

The Workshop or the Home? Gender Visions in the History of Urban Built Environments: Canada and the United States

Maureen A. Flanagan
Michigan State University

In 1994, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) held a conference in Paris titled “Women in the City: Housing, Services and the Urban Environment.” The proposal for the conference boldly stated that “A major aim of this Conference is to accord higher visibility to women’s ‘vision of the city’...in order to take more into account their views and contributions to urban society.”¹ The conference’s sessions and presentations all highlighted the idea that women have a particular *vision* of the city. Women social scientists in Canada, the United States, and Europe have been actively supporting this proposition. They argue that “women experience cities differently...because of the gender asymmetries that are embedded in distinct institutions and local institutional relations”; that “planning and policy making have historically been the province of white, upper-middle-class men, and the decisions that have been made reflect the interests and experiences of this group”; and that urban space and the built environment must be acknowledged as social constructs that reflect “the dominant thinking about women and families.” Social scientists concerned with the issue of gender and cities quite simply assert that the city is gendered because it has been “historically designed by men and for men.”² While some recent work in U.S. and Canadian urban history does bring women more centrally into the consideration of urban issues than did previous work, overall it depicts the city as a place and space constructed within a supposedly normative, unitary, gender-neutral vision.³

A major purpose of this essay, therefore, is to apply the insights of contemporary social science inquiries, as well as the issues raised at the OECD conference, to investigate the historical formation of a gendered urban built environment. It does not pretend to be definitive, but rather suggestive of the possibilities for such a re-envisioning of the urban built environment. It does not attempt to show a clear historical progression, but of necessity for an essay and not a book, it takes representative examples across place and time as evidence for its main arguments. It is an attempt to rethink the city along the lines proposed by Canadian urban geographer Suzanne MacKenzie:

[I]n order to understand the importance of changing gender roles to the constitution and change of city form and urban process, we must examine the city from the perspective of the relationship between production and reproduction...[we must look at cities as] concrete but mutable systems which provide resources for production and reproduction.⁴

To this I would add that we must look at the historical processes by which the productive world of work has been segregated from the reproductive world of the home in the urban environment. Such a segregation of daily lived experiences continues to be reflected in the construction of the built environment of cities—and suburbs. The specifics of this vision of the city change over time to reflect historical context, but a gendered vision of the city's built environment continues to shape urban space and its access and use.⁵

The introductory essay to the volume *Gender and the Built Environment* outlines the necessity of a “gender aware approach to the built environment” for the contemporary city. Two of the important elements of such an approach are: that there must be an integral approach “in which housing, living environment, level of provisions and facilities, transportation and employment are dealt with as a whole”; and that cities must adopt “an approach, directed at improving a district, neighbourhood or village as *a place where people spend their lives*” [emphasis mine].⁶ As this essay will discuss, in the early twentieth century, women in Canada and the United States who were concerned with urban problems conceptualized reform as rooted in just such an approach. As this essay also discusses, their agendas were almost invariably countered by male reformers holding to a very different understanding of the city, its problems, and how to solve them.

Historians always need a place in time to start their investigations and the decades of the later nineteenth through the early twentieth century provide a propitious place to begin for considering the subject matter of this essay. It was in that time period that the effects of industrial development (production) on the urban built environment—rapid growth, conspicuous poverty, miserable housing, lack of adequate sanitation facilities, among other problems—moved many urban residents to think strategically about how to reform their cities. At the same time, the earlier town-specific focus of planning moved toward developing a profession of urban planning which promised a comprehensive approach to relieving all cities from such conditions. In the United States, the first National Conference on City Planning met in 1909; in 1917, planning professionals officially organized the American City Planning Institute. In

Canada, town-planning commissions were functioning in cities by the early twentieth century, the Commission of Conservation had been formed in 1909, and in 1919 men already involved in these local initiatives formed a town-planning institute. Canadian planners often invited American city planners to speak and to help them draft plans for Canadian cities. In May 1919, the 11th annual Conference on City Planning was a joint Canadian/U.S. affair, with the meetings taking place in Niagara Falls, Ontario, and Buffalo, New York. In these early years, in both countries, planners were architects, landscape architects, health professionals, and engineers as there was not yet an official profession called urban planning.⁷

Urban planning as a profession underwent its own changes and developments over time, but my purpose here is not to engage with those issues.⁸ Rather, it is to examine U.S. and Canadian urbanization processes during that period in which industrial production separated the work place from the residential: the workshop from the home; the productive from the reproductive spaces; the public world from the private. Perforce, at this earlier time, men controlled the city—they wielded virtually all the political and economic power. They might, and often did, listen to middle-class women’s organizations, but felt little obligation to do so, or to satisfy women’s demands, if they disagreed with women.⁹ What male planners, politicians, and businessmen proposed was to reorder and control urban growth by embedding the separation of the public world of the city (the productive domain) from the private world of the home (the reproductive domain) in a new vision of the physical spatial arrangements of the urban environment. Evidence from a variety of sources also clearly suggests that when men spoke of a home-centered city, they meant one in which the home was *separated* from the work spaces of the city, so that the male worker could enjoy the benefits of a stable family situation. Many women, on the other hand, were trying to make the point that the public and private spaces of the city could not be separated: what happened in public affected the private sphere of the home, so reforming the city meant making decisions in the public arena that would make anyone’s home in the city a cleaner, and safer, place especially for children.¹⁰

Daily Lives, Gendered Visions

At the OECD conference, historian Elizabeth Wilson argued that by the late nineteenth century increasing “urbanization [had] loosened the patriarchal, familial control of women” and threatened to disrupt the prevailing order of society. The need for factory labor, and the impoverishment of many in the working classes, necessitated that women either leave the home to work out-

side of it, or that the home take in lodgers for extra income. These conditions took increasing numbers of women out of the home, left them at home without male supervision, or brought “strangers” into the household. Thus, Wilson argued, new forms proposed for ordering the urban built environment arose in tandem with women crossing the older boundaries between the public and the private that presumably had been constructed to keep western women out of the public spaces of the city and prevent them from transgressing their purely reproductive functions. “Utopias, model villages, garden cities and town planning,” according to Wilson, “represented one answer to the threat of female independence.” Ebenezer Howard’s “Garden Cities” ideal, she contended, ought to be perceived as not simply a model community but as a “gendered” model community. Such cities were gendered spaces whose “strict zoning separation between the location of...housing, work and leisure [makes] a rigid division between the ‘public’ and the ‘private’ with homemaking women being assumed to occupy the private realm of the city.” Garden Cities, other conference participants asserted, were predicated “on very conservative images of women and their role in society.”¹¹

In both the Canadian and United States contexts around the turn of the last century, such thinking (and preoccupation with women’s changing public roles) led men in control of cities and male professionals to propose urban reforms that emphasized separate gendered spheres for the city. One way to understand this idea is to read the rhetoric used by male reformers that stressed the democratic potential of the home (the private realm) and that resulted in proposed planning solutions that focused on maintaining the importance of the insular home, with women in it. Canadian reformer J.S. Woodsworth for example, declared that city conditions were “undermining the home.” Jens Jensen, a Chicago landscape architect, declared that “the American home is the foundation upon which the world’s greatest democracy rests.” The city housing manager of Bridgeport, Connecticut declared during World War One that “the home of the workingman is the balance wheel of democracy.” At the same time, John Nolen, a preeminent urban planner in the United States, proposed that new housing schemes were needed to “to defuse worker militancy...[and] redomesticate women workers after the war. The links these men made between reform and the private home were ever present in their discussions. They support Suzanne MacKenzie’s contention that such thinking led to “reorganizing the urban landscape into a city of separate spheres.”¹²

In 1917, W.F. Burditt, Chair of the St. John, New Brunswick Town Planning Committee, articulated the separation of the residence (home) and the workshop when he advocated that the city:

be planned as a whole, functioning the different parts to the needs of the whole community: one part should be for work and service, another for rest and still another for recreation. It follows that the effective planning of a city involves the proper choice of sites for the different parts; industrial establishments should be located on land best suited to industrial purposes, while the residential portion, the rest-room of the city, should be protected from the noisy intrusion of the workshop.

He went on to clarify that “the city is not only the home and the dwelling place of the community it is also the workshop; hence it needs to be planned as we plan our modern factories, with every possible facility for commercial traffic.”¹³

The city as workshop was, in fact, becoming a familiar male metaphor for the city in the early twentieth century. In the United States, the celebrated poet of the industrial city, Carl Sandburg, may be most famous for portraying Chicago as “Hog Butcher for the World, Tool Maker, Stacker of Wheat.” In another Sandburg poem the city becomes “a tool chest opened every day, a time clock punched every morning, a shop door, bunkers and overalls counting every day.” But others expressed the same ideas in more prosaic fashion. As early as 1895 one Toronto publication declared that “The People of Toronto are nothing more or less, from a business point of view, than a joint stock company.” A newspaper editor in Berlin (now Kitchener) Ontario later used another functional metaphor: “The city was like a watch; wheels within wheels. The factories were the great wheel, industry the mainspring; the Council the balance wheel, and the Board of Trade the hair-spring.”¹⁴

If many men envisioned the city as a well-oiled machine—a tool chest, a workshop, a time clock, a watch, or even a joint stock company—then it followed that they could, at times, seek to deflect attention from urban structural problems during industrialization by blaming women for some of its social problems. As early as 1869, the *Chicago Tribune* blamed women’s mania for consumption for the conditions produced by industrial poverty. “In our principal thoroughfares,” the paper exclaimed, “the richly-dressed lady of the avenue magnificently sweeps by her thinly-clad sister of the alley who, with scanty clothing, hurries from her fireless garret to perform her daily fourteen hours labor for a pittance.” Several decades later, Canadian reformer J.S. Woodsworth similarly indicted women as responsible for urban social problems:

A lady hastens...to the bargain counter. She returns elated with her prize, which she boasts she has bought at 'less than its cost.' Away across the city a poor girl is working early and late.... She has been forced to sell her 'work at less than it cost.' Has the bargain-hunter no connection with that factory girl?

Consider also Woodsworth's observations while on a streetcar as it moves through changing neighborhoods: "A fashionably dressed woman took her place opposite me in the very spot previously occupied by the man of the slums, from whom, had he been there, she would have shrunk in disgust and fear."¹⁵ This chapter of his book titled "The Modern City" does not acknowledge that poverty, worker exploitation, or slums might be caused by the men who ran the city and its economy. Despite all of Woodsworth's well-known reform activism, we need to contemplate why he so readily made women the object lesson of the city's problems. Why not a well-dressed man shrinking in disgust from a woman from the slums? Scholars have rarely asked such a question when investigating cities, but it must be asked and investigated to understand the way in which ideas about gender fashioned the vision of the urban context of the industrial city.

In Sandburg's Chicago poem, the metaphor for evil and lack of vigor in the city is women. "They tell me you are wicked, and I believe them; for I have seen your painted women under the gas lamps luring the farm boys." In his poem "Streets Too Old," women stand for the tired and the old. "How old, how old, how old, we are;—the walls went on saying...like old women of the people, like old midwives tired and only doing what must be done." Again in less poetic terms, Toronto Mayor Horatio Hocken, addressing the issue of "welfare work" in 1913, made the astonishing claim that "there can be nothing more dreadful in a large community than to have feeble-minded women running at large."¹⁶ Again, the question is why a feeble-minded woman and not a man, or why not just the feeble-minded generally? The choice of gender is important to note. As with the quote from Woodsworth and Sandburg's poetry, the use of women to exemplify urban problems is representative of what Kristine Miranne and Alma Young posit about "the interconnectedness between socially constructed gender relations and the visible and invisible boundaries that affect how women use urban space." Feeble-minded women, painted ladies, etc., were a threat to the order of the city because they invaded its public spaces. They were, as Miranne and Young point out, crossing and resisting the boundaries that had been constructed to keep women in their private sphere in the city.¹⁷

This vision of the city as a vigorous, productive workshop, and of women as its lesser—and potentially disruptive—residents, underlay almost all ideas of proposals for reordering and reforming the urban built environment in the decades of the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. But such vision contrasts sharply with the vision of the city offered by Chicago reformer Anna Nicholes, who resided in the Neighborhood House settlement on the city's south side. In 1913, Nicholes argued that the urban environment had to be seen first and foremost as a city of homes wherein its residents' needs held first priority. "The city and the home," she contended, "are tied up in the most intimate and important events of life." A city, for Nicholes, had to be acknowledged first and foremost as the place where people lived and wherein they were able "to rear children to live a joyous life." In 1917, Canadian Mary Joplin Clarke from the Central Neighborhood House in Toronto spoke along the same lines. She contended that a good city had to be one that eradicated bad housing, inadequate food and clothing, unjust labor conditions, and lack of recreational facilities—all of which, she contended, were "conditions resulting from unequal distribution of wealth." Julia Drummond of Montreal pointed to the lack of a sense of the city as a community in which everyone had to prosper when she very pointedly asked in 1913:

Take only Montreal with its noble site and splendid possibilities—and its slums and bad housing and lack of open spaces, with all that these bring of physical and moral degradation—are not these miserable actualities of today the direct results of the lack of public conscience, of the seeking only for immediate and personal profit in Montreal of the past?

A decade later, one of the few women elected mayor of a large U.S. city, Bertha Knight Landes, declared that "the city of Seattle represents a great big family consisting of men, women and children each with their own peculiar needs and desires which must be attended to."¹⁸

Yet, planning ideas at the time rejected the vision of the city as a home in favor of the city as a workshop. The winning plan submitted by architect Wilhelm Bernhard to a neighborhood-planning contest sponsored by the Chicago City Club in 1915 clearly separated the productive and reproductive spaces. His plan stressed street layout and traffic flow, separating business and residential buildings, and building a community center for business and civic life. At the sixth National City Planning Conference in Toronto in 1914, the plan singled out for praise was one of "handsome curves arranged in every sort of ingenious fashion...pleasing to the eye, as healthy and park-like as

possible while in no way interfering with commercial and other necessities.” Both examples implicitly separated the city into different spheres and gave no consideration to how such plans consigned women to the reproductive world of the home nor as to how such plans might make a homemaker’s life more difficult.¹⁹

The one plan submitted to the Chicago Club that differed was that of architect Anna P. Schenck of New York. The key element of her plan was to take family needs into account, by focusing on the *content* of the buildings themselves. She proposed buildings of different space and use: various sized apartments to accommodate different sized families, laundry, library, hospital facilities, nurseries and playgrounds were all to be services easily accessible to the people who lived in the buildings.²⁰ While male architects and planners generally offered plans in which “community” life would revolve around separate centers to which people had to travel, Schenck’s plan integrated daily life needs in planning.

In 1909, New York City Settlement House founder Mary Kingsbury Simkhovitch attempted to convince the new planning professionals to make the social needs of each neighborhood their first priority. “Parks, playgrounds, schools, churches, shopping centers, residences, and good transit facilities,” she argued, “all hang together.” When she and social activist Florence Kelley planned the first National Conference on City Planning that year, they chose the theme “using planning to deal with social problems.” Kelley and Simkhovitch encountered almost total resistance to this idea. Benjamin Marsh, Executive Secretary of the Committee on Congestion of Population in New York, declared that proper planning for “orderly development of a city by which each section is arranged for the purpose for which it is best and most economically adapted” would solve pressing urban problems.²¹

As concerns about reforming and reordering the urban built environment advanced across the early twentieth century, men used gender as a visual metaphor to express the differences between the unplanned and the planned city. An essay appearing in *American City* in 1922 reprinted a cartoon that proponents of planning in the city of Atlanta were using to promote their pro-zoning campaign. Side by side were pictures of two women. The one on the left was labeled “Miss Turvey Town” (as in topsy turvy). She was disheveled and slovenly in her appearance, with ripped stockings, messy hair, and wearing a shapeless dress. Next to her appeared “Miss Zoned City,” perfectly dressed and coiffed. The caption under her picture read:

While this Fair Town Has Clearly Had,
Some Plan in Her Formation,
Her Lythe Young Form For Charm and Grace
Is Famed Throughout the Nation.

The message was clear: if Atlanta adopted zoning, the city would be akin to a visually “orderly” woman. In another issue of the same publication, an article on Pittsburgh equated proper zoning with proper housekeeping. The accompanying cartoon depicted a three-level house whose rooms were all mixed up in their function. There was a bathtub in the living room and a car parked in the attic, for example. The caption read “The Sort of Homes We Should Have If Our Houses Were Like Our Cities.”²² The suggestion here is that men had to properly organize the areas of a city according to their function, as women, presumably, properly organized the functions of the rooms of a household. On the other hand, when activist women spoke about “municipal housekeeping” they meant taking care of the entire city as one would take care of all the spaces inside a house and not zoning it off into function-based spaces. As the head of the Women’s Municipal League of Boston expressed it in 1912:

[O]ur work is founded on the belief that woman has a special function in developing the welfare of humanity which man cannot perform. This function consists in her power to make, of any place in which she may happen to live, a *home* for all those who come there. Women must now learn to make of their cities great community homes for all the people.²³

In Canada, where professional men were urging comprehensive planning also at this time, their vision of the city was overwhelmingly one of order, segregation of purpose, and economic efficiency, not of the city as a community of homes and people. In 1914, G. Frank Beer, president of the Toronto Housing Company, asserted that the scope of city planning was sanitation, transportation, and coordination. Or, as he summarized it, “efficiency, economy, and vision in city planning are what are aimed at.” Transportation systems, harbor development, new thoroughfares, pure water, economic disposal of garbage, manufacturing districts, and planned residential districts all entered into his vision. Beyond this instrumental and economic approach to reforming the city, he did express a more humane concern: the need to eliminate slums, a problem that vexed U.S. and Canadian cities and raised calls for housing reform. Yet, here too there was a gendered difference in the approach to housing reform. Beer, for example, advocated housing reform because “We all know that the morals of a community are moulded largely by home environment. The very

existence of the family life upon which we pride ourselves is dependent upon decent housing.” Further, he explained, “Slums produce inefficiency—inefficiency begets poverty and poverty of this character means disease and degradation.” Achieving efficiency in the city became the target for the urban built environment in both Canada and the United States. Ten years after Beer, the president of the Town Planning Institute of Canada put it even more succinctly: “Health for Efficiency, Efficiency for Production, Production for Well-Being.”²⁴

This particular vision of a good city, with its emphasis on the family life of the individual home as the means to safeguard the city,²⁵ contrasted with that of Chicagoan Anna Nicholes, who called for a city that would “care because babies die of preventable diseases”; that would “open to all greater industrial and social opportunities.” It contrasted too with the vision of African American reformer Lugenia Burns Hope who wanted “to make the West Side of Atlanta a better place to rear our children.”²⁶ Beer’s emphasis on the “home environment” strongly suggests that he saw the home as the private space of reproduction (including the reproduction of morals) separate from the rest of the city. Like the cartoon on Pittsburgh described above, Beer and other men envisioned the city and the home as separated entities with the latter being the “moral” center of urban life. But Nicholes, Hope, and Mary Joplin Clarke rejected this home-center moralism by envisioning the home as an integral part of the city around whose needs the city should be structured.

Gendered Urban Experience

At the 1994 OECD conference, women argued that another gendered urban vision underlay all decision-making on urban problems. “Solutions [for urban problems] are typically put forward in terms of calculation (of costs and benefits) and technology,” several of the speakers contended. When urban problems are approached from such a perspective,

they crowd out moral and aesthetic views of environmental care...the experience of nurturing and household management is one in which moral principle, emotional sensitivity, and material interest are constantly in play together. It is this experience many women can and do bring forward in their approach to environmental questions.²⁷

Many women in the United States and Canada earlier in the twentieth century minimized reliance on the economics of cost/benefit analysis in determining

reforms. Rather, they stressed that women's social experiences in safeguarding the home ought to be applied when making policy decisions for the city. In a short survey of United States women mayors in the early 1920s, Mildred Adams expressed the difference between the two ideas:

Men think of roads and water and building and budgets in terms of engineering. Women translate them into terms of municipal house-keeping...and here is where housekeeping is broader than engineering. She is deeply interested in educating children. She knows how vitally important it is to have them surrounded with the right kind of environment.

Bertha Knight Landes tried to implement such an approach to urban policy in Seattle when she was mayor (1926–8). She declared that “[T]he physical manifestations of the city most vitally affect the well-being of the home, and in them the woman has as great, if not greater, interest than the man.” For Landes this meant that all decisions, from street grading and paving to methods of garbage removal, and from food and building inspection to public safety issues around fire and crime, had to have the good of the home as their first priority. The male leaders of Dallas, Texas, on the other hand, had the opposite priority. Women's organizations in that city wanted a new water filtration plant built to end the recurring outbreaks of typhoid. The men preferred instead to wait to see if there was another outbreak of the disease, at which time they would treat the water with chemicals.²⁸

As air pollution became an increasingly annoying condition for industrial cities, gendered approaches to urban problems also appeared. In the United States, men fairly consistently argued that only a cost/benefit analysis should determine how much and by what means to eliminate smoke. A Chicago banker told Anna Nicholes that, while he had once disliked the noxious odors from the city's stockyards, he had changed his mind and now saw no problem. “Do you know what it means to me now?” he asked. “Dollars.”²⁹ The women of the Anti-Smoke League in Chicago in 1908 sent a petition to the city council asking it to limit the smoke emitted by the coal-fired locomotives of the Illinois Central Railroad by requiring it to electrify its lines within the city if it wished to do business there. The petition declared that the smoke was “inimical to the health, welfare and opportunity to live in ordinary comfort and decency.” The city passed the petition to railroad, which responded that it would secure “the most able experts in the country to investigate the matter.” All the men involved in this issue—the council, businessmen, railroad men, both executives

and locomotive firemen—saw it purely in economic terms, one even contemptuously declaring that “this looks to me like a woman’s [measure].”³⁰

In 1909, Canadians Mary Higgs and a Miss Blackie, speaking before the International Congress of Women, attacked the notion that economics should determine urban environmental decision-making and that men should decide on and plan urban development. Blackie pointedly argued that women’s vision of the city differed from that of men by connecting the smoke pollution issue back to women’s daily lives. She lamented that the constant struggle with smoking chimneys was never viewed from the women’s perspective. “How we long for the practical woman architect to arise who will specialize on chimneys, and, perhaps, save the long-suffering housewife from this intolerable and often insurmountable grievance.” Higgs bluntly asserted that only women understood other women’s experiences and problems in the city, and thus it was imperative that women gain a strong voice in determining the urban environment.³¹

Like Higgs and Blackie, urban women in the United States agreed that women needed a voice in the city, believing that it would be a voice different from that of men, yet they constantly found their voices drowned out and their visions ignored. Environmental organizations often excluded women from membership as a way of separating a masculine environmentalism that stressed science and economics from a feminine environmentalism that presumably stressed aesthetics and health. It was also the case, however, that women’s emphasis on using municipal government to implement mandatory environmental controls rather than having private experts advise business about pollution controls divided male and female environmentalists from each other.³²

The exclusion of women and their ideas was also manifest in the housing movement on the local level. The Women’s City Club of Cincinnati, Ohio, for example, had raised the necessary funds to organize that city’s Better Housing League in 1916. The women were then outraged when the men of the league sought to appoint a board of directors consisting of ten men. The women asserted that “the city boosters [i.e. businessmen] and its social workers might have an entirely different viewpoint about the nature and goals of the housing organization.” Women’s work in the Better Housing League began largely as an educational project for the public. They recruited home visitors to show tenants better means of housekeeping and how to deal with repairs and landlords. They published and distributed through the schools a booklet titled *Home, Health and Happiness*. For these women, the home and its conditions were the crucial locus of city life, not only the locus of morality. Providing a bet-

ter housing supply, they believed, was an absolute priority for reforming the built environment. By 1919, however, the women had largely lost their voice in the organization. The men of the league successfully shifted its emphasis to zoning and development. The league no longer concerned itself with the conditions of existing housing, but promoted zoning “to protect future growth, not only of its residences, but its business buildings.” The league declared that what the city needed first was a plan, without which “there can be no satisfactory solution to the housing problem.”³³

Women also recognized male insincerity toward them on issues such as housing. When Ontario constituted the Ontario Housing Committee in 1918, for example, no women were appointed to serve on it. In an angry letter to the Toronto newspaper, the female letter writer complained of men’s insincerity in not including women despite “Men telling us for years that women’s place is in the home.”³⁴

In Canada, by the early 1920s, planners allied themselves with real estate interests. W.F. Burditt wrote to British planner Thomas Adams (who had been hired to work in Canada) that planners and real estate developers needed to realize that their “interests are in harmony.” Zoning was their shared purpose, and this had as its “principle function, the enhancement of property rights of the wealthier members of society.” Or, as Gilliland and Sendbuehler conclude:

Dominant ideas in town planning and domestic architecture during the 1920s constituted an ideology of house, home, and city intended to remake existing cities and to create new, efficient and healthy settlements. It was predicated on two notions: that efficiency resulted from the separation of functions at all spatial scales, and that individual and social health could be achieved through scientifically designed environments. The ideal city featured increasingly similar, but separate, working- and middle-class homes and neighbourhoods, as well as the sharper definition of functionally specific spaces within the home and the city.³⁵

The point here is not to prove that one vision is better than the other. The purpose rather is to demonstrate that there are differing gendered visions, and that the built environment of cities is largely the result of only one of these visions. This historical circumstance in turn has created a built environment that functions differently for men and women. As one investigates cities from this perspective, it becomes quite clear that in most aspects of urban studies scholarship has “reflected a gender bias in both the construction of theory

and the avoidance of research that directly addresses women's lived experiences." Unless produced by feminist scholars, urban studies seems unable to imagine that women might have a different history in that environment and that this difference has "bounded" women's circumstances in the city. Such a conclusion underlies all the essays of volumes such as *Gendering the City*, *Life Spaces*, and *Women in Cities*.³⁶

Urban Spaces and Safety

The final example that I want to present here regards the different way in which the safety of urban spaces affects women. Speakers at the OECD conference spoke extensively about how public safety in the city's public spaces was a crucial problem for women, one that limits both their mobility and their equal citizenship. The depth of feeling in this regard comes in the declaration that women's fear for their personal safety in the city "can prove as effective as *purdah* in restricting women's mobility."³⁷ Historically, urban scholars have either too easily dismissed such ideas, or posited that they "suggested a class-linked approach to the relationship of women to mass transit."³⁸ In 1913, for example, a group of stenographers and businesswomen in Chicago requested that a new transit stop be added because they currently had to descend at a location in that city's "vice district." The location of transit stops is a legitimate public concern for women, yet what little has been done to discover women's earlier attitudes toward or concern about public safety on mass transit has rarely explored this angle.³⁹ Nor is it much different in the contemporary context, and it is relevant to understanding the past to see how gendered ideas have played out into the present. Once the building and provision of public services such as transit systems became defined as a "business enterprise," technology and cost/benefit analysis became the driving forces of decision-making, as Canadian scholar Gerda Wekerle has demonstrated for public transit in Toronto at the end of the twentieth century. Although studies show that the majority of the system's users are women, women's pleas to the Toronto Transit Commission for the system to be redesigned to "protect and better serve women" were too often rejected as "social" concerns, not relevant to transit. Decisions were ultimately made, not just by a cost/benefit analysis, but within a specific male vision of what a public service was:

Those aspects of feminist discourse that were congruent with the prevailing business discourse were adopted; other gender needs were ignored. The discourse on equity which expanded the discussion to rights of access to resources was dismissed as social welfare

demands that were not legitimately the concern of a business, albeit a business that is a monopoly with no competitors.⁴⁰

If we begin to think historically about the issue of women's public safety, we might also be able to rethink our analysis regarding the creation of women's spaces in the city and the work of reform-minded women in forming them. The Julia Drummond Residence in Montreal is one possible example. The residence was founded in the early 1920s as more single women flooded into the city to work and became a more visible presence throughout the city. The usual "social" interpretation for the residence's establishment is that elite Montreal women (in this case supported by the Anglican church) were "concerned about the respectability and morality of these women" and believed it "immensely important to monitor and mould their morality" by furnishing suitable housing for them. They may well have thought this way, yet two urban circumstances ought to make us cautious about simply attributing the residence's founding to elite social control. The first is that there were many other residences and housing services for working women in the city. The YWCA, the Grey Nuns and other Roman Catholic organizations, and Les Maisons du Foyer, for example, were all providing housing for women. The second circumstance is that women workers were poorly paid and many could hardly afford to rent decent rooms in decent areas of the city at the going market rate.⁴¹

A similar process took place in the United States. When Jane Edna Hunter arrived in Cleveland in 1905, she could not find any decent room to rent. She ultimately founded the Working Girls' Home Association to provide lodging to other single African American young women. The absence in the industrial city of safe space for women resulted in women founding residences such as the Working Girls' Home and the Julia Drummond Residence for white and black young women in cities of both the United States and Canada.⁴² While the men in cities built places of both public and private spaces for themselves, women were left largely to the mercy of charity—or other women. Women responded by taking care of each other through their own programs and institutions. In Los Angeles, for example, women organized a City Mothers' Bureau, a confidential program to prevent youth from getting into trouble, which also operated a day care nursery for working mothers. The African American Women's League of Newport, Rhode Island, is another such example of women's organizations that founded and ran day care nurseries, believing that women had to take care of one another and their children.⁴³

As more and more urban women moved into the work force, the men who controlled cities gave little heed to women's needs and concerns beyond their

gender assumption that women should stay in the private home, or worse, that any lone woman in public was either immoral or fair game. Either way, women were considered disruptive to the proper urban order. So women's choices were always constrained by the decisions men made on the built environment and their attitudes about women's "proper" place. In Montreal, for example, one examination of the census from 1861–1901 shows a persistently higher ratio of females to males in the city between the ages of 15 and 29, yet as transit systems were constructed, the low wages of women workers meant they could not afford even the special morning and evening tickets intended for "workingmen." So, these women were constrained to live within walking distance of their employment, often in the less desirable areas. As zoning laws were applied to cities, they followed the principle that industrial development should be banned from residential neighborhoods, but no such ban applied to housing in industrial neighborhoods. Thus, poorly paid women workers often had little choice but to live in the less salubrious, and less safe, areas of the city. We might do well to try and see what effect the 1912 Toronto prohibition against the use and erection of apartment or tenement buildings in residential areas may have had on women's possibilities in that city. There is also the fact that by passing such regulations, the men of the city were exposing how they thought first and foremost about the property values of the private home in certain areas of the city, and certainly not about the city as a whole.⁴⁴

Jane Hunter herself was a single working woman who applied her personal experience of having to take the "least disreputable room" that she could find to creating a safe place for other working women. Other women, in other cities in both Canada and the United States, were also concerned to provide affordable and safe living and "social spaces," while those in control of cities were more concerned to construct a profitable economic situation than to provide for the public safety of women. Unfortunately, we have no surveys or statistics that could give us incontrovertible evidence from women themselves about their fears for urban public safety earlier in the twentieth century. But there is no reason to believe that surveys from later in the century that expose how much more fearful women are for their personal safety in public than are men reflect any dramatic change in women's concerns earlier. Moreover, the rigid zoning practices advocated, and adopted, largely by men have contributed to putting women's safety at risk in business and industrial areas of cities, where, presumably, they are not supposed to be at certain times of the night and day.⁴⁵

One final example of the organization of public space, that of the early twentieth-century playground movement, exposes both a gendered split, as well as how historical interpretation has tended to conflate what men and women were

trying to accomplish within a male-centered perspective. Men's groups were urged to support playgrounds because they would be good training grounds for "modern business." Thomas Adams concurred heartily with the vision of men in the United States that parks should be included in a comprehensive city plan, but that these "should be studied in relation to the street and railroad system" and that "care should be taken not to burden either the city or the real estate owners with more unproductive park area than is economical." The women of the Montreal Parks Protective Association, on the other hand, agreed with women in cities in the United States that small playgrounds were what the city really needed in order to "keep children of slum areas off the streets, where they might be injured...get them out into the sunshine to improve their health, and train them to be better citizens."⁴⁶

Conclusion

New York City Settlement House resident Mary Simkhovitch worked hard to convince early planners in the United States that social needs should take first priority in planning. She urged them to "let life, not theory lead the way." Simkhovitch held to a vision of neighborhood cooperation and the interconnectedness of living in the city that resembled that of Mary Joplin Clarke in Toronto. We now know that Simkhovitch's vision was rejected by the mainstream planning movement in the United States where attention to private individuals and business interests came to dominate. In Canada, "civic enhancement" came to embody "the first and one of the more influential forces behind planning" in the early twentieth century.⁴⁷ This is not to claim that United States and Canadian cities developed exactly alike across the twentieth century. Urban development in each country is rooted in its particular historical development, social situations, and a political culture of differing relationship between government and cities. For women in Canada this has resulted in more appreciable attention to issues of gender in the processes of urbanization. Canada, for example, was heavily represented by governmental and non-governmental attendees at the 1994 OECD conference. The conference chair was Jean Augustine MP, Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister; the delegation included other MPs, provincial representatives, and academics, as well as the President of the Ministerial Task Force on Social Policy Reforms. The United States was represented by the USAID environmental advisor—not an especially appropriate agency for representing women in the United States since this is the Agency for International Development. One man from the Minneapolis Center for Community Economic Development and one woman from the New York Neighborhood Women's Renaissance Board rounded out the U.S. participation in this conference. So, a major international conference on women and the

urban environment, whose opening address by Jean Augustine decried the fact that “cities have traditionally been designed without due consideration to the particular roles women play in urban society,” elicited almost no interest from either the government or non-governmental agencies in the United States.

Despite even such interest as there was on the part of Canada for this conference, all current studies by feminist scholars emphasize that more attention does not mean the absence of gendered visions of the urban built environment even today. For more than a century, Canadian and United States’ cities have been envisioned as masculine endeavors, wherein the needs of production define the city’s built environment and those of reproduction come far behind. The result, moreover, of these gendered visions has been a failure to listen to women’s voices or consider women’s concerns as integral to decision-making.⁴⁸ Perhaps Julia Drummond best summed up the difference in perspective back in 1913 when she declared that the city’s social problems came from a lack of public conscience, from the vision of the city as the place to seek “immediate and personal profit.” This vision was not, as Lugenia Burns Hope had wished, one of the city as “a better place to rear our children.”

Endnotes

- ¹ OECD Conference on Women in the City, *Women in the City: Housing, Services and the Urban Environment*, 4–6 October 1994 (Paris, 1995), 13.
- ² Kristine B. Miranne and Alma H. Young, eds., *Gendering the City: Women, Boundaries, and Visions of Urban Life* (Lanham, MD, 2000), 5; Susan S. Fainstein and Lisa J. Servon, *Gender and Planning: A Reader* (New Brunswick, NJ, 2005), 2; and Lia Karsten, “Women and Children First,” in Liesbeth Ottes, Erica Poventud, Marijke van Schendelen, and Gertje Segond von Banchet, eds., *Gender and the Built Environment: Emancipation in planning, housing and mobility in Europe* (Assen, 1995), 8. For this last assertion, see Jo Beall, “Participation in the city: where do women fit in?” in Caroline Sweetman, ed., *Women and Urban Settlement* (Oxford, UK, 1996), 9.
- ³ For representative examples of how urban historians speak of “urban vision” when they clearly mean a male vision, see the special issues “North American Cities and Suburbs,” in *The Journal of Urban History* 27 (March 2001). For the U.S. specifically, see for example Robert B. Fairbanks, “Rethinking Urban Problems: Planning, Zoning, and City Government in Dallas, 1900–1930,” *The Journal of Urban History* 25 (September 1999):

810. For Canada, see for example John Weaver, *Shaping the Canadian City: Essays on Urban Politics and Policy, 1890–1920* (Toronto, 1977).
- ⁴ Suzanne MacKenzie, “Building Women, Building Cities: Toward Gender Sensitive Theory in the Environmental Disciplines,” in Caroline Andrew and Beth Moore Milroy, eds., *Life Spaces: Gender, Households, and Employment* (Vancouver, 1988), 16.
- ⁵ Andrew and Milroy, *Life Spaces*. See also Miranne and Young, *Gendering the City* and Jo Little, Linda Peaks, and Pat Richardson, eds., *Women in Cities: Gender and the Urban Environment* (New York, 1988) for more contemporary examples of this gendered ideal.
- ⁶ Ottes, Poventud, van Schendelen, and von Banchet, “Introduction,” in *Gender and the Built Environment*, xv.
- ⁷ For the most recent overview of the planning profession in the United States, see Jon Peterson, *The Birth of City Planning in the United States, 1840–1917* (Baltimore, 2003). But for a critique of this work and its lack of attention to women, especially in sanitation reform, see Daphne Spain, “Lofty Ambitions, Limited Achievements,” *H-Net Reviews* (H-Urban, March 2005). For a short account of the 1919 conference, see “11th Annual Conference on City Planning,” *American City* (May 1919), 501.
- ⁸ Peterson, for instance, distinguishes between city planning that targeted specific problems for resolution and the later development of urban planning that settled on articulating general resolutions such as zoning to redesign the city as a whole, while Jason Gilliland and Matt Sendbuehler, in “...To Produce the Highest Type of Manhood and Womanhood: The Ontario Housing Act, 1919, and a New Suburban Ideal,” *Urban History Review* 26 (March 1998), see less distinction, but rather a movement toward a more holistic solution to the same problems.
- ⁹ The municipal housekeeping movement and the playgrounds and recreations movements in both Canada and the United States, for example, brought many aesthetic, as well as other, reforms into the cities. But without suffrage, women had to depend largely on persuasion. In conceptualizing the urban built environment as a whole and how it should be structured and planned, when what women wanted conflicted with the desires of those men in power, women generally lost.
- ¹⁰ For example, see Gwendolyn Wright, *Moralism and the Model Home: Domestic Architecture and Cultural Conflict in Chicago, 1873–1913* (Chicago, 1980). See also the historical overview of the processes of home/work separation in MacKenzie, “Building Women, Building Cities,” in Andrew and Milroy, *Life Spaces*, 13–27. One possible way to conceptualize the difference in male and female approaches to the industrial city comes in the

- work of Daphne Spain, wherein she emphasizes how women channeled their concerns for the well-being of young women by founding homes that would be “safe havens” for these women. According to Spain, this was a way in which women were “shaping the urban landscape” when they had little power to reshape the city as a whole. See Spain, “Safe Havens for Cleveland’s Virtuous Women, 1868–1928,” *Journal of Planning History* 3 (November 2004): 267–91.
- ¹¹ For Wilson, see OECD, “Culture and Gender Concerns in Spatial Development,” in *Women in the City*, 41 and Wilson, *The Sphinx in the City: Urban Life, the Control of Disorder, and Women* (Berkeley: 1991). See also MacKenzie, “Building Women, Building Cities”. For early twentieth century interest in the Garden City concept in France, see Christian Topalov, “Les ‘réformateurs’ et leurs réseaux: enjeux d’un objet de recherche,” in Christian Topalov, ed., *Laboratoires du Nouveau Siècle: La nébuleuse réformatrice et ses réseaux en France, 1880–1914* (Paris, 1991): esp. 21–9; and OECD, *Women in the City*, 37–8. The map of Lindenlea, Ottawa, reprinted in Jill Delaney, “The Garden Suburb of Lindenlea, Ottawa: A Model Project for the First Federal Housing Policy, 1918–1924,” *Urban History Review* 19 (February 1991): 152, depicts just such a segregated vision.
- ¹² Woodsworth, *My Neighborhood: A Study of City Conditions* (Toronto, 1911), 115. See also Gwendolyn Wright, *Moralism and the Model Home: Domestic Architecture and Cultural Conflict in Chicago, 1873–1913* (Chicago, 1980), 263 for Jensen; and Robert Macieski, “‘The Home of the Workingman Is the Balance Wheel of Democracy’: Housing Reform in Wartime Bridgeport,” *Journal of Urban History* 26 (September 2000): 726–7. See MacKenzie, “Building Women, Building Cities,” 20. See also Delaney, “The Garden Suburb of Lindenlea, Ottawa,” 154 and 156.
- ¹³ W.F. Burditt, “Civic Efficiency and Social Welfare in Planning of Land,” in Paul Rutherford, ed., *Saving the Canadian City: the First Phase, 1880–1920, Anthology of Early Articles on Urban Reform* (Toronto, 1974), 238.
- ¹⁴ Burditt, “Civic Efficiency and Social Welfare in Planning of Land,” 238. Sandburg, “Chicago,” in *Chicago Poems* (1916), and “Windy City,” section 6, in *Slabs of the Sunburnt West* (1922), printed in Rebecca West, ed., *Selected Poems of Carl Sandburg* (New York, 1954). Toronto quote from John C. Weaver, *Shaping the Canadian City: Essays on Urban Politics and Policy, 1890–1920* (Toronto, 1977), 41; Berlin editor quoted in Elizabeth Bloomfield, “Community Leadership and Decision-Making: Entrepreneurial Elites in Two Ontario Towns, 1870–1930,” in Gilbert

- Stelter and Alan Artibise, eds., *Power and Place: Canadian Urban Development in the North American Context* (Vancouver, 1986), 99.
- ¹⁵ *Chicago Tribune*, November 3, 1869 and Woodsworth, "My Neighbor," 27–8. MacKenzie, "Building Women, Building Cities," 13, concludes that Canada's two most recent periods of "urban crisis" – the turn of the last century and the later twentieth century – correspond with periods of a "woman question" and that in both cases some observers suggested "that women were largely responsible for problems in the city."
- ¹⁶ Carl Sandburg, "Chicago" in *Chicago Poems*, and "Streets Too Old," in *Smoke and Steel* (1920), in West, ed., *Selected Poems of Carl Sandburg*. Hocken in Rutherford, *Saving Our Canadian City*, 197.
- ¹⁷ Miranne and Young, "Introduction," *Gendering the City*, 1.
- ¹⁸ Anna Nicholes, "How Women Can Help in the Administration of a City," *The Woman's Citizen Library* vol. 9 (New York, 1913): 2143, 2150–1; Mary Joplin Clarke, "Report of the Standing Committee on Neighbourhood Work," to Canadian Conference of Charities and Correction, 23–25 September 1917, in Rutherford, *Saving Our Canadian Cities*, 174; Drummond quoted in Jeanne M. Wolfe and Grace Strachan, "Practical Idealism: Women and Urban Reform, Julia Drummond and the Montreal Parks and Playgrounds Association," in Andrew and Milroy, *Life Spaces*, 75; and Landes quoted in Sandra Haarsager, *Bertha Knight Landes of Seattle: Big-City Mayor* (Norman, OK, 1994), 71.
- ¹⁹ See "Minutes of Meetings," November 18, 1915, *Committee on Housing Conditions*, City Club of Chicago, Ms Collection, Box 17, folder 3, and May 25, 1916, Box 18, folder 7, Chicago Historical Society and Alfred B. Yeomans, *City Residential Land Development: Studies in Planning, Competitive Plans for Subdividing a Typical Quarter Section of Land in the Outskirts of Chicago* (Chicago, 1916). For Canada, see Elizabeth Bloomfield, "Reshaping the Urban Landscape? Town Planning Efforts in Kitchener-Waterloo, 1912–1925," in Gilbert Stelter and Alan Artibise, eds., *Shaping the Urban Landscape: Aspects of the Canadian City-Building Process* (Ottawa, 1982): 256–98, quote 279–80.
- ²⁰ "Minutes of Meetings," March 8, 1915, *Committee on Housing Conditions*, City Club of Chicago, Ms Collection, Box 16, folder 3.
- ²¹ Susan Marie Wirka, "The City Social Movement: Progressive Women Reformers and Early Social Planning," in Mary Corbin Sies and Christopher Silver, eds., *Planning the Twentieth-Century American City* (Baltimore, 1996): 55–75, quote from 73. For Simkhovitch and Kelley, see also Daphne Spain, *How Women Saved the City* (Minneapolis, 2001), 71. For Marsh, see "Economic Aspects of City Planning," *Proceedings*,

- Municipal Engineers of the City of New York, paper 57 (1910): 73–87 and “Causes of Congestion in Population,” *Proceedings of the Second National Conference on City Planning and Congestion* (May 1910): 35–39.
- ²² Robert Whitten, “Atlanta Adopts Zoning,” *American City* 26 (June 1922), 542 and George Ketchum, “Official Recognition of Pittsburgh’s Citizens Committee on City Plan,” *American City* 27 (February 1923), 142.
- ²³ Mrs. T.J. Bowlker quoted in Spain, *How Women Saved the City*, 72–73. See also, Philip J. Ethington, “Recasting Urban Political History: Gender, the Public, the Household, and Political Participation in Boston and San Francisco during the Progressive Era,” *Social Science History* 16 (Summer 1992): 305–6 and Maureen A. Flanagan, “The City Profitable, the City Livable: Environmental Policy, Gender, and Power in Chicago in the 1910s,” *The Journal of Urban History* 22 (January 1996): 163–90.
- ²⁴ Beer, “A Plea for City Planning Organization,” in Rutherford, *Saving Our Canadian City*, 230–3; Thomas I. Gunton, “The Ideas and Policies of the Canadian Planning Profession, 1909–1931,” in Alan Artibise and Gilbert Stelter, eds., *The Usable Urban Past: Planning and Politics in the Modern Canadian City* (Ottawa, 1979), 182 for quote.
- ²⁵ In Canada, J.J. Kelso, founder of the Children’s Aid Society, called the family home the “foundation stone of the state”, while Toronto Medical Officer of Health, Charles Hastings, declared that all municipalities “must have a keen sense of the social and national significance of the term ‘home’ as being of one-family-dwellings.” Both quotes from Sean Purdy, “Industrial Efficiency, Social Order, and Moral Purity: Housing Reform Thought in English Canada, 1900–1950,” *Urban History Review* 25 (March 1997): 31, 35.
- ²⁶ Nicholes, “How Women Can Help in the Administration of a City,” 2150–1; Hope quoted in Elisabeth Lasch-Quinn, *Black Neighbors: Race and the Limits of Reform in the American Settlement Movement, 1890–1945* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1993), 122. For an extended account of Nicholes and her vision, see Maureen A. Flanagan, *Seeing with Their Hearts: Chicago Women and the Vision of the Good City, 1871–1933* (Princeton, 2002).
- ²⁷ OECD, *Women in the City*, 55–6.
- ²⁸ Mildred Adams, “What Are Women Mayors Doing?” *American City* 26 (June 1922): 544; Haarsager, *Bertha Knight Landes of Seattle*, 85, 226–7. It was not incidental that Landes’ ouster from office after two years was orchestrated largely by a combination of business and labor interests who ridiculed her administration as bringing “petticoat rule” to the city (258). For Dallas, see Judith McArthur, *Creating the New Woman: The Rise of*

- Southern Women's Progressive Culture in Texas, 1893–1918* (Urbana, 1998), 34.
- ²⁹ Nicholes, “How Women Can Help in the Administration of a City,” 2151 and 2153. For examples of work that argues for the importance of gender experiences, not merely class ones, for shaping ideas, actions and environmental policy decisions, see Flanagan, “The City Profitable, the City Livable,” and Angela Gugliotta, “Class, Gender, and Coal Smoke: Gender Ideology and Environmental Injustice in Pittsburgh, 1868–1914,” *Environmental History* (April 2000): 165–93. Gugliotta, “How, When, and for Whom Was Smoke a Problem in Pittsburgh,” in Joel A. Tarr, ed., *Devastation and Renewal: An Environmental History of Pittsburgh and Its Region* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh, 2003), offers some interesting, albeit brief, discussion of the economic motivations of the 1910s Mellon Institute Smoke Investigation in the city.
- ³⁰ For the Chicago Anti-Smoke League, see David Stradling, *Smokestacks and Progressives: Environmentalists, Engineers, and Air Quality in America, 1881–1951* (Baltimore, 1999), 119–22.
- ³¹ Blackie and Higgs quoted in Sue Hendler and Helen Harrison, “Theorizing Canadian Planning History: Women, Gender and Feminist Perspectives,” in Miranne and Young, *Gendering the City*, 147.
- ³² Adam Rome, “‘Political Hermaphrodites’: Gender and Environmental Reform in Progressive America,” *Environmental History* 11 (July 2006): 454–5.
- ³³ Robert B. Fairbanks, *Making Better Citizens: Housing Reform and the Community Development Strategy in Cincinnati, 1890–1960* (Urbana, 1988), 186, n.22, and 29–32. Two women were eventually included and another was appointed Treasurer.
- ³⁴ *Toronto Daily News*, November 26, 1918, quoted in Purdy, “Industrial Efficiency, Social Order, and Moral Purity,” 35.
- ³⁵ Burditt quoted in Tom Gunton, “Origins of Canadian Urban Planning,” in Kent Gerecke, ed., *The Canadian City* (Montreal, 1991): 97; second quote from Gilliland and Sendbuehler, “...To Produce the Highest Type of Manhood and Womanhood,” 42.
- ³⁶ Quote from *Gendering the City*, 1.
- ³⁷ OECD, *Women in the City*, 98.
- ³⁸ See Paul Barrett, *The Automobile and Urban Transit: The Formation of Public Policy in Chicago, 1900–1930* (Philadelphia, 1983), 252, n. 45.
- ³⁹ Laurie Pickup, “Hard to get around: a study of women’s travel mobility,” in Little, Peake and Richardson, *Women in Cities*, 99–116. See also Caroline Andrew, “Getting Women’s Issues on the Municipal Agenda: Violence

- Against Women,” in Judith A. Garber and Robyne S. Turner, eds., *Gender in Urban Research (Urban Affairs Annual Review 42)* (Thousand Oaks, CA, 1995), 115, for her statement that policy measures regarding women’s safety can only be implemented “by understanding violence against women as being rooted in the unequal power relations of society.”
- ⁴⁰ Wekerle, *Gender Planning in Public Transit: Institutionalizing Feminist Policies, Changing Discourse, and Practices*,” in Fainstein and Servon, eds., *Gender and Planning: A Reader*, 277, 283, and 291–2. Wekerle outlines how some of the women’s requests were implemented, but that changing political administrations subsequently dismantled some of the more “woman friendly” initiatives and the TTC removed women from its “policy agenda.”
- ⁴¹ Elizabeth Kirkland, “A Home away from Home: Defining, Regulating, and Challenging Femininity at the Julia Drummond Residence in Montreal, 1920–1971,” *Urban History Review* 34 (Spring 2006): 4 and 5.
- ⁴² See also Spain, “Safe Havens for Cleveland’s Virtuous Women, 1868–1928.”
- ⁴³ See Spain, *How Women Saved the City*, for an extensive discussion of women’s residential facilities and Mrs. Aletha Gilber, “The Duties of a ‘City Mother,’” *American City* 26 (March 1922): 239–40 for the City Mothers’ Bureau.
- ⁴⁴ D. Suzanne Cross, *The Neglected Majority: The Changing Role of Women in Nineteenth-Century Montreal*,” in Gilbert Stelter and Alan Artibise, eds., *The Canadian City: Essays in Urban and Social History* (Ottawa, 1984), 306–9; Gunton, “The Ideas and Policies of the Canadian Planning Profession,” 182; and Peter W. Moore, “Zoning and Planning: The Toronto Experience, 1904–1907,” in Artibise and Stelter, *The Usable Urban Past*, 322.
- ⁴⁵ For Hunter, see Spain, *How Women Saved the City*, 152–5. See also McArthur, *Creating the New Woman*, 92–5; Margaret T. Gordon, Stephanie Riger, Robert K. LeBailly, and Linda Heath, “Crime, Women, and the Quality of Urban Life,” in Stimpson, et al., eds., *Women and the American City*, 144–8; and Caroline Andrew, “Resisting Boundaries? Using Safety Audits for Women,” in Miranne and Young, eds., *Gendering the City*, 157–60.
- ⁴⁶ See Sarah Jo Peterson, “Voting for Play: The Democratic Potential of Progressive Era Playgrounds,” *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era* 3 (April 2004): 145–75; Adams, “Modern City Planning: Its Meaning and Methods,” in Rutherford, *Saving the Canadian City*, 263; and Wolfe and Strachan, “Practical Idealism,” 67.

- ⁴⁷ Wirka, “The City Social Movement,” 73; and Weaver, *Shaping the Canadian City*, 33.
- ⁴⁸ See, for example, Sylvia Novac, “Not Seen, Not Heard: Women in Housing Policy,” in Nuzhat Anun, Frances Beer, Kathryn McPherson, Andrea Medovarski, Angela Miles, Goli Rezai-Roshti, eds., *Canadian Woman Studies: An Introductory Reader* (Toronto, 1999): 173–81.

