who don't usually get an opportunity… These were people who we would let in with a GED, or people who maybe had flunked courses at a community college many years in the past… Even progressives in other departments didn't always support us because they saw us as working too hard… But for us, our work was also our political work… It was the same thing.

Planners for Equal Opportunity

While UPA directly connected planners with communities in need and Urban Underground focused on local planning politics in cities on the East Coast, a group called Planners for Equal Opportunity (PEO) launched an assault on the national planning institutional

[130] Hayden, interview.
[131] Marie Kennedy, In Person, March 8, 2018.

apparatus. Jackie Leavitt and Walter Thabit, along with a group of radical social activists that included Frances Fox Piven, started PEO in 1964 to get planners "to take a stand against racist policies and acquire the skills for addressing the urban crisis."[132] PEO distributed a newsletter and convened annual conferences between 1966 and 1972 which often explicitly agitated against the agendas set at mainstream planning conferences. With four hundred members at their peak, PEO was a counter-organization to the planning establishment and their disruptive tactics were intentional. One meeting agenda noted that "To call attention to the need for reforms and changes, our position papers and action recommendations must be a provocative and lively exposition of realities."[133] They were perhaps most outspoken about their conviction that planners practiced discrimination, and they loudly called the profession out for this.[134] PEO drew connections between planning and housing policy, the Model Cities program, and Vietnam through a lens of racial and class oppression.[135]

PEO held its first conference in New York City in 1966, drawing 200 members, students, and grassroots leaders, but by the next year they had formed a plan for direct action against the American Institute of Planners, the national professional planning organization, at their fiftieth anniversary conference in Washington, D.C. PEO held what members called the "AIP Coup" or "AIP Revolt," staging a sit-in outside the hotel with their own slate of speakers and sessions. In direct commentary on AIP's conference theme, "Planning in the Next Fifty Years," PEO called their conference "Planning: Black and White Today."[136] They launched a public relations

---

[132] Sharon E. Sutton, *When Ivory Towers Were Black: A Story about Race in America's Cities and Universities* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2017).
[133] Planners for Equal Opportunity, "PEO Annual Meeting Conference Drafting Workshops" (July 9, 1969), Box 1, Folder 6, Planners for Equal Opportunity records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
[134] Thomas, "Socially Responsible Practice."
[135] Planners for Equal Opportunity, "PEO Annual Meeting Conference Drafting Workshops"; Planners for Equal Opportunity, "Resolution to AIP Board of Governors" (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, October 15, 1968), Box 1, Folder 19, Planners for Equal Opportunity records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
[136] Planners for Equal Opportunity, "Planning: Black and White Today" (Poster, Washington, D.C., October 1, 1967), Box 1, Folder 17, Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library; Planners for Equal Opportunity, "Planning Group Stages Rival Convention" (Press Release, Washington, D.C., n.d.), Box 1, Folder 17, Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library (PEO); See also Hoffman, *The Politics of Knowledge: Activist Movements in Medicine and Planning*.

strategy that garnered national press attention[137] and presented a slate of resolutions to the AIP board at the closing of the conference.[138]

PEO accomplished a joint task force with AIP, which carried on activities like publicizing a platform for PEO endorsement of candidates for officer positions within AIP.[139] But the task force didn't really go anywhere; a PEO member reporting on the Task Force wrote:

> It seems… that AIP can't go much beyond these recommendations under its current structure and mandate. If AIP were to really implement the goals of the Task Force it would have to attempt to radically expand the membership base and move to politicize the profession. This in turn would imply a very different kind of staff and organizational structure – changes that can probably be successfully resisted [by AIP] for some time to come.[140]

In addition to these structural challenges, the 1967 conference did not endear PEO to the general AIP membership; several members sent letters to PEO leadership after the 1967 coup expressing their outrage at being accused of racism.[141]

A different type of response came from Black advocate planners, who in effect declared their own counter-conference to PEO's 1968 counter-conference in Philadelphia, calling it the "First Annual Planners for Black Liberation Conference." They issued a scathing condemnation of PEO, asking,

> Just what the hell do you mean by 'Equal Opportunity'? That is not the question with which Black people are being confronted. Our problems, as we have identified them, are essentially Urban Domestic Colonialism and Rural Feudalism. By now it should be obvious… that Colonialism can be dealt with in only one way: through liberation… Black Liberation… by definition will be brought about by Black people. That is not to

---

[137] Ada Louise Huxtable, "Cities Getting Full Hearing in Capital," *New York Times*, October 3, 1967; Eugene L. Meyer, "Planners Told to Do More for the Poor," *Philadelphia Bulletin*, October 4, 1967; Robert J. Lewis, "Planners Hear Dissidents Blast Government Programs," *Washington Evening Star*, October 5, 1967; Robert Maynard, "City Planners Tour Two Washingtons," *Washington Post*, October 5, 1967.
[138] Planners for Equal Opportunity, "Rebels Challenge A.I.P. to Take a Strong Stand" (Press Release, Washington, D.C., October 3, 1967), Box 1, Folder 16, Planners for Equal Opportunity records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
[139] Planners for Equal Opportunity, "Platform for Candidates for AIP Office Accepting PEO Endorsements" (April 9, 1969), Box 1, Folder 24, Planners for Equal Opportunity records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
[140] David Stoloff, "Report on the AIP Task Force" (December 23, 1968), Box 1, Folder 24, Planners for Equal Opportunity records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
[141] Hoffman, *The Politics of Knowledge: Activist Movements in Medicine and Planning*.

> say that there is not a supporting role for idealistic or guilt-stricken young whites; but as in all liberation movements, those striving for liberation must lead![142]

In this way, Black liberation planners turned white radical planners' questions about planning *for whom* into questions about planning *by whom*.

This strong outcry from Black planners precipitated a decline in PEO's activities almost as soon as they began. PEO continued to hold counter-conferences for a few more years and convened a national conference on Advocacy and Pluralistic Planning at Hunter College in 1969 that featured Sherry Arnstein, Paul Davidoff, Walter Thabit, and Lisa Peattie.[143] But their efforts were hard to scale up, especially because internal conflicts continued to threaten the types of collective action strategies advocacy planning proponents relied on, and advocacy planners continued to be plagued by inadequate representation from among the groups they claimed to represent.[144]

Conclusion

Despite the fact that these groups were relatively short-lived, activist planners' actions in the late 1960s and early 1970s made lasting impacts on the profession and the broader planning discourse. Articles dealing with race and poverty from a variety of perspectives appeared frequently in the *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* by the late 1960s. AIP eventually changed its professional code to include language about "the planner's special responsibility to plan for the disadvantaged," and by 1974 developed a program for decentralized advocacy planning.[145] Impacts on planning education included the incorporation of action-oriented coursework and community-based studios at schools such as Hunter College at the City University of New York, the University of Pennsylvania, and the Pratt Institute. In all these activities, women were integral. They led local planning efforts, they participated in radical groups agitating against professional planning organizations, and they coordinated new forms of

---

[142] 2MJQ, Black Advocate Planners, and Organisation for Environmental Growth, "First Annual 'Planners for Black Liberation' Conference (Formerly: Second Annual Planners for Equal Opportunity Conference)" (Philadelphia, PA, March 16, 1968), Box 1, Folder 14, Planners for Equal Opportunity records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.

[143] "National Conference on Advocacy and Pluralistic Planning" (Conference Program, New York, N.Y., January 10, 1969), Box 2, Folder 5, Planners for Equal Opportunity records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.

[144] Hoffman, *The Politics of Knowledge: Activist Movements in Medicine and Planning*.

[145] Thomas, "Socially Responsible Practice."

community-engaged education with a goal of creating social change through planning. Though their efforts were more focused on racial and class equity than on gender during this period, the values and tactics that would characterize feminist planning in the next decade emerged from their experiences in the social movements of the 1960s.

Above all, radical planners applied pressure on the field to acknowledge race, class (and to a certain extent, gender) discrimination inherent in planning policies, processes, and institutions. Urban renewal policies provided a catalyzing point for activist planners to organize around. By challenging dominant assumptions of postwar technical planning and asking questions about to whom planning is beholden, radical planners placed their profession in the realm of social policy instead of merely a technical or physical endeavor. Their call to serve a plural public interest specified new constituencies for planning that included disadvantaged and underrepresented groups. Finally, the collective actions of activist planners during this period contributed to an academic culture that would draw in a large number of feminist activists in the 1970s, who in turn would build on earlier efforts to expose planning's and planners' roles in perpetuating inequality.

At the same time as these shifts were occurring in the profession, the policy context of women's education, in general and in terms of the planning profession, was changing. A number of national executive and legislative measures to increase the number of women in the academy and public service were implemented during this period. In 1967, President Johnson signed an executive order expanding affirmative action programs to include women (though as with the 1964 Civil Rights Act there was no mechanism for enforcement until the 1972 passage of the Equal Employment Act).[146] Title IX, designed to end gender discrimination in education by protecting people in programs receiving financial assistance from the federal government, passed in 1972. In addition to hiring requirements that allowed women to gain a foothold in the academy, the Johnson and Carter administrations provided grants for research on community-level urban and women's issues through the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Transportation, and Health and Human Services. All of the social movement pressure brought to bear on U.S. cities had created opportunities and

[146] Jonathan S Leonard, "Women and Affirmative Action," *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 3, no. 1 (February 1989): 61–75; Sheila M. Rothman, *Woman's Proper Place: A History of Changing Ideals and Practices, 1870 to the Present* (New York: Basic Books, 1978).

funding to research urban social problems in the U.S. This combination of support for women in higher education and funding made available for urban research encouraged the women in this chapter, and others who I introduce in the next chapter, to pursue careers as planning academics.

Chapter 3: Feminist Planning Emerges, 1970-1985

At the 1970 annual conference of the American Society of Planning Officials (ASPO) in New York City, organizers listed a "Women's Program" in the conference brochure advertising special tours and social events to "wives of delegates.[147] In response, a group of women passed out flyers advertising a meeting on women and planning to be held the afternoon of Sunday, April 5th, in the conference hotel. The flyer pointedly declared:

> ASPO's women's New York reflects the narrow aspect of the planning profession dominated by men. It is an outlook which has led to an emphasis on methods at the expense of human needs and values, to fascination with computer technology, and an unwillingness to talk to the people who live in the communities they plan – including their own wives… Where are the women planners at the conference? Not on the ASPO Board of Directors – all fifteen are men. Not among the conference organizers – they are all men but for Congresswoman [Shirley] Chisholm and conservationist Gay Ewing. Not on the Conference Committee – of its 22 members, four are women whose jobs are the frosting of an already structured program – field trips, publicity, social events and the 'women's program.'[148]

Attendees collectively issued a press release entitled "Women and Planning: A Condemnation," stating that planning "done by men" takes "little account of the needs of women" and that "the occupational world is now structured not to exclude women but to exploit them and, in fact, they do work – for lower wages than men at lower status jobs, while they are expected simultaneously to be full time work force for the maintenance of their households."[149]

---

[147] American Society of Planning Officials, "National Planning Conference" (Conference Program, New York, April 1970), Box 69, Folder 3, American Planning Association records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
[148] "Women and Planning." 1970. Flyer. New York. Box 3, folder 50. Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library (PEO).
[149] "Women and Planning: A Condemnation" (Press Release, April 6, 1970), Box 3, Folder 50, Planners for Equal Opportunity records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.

The press release linked the planning establishment's lack of attention to women to harmful stereotypes while also calling out the double burden intrinsic in women's work.

While this language reflects the economic rhetoric of the emerging women's movement, it also directly linked the treatment of women to the changing politics of planning at a time when planning organizations were sites of protests over racial and class inequality. As chapter two outlines, in the late 1960s, top-down urban renewal policies provided a catalyst for both community activists and planners alike, which forced a reevaluation of planning goals, definitions, and mechanisms. While women were always involved in this push towards advocacy, community agency, and participation in planning, the 1970s and early 1980s brought specific focus to women as a marginalized group. The press release stated:

> While the profession claims to be trying to humanize its practice, the Conference panel topics and the resource people are a denial of this claim. Discussions of the inner city, of minorities in the profession, of land use policies, and of neighborhood planning all affect women and community people intimately. Women who are a legitimate constituency and an invaluable resource have been dealt with by the Conference only as 'wives' of 'delegates', shunted off to T.V. studios, department stores, and museums.[150]

Authors noted that even while trying to bring a focus on underserved communities, male planners were leaving out half of the population. They continue, "Where are the real idea generators if the intent of the ASPO conference is in fact to reach citizen boards and commission members, community organizers and others who have no formal training or experience in planning?"[151] These themes of agency and attention to planning outcomes raised in 1970 would be repeated throughout the next two decades by women who centered the concept of woman and employed gender as a category of analysis to advocate for structural and cultural change in planning practice, scholarship, and education.

In this chapter, I show how feminist interventions into planning practice, scholarship, and education forced the field to rethink relationships between urban space and social norms. As they entered the planning academy in substantial numbers for the first time in the 1970s and early 80s, women leveraged their extensive experience with social activism and community planning to insert gender into planning discourse to affect social change through planning and design. Their

[150] "Women and Planning: A Condemnation."
[151] "Women and Planning: A Condemnation."

organizing ties and experience in neighborhood activism enabled them to connect social and human struggles to oppressive structures through the physical form of the built environment and the political process of planning. Feminist planners creatively produced knowledge to draw attention to their perspectives and to build a canon of feminist scholarship. In particular, these women built on expertise in housing and community development to re-insert the importance of those endeavors as part of planning (which, as chapter 1 makes clear, had been sidelined from planning practice since the early 20th century).

"We Don't Want You Here": Experiences of Marginalization

This chapter draws on oral history interviews with women active in the planning field who completed their graduate degrees and obtained their first faculty jobs in the 1970s and early 1980s. In line with broader demographic trends in women's higher education at the time, they are primarily white women from middle- or upper-class backgrounds, with a few exceptions. My interviewees' participation in women's movement activities like consciousness-raising and anti-domestic violence work, as well as their respective commitments to civil rights, anti-war, labor, environmental, and gay liberation organizing on campuses and in communities, gave them first-hand experience with spatialized struggles for justice. While not united as a formal group during this period, the women often banded together to ensure that gender was part of the conversation in urban planning.

My interviewees shared experiences with community-level approaches to understanding and changing the built environment. Unlike in traditional postwar planning positions, women were not an anomaly in grassroots and community-based organizations during the 1960s and 1970s. They occupied leadership roles and addressed precarity in housing, education, and access to resources that planning as a field was only beginning to consider. These forms of women-led community activism shaped feminist scholars' research and the ways they disseminated their points of view. Feminist planners were heavily involved in grassroots political action before and during their graduate educations, participating in groups like the National Congress of Neighborhood Women (NCNW), an advocacy organization founded in 1974 to create social change by organizing poor and working-class women around public housing. As one interviewee active in NCNW told me, "I became involved in the world of community development via my

feminism."[152] Women leveraged their experience working on social issues at the community scale throughout their careers in order to revitalize social aspects of planning that had been deemphasized by postwar models.

Many women I interviewed agreed that a driving force behind their individual choices to pursue careers in academia was a combination of increased support for women in higher education and funding for urban research.[153] National policies such as President Johnson's 1967 executive order expanding affirmative action to women, the 1972 Equal Employment Act, and Title IX banning gender discrimination in education, intended to level the playing field. Urban planning's normative and theoretical commitments were beginning to shift at the same time as educational and employment policies were increasing for women. The women I talked to were attracted to the field of planning because the emerging redefinition and expansion of planning goals, issues, and scales (as described in chapter 2) appealed to their experiences and skills.

Emerging disciplinary commitments to equity and critiques of rational planning signaled to feminist activists that urban planning would be a good field in which to pursue their interests in social aspects of the built environment. Since few schools offered doctoral degrees in urban planning before the 1960s, the majority of both male and female planning faculty during this period obtained their PhDs in other fields. Attracted by planning's permeable theoretical and institutional boundaries, women came from an array of disciplines, including architecture, environmental psychology, geography, political science, history, sociology, African studies, and English literature.

Housing and international development scholar Ayse Yonder, who studied urban design in her home country of Turkey before completing a planning doctorate at Berkeley, explained to me that courses about housing in the U.S. were always geared towards policy programs instead of "about what it does to people. The people part never came with the content… I wanted to see… what it does to people, and I think that's how I also got closer to women's stuff."[154]

[152] Anonymous 1, In Person, January 25, 2017.
[153] The Johnson and Carter administrations provided grants for research on community-level urban and women's issues through the 1964 Economic Opportunity Act, the National Institutes of Health, and the departments of Transportation and Health and Human Services. See Chapter 2 for discussion.
[154] Ayse Yonder, In Person, January 20, 2017.

Jacqueline Leavitt chose the field of urban planning over architecture because she believed in its "ability to support social movements through both rigorous research and ethical practice."[155]

Education and employment policies like Affirmative Action helped women obtain jobs in planning practice and academia. Daphne Spain, who first held a temporary appointment in Women's Studies at the University of Virginia in the early 1980s, recalled,

> I went to the sociology department and I went to the planning department and I said, 'You need women, you need to fill these affirmative action slots.' There was one senior woman in the entire school of architecture and she had come in as a full professor. One. So, I went to the chairs of both departments and I said… 'Each of you can give me a part time appointment and you'll be credited for a new woman and I get a real job.' And so that was another way I created a job for myself and also that's why I've always acknowledged the importance of affirmative action. Had it not been for affirmative action there would have been no pressure at all to hire me.[156]

Despite structural supports that allowed them to get a foot in the door, however, women faced tremendous challenges in the planning academy. They had to overcome daunting obstacles in an academic environment that was often dismissive or hostile towards them. Those starting careers in the 1970s were commonly the only woman in an otherwise male department and usually several decades younger than most of their colleagues. Many women I interviewed were handed an outsized amount of responsibility as junior scholars, such as being asked to head up high profile initiatives like research centers. Too often, university administrators handed them these "privileges" with few on-the-ground resources to help with the learning curve, not to mention the active resistance they faced when leading such initiatives. Susan Saegert, for example, was tapped to direct the Center for the Study of Women and Sex Roles at CUNY after only a few years of experience as an assistant professor at the Graduate School. Research centers created in a "climate of funding for women and research on women" carried a lot of responsibility and pressure, especially to maintain funding.[157] On the other hand, these positions provided potent opportunities for young scholars to shape the research landscape.

---

[155] "Progressive Planning Profile: Jacqueline Leavitt," Planners Network, January 3, 2008, http://www.plannersnetwork.org/2008/01/progressive-planning-profile-jacqueline-leavitt/.
[156] Spain, interview, January 31, 2017.
[157] Catharine R. Stimpson, *Women's Studies in the United States* (New York, N.Y.: Ford Foundation, 1986).

Speaking about her first academic job in the Faculty of Environmental Studies, York University, in 1972, Gerda Wekerle recalled, "I was in this horrible environment where I was young and the only woman. And as it turned out, the reason I seem to have gotten hired was that a group of graduate students who were women made a lot of trouble and noise to the dean saying that this was shameful there were no women. And so, to placate them I got hired."[158] Many interviewees told me that male faculty and graduate students often took credit for their ideas, overtly stole their work, and participated in more insidious behaviors like refusing to cite publications authored by women. One interviewee told me, "Guys just don't cite women. And they take their ideas,"[159] implying that such attitudes pervade even today.

In addition to being the targets of sexism, women entered an unequal playing field regarding educational preparedness and family responsibilities. For one, female secondary students were simply not given the same training as their male counterparts, leaving them less experienced with the technical skills necessary to work in planning and the design professions. As a student in Pasadena, California, in the early 1960s, Marie Kennedy's high school offered a program that matched students with professionals from their fields of interest. Kennedy was excited to be matched with an architect, whom she described as a "very nice man," but who nonetheless told her during their meeting that "girls can't be architects."[160] She said, "Because we had no experience in my family, I remember going back and telling my dad, 'Oh, Mr. So-and-So says girls can't be architects.' And just sort of accepting it." Messages such as these did not dampen Kennedy's resolve, however. She became the first girl in her high school to take a drafting course instead of the traditional homemaking class. Although she received "A's" on all of her projects, the male teacher gave her an "F" in the course, telling her, "The boys can't be boys if there's a girl around." Kennedy's father, who had only attended school as far as the sixth grade, took his allegation of bias all the way to the school board to get her grade changed; the teacher was ultimately fired.

When she moved to Boston after completing her undergraduate degree at the University of California at Berkeley in 1962, Kennedy worked in secretarial positions while searching for a better-paying job. Faced with few options, she responded to an advertisement for employment at

[158] Wekerle, interview, February 9, 2017.
[159] Anonymous 1, interview.
[160] Kennedy, interview.

the Downtown Waterfront Corporation, the group responsible for a massive redevelopment project in Boston. When she called and was immediately asked about her drafting skills, Kennedy replied, "I had a course in it in high school and I've done a lot of drafting for my brother who is an engineer," although the latter claim was a lie. Kennedy misrepresented herself in order to get the position and once there, taught herself the technical skills on the job, excelling so quickly that the male architects in the office encouraged her to go to graduate school. Shortly thereafter, the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) took over Boston's waterfront development and Kennedy, with her foot in the door, leveraged her initial position to move within the ranks of the BRA to work on low-income housing and community outreach.

Disparities in traditional girls' and boys' educations also put women at a disadvantage for professional networks and in traditionally male subjects like economics and math. Margaret Dewar attended Wellesley, an elite women's college in Massachusetts, before beginning a master's program in city planning at Harvard in 1972. When she arrived, she realized that many of her male classmates had already held jobs in planning and that she simply did not have the same professional connections as they did. She told me, "Wellesley had not provided me any context. There weren't women ahead of me, there weren't people I could call. And for first jobs, social contacts are key."[161]

The interest in scholarship Dewar gained at Harvard led her to pursue a doctorate in Urban Studies and Planning at MIT in the mid-1970s. She recalled having a "support network of one,"[162] a classmate in the first year of the PhD program: "We went into advanced economics from virtually no background and managed to pull each other through. It was quite something." In the PhD level economics class of 50 or 60, only a few students were women. She told me,

> We kept each other going… The first year was like extreme hazing, going through those advanced economics courses… They had all been economics majors and they had all, and I don't remember ever thinking this part, but they had all been the top of their classes. That's why they were in a PhD program at MIT. We had only taken Economics 101 and 102… We didn't have the math. I mean I had taken calculus and everything, but this is a different type of calculus. So, we poured over it. We'd do these problem sets together, and it would be all night, every week. And then we might get nothing right.

[161] Margaret Dewar, In Person, February 17, 2018.
[162] Dewar.

Despite the "hazing" that Dewar and her classmate endured, they were able to help each other through the experience. Dewar went on to specialize in economic development, along with housing and community development.

Family arrangements also affected women's careers in a way that did not affect their male counterparts. In some instances, men explicitly referenced women's decisions about motherhood and family in ways that discouraged them from pursuing careers. Eugenie Birch completed her master's degree in urban planning at Columbia in 1969 and was working for Chester Rapkin at the Institute of Urban Environment when she decided to pursue a PhD. She told me,

> I knocked on Dr. Rapkin's door and said, 'I'd like to get my doctorate.' … He said, 'Fine, fine, that sounds like a great idea. Just don't get pregnant.' And I looked and said, 'Oh, no.' Well guess what? I was three months pregnant! So, I spent the next six months hiding behind columns. Never mentioned the child. And proceeded to get my doctorate.[163]

Faced with an ultimatum, even if it was couched in a joke, Birch chose to downplay (or effectively ignore) her pregnancy in order to not let the situation affect her status in the program.

Susan Fainstein also referenced the expectation that women with children would not work in academic positions, telling me that she quit her job as a managing editor at an academic journal after becoming pregnant with her first child, "because at that time one didn't continue [working]."[164] Fainstein had already completed a master's degree in African Studies at Boston University and maintained freelance editing work while serving as a "not quite full-time mother" for several years. One of these jobs involved assisting a Harvard doctoral student on his political science thesis. Speaking about how this experience influenced her career trajectory, Fainstein said,

> He was blind, so he couldn't actually do the research. So, I did it and that didn't seem illegitimate, but once he started having me actually drafting chapters of his thesis (and he did get a PhD I might note), I thought well, I'm tired of this role of assisting others and that I would like to get a PhD myself. And since I felt I had already written one doctoral dissertation….

[163] Birch, interview, April 15, 2018.
[164] Susan S. Fainstein, In Person, April 20, 2018.

Though Fainstein's experience of exploitation is extreme, many interviewees reported men taking credit for their ideas, research, and designs over the course of their careers.

In the late 1960s, when her second son was nine months old, Fainstein applied to Harvard's PhD program in political science:

> Because I assumed having graduated magna cum laude [from Radcliffe College] they would be happy to have me. But as it turns out they were not happy to have me. They said quite bluntly, 'We only accept two women in a class, women with children are just a waste of our time and money and so forget about it.'[165]

This was not the first time Fainstein had experienced blatant sexism from Harvard, who reported being "treated terribly" while an undergraduate at Radcliffe in the late 1950s. The university maintained a ratio of four males to each female undergraduate student and there were no female professors. Fainstein said, "It was an extraordinarily sexist place… Women were treated as if they were there by sufferance… Professors would say 'well, girls got better grades, but it's because they study hard and have good handwriting.' It was a very heartless, difficult place. But it kind of toughed you up."[166] After being denied by Harvard's PhD program, Fainstein was able to leverage a professional connection with the admissions chair at MIT, who conditionally accepted her into their doctoral program (she had to prove herself before being accepted as a "regular" student). In 2006, Fainstein ended up being recruited to join Harvard's faculty as a full professor, which she described as "a kind of sweet revenge" for the conditions she faced there early in her career.

Most of the early women planning scholars experienced feelings of exclusion from their departments, where they were often the only woman on faculty and were much younger than their colleagues. Margaret Dewar told me that in faculty meetings there would be "lots of girl jokes, lots of sexist comments, not to me but … in the beginning of the meeting they'd be exchanging inappropriate jokes. Which of course excluded me."[167] When Susan Fainstein was hired as an assistant professor at Rutgers University in 1970, she was one of two women in the planning department. When I asked her about challenges from that experience, she recalled,

[165] Fainstein.
[166] Fainstein.
[167] Dewar, interview, February 17, 2018.

> Well one of the things that was sort of peculiar at the beginning was nobody would have lunch with me… It seemed to be that these men were kind of wary… Rather than … putting the moves, hitting on me, the opposite. They were fearful of any kind of work entanglement. So that I felt so lonely that I actually went to the chair and said, 'nobody talks to me.'[168]

The department chair hosted a party to encourage people to mix socially, which eased Fainstein's isolation.

Support networks and information sharing were critical since women were often isolated from each other, but maintaining and growing those networks often came at a personal cost. Gerda Wekerle joined the faculty of Environmental Studies at York University in 1972, after completing a PhD in sociology at Northwestern University outside Chicago. Wekerle and her Canadian colleagues took advantage of the Vancouver location for the 1976 United Nations Habitat meeting to strengthen international ties. They organized a session on Women and Environments and were pleasantly surprised when a hundred people showed up from all over the world. They collected names and addresses of attendees and decided the best course of action to take in order to maintain the network was to produce a newsletter. *Women and Environments* became a touchstone for planners and community activists. Wekerle explained,

> We never saw it as an academic journal just because the people who were interested initially were … activists and [from NGOs] and they weren't looking for … refereed journals. They kind of just wanted to know what was going on… It was designed as this niche … that covered stuff that didn't hit the feminist press or the planning press.[169]

Despite its importance to many, Wekerle had a very hard time keeping the newsletter afloat due to lack of resources and insecure institutional affiliation. She continued running it until 1984, when she was on maternity leave with a newborn and convinced other members of the editorial board to take it over. At that point, she said, it was long enough: "I mean spending eight years of your research time when you're not tenured on a magazine that gets you no kudos in the university…."

In addition to family responsibilities and extra professional burdens, gendered clothing was used as a mechanism for discrimination. Chester Hartman, founder of the Urban Field

[168] Fainstein, interview.
[169] Wekerle, interview, February 9, 2017.

Service (UFS), a program that integrated community studios into Harvard's Graduate School of Design, recruited Marie Kennedy to set up all the field projects for planning and architecture courses. Kennedy's role entailed serving as the point person between the university and community groups working with UFS, many of which were organizing against a planned Harvard expansion that fed into a massive student strike in 1969. Kennedy recalled "one small victory" after the strike ended unsuccessfully. The university set up a committee comprised mostly of administrative personnel to address some of the issues raised; they included Kennedy as the community representative since she was seen as person with strong links to the community. She told me,

> They had these meetings at the faculty club. I did not own a skirt. I didn't probably own any even pants that weren't jeans. And so, I would go to the faculty club and they'd say, 'You can't come in because we have this dress code.' And I'd say, 'Fine, please send … this note to Dean Such-and-What as to why I'm not coming to the meeting.' After doing this a couple of times, they finally … caved. They said, 'OK, we'll let women in with pants. But could it be something not jeans?' So, I went out and bought a pair of, I don't know, khakis or something. So, I broke the no pants on women [rule].[170]

Kennedy's experience at the Harvard faculty club was layered with class discrimination, and she shared many examples of class-related experiences that, for her, oftentimes eclipsed the concerns of the women's movement. Kennedy was active in a plethora of radical women's and community-based organizing efforts, but she described herself as "late to feminism" because the women she was around were often insensitive to her financial situation and to her needs as a parent.[171] In 1975, Kennedy was working for the Open Design Office in Boston on various projects such as a women's restaurant, a women's bookstore, women's health centers, and a feminist public theater.[172] Yet for her, "class issues and women with children, especially single mothers … were not part of the mix yet" in the feminist movement. She described the attitude from within the movement as, "Well you're a feminist, we don't have to pay you." Kennedy recalled reacting to this bluntly: "Well yeah you do, because I like to eat, and I like to feed my kids and keep a roof over our heads."

---

[170] Kennedy, interview.
[171] Kennedy.
[172] For more on the Open Design Office, see Reif, Rita. 1975. "Architecture: Feminist Ferment." *The New York Times*, August 9, 1975.

Kennedy most often felt like she was "suffering more [from] class issues," even though she had experienced her fair share of gender-based discrimination. For example, during her first job at the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA), she told me,

> The guy who had the drafting table … next to me used to come in … after the gym with his sweaty jock strap and hang it on the thing… There were all of these kinds of really ugly things that happened to me that were really like 'We don't want you here.' But the class stuff was much, much more painful to me.[173]

One of the reasons Kennedy initially decided to go to Harvard, as opposed to one of the other four architecture programs at which she was accepted, was because she would be able to continue working at the BRA. When she started at Harvard's Graduate School of Design (GSD), she was in a political role that she enjoyed, working on low-income housing in the downtown waterfront with residents, city council, and the state legislature. When she got to Harvard, however, she discovered,

> They made you sign something that said you wouldn't work during the school year, so that you could take advantage and everything. I thought it was one of those famous messages of Blue Laws, I thought this was a joke. And so, I worked. And I got called in after a month of school by the head of the first year, who sat me down in his office and said, 'It's come to my attention that you have a job.' And I said, 'Well, yeah. You only pay half of my tuition, I have to do the other half, I have to do all my supply, I have to have a place to live. Of course, I have a job.[174]

When the faculty member told her that she either had to quit working or he would kick her out of school, her response was, "You know what? You already got town and gown problems here with this university and I am going to go to everybody, TV station, the legislature. I've already got all these contacts."[175] He replied quietly, "Ok. Be discreet." Kennedy laughed about leveraging her position in this way but then admitted,

> It was a tough time for me… To this day I regret that I did have to work, because other people were taking these fabulous extra courses like in filmmaking and sculpture and

[173] Kennedy, interview.
[174] Kennedy.
[175] Kennedy.

whatever at the Carpenter Center and you know, they were really able to take full advantage of the university. Whereas I had to just stick to my thing.

For those women among this first generation of female planning scholars with limited financial means, class discrimination layered onto gendered marginalization and created extra barriers to overcome. While women were able to take advantage of opportunities in education and employment that had not been available to previous generations, they were isolated from each other and frequently discriminated against in those roles.

Tactics for Feminist Knowledge Production

How did feminist planners produce and circulate knowledge in this climate? Women made space to develop, disseminate, and debate their ideas when the establishment did not provide room for them. The resulting visibility of feminist ideas and activism in the planning academy occurred because women employed a variety of tactics for their own survival. They formed collectives, convened conferences, created publishing opportunities, and worked to institutionalize their demands for gender equity. When faced with marginalization in the planning academy, feminist planners took matters into their own hands to ensure that their intellectual and pedagogical networks grew.

Women formed working relationships for the practical reason that there were so few of them in the academy at the time. They found each other easily. Working across disciplines at the university level, they advocated for each other's careers to gain institutional footholds by strategically serving on tenure committees. They formed local women's writing groups and reading groups, which functioned as forums for sharing ideas and provided informal support networks. Many women also found natural ties with Women's Studies faculty at their institutions and formed influential friendships.

Groups of women in environmental design fields like architecture and planning formed collectives centered around feminist principles and practices. Ranging from experimental groups to formal organizations, collectives attracted professionals and academics alike and served as research groups and platforms for advocacy. For example, the Women's School of Planning and Architecture (WSPA) was founded in 1974 as a feminist "summer school" of environmental

design that ran short-term interdisciplinary educational seminars semiannually around the U.S.[176] WSPA's seven founders took an explicitly separatist approach and envisioned the group as a concrete link between the women's movement and architecture and planning education. They focused on translating tactics from the women's movement into pedagogical and research innovations for the design professions, such as breaking down hierarchies through collaboration in the formation and execution of the retreats' educational programming.[177] The group "encouraged and optimized diversity of age, experience, and geography as a major learning resource" and adopted affirmative action measures to "draw more low-income and minority women into the network," including active recruitment and partial fee subsidies.[178]

Dolores Hayden, a feminist architect and planning and urban historian, was instrumental in starting Women in Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Planning (WALAP) in the greater Boston area in 1971 while she was on faculty at MIT. WALAP was more focused on the academy than WSPA, often directing advocacy efforts at Harvard and MIT departments. WALAP members took a practical approach: the group's objectives included increasing the "influence of women felt in the design and planning professions," making the "influence of the design and planning professions felt in the environment," and generating a "meaningful way that women can work together to further such goals."[179] WALAP hosted open meetings for professional women that integrated consciousness-raising practices and maintained a nonhierarchical model. From these meetings, they identified interest areas of the membership, such as education and professionalism, gender discrimination in employment, and political action on specific community issues. They accumulated a mailing list of nearly 250 names by 1972,[180] to which they circulated a newsletter with meeting minutes, updates on campaigns, and job advertisements.

---

[176] Leslie Weisman, *Discrimination by Design: A Feminist Critique of the Man-Made Environment* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992).
[177] Elizabeth Cahn, "Project Space(s) in the Design Professions: An Intersectional Feminist Study of the Women's School of Planning and Architecture (1974-1981)" (Dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst, 2014).
[178] Women's School of Planning and Architecture, "Draft Statement of WSPA Goals and Policies" (n.d.), Box 1, Folder 14, Women's School of Planning and Architecture Records, Sophia Smith Collection of Women's History, Smith College.
[179] Women in Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Planning, "By-Laws" (n.d.), Ellen Perry Berkeley personal papers.
[180] Women in Environmental Planning and Design, "Women in Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and City Planning in the Boston-Cambridge or Suburban Area" (February 1972), Ellen Perry Berkeley personal papers.

WALAP members also applied direct pressure to institutions in the name of professional equity, urging the Harvard dean and the Graduate School of Design (GSD) to fix discriminatory practices in hiring, citing the absence of women faculty in the GSD and calling for affirmative action measures.[181] They wrote letters to the Board of Registration of Architects arguing that women are disproportionately affected by certification requirements for qualifying work hours, and collectively published a 1972 article in *Architectural Forum* laying out a case for flexible work schedules.[182] Though they took different approaches, both WSPA and WALAP overtly stated goals of fostering networks to expand the feminist knowledge base across disciplines and providing a platform from which to agitate against the mainstream profession and academy.

Despite these collectives' commitments to non-hierarchical models and attempts to reach a diverse audience, some women experienced exclusion in this environment. Kennedy was one of the original WSPA founders but remembered having to "really fight" to get child care for her daughter and the few other children who attended the summer schools with their mothers. She told me, "It wasn't in people's consciousness. None of the rest of them had children."[183] Another of WSPA's activities involved getting its members invited to speak at various conferences to raise the profile and impact of their work. This was a struggle for Kennedy, who remembered, "Luckily I had a friend who would take care of the kids sometimes. But again, there was no accommodation for the fact that I didn't have money, I didn't have child care, I was the only one with children." Kennedy was also active in WALAP but when they recruited her to join their board, she expressed doubts:

> I had begun to understand that it didn't really serve me well to go… They would pay transportation but they wouldn't pay child care. So I said, 'You don't pay child care, I'm not going to your board.' But I also understood that it wasn't good to always be the token woman, that you needed a critical mass to be able to get things to change. And I was beginning to be more of an organizer and to think about those issues, which came up very much in my practice as a planner as well.

---

[181] Women in Environmental Planning and Design, "Letter to Dean Kilbridge, Graduate School of Design, Harvard University," February 4, 1972, Ellen Perry Berkeley personal papers; Women in Architecture, Landscape Architecture and Planning, "An Open Letter to Members of the Harvard Graduate School of Design Association," June 15, 1972, Ellen Perry Berkeley personal papers.
[182] Women in Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Planning, "The Case for Flexible Work Schedules," *Architectural Forum* 137, no. 2 (September 1, 1972): 53–66.
[183] Kennedy, interview.

Another tactic women used to build a critical mass and cultivate feminist knowledge was designing undergraduate and graduate courses devoted specifically to issues of gender and urban space. With titles such as "Gender and the City," "Women in Planning and Design," and "Planning for Spatial Justice in the City: Women and Urban Change," the courses were cross listed to a variety of departments and were often co-taught with Women's Studies faculty. While a graduate student in the early 1970s, Gerda Wekerle helped to design Northwestern University's first Women's Studies course and later her Women and Environments course at York University in Toronto attracted students before a Women's Studies department existed at that institution. Wekerle was teaching courses on housing and became involved with faculty in the emerging field of Environment and Behavior, but at that time "stuff on gender and women was totally separate [from Environment and Behavior]."[184] That changed when Wekerle, alongside colleagues David Morley, a geographer, and Rebecca Peterson, an environmental psychologist, developed a graduate course on Women and Environments that they began co-teaching in the Environmental Studies program in 1975. Even then,

> There was never a big demand for the course … I'd always had a small enrollment and … often it got cancelled 'cause there wasn't enough enrollment… You had to have at least six and then the enrollment target went up to eight and then it was ten… I also kept changing the title… sometimes it was Women in Urban Change and then once it was called Women and the Non-Sexist City and etc."[185]

Wekerle played around with different titles to broaden the appeal of the course, but regardless of steadily low enrollment it represented a tangible bridge between planning-related disciplines and the women's movement in higher education.

A Hunter College seminar on women and housing co-taught by Eugenie Birch between 1981 and 1984 provided a similar formative learning experience for some high-profile feminist policymakers. After Birch completed her PhD at Columbia in 1976, she taught planning at various universities around New York while searching for a tenure-track job. When a faculty member at Hunter College told her about a grant-funded position opening up, he also mentioned that, "They really needed a woman, because Donna Shalala was going to be president of Hunter and this department, which was all guys, many of whom had gone to Syracuse with her, were

[184] Wekerle, interview, February 9, 2017.
[185] Wekerle.

very nervous."[186] Birch got the temporary, grant-funded job, ultimately obtained a permanent appointment, and ended up staying at Hunter for seventeen years.

Donna Shalala had served as assistant secretary for policy and research at HUD during the Carter Administration and would later serve as the U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services under President Bill Clinton. Birch described Shalala as a "connector person" who hosted brown bag lunches in each of her new departments, listened to what people were doing, and put her "presence" behind certain projects. When the planning department's turn came, Shalala told Birch she had some money from the Ford Foundation to allocate to Birch's work on women and housing. Together, the two women came up with the idea to convene women housing experts and activists in New York. They decided to do a seminar on women and housing as a course for planning students, but also held monthly meetings to which they invited speakers with careers in housing, including graduate students and faculty from Hunter and other schools interested in the topic. Birch described it as "a very congenial, wonderful gathering" where participants talked about their work over a shared meal. The seminar "ran its course" after several years, according to Birch, but seminar participants succeeded in making national policy recommendations at the Democratic Platform Committee in 1984. In addition, Birch's edited volume, *The Unsheltered Woman: Women and Housing in the 80's*, collected works by seminar participants and ensured wider dissemination of the topics it covered, including how to define gender-related needs, how to plan gender-responsive projects, and how to design implementation strategies.[187]

As the number of women-centered courses increased, scholars began to form a canon for research and teaching by circulating syllabi amongst themselves and compiling bibliographies on gender and planning. Personal collections of interviewees demonstrate the existence of informal networks of knowledge circulation, as women mailed and faxed annotated reading lists to each other. Bibliography circulation also provided an opportunity to distribute feminist work through formal channels such as the national professional and academic planning organizations. These groups, and the various task forces and interest groups formed within them, became important venues for women to insert gender into planning discourse.

---

[186] Birch, interview, April 15, 2018.
[187] Eugenie Ladner Birch, ed., *The Unsheltered Woman: Women and Housing in the 80s* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University, 1985).

A flurry of activity among professional women commenced in the early 1970s under the auspices of the AIP and ASPO's Women's Rights Committees, which often functioned as a joint effort. In the next period (covered in chapter 4), faculty women would build an institutional support network specifically for academics in the U.S. and Canada. But during the 1970s and early 1980s institutional efforts to demonstrate discrimination and raise awareness of women's experiences happened primarily in professional planning organizations. The academic group, the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP), was a nascent organization during this period and many faculty women were heavily involved in professional groups like the AIP, ASPO, and the American Planning Association (APA) after the two former groups merged.

The 1970 women's condemnation that opened this chapter was certainly not the first time that female planners in the U.S. and Canada had appealed to male-dominated planning institutions over gender discrimination. For example, Ann Fathy, a planner at the San Diego Planning Department, wrote to the ASPO board to "speak out" about a job advertisement circulated by ASPO.[188] The ad read, "Regional planning staff seeks an unusually bright man" before explicitly listing the company as an equal opportunity employer. Fathy called on ASPO to conduct and publish results of a survey that she hoped would "let the profession see itself as it is: talking equal opportunity, but practicing discrimination."[189]

In response to individual feedback and growing collective outcry after the public condemnation at the 1970 conference, ASPO's directed efforts towards surveying women in the profession and conducting research on women's experiences as they related to planning issues. In 1974, Karen Hapgood and Judith Getzels co-authored an ASPO Planning Advisory Service Report entitled "Planning, Women, and Change." With grant funding and staff support from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development's Office of Policy Development and Research, the ASPO women's committee sponsored a 1974 workshop on Planning for Women that was held at the Center for Continuing Education at the University of Chicago. In addition to publishing papers from the workshop, the report provided "guidance in areas of planning practice relating to the requirements of modern women" in areas such as community design, aging

[188] Ann T. Fathy, "Letter to American Society of Planning Officials," September 14, 1970, Box 3, Folder 34, American Planning Association records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
[189] Her letter, addressed "To whom it may concern," included the following postscript: "Faced with the traditional terms of address, Dear Sirs or Gentlemen, both of which assume that the executive positions are filled by men and that women are only typists and secretaries, I prefer this unbiased salutation."

populations, transportation, and supportive services (including child care) and offered suggestions for tying planning measures such as zoning to "women's new economic role."[190] They noted additionally that "this report is intended to affect all women, especially the many women who by reason of income, class, and color are further separated from access to new opportunities."

Similarly, AIP surveyed women planners in 1971 and formed a seven-person committee tasked with presenting a policy paper on women's rights to the AIP Board of Governors in 1972.[191] Using AIP's equal opportunity guidelines as grounds for involvement, the committee also investigated a case of alleged sex discrimination brought by a group of women planners against the Boston Redevelopment Authority.[192]

In 1978, AIP and ASPO merged to form the American Planning Association (APA), around the same time that the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP) was beginning to grow into its contemporary role as the primary organization for academics. A year later, the APA's Planning and Women Division (PAW) was founded to lend legitimacy to gender issues in planning practice. PAW published a quarterly newsletter starting in 1980,[193] which they distributed to a growing number of women in the profession: the number of women graduating from planning programs went from 7.5 percent in 1968 to 31 percent in 1978.[194] With funding from HUD's Office of Policy Development and Research, PAW published *Women and Urban Planning: A Bibliography* in 1981.[195] Feminist planners adopted the bibliography strategy commonly employed by feminist scholars during this period to circulate new knowledge.[196]

In addition to the Planning and Women division's activities, The APA formed a Task Force on Women and Minorities in 1983, consisting of five members from both the PAW

---

[190] Karen Hapgood and Judith Getzels, "Planning, Women, and Change" (ASPO Planning Advisory Service Report, Chicago, 1974).
[191] American Institute of Planners, "Woman's Rights Policy Paper Committee" (n.d.), Box 3, Folder 34, American Planning Association records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
[192] Jerome Kaufman, "Letter to Diana Donald," November 10, 1972, Box 3, Folder 34, American Planning Association records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
[193] APA archive has PAW annual reports and newsletters from the 80s – list a few examples of efforts. April 1980 list of recommendations in Wekerle docs.
[194] Leavitt, "Feminist Advocacy Planning in the 1980s."
[195] Patricia A. Coatsworth, ed., "Women and Urban Planning: A Bibliography" (Office of Policy Development and Research, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1981).
[196] See Patricia K. Ballou, *Women: A Bibliography of Bibliographies*, 2nd ed., G.K. Hall Women's Studies Publications (Boston, MA: G.K. Hall & Co., 1986); Barbara Sicherman et al., *Recent United States Scholarship on the History of Women* (Washington, DC: American Historical Association, 1980); Jane Williamson, *New Feminist Scholarship: A Guide to Bibliographies* (Old Westbury, NY: The Feminist Press, 1979).

division and the Planning and the Black Community division.[197] Recommendations included a request that APA studies include data on women and minorities as a matter of course, encouraged a national program to encourage more equal representation in the profession and on the board of governors, and sought to eliminate the 20 percent pay gap between men and women.[198] In 1988, the Task Force on Women and Minorities produced a report from survey data on Women's Experience with Harassment and Discrimination on the Job.[199] The survey provided evidence of both explicit and subtle discriminatory behaviors directed at women, which not only reached a male audience, but also signaled to women that the problems were systemic and widespread, not a result of personal failings.

Conferences also served as sites for women to carve out space to share their experiences and devise collective actions during a time of institutional flux. One of the earliest examples of women being highlighted on a planning conference program occurred in 1977 at a joint conference of the AIP and ACSP held in Kansas City, Kansas. Jacqueline Leavitt, a PhD student at Columbia at the time, organized a panel entitled "Women in Planning: Do Numbers Really Make a Difference."[200] During the discussion, attendees expressed concerns about meeting in a state that had not ratified the Equal Rights Amendment. Their boycott effort to pressure AIP and ASPO to factor this into conference location decisions was unsuccessful, but ongoing conversations among the women present at the panel contributed to the 1979 establishment of PAW, of which Leavitt served as a co-founder.[201]

Leavitt researched women in the planning profession extensively: her 1980 dissertation, *Planning and Women, Women in Planning*, was the first comprehensive study of women as

[197] "Minutes of the Task Force on Women and Minorities for American Planning Association" (New York, July 28, 1983), Box 63, Folder 12, American Planning Association records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
[198] American Planning Association, "Report of the Task Force on Minorities and Women" (April 18, 1984), Box 63, Folder 12, American Planning Association records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
[199] Carol D. Barrett, "Women's Experience with Harassment and Discrimination on the Job: A Report to the American Planning Association Board of Directors" (San Antonio, TX: Task Force on Women and Minorities, April 1988), Box 63, Folder 12, American Planning Association records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
[200] "Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning Conference" (Conference Program, Kansas City, Kansas, October 8, 1977), US 94-3, Box 1, Folder 1, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[201] Marjorie Macris, "Beginnings of the Women and Planning Division of the American Planning Association," American Planning Association, accessed May 24, 2017, https://women.planning.org/about/history-division/.

planners and women as planning subjects.[202] The dissertation collected and analyzed data on women as planning professionals and treatment of women in the profession, arguing that although the number of women in the profession rose and women held similar career patterns to men, the incidence of women as the subject of planning research had not increased.[203] Like the women responsible for the 1970 Women and Planning Condemnation, Leavitt drew a connection between these two aspects of situation women were facing: "If the planning profession does not accommodate the needs of its own practitioners, is it likely that those who are being discriminated against will advocate other women's needs?"[204]

Due to Leavitt's and others' relentless advocacy, and in contrast to the earlier paucity of substantive conference programming addressing women's issues, PAW sponsored sessions at the APA annual conference throughout the 1980s on topics like child care, planning for families, women's economic status, and alliances between professional and grassroots women. By organizing panels at mainstream conferences on topics such as "Feminist Contributions to Planning" and "Changing Roles and Expectations of Women: Implications for Policy," feminists provided knowledge sharing and networking opportunities that generated further collaboration.

Women also organized their own interdisciplinary conferences specifically dedicated to gender and planning-related issues. Organizations like WALAP provided resources and served as platforms to publicize the events, as was the case with the 1973 "Women in Housing" conference organized by Harvard students at the Graduate School of Design. Over the next several years, conferences on women in architecture and design took place around the country.[205] Dolores Hayden and Sheila DeBretteville helped to organize the 1975 event "Women in Design" at the Women's Building, a feminist art and education community center in Los Angeles from which the interdisciplinary feminist journal *Heresies* launched in 1977. Feminist Planners and Designers (FPD) at UCLA was an influential student group that hosted yearly conferences on a gender theme for almost a decade, starting with the 1979 "Planning and Designing a Non-Sexist

[202] Jacqueline Leavitt, "Planning and Women, Women in Planning" (Dissertation, New York, Columbia University, 1980).
[203] Leavitt.
[204] Jacqueline Leavitt, "Women in Planning: There's More to Affirmative Action than Gaining Access," in *New Space for Women*, ed. Gerda R. Wekerle, Rebecca Peterson, and David Morley (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1980), 219–34.
[205] Dolores Hayden and Gwendolyn Wright, "Review Essay: Architecture and Urban Planning," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 1, no. 4 (July 1, 1976): 923–33; Jacqueline Leavitt, "Gendered Planning: Inside/Out?," *Critical Planning Journal* 6, no. Spring (1999): 110–13.

City" conference.[206] UCLA's Planning Department, which employed such figures as Leavitt and Hayden, was an influential site for challenging and honing feminist planning knowledge by the mid-1980s and FPD would exert later direct influence on ACSP policy.[207]

Networks were not only national. The United Nations Human Settlements meetings were important venues for building international feminist networks during the 1970s and 80s, particularly following the UN's designation of 1975 as International Women's Year. After the 1976 meeting in Vancouver, for example, Gerda Wekerle reflected, "For many of us, there was a great sense of excitement and joy to discover women (and some men) from other countries who also viewed urban issues as feminist issues. We felt that we were witnessing the birth of an exciting new interdisciplinary field -- one that combined an interest in the urban environment with feminist analysis and consciousness."[208] Edited volumes often served as a way to document shared ideas from a conference, particularly during this time when publicizing conference proceedings was rare. Interdisciplinary edited volumes were instrumental in defining research on the relationship of gender roles to the built environment and urban design.[209] Some groups started their own publications, such as the newsletter *Women and Environments* that Wekerle co-founded, to serve a need for non-academic publications for an audience of women's activists and NGO workers that felt left out by both feminist and planning literatures.[210]

In addition to creating discursive spaces through conferences, feminist planners were strategic about collaborative publishing choices. As part of a concerted effort to build women's studies across disciplines, new interdisciplinary feminist journals formed in the mid-1970s, such as *Quest: A Feminist Quarterly*, *Heresies, Frontiers*, and *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. Feminist planning scholars such as Ann Markusen, a regional economist and planning scholar who taught at Berkeley from 1977 to 1986, worked alongside members of

---

[206] Leavitt, "Gendered Planning: Inside/Out?"
[207] Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting" (Los Angeles, CA, November 5, 1987), US 98-1, Box 1, Folder 27, Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning records, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[208] Gerda R. Wekerle, Rebecca Peterson, and David Morley, eds., *New Space for Women*, Westview Special Studies on Women in Contemporary Society (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1980), xiii.
[209] See Wekerle, Peterson, and Morley, *New Space for Women*; Suzanne Infeld Keller, ed., *Building for Women* (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1981); Birch, *The Unsheltered Woman*; Jo Little, Linda Peake, and Pat Richardson, eds., *Women in Cities: Gender and the Urban Environment* (New York: New York University Press, 1988); Ellen Perry. Berkeley and Matilda. McQuaid, *Architecture: A Place for Women* (Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1989).
[210] Wekerle, interview, February 9, 2017.

Women's Studies programs to raise the profile of environmental design and spatial disciplines among feminists in the broader sphere. Several feminist journals featured discussions of women and space in special issues, including *Centerpoint*'s 1980 issue on "Women: The Dialectic of Public and Private Spaces," and *Heresies* 1981 "Making Room: Women and Architecture."

Sometimes these opportunities arose out of local feminist activist ties, as was the case with *Heresies* and the Women's Building in Los Angeles. At other times a feminist scholar recruited planners, as when Women's Studies pioneer Catherine Stimpson reached out to a number of feminist planners and designers to produce a 1980 supplemental issue of *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* focused on the role of women in urban politics and community organizations. By 1980 *Signs* was considered the premier journal of interdisciplinary academic feminism. One of the contributors gave credit to Stimpson for what would become a well-cited piece, telling me that she "would have never written that article" if Stimpson had not contacted her "out of the blue."[211] The issue, which was republished a year later as a book with a grant from HUD's Office of Policy Development and Research,[212] formed a watershed moment for many feminist planners who saw this as evidence for the mutually beneficial relationships between feminists and planners. Along with Hayden's *Grand Domestic Revolution* (1981), this *Signs* issue was named by many women I interviewed as the most formative publication for that period in their intellectual development.

Another strategy for building feminist scholarship in planning-related disciplines was producing special issues of mainstream journals devoted to women, such as the 1978 special issue of the *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* entitled "Women and the City." Ellen Perry Berkeley, one of WSPA's co-founders, leveraged her position as a senior editor at *The Architectural Forum* to feature two feminist articles in a 1972 issue, including a piece advocating for flexible work schedules written by WALAP members. In the case of a 1983 special issue of the *Journal of the American Planning Association* entitled "Planning and the Changing Family," one of the scholars involved told me that the benign title was a strategically rhetorical "feint." She said, "To get the editors to do it we talked about general issues, but all the articles were written by women about women!" Even the one article that contained the word "feminist" in the title appeared to couch the issue in neutral terms by referring to the feminist

[211] Ann Markusen, In Person, February 7, 2017.
[212] Catharine R. Stimpson et al., eds., *Women and the American City* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981).

"past."[213] In order to center women's perspectives, contributors strategically used language about the family (writing, for example, about changing structure, forms, and definitions of family in relation to urban planning topics).

Inserting a gendered perspective into planning education and practice required women to employ creative tactics for visibility. They formed collectives, taught courses, compiled bibliographies, institutionalized information sharing through interest groups and reporting standards, convened conferences, and charted varied publishing paths. The knowledge production conducted through both informal and mainstream channels produced a uniquely feminist perspective on urban planning.

Feminist Planning Scholarship

As Women's Studies developed as an academic field in the 1970s, it primarily revolved around three main topics: demonstrating that women's experiences differed from men, differentiating between gender and sex, and illuminating relationships of power (particularly sexism).[214] Like their Women's Studies colleagues, feminist scholars in planning and built environment fields engaged in research that questioned power and that centered women as subjects. They used a gender analytic to examine the relationships between planning, changing social structures and norms, the economy, and the built environment. Feminist planning scholars leveraged their extensive experience with grassroots planning through community organizations to bring attention to social aspects of planning through their scholarship and to highlight the contributions and experiences of women. In particular, feminists' contributions to innovative research in housing and community development sought to legitimize those areas of planning research.

As I discussed in chapter 1, feminist planning historians viewed city planning history through the lens of gender and related concepts like domesticity and rationality, exposing the ideological work that planning performs to fulfill its desires for social order and professionalism.[215] The majority of historical scholarship during this period highlighted the

---

[213] Dolores Hayden, "The Egalitarian Future and the Feminist Past," *Journal of the American Planning Association* 49, no. 2 (June 30, 1983): 182–182.
[214] Stimpson, *Women's Studies in the United States*.
[215] Gwendolyn Wright, *Moralism and the Model Home: Domestic Architecture and Cultural Conflict in Chicago, 1873-1913* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980); M. Christine. Boyer, *Dreaming the Rational City: The Myth of American City Planning* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1983).

previously unrecognized contributions of women to social and community planning through housing movements from the early 20th century through the Progressive and New Deal Eras.[216] This work reveals the gendered origins of the profession of city planning, in which men delegitimized women's involvement in areas like housing advocacy while consolidating the profession around technical aspects to which women had little access. The long tradition of women's efforts to tether city planning to social issues at the neighborhood scale allowed feminists to reclaim housing advocacy and community development activities under the purview of planning in the 1970s. Eugenie Birch reminded me that near the beginning of her career "urban history was just in its infancy, and city planning history didn't exist,"[217] so their work came at an opportune time to shape the field.

Overall, feminist scholars offered a vision of planning research that takes a stand against oppression,[218] actively critiqued planning's role in structural and symbolic disadvantage to women,[219] and propelled planners to engage directly in advocacy.[220] Many scholars built on their New Left origins and took cues from feminist thought to critique the lack of social reproduction in Marxist theory, calling for expanding the definition of "work" to include domestic and community labor, reproduction and elder care.[221] Topics focused around women's household work and its connection to housing and urban form like suburbanization, engaging in larger conversations about women entering the paid workforce and other changes to family structures. The promise of feminist planning lay in binding equity to the built environment at the neighborhood scale, where women historically had a higher degree of self-determination and

---

[216] Birch, "Woman-Made America The Case of Early Public Housing Policy"; Birch, "From Civic Worker to City Planner: Women and Planning, 1890-1980"; Dolores Hayden, "Two Utopian Feminists and Their Campaigns for Kitchenless Houses," *Signs* 4, no. 2 (1978): 274–90; Hayden, *The Grand Domestic Revolution*.
[217] Birch, interview, April 15, 2018.
[218] Beth Moore Milroy, "Taking Stock of Planning, Space, and Gender," *Journal of Planning Literature* 6, no. 1 (August 1, 1991): 3–15.
[219] Susan S. Fainstein, "Feminism and Planning: Theoretical Issues," in *Gender and Planning: A Reader*, ed. Susan S. Fainstein and Lisa J. Servon (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2005), 120–38.
[220] Leavitt, "Feminist Advocacy Planning in the 1980s"; Leonie Sandercock and Ann Forsyth, "A Gender Agenda: New Directions for Planning Theory," *Journal of the American Planning Association* 58, no. 1 (March 31, 1992): 49–59.
[221] Fainstein, "Feminism and Planning: Theoretical Issues"; Dolores Hayden, *Redesigning the American Dream: The Future of Housing, Work, and Family Life* (W. W. Norton & Company, 2002); Dolores Hayden, "What Would a Nonsexist City Be Like?: Speculations on Housing, Urban Design, and Human Work," in *Gender and Planning: A Reader*, ed. Susan S. Fainstein and Lisa J. Servon (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2005), 47–64; Dolores Hayden, "Nurturing: Home, Mom, and Apple Pie," in *Readings in Planning Theory*, ed. Susan S. Fainstein and Scott Campbell, 3rd ed. (1984; repr., Chichester ; New York: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012), 358–83; Ann R. Markusen, "City Spatial Structure, Women's Household Work, and National Urban Policy," *Signs* 5, no. 3 (1980): S23–44; Milroy, "Taking Stock of Planning, Space, and Gender."

influence. In the inaugural issue of the interdisciplinary feminist journal *Frontiers*, which she helped found during her first faculty job at the University of Colorado, Ann Markusen addressed the theme of "women and work" by directly linking the economic demands of the women's movement to community provision of services at the neighborhood level, for example.[222]

In addition to drawing attention to women's contributions and social aspects of planning that had been overlooked or disregarded, feminist planning scholarship focused on spatial outcomes of gendered norms. Feminist research highlighted various ways the built environment reproduces the gender imbalance in labor and economic opportunities and reifies gendered expectations about urban space and access. These perspectives contrasted sharply with modernist planning ideals of scientific rationality that held sway through the 1950s. Feminist scholarship vehemently rejected notions of objectivity, renouncing the idea of planning as an arms-length practice and arguing instead that planners are complicit in perpetuating inequality through the built environment.[223] Policy and regulatory frameworks and planning tools are therefore not value neutral,[224] and neither are the planning institutions and processes that create and enforce them.[225] Only by confronting this perceived neutrality, feminists argued, can planners illuminate the ways social and political relationships, language and discourse, and the built environment all structure (and are structured by) gendered identities, relations, and expectations.

Marsha Ritzdorf, who left a professional planning career to complete a PhD at the University of Washington in 1983, exemplified this work on norms in her research on municipal zoning, one of the primary tools that planners use to regulate land use development. Although often viewed as a technical planning mechanism, zoning is instead a system laden with values. Traditional zoning practices that regulate housing type, form, and placement contain ideological

---

[222] Ann R. Markusen, "The Economics of the Women's Movement," *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 1, no. 1 (1975): 42–52.
[223] Leavitt, "Feminist Advocacy Planning in the 1980s"; Sandra Rosenbloom, "Women's Travel Issues: The Research and Policy Environment," in *Gender and Planning: A Reader*, ed. Susan S. Fainstein and Lisa J. Servon (1978; repr., New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2005), 235–55; Susan Saegert, "Masculine Cities and Feminine Suburbs: Polarized Ideas, Contradictory Realities," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 5, no. s3 (January 1980): S96; Milroy, "Taking Stock of Planning, Space, and Gender"; Marsha Ritzdorf, "A Feminist Analysis of Gender and Residential Zoning in the United States," in *Women and the Environment*, ed. Irwin Altman and Arza Churchman, Human Behavior and Environment 13 (New York: Springer US, 1994), 255–79; Sandercock and Forsyth, "A Gender Agenda."
[224] Ann Forsyth, "Queerying Planning Practice: Understanding Non-Conformist Populations," in *Queerying Planning: Challenging Heteronormative Assumptions and Reframing Planning Practice*, ed. Petra L. Doan (Farnham, Surrey ; Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2011), 21–52; Sonia A. Hirt, *Zoned in the USA: The Origins and Implications of American Land-Use Regulation* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2014).
[225] Ritzdorf, "A Feminist Analysis of Gender and Residential Zoning in the United States."

orientations about gender roles, impeding "both the creation of innovative housing and the formation of alternative families."[226] As Ritzdorf's later publications made clear, hegemonic family values and definitions are embedded in zoning ordinances that define and enforce household composition rules and place compounded barriers on female-headed and minority-headed households.[227]

Prior to the 1990s, however, this type of analysis was rarely present in feminist planning scholarship. Much of the early feminist planning literature linked gendered inequalities to the physical and symbolic separation of the public and private spheres,[228] and asserted that women experience urban environments and planning processes differently than men as a result. Planners adversely affect women when they zone child care out of suburban neighborhoods or design transportation systems around male-centric employment patterns, for example.[229] However, while the prevalence of Marxist perspectives led to integrated class analysis at times and some scholars confronted race and class head-on without a simultaneous gender analysis,[230] scholarship focused on women during this period neglected in most cases to note the wide range of women's experiences beyond how their differences in age contributed to varying needs.

While enumerating the double burden placed on women by the segregation of the city from the suburb, feminist analyses nonetheless left intact many problematic assumptions embedded in the category of woman. Analysis of the economic and social shifts contributing to women's "double day" and resulting spatial outcomes tended to assume women to be white, middle class, and heterosexual, for example.[231] Scholars sometimes leveraged discourse around

---

[226] Marsha Ritzdorf, "Zoning Barriers to Housing Innovation," *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 4, no. 3 (April 1, 1985): 183.
[227] Ritzdorf, "Family Values, Municipal Zoning, and African American Family Life"; Marsha Ritzdorf, "Sex, Lies, and Urban Life: How Municipal Planning Marginalizes African American Women and Their Families," in *Gendering the City: Women, Boundaries, and Visions of Urban Life*, ed. Kristine B. Miranne and Alma H. Young (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000), 169–82; Ritzdorf, "A Feminist Analysis of Gender and Residential Zoning in the United States."
[228] Saegert, "Masculine Cities and Feminine Suburbs"; Leavitt, "Women in Planning: There's More to Affirmative Action than Gaining Access"; Gerda R. Wekerle, "Women in the Urban Environment," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 5, no. 3 (Spring 1980): 188–214; Gerda R. Wekerle, "From Refuge to Service Center: Neighborhoods That Support Women," *Sociological Focus* 18, no. 2 (April 1, 1985): 79–95.
[229] Birch, *The Unsheltered Woman*; Markusen, "City Spatial Structure, Women's Household Work, and National Urban Policy"; Wekerle, "Women in the Urban Environment."
[230] Jennifer R. Wolch, "Residential Location of the Service-Dependent Poor," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 70, no. 3 (September 1980): 330–41; Norman Fainstein and Susan S. Fainstein, *Urban Political Movements: The Search for Power by Minority Groups in American Cities* (Englewood Cliffs, NY: Prentice Hall, 1974); June Manning Thomas, "Neighborhood Response to Redevelopment in Detroit," *Community Development Journal* 20, no. 2 (1985): 89–98.
[231] Saegert, "Masculine Cities and Feminine Suburbs"; Wekerle, "From Refuge to Service Center."

segregation to draw attention to women, writing about segregation between the sexes or segregation of public from private,[232] but they in effect shifted the conversation from race to gender instead of examining how those oppressions interacted with each other.

Scholarship about gender from this period often did not acknowledge race at all. When it did, authors tended to mentioned race more as a footnote rather than as a system of oppression intertwined with gender.[233] A few publications indicate that feminists made a conscious decision to subsume race to gender in their scholarship, arguing that research was already being directed towards so-called minority groups and the poor.[234] The sheer lack of women in the planning profession and academy[235] indicates that it made sense to women in the early years to consider themselves as a unified group (a strategy institutionalized in the planning academy during the late 1980s to mixed results, as I explore in the next chapter). Mirroring broader trends in the women's movement, feminists were attempting to bind women together through shared experiences such as the need for and access to child care, for example.

Feminists achieved a higher profile for women's interests and needs in planning by stressing the importance of social aspects and outcomes of planning. Despite the fact that many feminist planners were steeped in community-level engagement with diverse populations through their research and activism, scholarship often elided discussions of race. They introduced gender as a frame of analysis for planning research and theory but often treated "woman" as a universal category, which further masked structural and experiential variations among women.

There were some exceptions, as some academic planners analyzed gender in terms of race and/or class. Catherine Ross, who joined Georgia Institute of Technology's planning faculty in 1976 and was one of the few African American women in the planning academy during this period, analyzed both race and gender variables while studying community members' attitudes

---

[232] Saegert, "Masculine Cities and Feminine Suburbs"; Daphne. Spain, *Gendered Spaces* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992); Susan Hanson and Geraldine Pratt, "Spatial Dimentions of the Gender Division of Labor in a Local Labor Market," *Urban Geography* 9, no. 2 (March 1988): 180–202.
[233] See, for example, Saegert, "Masculine Cities and Feminine Suburbs"; Wekerle, "Women in the Urban Environment"; Leavitt, "Feminist Advocacy Planning in the 1980s."
[234] Markusen, "The Economics of the Women's Movement"; Birch, *The Unsheltered Woman*; Gerda R. Wekerle, "Women House Themselves," *Heresies: A Feminist Publication on Art and Politics* 3, no. 3 (1981): 14–17; Jacqueline Leavitt, "Where's the Gender in Community Development?," *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 29, no. 1 (September 1, 2003): 207–31.
[235] Leavitt, "Feminist Advocacy Planning in the 1980s."

towards public transportation.[236] Jacqueline Leavitt and Susan Saegert's research on African American women in landlord-abandoned properties in Harlem also placed the experiences of poor women of color firmly at the forefront.[237] While the majority of feminist research promoted gender perspectives without race and class analysis, however, many women continued to promote community-oriented research as necessary to transform planning from a top-down technical enterprise to a socially and politically engaged one.

Conclusion

While planning had previously been a top-down process enacted along rational-scientific principles, social movement pressure helped to reorient the field towards social and subjective aspects of planning at the neighborhood and community scale. Many forces contributed to these shifts, but oral histories, archival documents, and published scholarship reveal that feminist planners contributed significantly to the disciplinary values of engagement, participation, and advocacy that characterize the field today. Women raised the profile of feminist perspectives through educational collectives and advocacy groups and by strategically organizing conferences and publishing opportunities in planning and related fields. Though the discourse was largely limited during this period to white, middle class women's needs and experiences, feminists were a catalytic force for social justice efforts in planning by creating spaces to introduce gendered power differentials and push back against technocratic ideals.

Feminist planners introduced a gender analytic into planning research and literature. By the mid-1980s, when Doreen Massey declared that feminism was "clearly on the agenda in geography,"[238] women's and gender issues were likewise visible in planning discourses and institutions. By banding together as a marginalized group in the academy, feminists fostered spaces for knowledge sharing, made it more commonplace to study women's experiences in planning, and achieved a basic level of topical representation in the discipline. Their backgrounds in community advocacy enabled them to insert under-represented topics like

---

[236] Catherine Ross, "The Influence of Race and Gender on Perceptions of Community Impact," *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 5, no. 2 (June 1, 1985): 169–79.
[237] Jacqueline Leavitt and Susan Saegert, "Women and Abandoned Buildings: A Feminist Approach to Housing," *Social Policy* 15, no. 1 (Summer 1984): 32–39; Jacqueline Leavitt and Susan Saegert, *From Abandonment to Hope: Community-Households in Harlem*, Columbia History of Urban Life (New York: Columbia University Press, 1990).
[238] Women and Geography Study Group of the IBG, *Geography and Gender: An Introduction to Feminist Geography* (London ; Dover, NH: Hutchinson in association with Explorations in Feminism Collective, 1984).

housing and child care into planning. In addition to influencing subject matter, feminist planners encouraged new ways of conceiving and imagining the discipline by affirming social perspectives and expanding the role of activists and community organizers at a time when city planning departments housed much of the recognized knowledge production in the field.

The conception of gender emerging from feminist planning scholarship from the 1970s and 1980s centered social perspectives on the built environment and questions of power. Feminist planners criticized their profession for its role in reproducing gendered inequalities. Marsha Ritzdorf wrote that underlying feminist work is a recognition that "gender is a significant aspect of the cultural, social, political, and economic construction of reality."[239] If the professional practice of planning (as well as research about planning) always contains an implicit set of values and attitudes about the role of women, as Ritzdorf argues, then questioning the assumed neutrality of planning formed a cornerstone of feminist work. Publications from the 1990s would reflect this most explicitly,[240] but by introducing gender as an analytic for examining power differentials, early feminist planners used gender to highlight inequitable practices and policies.

While this gender framework united their scholarship, the effort to put gender on the table in planning sometimes flattened women's experiences into a falsely universal category. In highlighting the role of norms, feminists typically were focusing on only one manifestation of that norm: the changing roles and expectations of middle-class white women in suburban contexts. Feminists inserted gender discourse in a way that often elided connections to race and class oppression, despite often working on the ground in research and advocacy contexts where those intersections were evident in high relief.

Despite these blind spots, feminist practices of knowledge sharing in the 1970s and early 1980s opened up space for intersectional perspectives and epistemological interventions in the decades that followed. By contributing to new discourses and practices fostering attention to social problems and power dynamics, feminist planning scholars helped lay the groundwork for a more inclusive and just planning practice.

---

[239] Marsha Ritzdorf, "Feminist Contributions to Ethics and Planning Theory," in *Planning Ethics: A Reader in Planning Theory, Practices, and Education*, ed. Sue Hendler (New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research, 1995), 104–19.

[240] See Milroy, "Taking Stock of Planning, Space, and Gender"; Ritzdorf, "A Feminist Analysis of Gender and Residential Zoning in the United States"; Sandercock and Forsyth, "A Gender Agenda."

Chapter 4: From Marginalization to Mainstreaming: Gender, Diversity, and the Search for Institutional Power

In 1986, a somewhat vague session description appeared in the conference program for the last day of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning's (ACSP) annual meeting in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Conference participants had the option to attend a "Meeting of Women Faculty," convened by Marsha Ritzdorf and Eugenie Birch.[241] Of the twenty-one women in attendance that October morning, most were junior professors. Attendees looked around the room and noted that those present not only represented nearly every female planning professor in the U.S. at that time, but that they could count only a handful of tenured professors in their small ranks. At this first meeting of the "Faculty Women's Interest Group" (FWIG), a placeholder name that was never changed in over three decades of the group's existence, women decided to take advantage of ACSP's new policy allowing for the formation of special interest groups in its organizational structure.[242] FWIG would grow into a loosely affiliated yet influential group of women that set its sights on achieving a critical mass of female faculty in the discipline.

FWIG's formation in 1986 marked the beginning of a period where female planning scholars made great strides in institutional representation. Women had certainly not been absent during the late 1970s and early 1980s: Judith Innes recalled that during the "exhilarating" early years of ACSP, "The boys ran it but women got things done."[243] After 1986, however, a concerted campaign for institutional power resulted in women moving from the background to the forefront of the institutions that made up the planning academy. Women turned from simply being present (often in a tokenistic fashion, as the only woman in their departments, for example) to being influential actors in terms of holding leadership positions and having clout in the national academic planning organization.

---

[241] "28th Annual Conference, Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning" (Conference Program, Milwaukee, WI, October 10, 1986), US 90-6, Box 2, Folder 5.11, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[242] "Minutes of the First Meeting of the Faculty Women's Interest Group" (Milwaukee, WI, October 12, 1986), organizational files in possession of the author, hereafter known as FWIG Binder.
[243] Judith E. Innes, In Person, February 22, 2017.

This chapter documents institutional interventions led by women in the decades following FWIG's formation, when at least a few women had achieved a foothold by obtaining planning faculty jobs and publishing planning scholarship about gender. FWIG achieved a measure of visibility and support for women's careers in the planning academy by building a pipeline through which women could obtain faculty jobs and get tenure in planning. Working through other ACSP sub-organizations and committees, women also worked to increase the number of planning scholars from underrepresented groups by documenting the need for institutional support for both gender and racial diversity and working to mainstream marginalized perspectives such as gender, race, and class in planning curriculum and education. In the final section of the chapter, I examine several unintended consequences of actions taken during the 1980s and 90s, including the alienation of many women of color from these institutional gains.

FWIG Creates a Professional Support Network

Through the activities of FWIG, women institutionalized measures of support, advocacy, and professional development for faculty women at a time when ACSP was still a small and somewhat malleable organization. ACSP officially formed in 1959 but did not develop its leading role in fostering scholarly planning discourse by hosting academic conferences, promoting research specific to the planning discipline, and streamlining planning education standards in the US until the late 1970s. ACSP had previously participated in joint conferences with organizations focused on the profession and practice of planning, including the American Society of Planning Officials (ASPO) and the American Institute of Planners (AIP), which merged to form the American Planning Association (APA) in 1978. In 1981, however, ACSP began hosting its own academic conference, and developed a unique focus on university planning programs and research even as many people active in ACSP stayed involved with the APA. Attendance at ACSP's stand-alone conferences averaged one hundred to two hundred people in the early years and grew to four hundred attendees by 1990,[244] providing an intimate

[244] Mickey Lauria, "ACSP at 50: Introduction," *The Town Planning Review* 81, no. 2 (2010): I,II.

setting in which to mingle with influential thinkers from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds and expertise areas who were helping to form this emerging academic field.[245]

ACSP started an academic journal in 1981, and the *Journal of Planning Education and Research (JPER)* would become the planning academy's flagship publication, supplementing the practice-oriented *Journal of the American Planning Association (JAPA)*. ACSP also provided oversight of the Planning Accreditation Board (PAB), the entity responsible for the accreditation of undergraduate and graduate planning programs in the US. ACSP's organizational structure consisted of an Executive Committee with four elected roles (president, past president, vice president/president-elect, and secretary-treasurer) and a Governing Board (including regional representatives, chairs of committees, and liaisons from *JPER* and PAB). The Governing Board, which met semi-annually, managed the expanding institutional needs of the planning academy and carried a great deal of weight in shaping priorities and protocols.

Before 1991, when Catherine Ross became ACSP president-elect and the first African American elected to the Executive Committee, the board had been entirely white and almost exclusively male. Besides Margarita McCoy, who served as secretary from 1976-77, the only other woman out of approximately sixty individuals who held elected positions was Marsha Marker Feld from the University of Rhode Island.[246] Before she was elected ACSP's secretary-treasurer in 1981, Feld had been a charter member of the radical group Planners for Equal Opportunity (PEO) and served on the steering committee guiding PEO's anti-racist organizing in the planning profession during the late 1960s.[247] She became the first woman to receive a PhD in urban planning from Harvard in 1973, where her dissertation on the intersection of participatory planning and public education launched an academic and public service career that included helping to desegregate Boston's public schools.[248] Given that Feld was the only woman at the time with extensive ACSP executive committee experience (and an organizer in her own right),

---

[245] Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, *The History & Future of ACSP*, 2018, https://youtu.be/KSEEu4Smuh8.

[246] Peter Fisher, "Letter to Catherine Ross," March 13, 1992, US 98-1, Box 4, Folder 36, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.

[247] "Initial Charter Membership - City Planners for Civil Rights" (Membership Roster, New York, July 22, 1964), 3943, Box 2, Folder 3, Planners for Equal Opportunity records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library; "2nd Annual Conference, Planners for Equal Opportunity" (Conference Program, Philadelphia, PA, March 16, 1968), Planners for Equal Opportunity records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.

[248] "Marcia Marker Feld," Jewish Women's Archive, accessed August 30, 2018, https://jwa.org/people/feld-marcia.

it is no surprise that attendees at the 1986 Milwaukee meeting tapped Feld as FWIG's first director.

The group tasked her with drafting a statement to present to the ACSP board with a slate of signatures endorsing the group's formation.[249] In her letter soliciting signatures from female faculty at ACSP member schools Feld noted, "While I am sure we will meet the necessary 20 faculty members' signature criteria, a massive showing would be terrific!"[250] The thirty-six signatures they garnered from faculty members at twenty-two member schools may not qualify as "massive,"[251] but when Feld presented the petition at the April 1987 Executive Committee meeting the proposal passed unanimously.[252]

With a drive and efficiency that would mark the group's activities for the next decade, attendees at the 1986 Milwaukee meeting agreed not to wait for official recognition before setting objectives. Consensus emerged around several areas of focus: recruiting female PhD students to careers in academia, coordinating a presence for gender and planning issues at future ACSP conferences, and increasing the number of female reviewers for *JPER* and *JAPA*.[253] The priorities set at FWIG's first meeting, such as ushering women into tenured positions and increasing women's representation at various scales in the academy, foreshadowed the agenda of this group of women leaders over the following decade. These priorities also reflected the conditions under which women were operating: once women started talking to each other at ACSP conferences they realized that gender discrimination was not an individual reflection on themselves but rather a systemic and widespread problem in the planning academy. As Margaret Dewar told me, "it felt like nothing was going to change unless there were more women."[254]

Planning's emerging academic identity provided opportunities for women to organize around gender concerns as the discipline's institutional infrastructure was just forming. The ACSP president and other officers held the power to convene task forces, commissions, and institute more long-term standing committees. These avenues gave women a place to appeal for representation for themselves and issues they cared about by increasing the number of women

[249] "Minutes of the First Meeting of the Faculty Women's Interest Group."
[250] Marsha Marker Feld, "Memo to Faculty Women" (February 1987), FWIG binder.
[251] "Proposal for the Establishment of an ACSP Women's Interest Group" (April 1987), US 98-1, Box 3, Folder 26, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[252] Feld, "Memo to Faculty Women."
[253] "Minutes of the First Meeting of the Faculty Women's Interest Group."
[254] Margaret Dewar, In Person, February 17, 2018.

present in all parts of the institutional structure. To that end, FWIG placed a priority on encouraging women to volunteer for positions in ACSP's affiliated institutions, such as serving as reviewers for planning journals, as discussants at ACSP conferences, and as members of PAB accreditation site visit teams. And they creatively appropriated resources to reach those goals. When attendees at FWIG's first meeting decided to solicit a list of female reviewers for planning journals, for example, the minutes note that "Since we are not an 'official' group as of yet, it was agreed upon that [Marsha Ritzdorf] would forward the list to the editors on APA Planning and Women (PAW) Division stationery."[255] In the absence of institutional sanction (or even letterhead), Ritzdorf was able to use her position as director of PAW to lend credibility to the group's communications.

Women had been organizing among themselves and gaining traction for women's representation in ACSP conference programming for several years prior to the Milwaukee meeting.[256] ACSP's 1984 conference was held in New York City, a locale that provided an opportunity to recruit and include a number of influential local feminist activist scholars that did not usually attend ACSP. A panel chaired by Jacqueline Leavitt entitled "Poverty, Women and the City" hosted papers on topics such as the welfare state, housing, child care, and economic development by Frances Fox Piven, Dolores Hayden and Susan Saegert, among others.[257] Another panel, "Designing and Teaching Courses Oriented to Women's Issues and Their Role in the Planning Curriculum," featured Leslie Kanes Weisman, a co-founder of the Women's School of Planning and Architecture (WSPA).[258] Margaret Dewar, then an assistant professor at the University of Minnesota, remembers that the session on women's issues in planning curriculum sparked a discussion on the lack of women faculty members and what could be done to remedy the deficit.[259]

FWIG offered an opportunity to officially recognize and support informal discussions that had been taking place at (and outside of) ACSP conferences. After the Milwaukee meeting, Marsha Ritzdorf mailed out the minutes from the first meeting to women in ACSP schools with a

[255] "Minutes of the First Meeting of the Faculty Women's Interest Group."
[256] Dewar, interview, February 17, 2018.
[257] "Twenty-Sixth Annual Conference, Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning" (Conference Program, New York, N.Y., October 19, 1984), US 90-6, Box 2, Folder 5.9, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[258] "Twenty-Sixth Annual Conference, Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning."
[259] Dewar, interview, February 17, 2018.

note underscoring two of FWIG's emergent priorities: asking women to serve as peer reviewers for planning journals and actively recruiting female PhD students.[260] This type of communication was typical in the years that followed, as FWIG built a professionalization network intent on increasing the number of women in the planning academy and achieving parity in demographic representation between women and men. In many cases, FWIG was building on informal traditions among individual women, creating an institutional structure to ensure that nobody fell through the cracks as the number of planning academics rose. A report on the interest group's activities to the ACSP Executive Committee in 1993 spells out their primary tasks: "FWIG is primarily concerned with programming, information dissemination, and networking which is reflected in a variety of ACSP conference sessions and meetings. In addition, FWIG has taken on responsibility for disseminating a book of women's resumes and a publication on earning tenure."[261] FWIG focused efforts on producing a number of resources geared towards obtaining faculty positions and tenure, such as producing the Resume Booklet to promote female job candidates, and within a few years became "an important support for women faculty who find themselves the only woman in their department, as a source of caring mentors who understand balancing careers, families and our own personal needs, and a voice for women in academe." [262] In contrast to some feminist organizing efforts in the 1970s that ignored or sidelined women's responsibilities for child care, for example, FWIG placed overt emphasis on the need for work-life balance among its members.

FWIG members engaged in several types of support strategies, ranging from social engagement to vouching for professional advancement. For one, senior women shepherded incoming female planning academics in an informal capacity. Cheryl Contant, who completed her doctorate in 1984 and would become ACSP President in 2009, recalled that "It was really a couple of colleagues from institutions around the country, sort of took me under their wing. Sandi Rosenbloom and Catherine Ross were two people who really just took me under their wing and introduced me to people, made sure I got around and saw people, invited me to events, we went out to dinner. And it was just sort of that sense of being part of something that was

[260] Marsha Ritzdorf, "To Women in ACSP Schools and Those Who Attended the Meeting in Milwaukee," Memo, n.d., FWIG binder.
[261] Faculty Women's Interest Group, "Report to the ACSP Executive Committee" (April 1993), US 01-15, Box 1, Folder 19, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[262] Margot Garcia, "Letter to FWIG Members," Member Communication, October 14, 1992, FWIG binder.

important, and being brought in by, what I considered at that time, my senior colleagues."[263] Daphne Spain, then an assistant professor at the University of Virginia, recalled that "Genie [Birch] and Sandi [Rosenbloom] really helped generations of women complete their dissertations, get published.… It took women like Genie and Sandi to promote other women and they did it selflessly."[264]

Senior women read the work of more junior faculty, providing substantive feedback and validating the importance of research that male colleagues had routinely devalued or ignored simply because a woman produced it.[265] And senior women provided invaluable support by writing tenure letters for junior women who they met informally and at FWIG gatherings at ACSP. Sandra "Sandi" Rosenbloom, from the University of Texas, explained to me that because there were so few women initially, they were able to make a big impact in the promotion pipeline by providing tenure letters from professors at first tier universities.[266]

Their efforts were not always successful. Margaret Dewar, for example, was denied tenure at the University of Minnesota, along with a male colleague who had been hired at the same time, despite having a "cumulative body of work that was aligned with what [she] had been asked to do."[267] In a heated case that garnered national attention and benefited when the provost lost his job, Dewar's case was overturned. She told me, "retroactively it's like it never happened, only it did." Dewar was hired at the University of Michigan, where she "found how wonderful it was to not be under siege all the time." FWIG meetings provided a space for important shared realizations, such as the fact that men were routinely devaluing women's research accomplishments, whether by making comments that downplayed its importance or by refusing to cite women altogether. Margaret Dewar recalled men saying things to her like "Not the most pathbreaking work, but adequate," for example, about other women's research.[268] FWIG meetings helped more junior women see that the treatment they were facing was not the result of individual failings but rather indicative of a pervasively harmful culture towards women. Senior women served as mentors, validating and providing feedback on newer scholars' work and

[263] Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, *The History & Future of ACSP*.
[264] Spain, interview, January 31, 2017.
[265] Dewar, interview, February 17, 2018.
[266] Sandra Rosenbloom, Phone, July 25, 2016.
[267] Dewar, interview, February 17, 2018.
[268] Dewar.

writing tenure letters. Dewar recalled, "I was in desperate need of help in not blaming myself … And the support was incredible."[269]

In addition to individual validation, FWIG also fostered an ethos of collective celebration. Since the ACSP annual conference provided a prime site for FWIG to raise its profile in the broader planning academy and recruit new members, FWIG leadership decided to host a dedicated event for women faculty and graduate students to network and engage socially with each other. The FWIG gathering began as a networking breakfast in 1990,[270] held during a 7:00AM session for several years until they succeeded in securing a more prominent lunch spot on the program.[271] Separate from the annual business meeting (a requirement for ACSP special interest groups), the FWIG luncheon served as a forum for mingling, networking, and celebrating victories. As Ann Markusen remembered, "The FWIG gatherings were very exciting… There were all these new women I had never met who all had planning degrees and I thought it was a wonderful thing… to have a caucus of women."[272] Beth Moore Milroy, a junior faculty at the time, recalled how remarkable it felt to be "together in a room and knowing that at your table of five, or however many, you could've turned to any one of those women and said, 'I'm really have a problem with this and what do you think?'"[273]

Members began the practice of sharing professional accomplishments with each other at the annual luncheon during a time reserved for this purpose. Women took turns standing to share their achievements with the room. Ann Markusen remembers this mode of validation being particularly important because there were so few of them, describing the feeling in the group when a woman received tenure as "just *joy*" [emphasis in original].[274] For about ten years, Sandi Rosenbloom used personal funds to send a dozen roses to every woman who got tenure, telling me that it was not as extravagant as it might appear because "there just weren't that many!"[275] It was such a big deal for a woman to get promoted that a "great roar of applause" went up when someone was promoted to full professor,[276] as Rosenbloom recalled. During the early 1990s, a win for one woman felt like a win for most, if not all, of the group.

---

[269] Dewar.
[270] Faculty Women's Interest Group, "Report to the ACSP Executive Committee," April 1993.
[271] Garcia, "Letter to FWIG Members," October 14, 1992.
[272] Ann Markusen, In Person, February 7, 2017.
[273] Beth Moore Milroy, In Person, February 10, 2017.
[274] Markusen, interview, February 7, 2017.
[275] Sandra Rosenbloom, In Person, November 2, 2016.
[276] Rosenbloom.

To facilitate a formal network, FWIG began building a database to serve as a "clearinghouse" for women and their interests,[277] and by 1990 it maintained a mailing list of female faculty and PhD students. Members discussed starting a newsletter where women could share networking information, research interests, and job announcements,[278] but the mailing list (and later the email listserv,[279] which had about 80 subscribers by 1996[280]) primarily functioned as a place for leadership to share annual business meeting minutes, announcements and opportunities for involvement, and to advertise paper sessions at ACSP conferences. Annual business meetings, which by 1995 drew about sixty attendees,[281] were used to discuss nominations for ACSP board elections[282] and to strategize about how to increase the number of women in leadership positions.

FWIG members noted early on that the number of women with PhDs in planning and related fields was rising, but the gender makeup of academic planning faculties had changed very little.[283] This disconnect between women qualified to teach planning and the persistent gender gap in planning faculties led FWIG to place the mentorship of graduate students atop their priority list. They wanted to bridge a gap in the female faculty pipeline by reaching out to graduating female doctoral students about a career in academia. At the 1988 FWIG meeting, for example, attendees presented ideas for how to attract female doctoral students to academia, such as encouraging their own doctoral students to submit papers to ACSP conferences, requesting that calls for proposals for sessions go out to students as well as faculty, and encouraging students to present co-authored papers with faculty. Other suggestions included making student housing available at conferences and encouraging student interaction by hosting a student reception.[284] FWIG established a special committee to add female PhD candidates to their

[277] "Minutes of the Women's Special Interest Group" (Buffalo, NY, October 30, 1988), FWIG Binder.
[278] Unknown, "Handwritten Notes on FWIG Annual Meeting" (Austin, TX, November 4, 1990), FWIG binder.
[279] Faculty Women's Interest Group, "Report to the ACSP Executive Committee" (April 1994), US 01-15, Box 1, Folder 20, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[280] Nancey Green Leigh, "The Faculty Women's Interest Group Toronto Conference Report," *Update*, 1996, US 01-15, Box 1, Folder 23, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[281] Nancey Green Leigh, "Report to the ACSP Executive Board" (Orlando, FL, April 13, 1996), US 01-15, Box 1, Folder 20, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[282] "Minutes from the FWIG Meeting of the ACSP" (Austin, TX, November 4, 1990), FWIG binder.
[283] "Minutes of the First Meeting of the Faculty Women's Interest Group."
[284] "Minutes of the Women's Special Interest Group."

database,[285] and targeted graduate students through conference programming.[286] These efforts demonstrate a collective commitment to including and amplifying students' voices in order to tip the gender balance in the academy in the generations of planning scholars to follow.

FWIG instituted a mentoring program to foster connections between junior and senior scholars. Two assistant professors, Cheryl Contant from the University of Iowa and Ellen Pader from the University of Massachusetts, spearheaded the program by sending out forms to the mailing list for interested mentors and mentees to record their areas of interest and personal situations (such as whether they had children or were a part of two-career households).[287] They solicited women with tenure "to advise and consult with the junior woman, help focus their research program, review grant proposals and manuscripts if desired, network, be available for discussions about balancing professional and personal life, be a friend, and introduce the mentee to colleagues at professional meetings."[288] The mentoring program matched its first pairs over the summer of 1993 from among several dozen respondents,[289] and was held up as a model within ACSP, as evidenced by a request for Contant and Pader to publicize their efforts to the broader academic community by writing an article about it in ACSP's newsletter *Update*.[290] Contant and Pader's effort also demonstrates that junior women faculty without tenure also contributed heavily to FWIG's institutional efforts.

For Markusen, the importance of a mentoring program stemmed from the general lack of women faculty. She noted that in more recent years the program seems to have fallen away, because "maybe we don't need it anymore because we have more women faculty."[291] At the time, however, the mentoring program was important because there were so few women and so few supports for the ones that were there. According to Markusen,

> I have always felt that this… mentoring function, and not just of people in your own faculty or your own students, but tuning in, whenever anybody else approached me from another school to ask for help, I was always really there… That's the pushback to the

[285] "Minutes of the Business Meeting of the Faculty Women's Interest Group" (Philadelphia, PA, October 30, 1993), FWIG binder.
[286] "Minutes of the Women's Special Interest Group."
[287] Faculty Women's Interest Group, "Report to the ACSP Executive Committee," April 1994.
[288] "Minutes of the FWIG Annual Meeting" (Columbus, OH, November 1, 1992), FWIG binder.
[289] "Minutes of the Business Meeting of the Faculty Women's Interest Group," October 30, 1993.
[290] "Minutes of the Business Meeting of the Faculty Women's Interest Group" (Phoenix, AZ, November 6, 1994), FWIG binder.
[291] Markusen, interview, February 7, 2017.

> patriarchy, because you know men are doing that for men. And some men do it for women – I definitely got a lot of support from some men in my graduate school and on my faculty, but not all.[292]

Markusen also noted the impact of sharing experiences in a group setting, recalling one ACSP conference when mentees got up at the FWIG gathering to talk about what the mentoring program had meant to them.[293] By highlighting activities like this at conference meetings, FWIG demonstrated that though the mentoring program connected pairs of women, its impacts were felt collectively.

As the most prominent manifestation of ACSP's efforts to bring planning academics together during this period, the annual ACSP conference provided an important site for FWIG organizing. Working in conjunction with efforts outlined in the previous sections, FWIG leadership focused heavily on programming at and alongside these annual meetings. FWIG began sponsoring panels and workshops at ACSP in 1987, one year after their first meeting in Milwaukee. Women active in FWIG, such as Eugenie Birch and Marsha Marker Feld, had been organizing panels centering feminist perspectives at ACSP since the late 1970s, such as "Changing Roles and Expectations of Women: Implications for Policy,"[294] "Feminist Contributions to Planning,"[295] and the 1984 sessions in New York City with feminist activists described earlier in this chapter. Throughout the 1970s and early 80s, conferences functioned as sites where women carved out space to gain visibility for their ideas and experiences. This practice of inserting gender perspectives at planning conferences continued after FWIG's formation, but the organization vastly increased the amount of practical content oriented towards women's careers in the academy.

At the nine annual ACSP conferences between 1987 and 1995, FWIG would sponsor at least twenty-two sessions, most of which were geared towards institutionalizing support for women in academic planning positions. The group chose a point person for each conference who coordinated logistics for FWIG-sponsored panels,[296] and FWIG members brainstormed together

---

[292] Markusen.
[293] Markusen.
[294] "21st Annual Conference, Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning" (Conference Program, Baltimore, MD, October 13, 1979), US 90-6, Box 2, Folder 5.4, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[295] "23rd Annual Conference, Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning" (Conference Program, Washington, DC, October 22, 1981), US 90-6, Box 2, Folder 5.6, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[296] "Minutes of the FWIG Business Meeting" (Portland, OR, October 7, 1989), FWIG binder.

about conference programming at each of their annual business meetings and session conveners occasionally submitted proposals to FWIG for consideration.[297] Group members agreed on panels and sponsorship simply consisted of advertising these panels to the membership and printing FWIG's name on the conference program by the session. Nonetheless, FWIG provided an opportunity for institutional attachment, placing symbolic and practical weight behind professional advancement for women and substantive attention to topics of gender and race.

Sessions such as the 1989 "Women's Forum: Getting Hired, Getting Tenure and Staying Sane through it All"[298] were characteristic of a whole slate of panels specifically geared towards women in academic planning careers, featuring the role of research, grant-writing, publication, and service in the tenure process. How-to and what-to workshops covered topics like promotion, tenure, child care, and maternity policies. Often these sessions were organized and facilitated by more senior women involved in FWIG, as when Marsha Ritzdorf moderated a panel in 1988 called "Alligators in the Moat: Faculty Retention and Advancement for Women," which featured a discussion with three other prominent female planning scholars: Susan Fainstein, Judith Innes, Sandi Rosenbloom.[299] At other times, FWIG used their funds to hire professional facilitators for these workshops.[300] In addition, FWIG sponsored panels focused particularly on students, including roundtable discussions about the doctoral experience and how to obtain funding, as well as giving mentors advice in sessions like "The Supportive Hand: Effective Advising and Thesis Support."[301] FWIG president Margot Garcia touted the group's success in promoting these practical workshops in a 1992 note to FWIG members, citing a Junior Faculty Workshop (a panel comprised of all men) as evidence that the "ongoing series on hints for getting tenure is being used as a model by others."[302] In other words, other groups such as those interested in the careers of younger scholars generally emulated FWIG's provision of this type of support for women. As the final section of this chapter shows, FWIG would also become a model for organizing faculty of color in the planning academy.

---

[297] Marsha Ritzdorf, "Session Proposal: Persistent Problems for Women Faculty and Faculty of Color in Planning Programs" (1994), FWIG binder; Gail Dubrow and Sue Hendler, "Proposal for a Panel Session: Feminist Research Methods in Planning" (1995), FWIG binder.
[298] "Minutes of the FWIG Business Meeting," October 7, 1989.
[299] Faculty Women's Interest Group, "Report to the ACSP Executive Committee," April 1993.
[300] Rosenbloom, interview, July 25, 2016.
[301] Faculty Women's Interest Group, "Report to the ACSP Executive Committee" (November 1994), US 98-1, Box 4, Folder 11, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[302] Garcia, "Letter to FWIG Members," October 14, 1992.

FWIG's practical focus reflected concerns expressed by the membership, the popularity of its workshops format, and the experiences of female faculty in leadership roles. As I've suggested, the demographic deficit in the planning academy at this time created a good deal of collective anxiety over whether women newly hired in the late 1970s as a result of expanded affirmative action measures would be able to achieve the next step of tenure. As Rosenbloom explained to me, the situation was so daunting that it created a widespread feeling among FWIG members that they might never make full professor. This resulted in a focus on "nitty gritty" sessions on topics like how to move from associate to full professor.

As FWIG business meetings minutes reflect, members raised practical concerns about employment, like differences in salary, conflict resolution, benefits for domestic partners, and questions about when the clock starts ticking on tenure.[303] Of the twelve ideas recorded from the October 1993 meeting, all are professionally- or career-focused save one ("Gender Pedagogy by Substantive Planning Areas").[304] While members were brainstorming about the 1990 conference, incoming FWIG president Margot Garcia noted that panels on the mechanics of career navigation (such as publishing, getting tenure, etc.) had been the most successful and would likely continue.[305] While discussions about conference sessions among attendees were often "lively,"[306] FWIG sponsorship was most often reserved for sessions explicitly related to women's careers in the academy. In 1989 at the Portland conference, for example, where FWIG sponsored "Women's Forum: Getting Hired, Getting Tenure and Staying Sane through it All," a planning history panel organized by Eugenie Birch, Jackie Leavitt, and Susie Wirka on "Planning Pioneers: Women and Housing Reform" did not receive the same FWIG designation on the program.[307] Not until the 1995 ACSP conference in Detroit did FWIG sessions explicitly address a range of perspectives in addition to gender; that year sponsored sessions included "Grassroots Mobilization: Race, Ethnicity, Class, and Gender," "Specificity of Women of Color in Planning Practice," and "Polarized populations: Issues of class, race, and gender in abandoned and reclaimed communities."[308]

---

[303] "Minutes of the Business Meeting of the Faculty Women's Interest Group," November 6, 1994; "Minutes of the FWIG Business Meeting," October 7, 1989.
[304] "Minutes of the Business Meeting of the Faculty Women's Interest Group," October 30, 1993.
[305] "Minutes of the FWIG Business Meeting," October 7, 1989.
[306] "Minutes of the Business Meeting of the Faculty Women's Interest Group," November 6, 1994.
[307] "31st Annual Meeting, Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning" (Conference Program, Portland, OR, October 4, 1989), US 90-6, Box 2, Folder 5.14, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[308] "Minutes of the FWIG Business Meeting" (Detroit, MI, October 20, 1995), FWIG binder.

Another support tactic that FWIG formalized was the publication of a handbook to help junior female scholars navigate their early careers and the tenure process. Sandi Rosenbloom first suggested the idea at a FWIG meeting in 1988 as a way to "distill bits of wisdom in a lively fashion."[309] The document, which assigns authorship to "The Irrepressible Women Planners of America,"[310] was officially titled *How (Not) to Get Ahead in Academia: A Guide for Women Planners*, but quickly became known simply as the "Yellow Book" due to the color of its first cover. Soon after the first publication in 1989 it was "sought out by both men and women as well as those outside the planning profession,"[311] and FWIG published revised editions in 1995 and 2011. FWIG received only nominal funding from ACSP for printing the Yellow Book and its annual Resume Booklet, so FWIG officers and members donated significant financial resources and time to the project, frequently paying for printing, mailings, and conference events out of their own pockets or personal research funds. Rosenbloom absorbed the costs of producing and distributing the Resume Booklet and Yellow Book and mailing materials to members for years,[312] and FWIG volunteers (both tenured and untenured) completed laborious tasks on their own time, such as going through each ACSP *Update* to add women to their database and mailing personalized letters to doctoral candidates.[313]

Sandi Rosenbloom maintained primary responsibility for the Yellow Book, not only drafting the document and circulating it among FWIG members to gather feedback,[314] but also spearheading an effort in 1995 to produce a second edition. When requesting funds for the "widely-acclaimed and now out-of-stock publication" from ACSP president Catherine Ross, FWIG chair Nancey Green Leigh noted that the "humorous and very clever publication offers pragmatic and reassuring advice to junior faculty about their tenure-seeking process. Dog-eared copies have frequently been copied and distributed to senior faculty and administrators as well to facilitate their mentoring roles."[315] Once funding was obtained, Rosenbloom enlisted Marsha Ritzdorf to run a FWIG-sponsored roundtable at the 1995 ACSP conference in Detroit to guide

[309] "Minutes of the Women's Special Interest Group."
[310] "Minutes of the Women's Special Interest Group."
[311] Faculty Women's Interest Group, "Report to the ACSP Executive Committee," April 1993.
[312] Nancey Green Leigh, "Letter to Catherine Ross," April 6, 1995, US 98-1, Box 4, Folder 10, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati; "Minutes of the FWIG Annual Meeting."
[313] Unknown, "Handwritten Notes on FWIG Annual Meeting," November 4, 1990.
[314] "Minutes of the Women's Special Interest Group."
[315] Leigh, "Letter to Catherine Ross," April 6, 1995.

revisions.[316] Regarding her in-depth involvement with the project over many years, Rosenbloom told me "I did the Yellow Book, mostly, not entirely… People gave really valuable insights, but nobody wanted to put the thing together and do it and stuff, so I ended up doing it… I was willing to do the grunt work. I'm always willing to do the grunt work and then that gives you a greater power you know."[317] Rosenbloom acknowledged not only her own initiative, but the resources she had at her disposal as a successful professor with tenure who had staff and research funds.[318]

As a type of advice manual, the Yellow Book was intended to teach junior women faculty the lessons that the first generation of female planning scholars learned while carving out a place for themselves in the academy. Ann Forsyth, a scholar of social aspects of planning and urban development who completed her PhD in planning at Cornell in 1993, described the circumstances leading to the advice and tenor of the publication:

> I used it to negotiate a better job… It's a very realistic book. What happened is lots of people didn't get tenure, but in fact they often shot themselves in the foot. So, this was in part to stop people shooting themselves in the foot, like really knowing what the rules are and so on… You could read it between the lines, particularly in the first edition. They say you're not going to get credit for going out and protesting about a lack of child care on campus… But you have to be doing other things. [Marsha Ritzdorf] said, 'You just have to publish. Your colleagues will deal with almost anything else you do, but you have to publish and… you have to dress ok at ACSP.' She had a few good tips like that, like you can try and resist the whole… institution or you can figure out what's worth resisting and what isn't. So, the FWIG Yellow Guide is about what's worth resisting and what isn't and how to play the game so that you can get to do what you want to do.[319]

This practice of sharing insider information about what *not* to do reflected the perspectives of senior women who through trial and error had "made it" and wanted to help younger women

[316] Nancey Green Leigh, "Letter to FWIG Members," Member Communication, August 21, 1995, US 01-15, Box 1, Folder 20, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[317] Rosenbloom, interview, November 2, 2016.
[318] Sandra Rosenbloom, Phone, July 25, 2016.
[319] Ann Forsyth, In Person, January 12, 2017.

avoid mistakes they'd made themselves or observed others making. Rosenbloom echoed this sentiment when she told me, "I'm not saying don't do any service, but be strategic about it. Do short term things with things that really matter, matter to your colleagues. Do not clean the bathroom because the cleaning staff doesn't clean it, unless you're very susceptible to bugs. I mean seriously, there's no reason whatsoever to be doing other people's housework, and women do it all the time… And then they get mad at the women who don't."[320]

This approach spoke to specific challenges that senior FWIG leaders faced in their early careers. The majority of the women in tenured positions by 1986 shared experiences during graduate school and in their careers of being the only woman in their respective programs and departments. As Margaret Dewar explained, there was a desperate need to not have to face things alone and to feel validated.[321] Markusen illustrated a motivation for institutionalizing survival strategies when she noted that senior women had previously been "mostly just fighting for ourselves" but then "over the years… became more focused on mentoring."[322] The hardships they faced (as a result of having little or no support and having to do everything alone) shaped the ways they envisioned changing the situation for the generations of female scholars to follow, and FWIG's institutional structure offered a place for successful women to pass along their knowledge.

To increase the visibility of women in planning faculty hiring pools, FWIG began producing "A Planning Department's Guide to Women Seeking Teaching Positions," an annual compilation of resumes distributed to ACSP member schools across the U.S. and Canada beginning in 1989[323] which included 117 resumes in the first five years.[324] In 1994, for example, the Resume Booklet contained about twenty women on the job market,[325] indicating that FWIG provided a relatively impressive amount of potential exposure for each applicant since it was distributed to all ACSP member schools. Sandi Rosenbloom headed this effort, and she and Margot Garcia personally absorbed the costs of producing and distributing the Resume Booklet for several years.[326]

---

[320] Rosenbloom, interview, November 2, 2016.
[321] Dewar, interview, February 17, 2018.
[322] Markusen, interview, February 7, 2017.
[323] "Minutes of the FWIG Business Meeting," October 7, 1989.
[324] Faculty Women's Interest Group, "Report to the ACSP Executive Committee," April 1993.
[325] Faculty Women's Interest Group, "Report to the ACSP Executive Committee," April 1994.
[326] "Minutes of the FWIG Annual Meeting."

By the early 1990s, this collection of strategies that FWIG employed to get more women hired in faculty positions and to get more women tenure showed signs of positive impact. In a particularly cheery note accompanying a set of business meeting minutes sent to FWIG members in 1991, President Margot Garcia recognized four recent recipients of tenure: Cheryl Contant, Daphne Spain, Deborah Howe, and herself. "Those without tenure should ask them what they did to achieve this goal… (I hope you notice that all the FWIG officers got tenure, so working in our group doesn't hurt!)."[327] While four women achieving tenure in a year may not seem like a large number on its own, the fact that there were only eleven full-time female professors in planning in 1990 shows the relative significance of this accomplishment.[328]

Over its first decade of existence, FWIG institutionalized measures of professional support for women in the planning academy to an astounding level of success. They created a pipeline to support and guide women through career stages, from graduate school through the tenure process. They dispensed advice, validated and promoted each other, and fostered a sense of solidarity in the overwhelmingly male planning academy. FWIG's strategy of increasing the women's representation through gaining a critical mass of women was executed with political savvy and great personal investment. Women at various levels of the academic ladder strategically took on a disproportionate share of service activities and created institutional infrastructure in the hopes that the next generations of female planning scholars would have fewer barriers to success.

By 1994, FWIG began directly claiming both women and people of color as the targets of their efforts. When FWIG president Deborah Howe gave her report to the Executive Committee at the April 1994 meeting in San Francisco, she proclaimed that FWIG "has emerged as a group of people to promote women faculty and people of color [and] also [to] substantively promote issues of gender and diversity."[329] Beginning in 1994, the FWIG Resume Booklet included men of color as well as women.[330] FWIG leadership advertised the Resume Booklet as a means to comply with policy intended to diversify the field. When debates about the effectiveness and cost

---

[327] Margot Garcia, "Letter to FWIG Members," Member Communication, June 17, 1991, FWIG binder.
[328] Catherine L. Ross, "Increasing Minority and Female Representation in the Profession: A Call for Diversity," *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 9, no. 2 (January 1990): 135–38.
[329] Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting" (San Francisco, CA, April 16, 1994), US 98-1, Box 4, Folder 11, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[330] Sandra Rosenbloom, "1994 Edition of Resume Book of Women - and People of Color - Seeking Teaching Positions," December 6, 1993, FWIG binder; "Minutes of the FWIG Business Meeting," October 20, 1995.

of the publication arose in 1995,[331] for example, FWIG president Nancey Green Leigh appealed for funds from ACSP president Catherine Ross by highlighting that "it greatly facilitates efforts to widen the applicant pool and meet affirmative action requirements."[332] The shift towards merging the causes of gender and racial diversity is the focus of the next section of this chapter.

Building a Case for Gender and Racial Diversity

While some women focused on producing support structures and resources for professional advancement through FWIG during this period, others (with substantial overlap between groups) positioned themselves in other roles within ACSP where they strategically directed resources to efforts aimed at increasing gender and racial diversity in the planning academy. With a more expansive mission and more explicit normative stance than FWIG proclaimed, several women-led committees embarked on data gathering projects and advocacy efforts within ACSP to increase representation of both women and racial minorities among planning faculty, students, and curriculum. As ACSP was undergoing a period of growth during the late 1980s, women like Judith Innes, Marsha Ritzdorf, and Catherine Ross took advantage of the malleable institutional structure, identifying and inhabiting points of institutional overlap to build a platform for combining women's and people of color's advancement in the planning academy. Women in ACSP leadership roles used the committee structure to direct resources towards demonstrating gender and racial disparities in the planning academy and to push for institutional changes to increase women's and minorities' representation on planning faculties.

Several ACSP committees spearheaded by women combined forums and resources with ongoing FWIG efforts to provide a statistical basis and institutional structure for diversity work in the planning academy. The most important forum for combining gender and racial equity goals was the Committee for the Recruitment and Retention of Women and People of Color (CRRWPOC).[333] A feminist planning conference held at UCLA on May 16, 1987 provided the impetus for CRRWPOC's formation. Unlike most of the feminist planning events held in the decade previous, "Accepting the Challenge: Gender, Race, and Disability in Urban Planning

[331] "Minutes of the Business Meeting of the Faculty Women's Interest Group," November 6, 1994.
[332] Leigh, "Letter to Catherine Ross," April 6, 1995.
[333] Meeting minutes refer to the committee's name irregularly, varying between "Committee for the Recruitment and Retention of Women and Minorities," "Committee on the Representation of Women and Minorities in Planning Education," and "Committee on the Representation and Retention of Women and Persons of Color in Planning Education." I refer to it as CRRWPOC throughout this section for clarity.

Education" did not focus on gender alone, but rather brought multiple facets of identity and oppression into focus. The conference was sponsored by the Graduate School of Architecture and Urban Planning (GSAUP) and two UCLA student groups, the Feminist Planners and Designers Group (FPDG) and the Minority Association of Planners and Architects (MAPA),[334] and included figures such as Dolores Hayden, Jacqueline Leavitt, Catherine Ross, and Marsha Ritzdorf. When Marsha Ritzdorf advertised the upcoming mini-conference at an ACSP executive committee meeting, [335] board member Larry Susskind suggested they invite conference organizers to share their findings.[336]

At the next executive committee meeting that November of 1987 in Los Angeles, three UCLA graduate students presented a report to the board entitled "Gender, Race and Disability in Planning Education: Steps Towards Achieving a Student and Professional Body Representative of the Population at Large."[337] Co-authors and fellow UCLA planning students Yvette Galindo, Mary Beth Welch, and Susie Wirka documented gender and racial disparities, such as the fact there were only eight women full professors and four tenured Latinos on planning faculties nationwide. They also relayed recommendations from the conference on recruitment, retention, institutional response, and addressing disability.[338] They also noted that "in order to successfully recruit and retain [women, minority, and disabled] students, the curriculum must reflect the real-life experiences of students from diverse backgrounds in order to become more meaningful and relevant to the planning process as a whole," a recommendation which grew out of discussions at UCLA about how to incorporate scholarship on gender, race, and disability into core planning curriculum.[339] The women then presented a resolution on behalf of FPDG and MAPA calling on

[334] "Accepting the Challenge: Gender, Race & Disability in Urban Planning Education" (Conference Program, Los Angeles, CA, May 16, 1987), US 98-1, Box 3, Folder 22, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[335] Note: there is a discrepancy in the ACSP organizational structure (Executive Committee vs. the larger Governing Board) and the notation of meeting minutes in the archive. I have referred to the terminology used in the primary documents but understand that there is some discrepancy between these two bodies and how the secretary presented the notes.
[336] Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting" (New York, NY, April 26, 1987), US 90-6, Box 1, Folder 1.4c, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[337] Yvette Galindo, Mary Beth Welch, and Susie Wirka, "Accepting the Challenge: Gender, Race & Disability in Urban Planning Education: Steps Towards Achieving a Student and Professional Body Representative of the Population at Large," November 5, 1987, US 98-1, Box 3, Folder 22, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[338] Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting," November 5, 1987.
[339] Galindo, Welch, and Wirka, "Accepting the Challenge: Gender, Race & Disability in Urban Planning Education: Steps Towards Achieving a Student and Professional Body Representative of the Population at Large."

ACSP to "reaffirm and collectively act on its commitment to the development of a student and professional body that reflects the diversity of communities served by the planning process" and demanded changes to accreditation processes that would require "the integration of issues regarding race, ethnicity, gender and disability into the core curriculum" and implementation of recruitment and retention programs at planning schools.[340] The resolution was eventually included as an appendix to CRRWPOC's 1990 report, underscoring the direct impact of this mini-conference and its organizers on ACSP policy.

The resolution passed the ACSP board,[341] setting the wheels in motion for ACSP President Don Krueckeberg to form CRRWPOC in 1988.[342] Despite equal weight given to disability concerns at both the UCLA conference and in the report to ACSP, disability language dropped out and "women and minorities" became the standard definition of diversity used by the committee. Headed by Marsha Ritzdorf, CRRWPOC would be responsible for producing a major report on minorities and women in the planning academy in 1990. CRRWPOC became a standing committee in 1990,[343] and conducted an annual survey of faculty and students thereafter. Often referred to as "the Ritzdorf report" after its main author, the 1990 study would become one of the most important institutional documents documenting disparities and guiding diversity principles and practice in the planning academy during the decade to follow.

Marsha Ritzdorf started her academic career at the University of Oregon's planning department in 1986, the same year as she and Eugenie Birch convened the first FWIG meeting in Milwaukee. Ritzdorf wrote about gender and race in relation to land use planning and zoning and was an outspoken activist for the advancement of women in the profession and academia and for feminist perspectives in planning research. Ann Forsyth described Ritzdorf as "A force of nature… She… did feminist work and also was organizing FWIG. [This was different because for some] it was more of just a support group for women and feminist in the sense of trying to promote women in planning."[344] Many women I interviewed spoke to Ritzdorf's gravitational

---

[340] Feminist Planners and Designers Group and Minority Association of Planners and Architects, Graduate School of Architecture and Urban Planning, UCLA, "Resolution" (November 5, 1987), US 98-1, Box 3, Folder 22, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[341] Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting," November 5, 1987.
[342] Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting" (San Antonio, TX, May 1, 1988), US 90-6, Box 1, Folder 1.4c, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[343] Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting" (Denver, CO, April 22, 1990), US 98-1, Box 1, Folder 27, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[344] Forsyth, interview, January 12, 2017.

pull, reporting that "she could get anybody to do anything."[345] In describing her involvement with FWIG activities, Beth Moore Milroy said, "I was never a wild organizer but boy, if Marsha Ritzdorf asked you to do something, you jumped. I mean nobody would argue with her."[346] Ritzdorf died rather suddenly in 1998 at the age of fifty-one, was an outstanding "whip" for ACSP diversity efforts.

In addition to possessing personal gravitas, which she used to encourage people to get involved with causes for gender and racial equity, Ritzdorf also leveraged collaborative research at the intersection of gender and race. One example is the 1997 volume, *Urban Planning and the African American Community: In the Shadows*.[347] *In the Shadows* collected accounts of zoning, planning, and policy decisions that impacted Black communities and reclaimed Black agency in postwar planning processes while explicitly including gender as an analytic. June Manning Thomas, an African American planning scholar of race and redevelopment who would serve in multiple leadership roles within ACSP, co-edited the volume with Ritzdorf over several years in the mid-1990s. At a time when scholarship on race was less accepted than gender research, Thomas told me, "I doubt that many of the other white women would have considered co-editing a book on urban planning and the African American community."[348]

In October of 1987, Ritzdorf reported to FWIG members that CRRWPOC had obtained funding for a survey of doctoral students over the previous eight years, to see where they ended up after completing their doctorates and to learn about hiring procedures in planning programs.[349] In 1990, Catherine Ross joined Ritzdorf as co-chair of CRRWPOC,[350] and they formed seven subcommittees to deal with faculty recruitment, student recruitment, curriculum, climate, ACSP organizational structure, professional development, and database management.[351] Ross' first major recommendation on behalf of CRRWPOC called for the adoption of an organizational position statement on diversity, a request to which the Executive Committee complied.[352] The policy statement read, "Racial and gender diversity in the planning community

[345] June Manning Thomas, "Personal Correspondence" (October 20, 2020).
[346] Beth Moore Milroy, In Person, February 10, 2017.
[347] Thomas and Ritzdorf, *Urban Planning and the African American Community*.
[348] Thomas, "Personal Correspondence."
[349] "Minutes of the Women's Special Interest Group."
[350] Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting," April 22, 1990.
[351] Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting" (Austin, TX, November 1, 1990), US 94-3, Box 1, Folder 1, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[352] Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning.

is central to planning education and practice. Therefore, it is ACSP's policy to promote such diversity within the organization and to encourage and assist member schools in their efforts to achieve diversity."[353] Codifying this commitment to diversity on behalf of the ACSP board was an important step towards acknowledging that women and minorities were at a disadvantage in the planning academy, a situation that CRRWPOC took steps to demonstrate empirically through the 1990 report.

While Ross was working on the diversity statement, Ritzdorf had been busy conducting the survey and analyzing results, with the assistance of Marsha Greer, one of her master's students at the University of Oregon who was writing her thesis on the recruitment of faculty women and faculty of color in planning.[354] The 1990 report is an extensive examination of the position of women and minorities in planning academia through both survey data and anecdotal evidence. While ACSP had commissioned several reports concerning the situation of racial and ethnic minorities as planning PhD students and faculty,[355] the 1990 CCRWM report was the first report that also focused on women as planning faculty[356] (building on the presentation by UCLA students in 1987).

The report sought to demonstrate the demographic deficit with quantitative and qualitative data and create accountability mechanisms for individual schools to increase their numbers of people from underrepresented groups, since as the authors noted, universities were choosing not to enforce affirmative action measures.[357] Although the number of women and minority faculty had increased over 20 years, the increase was "smallest and slowest at the top of the status hierarchy" as evidenced by the fact that only three white women and two black men held department chair positions in planning at the time of the report.[358] Of the two-thirds of women and minority faculty who reported being discriminated against at some point in their careers, this discrimination tended to increase as people rose in the hierarchy (for example,

---

[353] Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning.
[354] Marsha Greer, "Planning Education: Recruitment of Faculty Women and Faculty of Color" (University of Oregon, 1990).
[355] Waters et al. 1987. African Americans in Planning; Grigsby 1988. Minorities in Planning Education
[356] 1987-89 Committee on the Recruitment and Retention of Women and Minorities in Planning Education, "The Recruitment and Retention of Faculty Women and Faculty of Color in Planning Education: Survey Results" (Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, April 1990), US 01-15, Box 1, Folder 20, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[357] 1987-89 Committee on the Recruitment and Retention of Women and Minorities in Planning Education.
[358] 1987-89 Committee on the Recruitment and Retention of Women and Minorities in Planning Education.

faculty experienced more discrimination as faculty members than they had as PhD students).[359] The report noted an even "more disturbing" trend that while the percentage of women faculty hired was increasing (women made up 17.5% of the total faculty but 30% of people hired since 1980), people of color were losing numbers (14% of faculty but only 10% of new hires).[360]

One of the goals of the report had been to compile a list of planning faculty broken down by gender, race, and ethnicity, but the authors lamented, "Because of the appallingly small number of faculty of color, the results are not broken down any further… It is a sad statement on their numbers in our profession that any further breakdown by sex and race would destroy their confidentiality."[361] One of the challenges of combining the causes of racial and gender diversity in the planning academy, therefore, was that there were so few minority faculty that it was statistically difficult to acknowledge multiply marginalized identities, leading to individuals being designated as either women or as people of color, rather than both.

In addition to demographic analysis, the report compiled and examined a variety of experiences of female and minority students and faculty members, such as instances of discrimination, effectiveness of mentoring, department climate, distribution of tasks, sexual harassment, and presence in planning curriculum. The overwhelming burden of evidence showed that attitudes and departmental climates were not welcoming, and the report noted that people would not accept or keep jobs in institutions where they do not feel valued and respected. As the organization overseeing planning education in the US, the report argued, ACSP should be responsible for providing individual schools with data and resources to improve the situation. An August 1990 special issue of ACSP's newsletter *Update* distributed these conclusions to member schools across the US and Canada.[362]

While the report focused on providing demographic and anecdotal evidence for lack of diversity in the planning academy, its authors also clearly outlined theoretical and practical

[359] Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting," April 22, 1990.
[360] 1987-89 Committee on the Recruitment and Retention of Women and Minorities in Planning Education, "The Recruitment and Retention of Faculty Women and Faculty of Color in Planning Education: Survey Results," April 1990.
[361] 1987-89 Committee on the Recruitment and Retention of Women and Minorities in Planning Education.
[362] 1987-89 Committee on the Recruitment and Retention of Women and Minorities in Planning Education, "The Recruitment and Retention of Faculty Women and Faculty of Color in Planning Education: Survey Results," *Update*, 1990, US 98-1, Box 4, Folder 38, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.

stakes of addressing the problem, linking the planning academy's future with the future of urban America and the broader goals of the planning profession.[363] The report concluded,

> It is fair to say that women faculty and faculty of color are still very much pioneers in Planning Academia. For many of them, the environments they work in are hostile at the worst and non-welcoming and non-supportive at the best. Yet, women are half the population of the country and people of color are the majority in many urban areas. Planning schools should be on the forefront of teaching future practitioners how to work in the pluralistic metropolis. This cannot be accomplished without the perspective of a culturally diverse faculty.[364]

This conclusion also notes a disconnect between trends towards pluralism and multiculturalism in planning theory on the one hand and faltering (if not decreasing) diversity in the academy on the other.

The need for accurate data to empirically demonstrate issues for women and people of color framed much of CRRWPOC's work.[365] In 1988, when the CRRWPOC was just getting off the ground, Marsha Ritzdorf wrote a letter to Catherine Ross welcoming her as a member of the newly formed committee, which also included Peter Fischer, Bill Harris, Bill Siembieda, Sylvia White, and Susie Wirka.[366] Ritzdorf's first priority, as she explained it to Ross, was to get an "accurate accounting" of hiring and tenure of women and minorities and to find out what was happening to planning doctoral students after receiving their PhDs. She wrote, "As a member of the ACSP board for the last three years, I have been constantly irritated by the 'lip service' given to the issues I'd like our committee to address and would like to push for commitment of resources from them to begin to address the female and minority student and faculty needs. I look forward to working with all of you, and I am sure that we can, at the minimum, provide accurate and much needed information about these issues and (when I am in an optimistic mood) that we can begin to suggest and implement some strategies for change." Ritzdorf faxed a copy

---

[363]Catherine Ross echoes this imperative in Ross, Catherine L. 1990. "Increasing Minority and Female Representation in the Profession: A Call for Diversity." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 9 (2): 135–38.
[364] 1987-89 Committee on the Recruitment and Retention of Women and Minorities in Planning Education, "The Recruitment and Retention of Faculty Women and Faculty of Color in Planning Education: Survey Results," April 1990.
[365] Committee on the Retention and Recruitment of Women/Minority Faculty and Students, "Request for Research Funds from the ACSP Executive Board" (October 1988), US 90-6, box 1, folder 1.4c, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[366] Marsha Ritzdorf, "Letter to Catherine Ross," August 29, 1988, US 98-1, Box 3, Folder 22, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.

of the letter to ACSP President Don Krueckeberg as well, taking an opportunity to underscore a point she had already made to the board; namely that providing qualitative data and statistics that demonstrated the unequal footing for women and people of color constituted an essential first step to addressing inequality.[367]

In addition to working through the auspices of CRRWPOC towards increasing the numbers of women and people of color at all levels of planning academy institutions, women such as Linda Dalton worked on implementing diversity criteria through the Planning Accreditation Board (PAB). Formed in 1984 to oversee planning programs in the U.S. and Canada as part of a larger movement to professionalize the planning academy, PAB established and enforced standards for planning education. The PAB board, consisting at the time of three members from ACSP, three members from the American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP), a representative from APA, and a graduate student representative,[368] continues to oversee undergraduate and graduate program accreditation today. Individual programs prepare self-studies in advance of accreditation or re-accreditation and the process involves a multi-day site visit by a team of volunteer PAB representatives (both from academia and professional practice). Judith Innes, Eugenie Birch, Marsha Ritzdorf and others repeatedly suggested to the ACSP board that increasing the numbers of women and minorities on these site visit teams was a good way to demonstrate ACSP's commitment to diversity, and recruiting such individuals formed a sustained theme in executive committee discussions about accreditation.[369]

In the late 1980s, CRRWPOC began a campaign to make changes to PAB accreditation criteria by incorporating diversity language. They engaged with ACSP members and proposed additions such as "The goals and objectives shall reflect the program's plan and policy to move toward greater racial, ethnic, and gender diversity." They lobbied for "multicultural and gender dimensions" to assess subject matter in curricula, and specified ways that programs could

---

[367] Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting" (Buffalo, NY, October 27, 1988), US 98-1, Box 1, Folder 27, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[368] Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting" (Minneapolis, MN, May 5, 1984), US 94-3, Box 1, Folder 2, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[369] Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting," April 26, 1987; Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting" (Milwaukee, WI, October 9, 1986), US 98-1, Box 1, Folder 27, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati; Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting" (Los Angeles, CA, April 5, 1986), US 98-1, Box 1, Folder 27, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati; Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting" (Montreal, April 20, 1985), US 94-3, Box 1, Folder 2, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.

document affirmative action policies, such as instituting a "faculty recruitment plan that assesses the results of recruitment as measured by changes in racial, ethnic, and gender diversity."[370] PAB responded positively to the revised standards, which CCRWPOC tied directly to "increasing the ability of planning education and the profession to adapt to the growing needs of gender equity and racial diversity of society,[371] and it officially adopted these standards in May 1992.[372] FWIG then sponsored a mini-conference prior to the 1993 ACSP annual meeting in Philadelphia to raise awareness about the changes, how to comply with them, and to show members how their implementation could benefit planning programs.[373] Women leading these efforts highlighted the need for diverse students, faculty, and curriculum and provided concrete steps for changing policy that addressed the problem from multiple institutional scales and dimensions such as curriculum, individual programs, and national recruitment initiatives.

In 1989, ACSP president Carl Patton tapped Judith Innes to head a Commission on Doctoral Education in Planning, another important site for institutionalizing diversity aims and data gathering. Innes, a scholar of collaborative planning and decision-making who completed her PhD at MIT in 1973, received tenure at Berkeley in 1981 and was a successful female scholar active in ACSP. At the November 1990 FWIG business meeting in Austin, Innes appealed to FWIG members to attend meetings of this newly-formed committee, noting that "although gender/minority issues are not the central focus on the committee, *it can become a forum for women's concerns*"[374] [emphasis mine]. In other words, with the right level of involvement from women – by inhabiting these institutional spaces – the group of women and interests FWIG represented could increase their impact. Innes continued, "Specifically, there should be more research on the problems facing women in graduate programs. Fewer women and minorities are being placed in faculty appointments than are enrolled in grad schools. If we meet with women doctoral candidates and identify their concerns, we might be able to improve the retention and placement rates. Any documentation/anecdotal evidence should be brought to

[370] Planning Accreditation Board, "Accreditation Criteria Changes in The Accreditation Document Approved" (Washington, DC, May 7, 1992), US 98-1, Box 4, Folder 36, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[371] Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting" (Chicago, IL, November 16, 1991), US 98-1, Box 1, Folder 27, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[372] Planning Accreditation Board, "Accreditation Criteria Changes in The Accreditation Document Approved."
[373] "Planning Accreditation Standards on Diversity: The Framework for Change" (Conference Program, Philadelphia, PA, October 28, 1993), FWIG binder.
[374] "Minutes from the FWIG Meeting of the ACSP."

the attention of the PhD Commission."[375] The minutes note "The general sentiment of the membership [of FWIG is that] we need to adopt a proactive stance on this issue by developing ways in which to create a positive environment for women and minorities."[376]

Under Innes' leadership the Doctoral Commission (which became the Standing Committee on Doctoral Education in 1992[377]) undertook a massive survey study to report to the ACSP board and membership on a variety of problems and opportunities for the doctorate in planning, among them the climate for women and minorities in the field.[378] Innes and her colleagues found, for example, that twice as many men as women were being admitted into doctoral programs in planning, that "women are significantly less likely to enter academic life than men, and few women or minorities apply for faculty positions."[379] They made recommendations on how individual programs could boost their recruitment and retention of minority faculty, urged departments to evaluate their climate towards women and minorities, and suggested necessary forms of support for women, including provision of child care facilities and financial aid to students with child care responsibilities. Recommendations to ACSP included more conference sessions on professional development for women and students and faculty of color, as well as CRRWPOC involvement with further data collection and policy development.[380] Under the leadership of incoming CRRWPOC chair June Manning Thomas in 1994, the committee (which had simplified its name to the Diversity Committee by 1993[381]) began implementing some of these recommendations by preparing a list of self-study "diversity questions" for planning programs undergoing PAB accreditation.[382] The Diversity Committee

[375] "Minutes from the FWIG Meeting of the ACSP."
[376] "Minutes from the FWIG Meeting of the ACSP."
[377] Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting" (Columbus, OH, October 29, 1992), US 98-1, Box 4, Folder 16, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[378] Judith E. Innes et al., "Report of the Commission on the Doctorate in Planning to the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning," October 30, 1992, US 02-4, Box 1, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[379] Judith E. Innes, "Report of the Commission on the Doctorate in Planning to the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning: An Overview," *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 12, no. 2 (January 1, 1993): 168–71.
[380] Innes.
[381] Standing Committee on Diversity in Planning Education, "Fifth Annual Report to the ACSP Executive Committee," November 3, 1994, US 98-1, Box 4, Folder 11, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati; Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting" (Philadelphia, PA, October 28, 1993), US 98-1, Box 4, Folder 16, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[382] Thomas, June Manning, "Memorandum to ACSP Diversity Committee Members" (November 20, 1994), US 98-1, Box 4, Folder 17, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.

leveraged PAB standards to move from the broad scale of the planning academy to implementation in individual ACSP-member schools.

Women positioned themselves in roles with institutional reach where they could have a voice in agenda setting. Because the institutional growth of the planning academy during the late 1980s and early 1990s presented opportunities to shape its organizational structure and priorities, women increased their presence on various ACSP committees and in related ACSP sub-organizations and creatively directed resources from several forums towards efforts to increase diverse representation. CRRWPOC's 1992 annual report to the Executive Committee clearly illustrates awareness of these overlapping opportunities, stating "Since its inception, the committee recognized that it is not the only organization in planning interested in improving the representation of women and persons of color in education and in practice. During this past year, we have been actively promoting cooperative efforts with many of these other groups," including the Faculty Women's Interest Group, the Planning and Women Division of the American Planning Association, and other ACSP committees and commissions such as the Undergraduate committee, the PhD commission, and the Database committee.[383] In addition to highlighting intra-group cooperation, the report noted that certain individuals were active in multiple roles and uniquely positioned to coordinate across entities. Sylvia White, for example, simultaneously served as the director of PAW and as an active CRRWPOC member, enabling her to liaison between ACSP and APA divisions on promoting the status of women and people of color.[384] By using personal resources and convincing ACSP to sponsor major studies, such individuals provided institutional structure to codify diversity aims in the planning academy.

Mainstreaming Gender and Race in Planning Education

Alongside spearheading institutional data collection projects and successfully inserting normative language about gender and racial diversity into ACSP guiding documents and policies, women in leadership positions organized around a mainstreaming approach to planning education. In contrast to the prevailing model in the 1970s, when faculty devoted "special topics"

[383] "Third Annual Report of the Standing Committee on the Representation of Women and Persons of Color in Planning Education" (ACSP Executive Board, October 29, 1992), US 01-15, Box 1, Folder 11, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[384] "Third Annual Report of the Standing Committee on the Representation of Women and Persons of Color in Planning Education."

courses to women's issues, this mainstreaming effort sought to infuse previously marginalized topics throughout the standard planning curriculum. The goal was to spread perspectives related to gender, race, and to a lesser extent class (perhaps because class already held an accepted role in traditional planning research), into both introductory courses and when teaching about economic development, transportation planning, or neighborhood design, for example. Concurrent with demographic representation efforts, women in ACSP organized around visibility for feminist issues and scholarship and sought to expose these ideas to as wide an audience as possible. In fact, at the very first FWIG meeting, attendees raised concerns not only about professional challenges for female scholars, but also about the difficulty of publishing feminist content in planning journals.[385] In the 1990s, women organized within the ACSP conference structure to reach a broader audience with their research on topics related to gender, eventually combining the goals of substantive gender and racial representation in the planning field.

By 1994, FWIG began directly claiming both women and people of color as the targets of their efforts. When FWIG president Deborah Howe gave her report to the Executive Committee at the April 1994 meeting in San Francisco, she proclaimed that FWIG "has emerged as a group of people to promote women faculty and people of color [and] also [to] substantively promote issues of gender and diversity."[386] With only a few exceptions, FWIG and CRRWPOC documents refer primarily to gender and racial (and/or ethnic) diversity. They pay little attention to other identity markers or to the nature of simultaneous identities and the interlocking qualities of different forms of oppression. And even with the combined language of gender and race, perspectives on race often fell out. FWIG meeting minutes from 1995, for example, note that members agreed to "assert a gender perspective" as the conference review process was nationalized due to increasing attendance and cost.[387] FWIG members agreed to volunteer to review conference proposals and to be discussants, continuing to follow a strategy of doing more work than the men with an assumption that benefits would trickle down to future generations of women and scholars of color.

[385] Deborah Howe and Janet Hammer, "EnGendering Change: Impacts of the Faculty Women's Interest Group on the Planning Academy" (draft, 2002).
[386] Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting," April 16, 1994.
[387] "Minutes of the FWIG Business Meeting," October 20, 1995.

Mainstreaming appears in the record of FWIG discussions as early as 1989, when Deborah Howe expressed a desire to organize a panel on mainstreaming gender into the planning curriculum.[388] The session did not materialize at the 1990 conference, but discussions in FWIG meetings led to plans for a larger undertaking – a half-day conference on "Mainstreaming Issues of Gender and Ethnicity into the Planning Curriculum," which convened the day before the 1992 ACSP conference in Columbus, Ohio.[389] Nancey Green Leigh (who would become FWIG president in 1994) served as the main organizer of the conference, receiving assistance from Rosenbloom and members of CRRWPOC.[390] The conference focused on strategies for mainstreaming curricular issues of gender and ethnicity in substantive areas of planning education like economic development, housing, and transportation. Seeking to draw an audience of professors teaching "traditional" curriculum as well as faculty who had already adopted a mainstreaming approach in their classes, conference organizers also provided programming on general pedagogical issues.[391] Roundtable sessions covered three primary areas: "Incorporating Diversity within Teaching" addressed classroom climate and learning needs, "Planning Education" incorporated PAB requirements and planning ethics into discussions of how to incorporate planning issues affecting women and persons of color, and "Methodology" discussed producing data for gender and minority planning issues.[392]

Bolstering their own data collection efforts within ACSP, conference organizers also appealed to a broader and growing acknowledgement of racial and gender disparity in academia. A statement in the program noted, "It is time that Planning, as a discipline, initiates efforts paralleling those recently taken in other disciplines to address the problems of gender and ethnicity bias in the teaching and practice of our profession. This mini-conference addresses three primary areas where planning academia needs to examine and modify its teaching, research, and practice."[393] ACSP's CRRWPOC and the American Planning Association co-

[388] "Minutes of the FWIG Business Meeting," October 7, 1989.
[389] "Third Annual Report of the Standing Committee on the Representation of Women and Persons of Color in Planning Education."
[390] "Third Annual Report of the Standing Committee on the Representation of Women and Persons of Color in Planning Education."
[391] Nancey Green Leigh, "Letter to FWIG Members," Member Communication, February 20, 1992, FWIG binder.
[392] "Third Annual Report of the Standing Committee on the Representation of Women and Persons of Color in Planning Education."
[393] "Mainstreaming Issues of Gender and Ethnicity into the Planning Curriculum" (Conference Program, Columbus, OH, October 29, 1992), FWIG binder.

sponsored the conference as well,[394] a testimony to both the timeliness of the topic and to the organizers' ability to work across institutional boundaries. A year later, tangible results within ACSP appeared, when the Executive Committee took on a project to research course syllabi "as part of providing help on diversity teaching."[395]

Senior women's early experiences with teaching and presenting at conferences had fostered a sense that they were "preaching to the choir" while gender topics remained marginalized in the broader discourse. Eugenie Birch recalled that when she was teaching courses on women and planning at Hunter College in the early 1980s, she discovered she was only getting women in the classes, which she described as a problem "because I want[ed] to indoctrinate these young men. So my trick was to change the title of the classes. And I'd change it to 'Demographic Issues in Planning.' And then I got all these guys and then I taught the same stuff." [396] As Birch put it, she "had to be a little sneaky" in order to reach a wider audience with her research topic. Birch employed this tactic in publishing as well, as with a 1983 special issue of *JAPA* that she edited on "Planning and the Changing Family." In response to my question about how she made the choice to frame around "family" as opposed to "women," Birch said, "I didn't think I had to… If I wanted to get the message out… one way of doing that would be to be less confrontational and more careful in the language. Otherwise people wouldn't listen. The people that needed to listen wouldn't listen."[397] She described herself as "tired of preaching to the converted" and made a "strategic choice" to shift her approach.

FWIG had, from its inception, repeatedly reached out and tried to appeal to male faculty instead of branding themselves as a separatist group. At the ACSP executive committee meeting in 1987 when submitting the proposal for FWIG's establishment, they "explained that males are welcome to join the group even though it will focus on the needs of women faculty."[398] When FWIG began giving out its first sponsored award,[399] they chose to award it to "individuals who have worked within ACSP to promote/recognize women and foster diversity."[400] Nancey Green

---

[394] "Third Annual Report of the Standing Committee on the Representation of Women and Persons of Color in Planning Education."
[395] Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting," October 28, 1993.
[396] Eugenie Ladner Birch, In Person, April 15, 2018.
[397] Birch.
[398] Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting," April 26, 1987.
[399] Nancey Green Leigh and Linda Keyes, "Proposal to Establish the Margarita McCoy Award under the Sponsorship of the Faculty Women's Interest Group of ACSP" (Philadelphia, PA, October 1993), FWIG binder.
[400] "Minutes of the FWIG Annual Meeting."

Leigh, chair of the nominating committee, "noted that despite the Call for Nominations inviting nominations of individuals (e.g., not females only), there appeared to be the impression that only women were eligible for the award. She noted it would be wonderful if a future award was made to a male for his significant role in advancing women's interests in the planning academy through teaching, research, and service."[401] Although no man has won the award to date, FWIG leadership went out of their way to frame the organization as inclusive to men.

Despite a shared goal of gaining broader appeal for their scholarship, FWIG members demonstrated differences of opinion over how best to build support for women's issues and to tackle the problem of marginalization within ACSP. While the record does not reveal exactly how a mainstreaming approach rose to dominate both the FWIG and CRRWPOC agendas in the 1990s, we know that the "relative importance of gender-specific vs. mainstreamed sessions" at ACSP conferences formed a frequent point of discussion at FWIG meetings.[402] One of the reasons that mainstreaming arguments may have won out attests to the political conditions of backlash against feminism during this period. Speaking about the shift away from special courses devoted to gender, Gerda Wekerle underscores this point: "My sense is that with the backlash in the nineties and also with women students and the universities focusing more on identity than on politics, that it became more and more difficult to launch these courses or to keep them. Because somehow focusing on women in planning was considered politically incorrect."[403] By being sensitive to the "particular political ideological connotation" of terming activities or research *feminist*, Wekerle recognized that generations of female planners have differing priorities and life experiences that might change their orientation to the term.[404] Larger forces at work in the backlash against feminism became evident to Wekerle through her research.

> I was doing this research study on women in the local government, and what I was seeing, especially from the United States, is people would report we had a women's unit and we're replacing it by an equity unit. So it became a neutral term and "equity" then included race; race, gender, disability, et cetera… And so in the nineties they were

[401] "Minutes of the Business Meeting of the Faculty Women's Interest Group," November 6, 1994.
[402] "Minutes of the FWIG Business Meeting," October 20, 1995.
[403] Wekerle, interview, February 9, 2017.
[404] Gerda R. Wekerle, In Person, February 9, 2017.

saying… we have budget constraints… but it was also political, right. They didn't want to be seen as focusing on women.[405]

FWIG leadership chose the strategy of employing neutral language to appeal to a broad swath of people while attempting to mainstream issues of gender and diversity into planning education and institutions. Despite the fact that FWIG members discussed explicitly feminist theories and approaches to planning in their meetings,[406] the group tended to downplay feminist language for their conference programming "as a strategy to attract a broad range of participants to deal with gender and diversity issues."[407] Sometimes conference panel suggestions specifically referencing feminism appeared in the conference program rebranded in more neutral language;[408] it is possible that those who wanted to maintain space for the "most popular" topics convinced others of their approach or prevailed over other voices.[409] Others may not have thought it necessary to talk about feminism explicitly: Ann Forsyth, for example, told me, "In a way, who cares about feminist theory? I did at one stage very greatly, but mostly you don't for a really long time." Forsyth expressed an aversion to returning to the bitter debates over feminist theory in the 1980s, even though she saw feminism as effective in helping professional planners understand that "gender matters" in order to achieve "a very basic level of representation, maybe making people a little more sensitive to people's life circumstances."[410]

FWIG sponsored a second mini-conference before the next year's 1993 ACSP meeting in Philadelphia. Over 67 people participated in "The PAB Standards on Diversity: A Framework for Change," for which Sandi Rosenbloom served as lead organizer.[411] Panels ranged from the nuts and bolts ("What are the PAB Accreditation Guidelines and What Will They Mean for Planning Programs?") to sessions on exploring several facets of diversity work in the academy, including "Living Diversity at the Institutional Level," "Developing a Supportive Environment for Diverse Faculty and Students," and "Getting and Keeping Diverse Planning Faculty and Students."[412] A panel entitled "Creating the Required Curriculum: Incorporating Diversity into

[405] Wekerle.
[406] Unknown, "Handwritten Notes on FWIG Annual Meeting" (Columbus, OH, November 1, 1992), FWIG binder.
[407] "Minutes of the FWIG Annual Meeting."
[408] "Minutes of the FWIG Business Meeting," October 20, 1995; "Minutes of the Business Meeting of the Faculty Women's Interest Group," November 6, 1994.
[409] "Minutes of the FWIG Business Meeting," October 7, 1989.
[410] Ann Forsyth, In Person, January 12, 2017.
[411] Faculty Women's Interest Group, "Report to the ACSP Executive Committee," April 1994.
[412] "Planning Accreditation Standards on Diversity: The Framework for Change."

Everything (From methods courses to design studios!)" specifically addressed the curriculum component of standards as part of the ongoing effort to mainstream issues of gender and race in planning classrooms.[413]

After two years of mini-conferences designed to give visibility to issues of gender and ethnicity, mainstreaming advocates devised a way to employ their strategy with the ACSP conference as a whole. On October 12, 1994, five people in ACSP-related leadership positions sent a letter to all individuals that would be serving as either moderators or discussants at the upcoming conference in Tempe, Arizona. The signees – Linda Dalton, chair of the Planning Accreditation Board, ACSP president Catherine Ross, FWIG president Deborah Howe, FWIG vice president Nancey Green Leigh, and Sandi Rosenbloom, co-chair of the 1994 conference – issued the following instructions:

> We ask that you encourage the participants on 'your' ACSP panel to consider how race, gender, and ethnic issues have been reflected in either the teaching or research efforts under discussion. As educators, we believe that the ACSP Conference is the ideal place to incorporate a concern with these issues into the core of planning education and research. [FWIG mini-conferences and PAB diversity criteria efforts] recognize that bias results not only from conscious discrimination, but also from failing to consider that public policies and planning efforts, as well as the materials used to study those policies and plans, may have differential impacts, and different meanings, for women and persons of color.[414]

The communication included a page of "Suggestions on Introducing Diversity Issues into Conference Analysis and Discussion," which listed practices to avoid in defining planning problems and in reviewing previous research, while urging people to consider the marginalization of women and persons of color's experiences.[415] The growing body of feminist planning literature, for example, focused heavily on demonstrating that women experienced the built environment and planning processes in different ways than

[413] Faculty Women's Interest Group, "Report to the ACSP Executive Committee," April 1994.
[414] Linda Dalton et al., "Letter to ACSP Session Moderators and Discussants," October 12, 1994, US 98-1, Box 4, Folder 25, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[415] Faculty Women's Interest Group, "Guidelines for Incorporating Issues of Gender and Ethnicity into Planning Education and Research" (1995), US 01-15, Box 1, Folder 20, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.

men, so this mainstreaming approach also stood to boost citations of some of the women's research.

The letter to moderators and discussants went out only a few weeks before the Tempe ACSP conference, and at the FWIG business meeting that year members agreed that "the timing was a problem and had had some political backlash. However, Marsha Ritzdorf felt it was important to make it part of the instructions to discussants. Since presentors [sic] would not necessarily have access to this information, it was agreed that the instructions for cultural and gender diversity be included in the call for papers."[416] The record does not specify whether the "political backlash" was against the statement itself or the timing (people could have complained the short window did not give them time to prepare, for example), but regardless of the reason, FWIG members forged ahead with again broadening the scope of people they could reach.

FWIG took its final steps towards institutionalizing its mainstreaming approach at the ACSP Executive Committee meeting in Orlando in April 1996. Their report to the committee stated,

> FWIG has long had the goal of mainstreaming issues of ethnicity, gender, and race into conference sessions for some time, particularly in sessions covering practice, curriculum, and research methods. This year brought a commitment from the ACSP Executive Board to ensure that these efforts are more successful in future conferences. At the Detroit meeting, the Executive Board adopted a motion that the guidelines officially go out as an official part of the paper acceptance letter. This result should institutionalize FWIG's concern about mainstreaming gender, race, and class issues in the organization from next year, the culmination of a 5 year effort.[417]

The Fall 1996 issue of ACSP's quarterly newsletter, *Update*, announced that the board had adopted the mainstreaming approach and published the "Guidelines for Introducing Diversity Issues into Conference Analysis and Discussion" in full.[418]

In advance of the 1995 Detroit conference, FWIG chair Nancey Green Leigh redistributed the guideline list to the ACSP Executive Committee, explaining that FWIG had arranged with conference organizers to include it with the notification of conference participation

[416] "Minutes of the Business Meeting of the Faculty Women's Interest Group," November 6, 1994.
[417] Leigh, "Report to the ACSP Executive Board."
[418] Leigh, "The Faculty Women's Interest Group Toronto Conference Report."

along with a note asking people to give the guidelines thoughtful consideration as they prepared for the October conference in Detroit. When the measure came up for a vote at the subsequent ACSP Executive Committee meeting, an unnamed participant's concern that disseminating guidelines in this manner "opens up the conference to other political subjects" did not stop the measure from passing,[419] which attests to the political will that FWIG had built within ACSP.

These institutional gains were not achieved without pushback from the broader ACSP community against FWIG's conference activities. According to FWIG meeting minutes, members reported frustration with getting FWIG acknowledged as a sponsor in the ACSP program and being relegated to marginalized time slots in the program.[420] At times, criticism was leveled more overtly, as is evident in a 1993 letter from Seymour Mandelbaum at the University of Pennsylvania to ACSP leadership over what types of sessions were appropriate for an interest group to sponsor. The May 1993 memo, addressed to ACSP president Jerry Kaufman and Sandi Rosenbloom, co-chair of the 1994 Phoenix ACSP conference, relays a phone conversation that Mandelbaum had with FWIG president Deborah Howe: "Deborah was talking to [FWIG member] Margaret Dewar in Chicago. Margaret observed the FWIG was not sponsoring any sessions in the core of the conference. She wondered whether the Group might co-sponsor one or both of the session on women that she had arranged."[421] Mandelbaum objected to the idea, writing,

> While I had readily agreed to cosponsor sessions with the Canadian schools and with SIAP, it seemed inappropriate to me for an "interest" group to cosponsor sessions in the scholarly mode. Indeed, all the sessions that FWIG had sponsored in prior years had dealt with the concerns of women faculty in affirmative action, tenure policy and similar matters. None had dealt with issues such as the impact upon women of shifts in regional employment patterns or segmented labor markets.[422]

Howe reportedly accepted Mandelbaum's decision, but they agreed to reflect on the issue with the ACSP conference committee and work towards an "authoritative ruling for future years."[423]

---

[419] Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, "Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting" (Detroit, MI, October 19, 1995), US 98-1, Box 5, Folder 40, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[420] "Minutes of the FWIG Business Meeting," October 20, 1995.
[421] Seymour Mandelbaum, "Letter to Jerry Kaufman and Sandi Rosenbloom," May 14, 1993, US 98-1, Box 6, Folder 7, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
[422] Mandelbaum.
[423] Mandelbaum.

As the pioneering group within ACSP, it is possible that FWIG was a lightning rod of sorts, drawing attention and criticism during a time when ACSP's political agenda (or lack thereof) was still forming and being tested. Regardless, the 1995 conference in Detroit reflected success of mainstreaming efforts: in contrast to previous years, when professionally oriented panels dominated, four of the seven FWIG-sponsored panels substantively engaged race, ethnicity, class, and/or gender.[424]

Before the ACSP conference became the primary location for networking in the early 1980s, women planning scholars met and organized in less centralized venues (informally and through feminist collectives, as described in chapter 3). Though present, women were primarily on the margins of the institutions that constituted the planning academy until the late 1980s, when they began moving into positions of power and strategically using resources to institutionalize recognition of women's and gender concerns. In addition to providing individualized supports, these women engaged directly with an emerging institution to shape the direction of a discipline that was just beginning to adopt its current form and weight. ACSP provided a space for women to gain a foothold and, in less than a decade, women spread to the leadership ranks of ACSP. In 1993, Catherine Ross became the first female and first African American president to head the organization. Eugenie Birch and then Sandi Rosenbloom succeeded Ross, comprising a mostly female Executive Committee through the late 1990s (it would be 2009 before ACSP had a female president again).

Female faculty were organized, efficient, and determined, allowing them to accomplish an incredible amount of resource provision, data gathering, and policy change in a short amount of time. Senior women had checked off the "firsts" (first woman in an academic planning department, first woman with tenure or chairing a department, first woman on the ACSP Executive Committee, etc.) and from those positions instituted measures to change the demographic makeup and substantive content of the planning academy. They were politically savvy and strategic, and invested an incredible amount of personal time and financial resources into building a pipeline to achieve a critical mass. By mainstreaming gender and racial perspectives into planning curriculum, they helped legitimize marginalized scholarship and gain a wider audience for women's research within planning. Although much of this work was done

[424] "Minutes of the FWIG Business Meeting," October 20, 1995.

under the auspices of FWIG, women were cognizant of institutional overlap and achieved broad reach across ACSP committees and suborganizations.

In many ways, FWIG functioned as a test case for institutional politics within ACSP, testing the boundaries of the organization and setting a precedent for advocacy for professional development of underrepresented groups. In part because FWIG did most of its visible work at ACSP conferences, working on a mainstreaming plan while simultaneously sponsoring practical panels drew a rhetorical line between "issues" of gender, race, and ethnicity on the one hand, and career-oriented professional support for women to overcome systemic lack of opportunity or discrimination in the workplace on the other. Daphne Spain explained that while feminist planning scholarship from the 1980s impacted her greatly (in her case, particularly the *Signs* issue and scholarship by Dolores Hayden and Susan Saegert), the institutional work that FWIG was doing was motivated by the desire to appeal to people who were not already in their camp:

> Let's put it this way; somebody who is not a feminist is not going to pick up [a feminist] book in the first place… There has to be this predisposition to be open to those ideas and… what might this look like, what might the nonsexist city look like? And then you carry it on with you, you incorporate it into your research agenda or scholarship… as you go along.[425]

This dual strategy for recognition, working on the one hand for more equitable demographic representation (both in raw numbers and in leadership positions) and by linking representation to policy change and substantive scholarship, was by all accounts an impressive exercise of institutional organizing. While the male-dominated planning departments that employed many women certainly made it difficult for women to succeed in academia, the growth of ACSP as an organization and the planning academy in general offered an opportunity for women (most of whom were white and middle- or upper-class, and/or came from elite schools) to exercise power and have a strong voice in agenda setting.

Despite the enormous success of these tasks, however, institutionalizing gender in the planning academy cannot be counted as an unqualified win. While the measures represented progress, a pervasive assumption that more women would mean more equity proved inadequate. With only a few exceptions, FWIG and CRRWPOC documents refer primarily to gender and racial (and/or ethnic) diversity. They pay little attention to other identity markers or to the nature

[425] Daphne Spain, In Person, January 31, 2017.

of simultaneous identities and the interlocking qualities of different forms of oppression. And even with the combined language of gender and race, perspectives on race often fell out. FWIG meeting minutes from 1995, for example, note that members agreed to "assert a gender perspective" as the conference review process was nationalized due to increasing attendance and cost.[426] FWIG members agreed to volunteer to review conference proposals and to be discussants, continuing to follow a strategy of doing more work than the men with an assumption that benefits would trickle down to future generations of women and scholars of color.

Scholars of color, in particular, continued to struggle with many of the same barriers that had eased somewhat for white women by the end of the 1990s. FWIG operated for a decade without a formal mission statement, and when FWIG president Nancey Green Leigh drafted one in June 1996, it read simply "The Faculty Women Interest Group (FWIG) was established to ensure the interests of women are represented in the pedagogy, research, service, and membership of the ACSP."[427] The statement did not voice a normative agenda, nor did it make connections to race, ethnicity, class, ability, or sexuality. Regardless of whether the FWIG membership issued a simple statement as an explicit strategy, their choice left a key clause open to interpretation: "the interests of women." As the final section of this chapter demonstrates, this uncritical stance would alienate many of the younger scholars of color who were entering the planning academy in the 1990s.

Women of Color's Struggles and Responses

> "The challenges that women face and that now we celebrate of having largely been overcome, are enormously pressing to people of color." --Clara Irazábal

> "I think we've made a lot more gain in the field of gender than race within the academy. The numbers of women in ACSP ballooned in the 1990s and early 2000s, to the point where now the FWIG… banquet is as big as the main banquet… one of the largest gatherings during the conference and I think that's wonderful. But there's still very few women of color, and there are so few women of color in the higher ranks. And there are

[426] "Minutes of the FWIG Business Meeting," October 20, 1995.
[427] Nancey Green Leigh, "Email to FWIG Listserv" (June 24, 1996), US 01-15, Box 1, Folder 20, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.

> so many stories that you hear of women of color who have been denied tenure and are migrant professors. Or who have left the field… So I think there's a total lack of understanding of what women of color go through in the academy…. There are so many people with these kinds of stories that never get the light of day, 'cause it's not like we talk about it, right? We talk about it privately to other people or we console our colleagues who go through similar things, but there's never been a study of the horror stories that people have had based on their experiences." --Karen Umemoto

Between the 1960s and 1990s, women went from being "the only female scholar in the room" to comprising such a large portion of faculty that their presence can be easy to take for granted. The scholars I spoke with effectively advocated for women in the profession and academic field, they actively pushed planning towards participatory and community-based models, and they debated and defined particularly feminist ways of planning. While academic struggles certainly continue for most women, including white women, in this final section, I frame the many early accomplishments of women by asking: success *for whom*? I highlight the perspectives of nine women of color who faced multiple marginalizations along the lines of gender, race, citizenship status, and other identity markers. These women completed their doctorates in the 1990s and 2000s and navigated the context of the planning academy that was in the process of certain transformations of the gendered landscape. While much research remains to be done on this topic and it is outside the scope of this dissertation to exhaustively chronicle the complex issues and experiences at play, the space given here to their voices enables some initial observations about persistent problems, especially in terms of how they have experienced their own exclusions from feminism in planning and how we might collectively move toward a more just feminist urban planning.

The women of color I interviewed compared their experiences of being "the only one" to the white women in the 1970s and 1980s. Among my interviewees were women who were the only Black students in their graduate programs and the only immigrant women on their faculties, for example. While the number of white women in the planning academy grew rapidly, women of color still make up only a small fraction of planning faculty, even at the many planning schools in urban areas with majority populations of color. One interviewee told me, "The higher up you go, in terms of traditional U.S. measures of success, the fewer people of color there

are."[428] And even when there are others, that does not automatically breed understanding. The same interviewee told me, for example, "I was very fortunate to meet another Mexican-American woman [in graduate school], but we had radically different backgrounds."

In addition to being isolated from each other, women of color had more responsibilities and had to work harder to achieve their career goals. For one interviewee, this meant being constantly asked to do service work. She told me, "I'm often the only Black person in the room in committee meetings. I'm also frequently invited to serve on DEI [Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion] and other committees, or RPT [Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure] review committees, especially when there is not another woman or person of color. This has led to a much higher service load than that realized by my white colleagues."[429] While she categorically declines what she called "these kinds of check the box requests," her experience is indicative of many women of color in an academy where diversity is a growing (and marketable) institutional priority.[430]

Tokenism became apparent in the job market as well. Another interviewee was repeatedly slighted in job talks and campus visits, "It was clear they were not interested in me. Nobody was even paying attention, so very early… I figured out they [didn't] really want to hire me here, they just wanted to check the box that says… we interviewed a minority woman."[431] Her work was plagiarized as a result of another job talk she gave at a university where people, including the dean, appeared "very excited" about her research. They never contacted her after the campus visit, but less than a year later she happened to attend a conference at that same institution, where the dean was presented with an award. She told me, "Turns out he had taken the idea that I presented on my job talk, went to the state, got money for it, and they were awarding him, calling him brilliant, all of these things. He had stolen my idea. He had stolen my research." A friend in the audience asked her "Isn't that your research? I was like yeah, that's what I presented at my job talk." He took my idea, didn't hire me, and then went and… he got a lot of money from the state to do it."

[428] Anonymous 4, In Person, October 25, 2019.
[429] Anonymous 3, Zoom, November 6, 2019.
[430] See Sara Ahmed, *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2012).
[431] Anonymous 2, In Person, October 25, 2019.

The same interviewee told me that during her five years as the only faculty of color at one institution, "every single student of color ended up in my office crying, ready to drop out.... Many of them I convinced, 'you cannot drop out, you have to finish this.'" She remembered that "I spent a lot of hours counseling and helping… because the environment was so not welcoming for them that… they were having a similar experience to what I was having."[432] She knew she was taking on an extra burden of care but did not want students to feel as unwelcome as she did as a faculty of color.

Clara Irazábal, a community development scholar and professor of planning and Latinx and Latin American studies at the University of Missouri, Kansas City, told me, "As a woman of color I have had to do three times more, or more than that, in order to be factually considered for the same type of merit-based recognitions that others have had. And I have gone without, even doing that [much extra] work. I don't know if you're aware but I didn't get tenure at [University of Southern California]. It was scandalous. I would have been the first Latina woman tenured in the planning program at this university in Los Angeles, where the city, the county, and the state are already or are close to being majority Latinx."[433] Despite an impressive academic record, Irazábal was denied tenure not once, but twice: first from USC in 2008 and again at Columbia University in 2016.

Irazábal was only one of about thirteen men and women of color in planning who were either denied tenure or not reappointed following their third-year reviews in the mid-2000s, when interviewees reported that as many as five or six people were denied in one year. My interviewees all mentioned this moment as a kind of collective trauma, whether they were personally among this group or not. They described it with terms such as an "epidemic," a "plague," a "massive loss", and a "hemorrhaging" of faculty of color from planning. Elizabeth L. Sweet, an assistant professor of equitable and sustainable development in the Urban Planning and Community Development Program and the Department of Africana Studies at the University of Massachusetts Boston, told me that ACSP leadership "kept talking about the pipeline." Her response was "Hello, you got all these people you're kicking out. So you can't really say there's a pipeline issue."[434]

---

[432] Anonymous 2.
[433] Clara Irazábal, In Person, April 11, 2017.
[434] Elizabeth L. Sweet, In Person, April 19, 2018.

One Black woman, who was the only person of color in her department, told me, "I felt like they tried to lynch me."[435] She had experienced a total lack of support and felt set up. In fact, her chair told her point-blank in her second year that she wasn't going to make it there. "And so it was clear to me… that he had determined I wasn't going to make it there." When two other white male colleagues went up for their third-year reviews prior to her, "It was a very casual process. Very unstructured, there weren't a lot of rules… It was very informal. And then it came time for my third-year review, all of a sudden there were all these rules, all this structure, all these requirements that hadn't been there before." To make matters worse, the dean told her she could not appeal the case, which she found out later was untrue.

Why do these women believe people of color were denied tenure or cut in their third-year reviews in such staggering numbers? Why were procedures for tenure and grievances so inconsistent? My interviewees were consistently informed that the reason they were denied was that their research "wasn't planning" but instead sociology, or public health, or activism. Planning has long touted itself as an interdisciplinary field with strong ties to practice, but by the late 1990s, many scholars of color at the vanguard of making such connections found themselves heavily policed by disciplinary boundaries. Disciplinary protocols play a role, as do the shifting recognitions of what "counts" as scholarship: as numerous scholars have revealed, the appeal to supposedly unbiased "standards" has always been biased toward white perspectives. A shift toward inclusion must also involve deeper epistemological shifts that address institutional racism and xenophobia in the academy. Irazábal told me,

> The triangulation of [gender, ethnicity, and nationality] really create a cocktail that has been explosive in academia, that ha[s] prevented me from getting tenure. And that has been dismissed on the part of the institution that more or less now have in place systems to address matters of racism, or sexism, on an individual basis. And… totally unwilling to make the effort to see if they recognize intersectionality.[436]

She continued,

> We produce the tokenistic numbers that they need to… portray that they are a diverse program. But when the moment comes when they need to let us join their prestigious and exclusive club of tenured professors then they dismiss us… It is a revolving door. They

[435] Anonymous 2, interview.
[436] Irazábal, interview, April 11, 2017.

know that… they will be recruiting another one easily enough… and then dismiss them… right before tenure… It's a plague.

Irazábal specifically named white women as part of who has "provoked this in academia," saying "I was perhaps naive to believe in sisterhood when I came into academia and I thought that I was going to have the support of… white women [who are already in good numbers]."

While many of those people cut in the initial "epidemic" have since gotten tenure, they have borne great costs. Sweet, for example, was on the job market every year from 2007 to 2019, and many interviewees cited the long-lasting negative effects on their careers from not being renewed. In addition to harming their careers, the psychological effects have been quite painful as they internalized constant and persistent signals that they did not belong.

Facing challenges such as these, faculty of color began organizing. The few of them around in the late 1990s, both men and women, had begun a tradition of sharing experiences and coping strategies with each other at an informal dinner group that met at each ACSP conference. The wave of tenure denials and third-year review cuts that occurred around 2004-2006 provided the catalyst for the 2007 formation of the Planners of Color Interest Group (POCIG) that could push ACSP to collect data and track who was not getting tenure or not renewed in their third year, for example.[437] Jeffrey Lowe, who was then president of the Planning and the Black Community division of the APA and one of the Black faculty denied tenure, organized a meeting of twenty or thirty faculty at the 2006 ACSP conference in Fort Worth, Texas. He called for tenured faculty of color, in particular, to step up and take organizing roles because the untenured faculty could not afford to do it alone.[438] June Manning Thomas recalled being "the only living, breathing full professor of color sitting at the table,"[439] and she heeded Lowe's exhortation. Thomas and Teresa Vasquez, a more vulnerable faculty member due to her status as an adjunct professor, became the POCIG's first co-chairs, coordinating an organizing and communication effort undertaken with the help of a group of volunteers that was comprised of at least half women.

Starting with a list of people who indicated interest at the 2006 meeting, POCIG developed and maintained a listserv (a tracking and communication feat which Thomas

[437] Sweet, interview, April 19, 2018.
[438] Thomas, "Personal Correspondence."
[439] Thomas.

described as "a part-time job in itself"). They formed committees for ACSP conference coordination, mentoring, policy and advocacy, communications, and student representation and retention, among others.[440] The tasks they embarked upon were both a testimony to FWIG, in that they modeled FWIG's organizing strategy, and an indictment that FWIG had not been able to successfully address issues of race along with gender, as they claimed to do. Importantly, the majority of this labor was carried out by individuals without tenure and therefore without time or stability at their disposal, yet they still participated and took on leadership roles. These organizing efforts took place both *because of* and *in spite of* the terribly precarious positions that faculty of color held.

In 2011, POCIG released a strategic plan.[441] Marisa Zapata, who was then untenured, compiled the report with input from the POCIG executive committee and membership. Because ACSP is an organization comprised of volunteer positions with no ongoing staff to implement programs and recommendations produced by various task forces, POCIG leadership understood that they would need to write and implement the plan themselves. The plan laid out goals and concomitant strategies regarding recruitment and retention and integrating race and ethnicity into planning curriculum and accreditation along a 5-year timeline for implementation. Thomas credits the strategic plan with enabling the group to "stop the bleeding" of faculty of color, telling me "it's only because of this document that we have any Black faculty now!"[442]

In addition to its institutional efforts, POCIG imparted a structured sense of community. One interviewee recalled,

> That's how POCIG got started, because there were too many of us to ignore. In the beginning, it was so needed… to bring attention to… what was happening to people of color in planning. It was also important… to create a network of people of color in planning because the way bullying works, it's very easy to bully someone if you can keep them in the corner and have your back turned so nobody can see, and punch them. And so that's what was happening to a lot of us, is that we were in the corner being punched and

[440] "ACSP/POCIG Committee Volunteers" (2009), June Manning Thomas Personal Papers.
[441] Planners of Color Interest Group, "2011-16 Strategic Plan" (September 30, 2011), June Manning Thomas Personal Papers.
[442] Thomas, "Personal Correspondence."

nobody else knew about it… And so it allowed us to bring those issues out and also to support each other in ways that hadn't been done before.[443]

This perspective on banding together for strength in numbers is not unfamiliar for those who have read about FWIG's formation in the late 1980s. Nor is the story of substantive representation in planning discourse at ACSP conferences. When Karen Umemoto, a professor of urban planning and Asian American Studies at UCLA, began attending ACSP in the late 1990s, she described it as "really surreal" because "none of the concerns that I care[d] about, that really affect communities of color that I've worked with, [we]re really represented in the panel topics."[444] She went on to describe the importance of institutional diversity efforts in ACSP and through POCIG because "One of the important impacts of having a more diverse faculty is you bring into the field a more diverse array of concerns and experiences and realities, and those realities for scholars of color tend to be those things that are some of the most pressing… problems that we have."

Women of color I interviewed largely agreed that POCIG has been more active in critically engaging concepts and politics of feminism, while FWIG focused its efforts around the professional development of women faculty. The "epidemic" of tenure denials revealed that FWIG's career advancement tactics were not working for all women. According to June Manning Thomas, POCIG's formation was both a testimony to FWIG, in that they followed similar organizing tactics, and a clear statement that FWIG had not been able to accomplish what it said it was going to by combining efforts for gender and racial equity. While all of my interviewees had positive interactions with individual white women that were often formative, as a group, FWIG did not feel like a welcoming space for many women of color. Interviewees described the group as "a white women's organization" that "doesn't understand women of color." Women of color also did not feel that white women in ACSP were committed to a practice of solidarity. I reprint here a cross-section of anonymized descriptions of how female planning scholars of color I interviewed felt in regard to white women in ACSP (which is what FWIG represented to them):

[443] Anonymous 2, interview.
[444] Karen Umemoto, In Person, March 13, 2018.

> I'm hurt. I'm hurt by white women. Recognizing feminist planning and recognizing what they have done, I'm not ready to do that. I feel alienated.
>
> So if the emancipation of women has to a certain extent been conquered, at least to another extent than emancipation for people of color, then at that position white women are at an enormous opportunity to help along this other group if they paid attention to this new frontier of me.
>
> FWIG has nothing to do with feminism… It was about trying to fit in the man's world, trying to figure out how to be like them…. Not one iota of feminism in that organization at all, or any sort of consciousness about race, anti-racist stuff, nothing… It was complaining about their experiences, trying to support women getting tenure, support women getting jobs… It was about them supporting each other and trying… to get more women in, but that was the extent of their analysis.
>
> In the earlier years the white feminists really didn't understand communities of color and didn't care much, and I think there was a lot of feeling of alienation… How can you fight for women, on one hand, and then ignore women of color or men of color? Isn't it in essence the same thing in terms of what is just?

Claudia Isaac, a professor at the University of New Mexico, described her memories of the launch of the FWIG Yellow Book (described earlier in this chapter) at an ACSP roundtable:

> All of the senior women were talking about how to essentially pass in the academy. Not just that you have to publish but you have to publish in these journals. And you have to be dispassionate and you can't, as I did in one of my articles, start the first part with 'This is written from a Marxist-feminist perspective.' The Yellow Book said don't do that.[445]

Isaac laughed when she noted that she did it anyway and ended up getting tenure, while acknowledging, "That's what FWIG was really, really good for. It was good for helping junior faculty navigate a male-dominated academy. And that's cool. That's sort of liberal feminism at

[445] Claudia Isaac, In Person, April 23, 2019.

its best, but it wasn't doing everything that it could have done."[446] In other words, by taking a reformist and trickle-down approach, FWIG missed an opportunity to participate in a liberatory feminist politics that leads with the voices and needs of the most marginalized.

One interviewee, who began attending ACSP in the late 2000s, indicated to me that the ethos of the Yellow Book outlived its popularity. She said, "The women who were leading at ACSP at that time were all white women and very embracing of an older white woman way of thinking about how we perform and how we function in spaces. [They were] more about meeting men where they're at."[447] She described the "second wave" women as disconnected from the intersectionality of race and gender and exuding directives that she read as "fall in line" and "behave yourself."

This climate made this same interviewee feel like FWIG "was just such an alienating space" that she described as "much more like [a] ladies who lunch situation than women who were really fighting for what women needed and wanted."[448] She described that she understood part of the dynamic to be due to generational differences:

> I know part of this is when you get to the end of your career, you're tired and you've done a lot of great stuff and you can see marked change, and so I understand it can be annoying to have the next generations being like "We need more." But at the same time, if you're not doing a good job of bringing people along and you're not continually changing who you're appealing to, it makes it hard to then want to work together.

For Ananya Roy, a feminist scholar of international development and global urbanism at UCLA, planning's engagement with feminism has been "rather superficial." She told me, "I think feminism in particular remains outside the project. And the parts of feminism that have made it into the project are white liberal feminism." If we are to recuperate a more capacious and equitable promise of feminism for planning, then, how might we go about changing that dynamic and the structures that have created it and perpetuate it?

The first recommendation that emerged from my interviews concerns sharing experiences, both positive and negative. One of my interviewees happened to go to a retreat for women of color in the academy on the day she found out her contract was not being renewed.

---

[446] Isaac.
[447] Anonymous 4, interview.
[448] Anonymous 4.

She had just finished telling me about the traumatic ordeal and I asked her how she got through it. She said this sharing space "was like salve on the wound. It was a healing experience… I got to hear stories where it kind of validated you're not the only one. This is not just about you, these kinds of things are happening to women of color."[449]

Sharing opens up avenues for more junior women of color to be able to recognize what decent support and a good job fit actually looks like. In most cases, it took many years for these women to find that out on their own. One told me that when she finally got to a supportive institution, "So much of that oppression lifted. It was amazing. I didn't even realize how terrible it was until I got out."[450] Another interviewee, who experienced precarity for a number of years before landing at her current school, described how her dean "did everything in his power to make me feel comfortable, to make sure I succeeded… That's the difference, you know? I mean I could call him today, he's no longer the dean, and say I need you to do X, Y, Z. He'd be here and do it. And so that kind of support I had never experienced before, where people actually care whether you succeed or not."[451]

Some have ended up at institutions that write their commitment to multiple modes of academic work into tenure guidelines, validating community-engaged scholarship as a form of interdisciplinarity that goes back to planning's roots, for example. One interviewee told me,

> If you look at my tenure package there's some peer reviews, book chapters, there's reports, there's testimony to legislators, we get community letters… And so you actually have, in tenure guidelines, that this is a path. And you can kind of self-define it, like you don't have to be an activist scholar, and there's a lot of different modes, but the idea of being community-involved is a real thing and it's valued. And I think categorically that is the thing that… has mattered the most to me.[452]

Sharing experiences about what a positive environment looks and feels like can also lead to concrete action plans regarding the work needed to redefine standards of excellence and success.

The second recommendation I identified from my interviewees is a call for sustained and renewed institutional involvement. Irazábal, for example, told me that changing tenure standards "would require a lot more recognition on the part of promotion, accreditation, tenure processes in

[449] Anonymous 2, interview.
[450] Elizabeth L. Sweet, In Person, April 19, 2018.
[451] Anonymous 2, interview.
[452] Anonymous 4, interview.

these universities for these scholars willing to invest in doing those sorts of connections." Irazábal reiterated to me that "We have to infiltrate the institutions that have decision making power to promote change." For Irazábal, as an activist and community-based scholar, those institutions include both local governmental bodies as well as higher education.

Aware of the extra burden that institutional service creates for women of color, however, we must tread carefully when constructing that involvement. One interviewee told me, "Where I want to have impact is at the institute level. So if it's diversity-related and I know I can have impact and I can lead and not just be a member of the committee, not just be a box check, then I'll participate."[453] White women, in particular, need to listen and intentionally follow the lead of women of color, while still participating diligently. It is worth noting that at the time of this writing, two of the women of color I interviewed have moved into high-level leadership positions within ACSP: Elizabeth Sweet is the incoming president of FWIG, and Laxmi Ramasubramanian was elected to the position of Vice President/President Elect of ACSP and will assume the presidency in 2022.

Finally, my interviewees indicated that feminism must be about more than institutional involvement. Feminism in planning needs to recognize the overlapping and interlocking marginalizations highlighted by an intersectional lens and emancipatory politics. The women whose voices I highlight in this chapter repeatedly distinguished between what they saw as "feminist planning" and "women in planning." The former contains some element of solidarity politics and leads with the most marginalized instead of waiting for effects to trickle down. As a category of experience and analysis, "women in planning" has contained many uncomfortable conformist and damaging elements for women of color (and have not helped them as much as their white counterparts, even when adhered to).

Ananya Roy put it this way to me:

> I think that for women of color in planning, the very few of us, feminist planning has not been the umbrella under which any of us would organize, or it wouldn't be the label we would identify with. Partly because the terrain of struggle within planning has been varied, but also has… been much more focused on the Eurocentric nature of planning. So I want to also make a distinction between women and planning and sort of feminist planning. Women in planning have been willing to [play] politics of numbers and

[453] Anonymous 3, interview.

representation, the diversity stuff, but not call into question the fundamental practices of patriarchy.[454]

Interviewees agreed that centering intersectional perspectives is critical, even if "one of the challenges of feminist planning is that it's still difficult to talk about intersectionality."[455] One of the reasons for this difficulty is that, perhaps less so than gender, it is still very difficult for many planning scholars, especially white ones, to talk about race. One of my interviewees told me that she starts conversations focused on race for several reasons:

> One is that people who are white just cannot talk about race. And so when you enter a conversation about inequity and difference and you start with any of the other groups that experience inequity, you'll never get to race. If we talk about race first, we get to all the other things… The other reason is that people within most marginalized groups, the people who are faring worst, are people of color.[456]

Ananya Roy spoke to me about how Alicia Garza, one of the founders of Black Lives Matter, resonated with her vision for feminist planning. Roy had recently listened to Garza

> Talking about why black women's liberation matters. Why if black women are free, then everyone will be free. And she talks about how there's no such thing as trickle-down justice. It's about effervescence. But it sort of takes us back to bell hooks and how and why her response to Betty Friedan and white feminism was no, unless you can think about the most disadvantaged, and you can think about freedom in those terms, there will never be freedom. So that, I think, is a really important way of thinking about feminist planning.[457]

Clara Irazábal stated her emancipatory philosophy this way:

> [The women that made it] need to maintain this attitude of looking back to realize that beyond the white women there were other groups that were also on their ways but were tied to some barriers. That on their own, they couldn't. They needed allies on that other side of the fence. So that movement of looking back and figuring out who still remains without emancipation is something that as feminists, or as anybody interested in the realization of people, and social justice, need to maintain as a regular customary action.

[454] Ananya Roy, In Person, March 6, 2018.
[455] Isaac, interview.
[456] Anonymous 4, interview.
[457] Roy, interview.

> Look back, look back again, and look back again, and look back again. And almost always, perhaps, there's going to be yet another group that has been left behind that we could help support come through.[458]

Irazábal, like many of the interviewees of color highlighted in this section, does not foreground a feminist identity, or necessarily even ascribe to one. Yet in many ways, these women of color (supported by a growing coalition of white anti-racist and decolonial allies), are the scholars taking up the mantle of applying and furthering intersectional feminist ideals and emancipatory feminist praxis.

[458] Clara Irazábal, In Person, April 11, 2017.

Conclusion: A Way Forward for Feminist Planning

When I began my doctoral studies in 2014, I knew that I wanted to work on a project related to gender and planning. I had been steeped in women's activism during my career as an organizer, so when I pursued my master's in planning, many questions arose, such as why the "gender unit" in each of my introductory planning classes covered material that was primarily published in the 1980s. I tried to conceive of a dissertation project that researched some aspect of gender and the built environment, initially thinking it would be bounded by a particular planning issue or a particular geography. As I began to narrow down possible topics, however, I kept returning to the question: what happened to gender in planning?

This perceived "lack" of feminist scholarship framed my early research questions as I set about mapping out how gender had operated in planning discourse over time. As I began to research beyond the few texts commonly present in planning education, I realized that there was not so much a paucity of feminist scholarship in planning as much as there was a lack of visibility for these perspectives, beyond a few prominent feminist figures. (This certainly, I know now, can be at least partly attributed to the way that gender has been mainstreamed in planning education, but I wanted a stand-alone course!)

Informal conversations with my committee members early on, as well as coursework in feminist methods, helped me realize that analyzing scholarship would only tell a partial, and potentially misleading, story. I turned attention to the authors themselves in the hope that, with their help, I might be able to construct a history of gender perspectives in planning. What if I incorporated the first-hand perspectives and experiences of women planning scholars? What would institutional records add? As I started compiling these sources, I began to see a rich, multifaceted and, at times, contradictory history, rather than a lack of activity on gender in planning.

Women indelibly impacted the planning academy in a variety of ways. They influenced the issues considered in the field, particularly through activism and research related to social and community planning and broadened the perspectives through which planners view their

constituencies and values. They spearheaded institutional efforts for equity, forming an infrastructure of interest groups and committees that could push the academy to adopt normative organizational position statements and diversity criteria for program accreditation. However, the dominant organizing model growing out of early FWIG efforts focused on increasing participation in order to gain legitimacy (a liberal feminist model), and that trickle-down approach did not work for all women.

One of the main lessons from this history of women's activism in planning is that social change requires a variety of tactics; it takes radical agitators and incrementalists. The history of feminist planning (and of progressive politics in planning in general) teaches us that we need both people invested in institutions and we need people pushing from the outside. Without people from both sides of the spectrum, and everything in between, we will not be able to collectively hold the establishment or each other responsible. The important thing is to honor a shared vision by continuing to organize towards it, but also to honor differences (of positionality, of opinion, and of tactics) to see how we can help each other toward a common goal.

Secondly, feminist planning history highlights how the interdisciplinary nature of planning has gone in and out of focus. Though planning prides itself on being an inter-discipline, particularly since the 1960s and 70s when it created many possibilities for women, it seems to be going through a period of closing its ranks. This is due to a number of factors, including a desire to maintain the legitimacy of an interstitial field as it has ballooned over the last few decades, but it has borne out recently by creating extra burdens for women and scholars of color who are more likely to engage in activist, community-based research. While we must continue to promote and celebrate this work, we also have to be aware of the costs borne by those who maintain the connections between research and equitable practice through their scholarship and teaching.

Until recently, feminist planning focused primarily on binaries (between men and women, between white and non-white populations, between haves and have-nots). The concept of intersectionality, which legal scholar Kimberlé Crenshaw coined in 1991 to describe the overlapping and interlocking systems of oppression, has only recently gained traction in planning scholarship.[459] (Ironically, this comes at a time when many women's and gender studies scholars are debating whether the term is useful anymore because it has been overused and lost its initial

[459] Kimberlé Crenshaw, "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color," *Stanford Law Review*, 1991, 1241–1299.

focus on Black women's bodies.)[460] An intersectional analysis of the feminist literature and women's activism efforts in planning reveals that while feminist planners have at times acknowledged the multiplicity of women's identities and oppressions, there is much work to be done to consider their simultaneity and the contradictions that arise for the most marginalized.

Considering power inequities from an intersectional perspective leads us to the need for emancipatory politics. It is a moment of unique opportunity for anti-racist and decolonial feminists in planning. I recently participated in the 2020 ACSP conference, which featured a focus event on "Racial Equity and Justice in Urban Planning Research and Education in the Face of Racialized Inequality." The roundtable event at which I was a panelist, "Feminist Futures of Radical and Insurgent Planning," was co-sponsored by both FWIG and POCIG. Organized by two recent PhD graduates of color, Raksha Vasudevan and Magdalena Novoa Echaurren, and featuring a multi-racial and multi-generational panel of women and an audience of more than fifty people, the discussion centered around ways to engage liberatory feminist praxis in planning research and teaching. There was agreement that centering the voices, needs, skills, and agency of the most vulnerable populations will not only benefit everyone, but is the only way to proceed forward in a truly equitable fashion. Unlike in the 1970s and early 80s, when sessions on women's issues were attended by a handful of people and feminists felt like they were preaching to the choir, or in the 1990s and 2000s, when conference offerings primarily addressed career concerns, this panel garnered institutional support and a broad audience for a new type of feminism. While one roundtable event hardly represents consensus in the broader planning discipline, it is evidence of a sea change from previous decades and provides hope for continued organizing.

Transformative feminist change is possible, and although new strategies and tactics will be needed, there is also a great deal to build on. Institutional scaffolding has already been set up by women before us, and while we must be critical of it and wary of tendencies for retrenchment, it is a moment of great opportunity. We are again taking our cues from social movements: indigenous struggles, anti-colonial and abolitionist organizing, and the Black Lives Matter movement. Cisgender white women, like myself, must listen and take our lead from women and nonbinary people of color in the planning academy, allowing them to lead in a meaningful way,

[460] Jennifer C. Nash, "Re-Thinking Intersectionality," *Feminist Review* 89, no. 1 (June 1, 2008): 1–15.

not just a tokenistic way, while offering all the support we can muster so that marginalized folks are not the only ones doing the work.

Finally, we need to look beyond scholars or research that term themselves feminist when building intersectional feminist coalitions. Many of my interviewees, both white and non-white, pointed out that a feminist identity carries heavy baggage, particularly in planning, and that therefore not all feminist planners or feminist planning is labeled as such. We need to define our ideals, identify our broader coalition, and examine the potentiality of emancipatory politics through and within planning more urgently than we need to hold the particular term.

Bibliography

2MJQ, Black Advocate Planners, and Organisation for Environmental Growth. "First Annual 'Planners for Black Liberation' Conference (Formerly: Second Annual Planners for Equal Opportunity Conference)." Philadelphia, PA, March 16, 1968. Box 1, Folder 14. Planners for Equal Opportunity records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.

"2nd Annual Conference, Planners for Equal Opportunity." Conference Program. Philadelphia, PA, March 16, 1968. Planners for Equal Opportunity records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.

"21st Annual Conference, Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning." Conference Program. Baltimore, MD, October 13, 1979. US 90-6, Box 2, Folder 5.4. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.

"23rd Annual Conference, Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning." Conference Program. Washington, DC, October 22, 1981. US 90-6, Box 2, Folder 5.6. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.

"28th Annual Conference, Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning." Conference Program. Milwaukee, WI, October 10, 1986. US 90-6, Box 2, Folder 5.11. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.

"31st Annual Meeting, Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning." Conference Program. Portland, OR, October 4, 1989. US 90-6, Box 2, Folder 5.14. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.

1987-89 Committee on the Recruitment and Retention of Women and Minorities in Planning Education. "The Recruitment and Retention of Faculty Women and Faculty of Color in Planning Education: Survey Results." *Update*, 1990. US 98-1, Box 4, Folder 38. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.

———. "The Recruitment and Retention of Faculty Women and Faculty of Color in Planning Education: Survey Results." Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning, April 1990. US 01-15, Box 1, Folder 20. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.

"Accepting the Challenge: Gender, Race & Disability in Urban Planning Education." Conference Program. Los Angeles, CA, May 16, 1987. US 98-1, Box 3, Folder 22. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.

"ACSP/POCIG Committee Volunteers," 2009. June Manning Thomas Personal Papers.

Ahmed, Sara. *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2012.

American Institute of Planners. "Woman's Rights Policy Paper Committee," n.d. Box 3, Folder 34. American Planning Association records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.

American Planning Association. "Report of the Task Force on Minorities and Women," April 18, 1984. Box 63, Folder 12. American Planning Association records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.

American Society of Planning Officials. “National Planning Conference.” Conference Program. New York, April 1970. Box 69, Folder 3. American Planning Association records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
Anderson, Kathryn, and Dana C. Jack. “Learning to Listen: Interview Techniques and Analyses.” In *Women’s Words: The Feminist Practice of Oral History*, edited by Sherna Berger. Gluck and Daphne Patai, 11–26. New York: Routledge, 1991.
Anonymous 1. In Person, January 25, 2017.
Anonymous 2. In Person, October 25, 2019.
Anonymous 3. Zoom, November 6, 2019.
Anonymous 4. In Person, October 25, 2019.
Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning. “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting.” Minneapolis, MN, May 5, 1984. US 94-3, Box 1, Folder 2. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
———. “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting.” Montreal, April 20, 1985. US 94-3, Box 1, Folder 2. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
———. “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting.” Los Angeles, CA, April 5, 1986. US 98-1, Box 1, Folder 27. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
———. “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting.” Milwaukee, WI, October 9, 1986. US 98-1, Box 1, Folder 27. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
———. “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting.” New York, NY, April 26, 1987. US 90-6, Box 1, Folder 1.4c. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
———. “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting.” Los Angeles, CA, November 5, 1987. US 98-1, Box 1, Folder 27. Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning records, Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
———. “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting.” San Antonio, TX, May 1, 1988. US 90-6, Box 1, Folder 1.4c. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
———. “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting.” Buffalo, NY, October 27, 1988. US 98-1, Box 1, Folder 27. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
———. “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting.” Denver, CO, April 22, 1990. US 98-1, Box 1, Folder 27. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
———. “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting.” Austin, TX, November 1, 1990. US 94-3, Box 1, Folder 1. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
———. “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting.” Chicago, IL, November 16, 1991. US 98-1, Box 1, Folder 27. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
———. “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting.” Columbus, OH, October 29, 1992. US 98-1, Box 4, Folder 16. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
———. “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting.” Philadelphia, PA, October 28, 1993. US 98-1, Box 4, Folder 16. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
———. “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting.” San Francisco, CA, April 16, 1994. US 98-1, Box 4, Folder 11. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
———. “Minutes of the Executive Committee Meeting.” Detroit, MI, October 19, 1995. US 98-1, Box 5, Folder 40. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
———. *The History & Future of ACSP*, 2018. https://youtu.be/KSEEu4Smuh8.
“Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning Conference.” Conference Program. Kansas City, Kansas, October 8, 1977. US 94-3, Box 1, Folder 1. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.

Ballou, Patricia K. *Women: A Bibliography of Bibliographies*. 2nd ed. G.K. Hall Women's Studies Publications. Boston, MA: G.K. Hall & Co., 1986.
Barrett, Carol D. "Women's Experience with Harassment and Discrimination on the Job: A Report to the American Planning Association Board of Directors." San Antonio, TX: Task Force on Women and Minorities, April 1988. Box 63, Folder 12. American Planning Association records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
Bauman, John F. *Public Housing, Race, and Renewal: Urban Planning in Philadelphia, 1920-1974*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1987.
Berkeley, Ellen Perry., and Matilda. McQuaid. *Architecture: A Place for Women*. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1989.
Birch, Eugenie Ladner. "An Urban View: Catherine Bauer's Five Questions." In *The American Planner: Biographies and Recollections*, edited by Donald A. Krueckeberg, 2nd ed., 311–43. 1989. Reprint, New Brunswick, N.J.: Center for Urban Policy Research, 1994.
———. "From Civic Worker to City Planner: Women and Planning, 1890-1980." In *The American Planner: Biographies and Recollections*, edited by Donald A. Krueckeberg, 2nd ed., 469–506. 1983. Reprint, New Brunswick, N.J.: Center for Urban Policy Research, 1994.
———, ed. *The Unsheltered Woman: Women and Housing in the 80s*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University, 1985.
———. "Woman-Made America The Case of Early Public Housing Policy." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 44, no. 2 (April 1978): 130–44.
———. In Person, April 15, 2018.
———. In Person, April 15, 2018.
Boyer, M. Christine. *Dreaming the Rational City: The Myth of American City Planning*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1983.
Cahn, Elizabeth. "Project Space(s) in the Design Professions: An Intersectional Feminist Study of the Women's School of Planning and Architecture (1974-1981)." Dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst, 2014.
Canning, Kathleen. "Feminist History after the Linguistic Turn: Historicizing Discourse and Experience." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 19, no. 2 (January 1994): 368–404.
Charmaz, Kathy. *Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide through Qualitative Analysis*. London ; Thousand Oaks: SAGE, 2006.
Coatsworth, Patricia A., ed. "Women and Urban Planning: A Bibliography." Office of Policy Development and Research, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1981.
Committee on the Retention and Recruitment of Women/Minority Faculty and Students. "Request for Research Funds from the ACSP Executive Board," October 20, 1988. US 90-6, Box 1, Folder 1.4c. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
Crenshaw, Kimberlé. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review*, 1991, 1241–1299.
Dalton, Linda, Catherine Ross, Deborah Howe, Nancey Green Leigh, and Sandi Rosenbloom. "Letter to ACSP Session Moderators and Discussants," October 12, 1994. US 98-1, Box 4, Folder 25. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.

Davidoff, Paul. “Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning.” In *Readings in Planning Theory*, edited by Susan S. Fainstein and Scott Campbell, 3rd ed., 544–55. 1965. Reprint, Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.
Dewar, Margaret. In Person, February 17, 2018.
———. In Person, February 17, 2018.
Dubrow, Gail, and Sue Hendler. “Proposal for a Panel Session: Feminist Research Methods in Planning,” 1995. FWIG binder.
Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I. Fretz, and Linda L. Shaw. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011.
Faculty Women’s Interest Group. “Guidelines for Incorporating Issues of Gender and Ethnicity into Planning Education and Research,” 1995. US 01-15, Box 1, Folder 20. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
———. “Report to the ACSP Executive Committee,” April 1993. US 01-15, Box 1, Folder 19. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
———. “Report to the ACSP Executive Committee,” April 1994. US 01-15, Box 1, Folder 20. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
———. “Report to the ACSP Executive Committee,” November 1994. US 98-1, Box 4, Folder 11. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
Fainstein, Norman, and Susan S. Fainstein. *Urban Political Movements: The Search for Power by Minority Groups in American Cities*. Englewood Cliffs, NY: Prentice Hall, 1974.
Fainstein, Susan S. “Feminism and Planning: Theoretical Issues.” In *Gender and Planning: A Reader*, edited by Susan S. Fainstein and Lisa J. Servon, 120–38. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2005.
———. In Person, April 20, 2018.
Fathy, Ann T. “Letter to American Society of Planning Officials,” September 14, 1970. Box 3, Folder 34. American Planning Association records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
Feiss, Carl. “The Foundations of Federal Planning Assistance A Personal Account of the 701 Program.” *Journal of the American Planning Association* 51, no. 2 (1985): 175–84.
Feld, Marsha Marker. “Memo to Faculty Women,” February 1987. FWIG binder.
Feminist Planners and Designers Group and Minority Association of Planners and Architects, Graduate School of Architecture and Urban Planning, UCLA. “Resolution,” November 5, 1987. US 98-1, Box 3, Folder 22. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
Fisher, Peter. “Letter to Catherine Ross,” March 13, 1992. US 98-1, Box 4, Folder 36. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
Forester, John. “Learning from Practice Stories: The Priority of Practical Judgment.” In *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*, edited by Frank Fischer and John Forester, 186–209. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1993.
Forsyth, Ann. “Queerying Planning Practice: Understanding Non-Conformist Populations.” In *Queerying Planning: Challenging Heteronormative Assumptions and Reframing Planning Practice*, edited by Petra L. Doan, 21–52. Farnham, Surrey ; Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2011.
———. In Person, January 12, 2017.
———. In Person, January 12, 2017.

Freeman, Lance. *A Haven and a Hell: The Ghetto in Black America*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2019.
Fullilove, Mindy Thompson. *Root Shock: How Tearing Up City Neighborhoods Hurts America, and What We Can Do About It*. New York: Ballantine, 2004.
Galindo, Yvette, Mary Beth Welch, and Susie Wirka. "Accepting the Challenge: Gender, Race & Disability in Urban Planning Education: Steps Towards Achieving a Student and Professional Body Representative of the Population at Large," November 5, 1987. US 98-1, Box 3, Folder 22. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
García, Ivis, April Jackson, Stacy A. Harwood, and Andrew J. Greenlee. "'Like a Fish out of Water': The Experience of African American and Latinx Planning Students." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, July 1, 2020, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/01944363.2020.1777184.
Garcia, Margot. Member Communication. "Letter to FWIG Members." Member Communication, June 17, 1991. FWIG binder.
———. Member Communication. "Letter to FWIG Members." Member Communication, October 14, 1992. FWIG binder.
Gluck, Sherna Berger., and Daphne Patai, eds. *Women's Words: The Feminist Practice of Oral History*. New York: Routledge, 1991.
Green Leigh, Nancey, and Linda Keyes. "Proposal to Establish the Margarita McCoy Award under the Sponsorship of the Faculty Women's Interest Group of ACSP." Philadelphia, PA, October 1993. FWIG binder.
Greer, Marsha. "Planning Education: Recruitment of Faculty Women and Faculty of Color." University of Oregon, 1990.
Hanson, Susan, and Geraldine Pratt. "Spatial Dimentions of the Gender Division of Labor in a Local Labor Market." *Urban Geography* 9, no. 2 (March 1988): 180–202.
Hapgood, Karen, and Judith Getzels. "Planning, Women, and Change." ASPO Planning Advisory Service Report. Chicago, 1974.
Hayden, Dolores. "Nurturing: Home, Mom, and Apple Pie." In *Readings in Planning Theory*, edited by Susan S. Fainstein and Scott Campbell, 3rd ed., 358–83. 1984. Reprint, Chichester ; New York: Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.
———. *Redesigning the American Dream: The Future of Housing, Work, and Family Life*. W. W. Norton & Company, 2002.
———. "The Egalitarian Future and the Feminist Past." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 49, no. 2 (June 30, 1983): 182–182.
———. *The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Designs for American Homes, Neighborhoods, and Cities*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1981.
———. "Two Utopian Feminists and Their Campaigns for Kitchenless Houses." *Signs* 4, no. 2 (1978): 274–90.
———. "What Would a Nonsexist City Be Like?: Speculations on Housing, Urban Design, and Human Work." In *Gender and Planning: A Reader*, edited by Susan S. Fainstein and Lisa J. Servon, 47–64. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2005.
———. In Person, January 13, 2017.
Hayden, Dolores, and Gwendolyn Wright. "Review Essay: Architecture and Urban Planning." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 1, no. 4 (July 1, 1976): 923–33.
Hirt, Sonia A. *Zoned in the USA: The Origins and Implications of American Land-Use Regulation*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2014.

Hoffman, Lily M. *The Politics of Knowledge: Activist Movements in Medicine and Planning*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1989.
Howe, Deborah, and Janet Hammer. "EnGendering Change: Impacts of the Faculty Women's Interest Group on the Planning Academy." Draft, 2002.
Huxtable, Ada Louise. "Cities Getting Full Hearing in Capital." *New York Times*, October 3, 1967.
"Initial Charter Membership - City Planners for Civil Rights." Membership Roster. New York, July 22, 1964. 3943, Box 2, Folder 3. Planners for Equal Opportunity records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
Innes, Judith E. "Report of the Commission on the Doctorate in Planning to the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning: An Overview." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 12, no. 2 (January 1, 1993): 168–71.
———. In Person, February 22, 2017.
Innes, Judith E., Leland Burns, Gary Hack, Susan Handy, Michael Hibbard, Jonathan Levine, Seymour Mandelbaum, and Biswapriya Sanyal. "Report of the Commission on the Doctorate in Planning to the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning," October 30, 1992. US 02-4, Box 1. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
Irazábal, Clara. In Person, April 11, 2017.
Isaac, Claudia. In Person, April 23, 2019.
Jackson, April, Ivis Garcia-Zambrana, Andrew J. Greenlee, C. Aujean Lee, and Benjamin Chrisinger. "All Talk No Walk: Student Perceptions on Integration of Diversity and Practice in Planning Programs." *Planning Practice & Research* 33, no. 5 (October 20, 2018): 574–95.
Kantor, Harvey A. "Benjamin C. Marsh and the Fight over Population Congestion." *Journal of the American Institute of Planners* 40, no. 6 (November 1, 1974): 422–29.
Kaufman, Jerome. "Letter to Diana Donald," November 10, 1972. Box 3, Folder 34. American Planning Association records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
Keller, Suzanne Infeld, ed. *Building for Women*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1981.
Kennedy, Marie. In Person, March 8, 2018.
Kerber, Linda K. *Toward an Intellectual History of Women*. Gender and American Culture. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997.
Krueckeberg, Donald A., ed. *Introduction to Planning History in the United States*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University, 1983.
Lauria, Mickey. "ACSP at 50: Introduction." *The Town Planning Review* 81, no. 2 (2010): I,II.
Leavitt, Jacqueline. "Charlotta A. Bass, the California Eagle, and Black Settlement in Los Angeles." In *Urban Planning and the African American Community: In the Shadows*, edited by June Manning Thomas and Marsha Ritzdorf, 167–86. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997.
———. "Feminist Advocacy Planning in the 1980s." In *Strategic Perspectives on Planning Practice*, edited by Barry Checkoway, 181–94. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1986.
———. "Gendered Planning: Inside/Out?" *Critical Planning Journal* 6, no. Spring (1999): 110–13.
———. "Planning and Women, Women in Planning." Dissertation, Columbia University, 1980.

———. “The Urban Underground Resurfaces: Statement Prepared for the People at a Public Hearing of the New York City Planning Commission, May 13, 1970.” New York, NY, May 13, 1970.
———. “Where’s the Gender in Community Development?” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 29, no. 1 (September 1, 2003): 207–31.
———. “Women in Planning: There’s More to Affirmative Action than Gaining Access.” In *New Space for Women*, edited by Gerda R. Wekerle, Rebecca Peterson, and David Morley, 219–34. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1980.
Leavitt, Jacqueline, and Susan Saegert. *From Abandonment to Hope: Community-Households in Harlem*. Columbia History of Urban Life. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.
———. “Women and Abandoned Buildings: A Feminist Approach to Housing.” *Social Policy* 15, no. 1 (Summer 1984): 32–39.
Lee, C. Aujean, Benjamin Chrisinger, Andrew J. Greenlee, Ivis Garcia Zambrana, and April Jackson. “Beyond Recruitment: Comparing Experiences of Climate and Diversity between International Students and Domestic Students of Color in U.S. Urban Planning Programs.” *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, March 12, 2020. http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0739456X20902241.
Leigh, Nancey Green. “Email to FWIG Listserv,” June 24, 1996. US 01-15, Box 1, Folder 20. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
———. “Letter to Catherine Ross,” April 6, 1995. US 98-1, Box 4, Folder 10. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
———. Member Communication. “Letter to FWIG Members.” Member Communication, February 20, 1992. FWIG binder.
———. Member Communication. “Letter to FWIG Members.” Member Communication, August 21, 1995. US 01-15, Box 1, Folder 20. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
———. “Report to the ACSP Executive Board.” Orlando, FL, April 13, 1996. US 01-15, Box 1, Folder 20. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
———. “The Faculty Women’s Interest Group Toronto Conference Report.” *Update*, 1996. US 01-15, Box 1, Folder 23. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
Leonard, Jonathan S. “Women and Affirmative Action.” *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 3, no. 1 (February 1989): 61–75.
Lewis, Robert J. “Planners Hear Dissidents Blast Government Programs.” *Washington Evening Star*, October 5, 1967.
Little, Jo, Linda Peake, and Pat Richardson, eds. *Women in Cities: Gender and the Urban Environment*. New York: New York University Press, 1988.
Lung-Amam, Willow, Stacy Anne Harwood, Gerardo Francisco Sandoval, and Siddhartha Sen. “Teaching Equity and Advocacy Planning in a Multicultural ‘Post-Racial’ World.” *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 35, no. 3 (September 1, 2015): 337–42.
Macris, Marjorie. “Beginnings of the Women and Planning Division of the American Planning Association.” American Planning Association. Accessed May 24, 2017. https://women.planning.org/about/history-division/.
“Mainstreaming Issues of Gender and Ethnicity into the Planning Curriculum.” Conference Program. Columbus, OH, October 29, 1992. FWIG binder.
Mandelbaum, Seymour. “Letter to Jerry Kaufman and Sandi Rosenbloom,” May 14, 1993. US 98-1, Box 6, Folder 7. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.

Jewish Women's Archive. "Marcia Marker Feld." Accessed August 30, 2018. https://jwa.org/people/feld-marcia.
Marcuse, Peter. "Housing in Early City Planning." *Journal of Urban History* 6, no. 2 (February 1980): 153–76.
Markusen, Ann. In Person, February 7, 2017.
———. In Person, February 7, 2017.
Markusen, Ann R. "City Spatial Structure, Women's Household Work, and National Urban Policy." *Signs* 5, no. 3 (1980): S23–44.
———. "The Economics of the Women's Movement." *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies* 1, no. 1 (1975): 42–52.
Marsh, Benjamin C. *An Introduction to City Planning: Democracy's Challenge and the American City*. New York, 1909.
Maynard, Robert. "City Planners Tour Two Washingtons." *Washington Post*, October 5, 1967.
Meyer, Eugene L. "Planners Told to Do More for the Poor." *Philadelphia Bulletin*, October 4, 1967.
Milroy, Beth Moore. "Taking Stock of Planning, Space, and Gender." *Journal of Planning Literature* 6, no. 1 (August 1, 1991): 3–15.
———. In Person, February 10, 2017.
———. In Person, February 10, 2017.
"Minutes from the FWIG Meeting of the ACSP." Austin, TX, November 4, 1990. FWIG binder.
"Minutes of the Business Meeting of the Faculty Women's Interest Group." Philadelphia, PA, October 30, 1993. FWIG binder.
"Minutes of the Business Meeting of the Faculty Women's Interest Group." Phoenix, AZ, November 6, 1994. FWIG binder.
"Minutes of the First Meeting of the Faculty Women's Interest Group." Milwaukee, WI, October 12, 1986. FWIG Binder.
"Minutes of the FWIG Annual Meeting." Columbus, OH, November 1, 1992. FWIG binder.
"Minutes of the FWIG Business Meeting." Portland, OR, October 7, 1989. FWIG binder.
"Minutes of the FWIG Business Meeting." Detroit, MI, October 20, 1995. FWIG binder.
"Minutes of the Task Force on Women and Minorities for American Planning Association." New York, July 28, 1983. Box 63, Folder 12. American Planning Association records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
"Minutes of the Women's Special Interest Group." Buffalo, NY, October 30, 1988. FWIG Binder.
Nash, Jennifer C. "Re-Thinking Intersectionality." *Feminist Review* 89, no. 1 (June 1, 2008): 1–15.
"National Conference on Advocacy and Pluralistic Planning." Conference Program. New York, N.Y., January 10, 1969. Box 2, Folder 5. Planners for Equal Opportunity records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
Nieves, Angel David. *An Architecture of Education: African American Women Design the New South*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2018.
Peattie, Lisa. "Reflections on Advocacy Planning." Ann Arbor, MI, 1967.
Planners for Equal Opportunity. "PEO Annual Meeting Conference Drafting Workshops," July 9, 1969. Box 1, Folder 6. Planners for Equal Opportunity records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.

———. “Planning: Black and White Today.” Poster. Washington, D.C., October 1, 1967. Box 1, Folder 17. Planners for Equal Opportunity records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
———. “Planning Group Stages Rival Convention.” Press Release. Washington, D.C., n.d. Box 1, Folder 17. Planners for Equal Opportunity records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
———. “Platform for Candidates for AIP Office Accepting PEO Endorsements,” April 9, 1969. Box 1, Folder 24. Planners for Equal Opportunity records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
———. “Rebels Challenge A.I.P. to Take a Strong Stand.” Press Release. Washington, D.C., October 3, 1967. Box 1, Folder 16. Planners for Equal Opportunity records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
———. “Resolution to AIP Board of Governors.” Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, October 15, 1968. Box 1, Folder 19. Planners for Equal Opportunity records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
Planners of Color Interest Group. “2011-16 Strategic Plan,” September 30, 2011. June Manning Thomas Personal Papers.
Planning Accreditation Board. “Accreditation Criteria Changes in The Accreditation Document Approved.” Washington, DC, May 7, 1992. US 98-1, Box 4, Folder 36. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
“Planning Accreditation Standards on Diversity: The Framework for Change.” Conference Program. Philadelphia, PA, October 28, 1993. FWIG binder.
Planners Network. “Progressive Planning Profile: Jacqueline Leavitt,” January 3, 2008. http://www.plannersnetwork.org/2008/01/progressive-planning-profile-jacqueline-leavitt/.
“Proposal for the Establishment of an ACSP Women’s Interest Group,” April 1987. US 98-1, Box 3, Folder 26. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
Radical Education Project. “Letting the Cat out of the City Planning Bag.” *Radicals in the Professions Newsletter*, August 1968. University of Michigan Special Collections.
———. “What White Response to Black Rebellions?” *Radicals in the Professions Newsletter*, May 1968. University of Michigan Special Collections.
Ritzdorf, Marsha. “A Feminist Analysis of Gender and Residential Zoning in the United States.” In *Women and the Environment*, edited by Irwin Altman and Arza Churchman, 255–79. Human Behavior and Environment 13. New York: Springer US, 1994.
———. “Family Values, Municipal Zoning, and African American Family Life.” In *Urban Planning and the African American Community: In the Shadows*, edited by June Manning Thomas and Marsha Ritzdorf, 75–89. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997.
———. “Feminist Contributions to Ethics and Planning Theory.” In *Planning Ethics: A Reader in Planning Theory, Practices, and Education*, edited by Sue Hendler, 104–19. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Urban Policy Research, 1995.
———. “Letter to Catherine Ross,” August 29, 1988. US 98-1, Box 3, Folder 22. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
———. “Session Proposal: Persistent Problems for Women Faculty and Faculty of Color in Planning Programs,” 1994. FWIG binder.
———. “Sex, Lies, and Urban Life: How Municipal Planning Marginalizes African American Women and Their Families.” In *Gendering the City: Women, Boundaries, and Visions of*

Urban Life, edited by Kristine B. Miranne and Alma H. Young, 169–82. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2000.
———. Memo. "To Women in ACSP Schools and Those Who Attended the Meeting in Milwaukee." Memo, n.d. FWIG binder.
———. "Zoning Barriers to Housing Innovation." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 4, no. 3 (April 1, 1985): 177–84.
Roberts, Andrea R. "The Farmers' Improvement Society and the Women's Barnyard Auxiliary of Texas: African American Community Building in the Progressive Era." *Journal of Planning History* 16, no. 3 (August 2017): 222–45.
Rosenbloom, Sandra. "1994 Edition of Resume Book of Women - and People of Color - Seeking Teaching Positions," December 6, 1993. FWIG binder.
———. "Women's Travel Issues: The Research and Policy Environment." In *Gender and Planning: A Reader*, edited by Susan S. Fainstein and Lisa J. Servon, 235–55. 1978. Reprint, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2005.
———. Phone, July 25, 2016.
———. In Person, November 2, 2016.
Ross, Catherine. "The Influence of Race and Gender on Perceptions of Community Impact." *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 5, no. 2 (June 1, 1985): 169–79.
Ross, Catherine L. "Increasing Minority and Female Representation in the Profession: A Call for Diversity." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 9, no. 2 (January 1990): 135–38.
Rothman, Sheila M. *Woman's Proper Place: A History of Changing Ideals and Practices, 1870 to the Present*. New York: Basic Books, 1978.
Roy, Ananya. In Person, March 6, 2018.
Saegert, Susan. "Masculine Cities and Feminine Suburbs: Polarized Ideas, Contradictory Realities." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 5, no. s3 (January 1980): S96.
Sandercock, Leonie, and Ann Forsyth. "A Gender Agenda: New Directions for Planning Theory." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 58, no. 1 (March 31, 1992): 49–59.
———. "Feminist Theory and Planning Theory: The Epistemological Linkages." *Planning Theory*, no. 7/8 (1992): 45–49.
Scott, Joan W. "The Evidence of Experience." *Critical Inquiry* 17, no. 4 (July 1991): 773–97.
Sicherman, Barbara, E. William Monter, Joan Wallach Scott, and Kathryn Kish Sklar. *Recent United States Scholarship on the History of Women*. Washington, DC: American Historical Association, 1980.
Simkhovitch, Mary Kingsbury. *Here Is God's Plenty: Reflections on American Social Advance*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949.
Spain, Daphne. *Constructive Feminism: Women's Spaces and Women's Rights in the American City*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2016.
Spain, Daphne. *Gendered Spaces*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1992.
Spain, Daphne. *How Women Saved the City*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2001.
———. "Octavia Hill's Philosophy of Housing Reform: From British Roots to American Soil." *Journal of Planning History* 5, no. 2 (May 1, 2006): 106–25.
———. In Person, January 31, 2017.
———. In Person, January 31, 2017.

Standing Committee on Diversity in Planning Education. “Fifth Annual Report to the ACSP Executive Committee,” November 3, 1994. US 98-1, Box 4, Folder 11. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
Stephen Ward. “Archival Research.” In *Researching the City*, edited by Kevin Ward, 24–37. Los Angeles: Sage, 2014.
Stimpson, Catharine R. *Women’s Studies in the United States*. New York, N.Y.: Ford Foundation, 1986.
Stimpson, Catharine R., Elsa Dixler, Martha J. Nelson, and Kathryn B. Yatrakis, eds. *Women and the American City*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
Stoloff, David. “Report on the AIP Task Force,” December 23, 1968. Box 1, Folder 24. Planners for Equal Opportunity records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
Sutton, Sharon E. *When Ivory Towers Were Black: A Story about Race in America’s Cities and Universities*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2017.
Sweet, Elizabeth L. In Person, April 19, 2018.
———. In Person, April 19, 2018.
“Third Annual Report of the Standing Committee on the Representation of Women and Persons of Color in Planning Education.” ACSP Executive Board, October 29, 1992. US 01-15, Box 1, Folder 11. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
Thomas, June Manning. “Josephine Gomon Plans for Detroit’s Rehabilitation.” *Journal of Planning History* 17, no. 2 (May 2018): 97–117.
Thomas, June Manning. “Memorandum to ACSP Diversity Committee Members,” November 20, 1994. US 98-1, Box 4, Folder 17. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
Thomas, June Manning. “Model Cities Revisited: Issues of Race and Empowerment.” In *Urban Planning and the African American Community: In the Shadows*, edited by June Manning Thomas and Marsha Ritzdorf, 143–63. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997.
———. “Neighborhood Response to Redevelopment in Detroit.” *Community Development Journal* 20, no. 2 (1985): 89–98.
———. “Personal Correspondence,” October 20, 2020.
———. “Planning History and the Black Urban Experience: Linkages and Contemporary Implications.” *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 14, no. 1 (1994): 1–11.
———. *Redevelopment and Race: Planning a Finer City in Postwar Detroit*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.
———. “Socially Responsible Practice: The Battle to Reshape the American Institute of Planners.” *Journal of Planning History*, September 27, 2018, 1–24.
Thomas, June Manning, and Marsha Ritzdorf, eds. *Urban Planning and the African American Community: In the Shadows*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997.
Tochterman, Brian. “Theorizing Neoliberal Urban Development: A Genealogy from Richard Florida to Jane Jacobs.” *Radical History Review*, no. 112 (2012): 65–87.
“Twenty-Sixth Annual Conference, Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning.” Conference Program. New York, N.Y., October 19, 1984. US 90-6, Box 2, Folder 5.9. Archives and Rare Books Library, University of Cincinnati.
Umemoto, Karen. In Person, March 13, 2018.
Unknown. “Handwritten Notes on FWIG Annual Meeting.” Austin, TX, November 4, 1990. FWIG binder.

———. “Handwritten Notes on FWIG Annual Meeting.” Columbus, OH, November 1, 1992. FWIG binder.
Vale, Lawrence J. *After the Projects: Public Housing Redevelopment and the Governance of the Poorest Americans*. Oxford University Press, 2018.
Weisman, Leslie. *Discrimination by Design: A Feminist Critique of the Man-Made Environment*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1992.
Wekerle, Gerda R. “From Refuge to Service Center: Neighborhoods That Support Women.” *Sociological Focus* 18, no. 2 (April 1, 1985): 79–95.
———. “Women House Themselves.” *Heresies: A Feminist Publication on Art and Politics* 3, no. 3 (1981): 14–17.
———. “Women in the Urban Environment.” *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 5, no. 3 (Spring 1980): 188–214.
———. In Person, February 9, 2017.
———. In Person, February 9, 2017.
Wekerle, Gerda R., Rebecca Peterson, and David Morley, eds. *New Space for Women*. Westview Special Studies on Women in Contemporary Society. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1980.
Williams, Rhonda Y. *The Politics of Public Housing: Black Women’s Struggles against Urban Inequality*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
Williamson, Jane. *New Feminist Scholarship: A Guide to Bibliographies*. Old Westbury, NY: The Feminist Press, 1979.
Wirka, Susan Marie. “Housing: Mary Kingsbury Simkhovitch.” In *The American Planner: Biographies and Recollections*, edited by Donald A. Krueckeberg, 2nd ed., 85–112. New Brunswick, N.J.: Center for Urban Policy Research, 1994.
———. “The City Social Movement: Progressive Women Reformers and Early Social Planning.” In *Planning the Twentieth-Century American City*, edited by Mary Corbin Sies and Christopher Silver, 55–75. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.
Wolch, Jennifer R. “Residential Location of the Service-Dependent Poor.” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 70, no. 3 (September 1980): 330–41.
Women and Geography Study Group of the IBG. *Geography and Gender: An Introduction to Feminist Geography*. London ; Dover, NH: Hutchinson in association with Explorations in Feminism Collective, 1984.
“Women and Planning: A Condemnation.” Press Release, April 6, 1970. Box 3, Folder 50. Planners for Equal Opportunity records, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library.
Women in Architecture, Landscape Architecture and Planning. “An Open Letter to Members of the Harvard Graduate School of Design Association,” June 15, 1972. Ellen Perry Berkeley personal papers.
Women in Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and Planning. “By-Laws,” n.d. Ellen Perry Berkeley personal papers.
———. “The Case for Flexible Work Schedules.” *Architectural Forum* 137, no. 2 (September 1, 1972): 53–66.
Women in Environmental Planning and Design. “Letter to Dean Kilbridge, Graduate School of Design, Harvard University,” February 4, 1972. Ellen Perry Berkeley personal papers.
———. “Women in Architecture, Landscape Architecture, and City Planning in the Boston-Cambridge or Suburban Area,” February 1972. Ellen Perry Berkeley personal papers.

Women's School of Planning and Architecture. "Draft Statement of WSPA Goals and Policies," n.d. Box 1, Folder 14. Women's School of Planning and Architecture Records, Sophia Smith Collection of Women's History, Smith College.
Wright, Gwendolyn. *Moralism and the Model Home: Domestic Architecture and Cultural Conflict in Chicago, 1873-1913*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
Yonder, Ayse. In Person, January 20, 2017.
Zapata, Marisa A., and Lisa K. Bates. "Equity Planning Revisited." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 35, no. 3 (September 1, 2015): 245–48.