

The last two chapters attempt to exploit the advantages of the book's hybrid research design, which combines qualitative, interpretive data analysis at the level of each case study plus a systematic attempt to report data on a common set of explanatory variables and outcome measures across cases. While these chapters do a fine job of recapping the major findings from each case, they generate few new patterns or insights, a nonresult that in hindsight might be expected from an analysis of a small number of cases purposefully sampled to maximize variation on a large number of key variables.

The book's greatest success is in demonstrating the wide diversity of collaborative initiatives in terms of their structure and decision-making arrangements; their size, scope, and duration; and the types of outputs and outcomes they are capable of producing. Overall, this is an excellent text for students being introduced to collaborative planning for the first time; for scholars, mediators, or planners whose work is topically related to one of the six cases; or for stakeholders in government or the private sector who are contemplating a new partnership and need to apprise themselves of the full range of opportunities and risks that collaboration entails.

► References

- Bingham, Gail. 2003. *When the sparks fly: Building consensus when the science is contested*. Washington, DC: Resolve.
- Kenney, Douglas S. 1999. Historical and sociopolitical context of the western watersheds movement. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 35 (3): 493–503.
- McCloskey, Michael. 2005. What we have learned from William Leach's study of 76 collaborative watershed projects in California and Washington. *The Collaborative Edge* Winter. <http://www.csus.edu/ccp/newsletter/2005/Winter/>.
- Sabatier, Paul A., Chris M. Weible, and Jared A. Ficker. 2005. History of water management in the U.S.: Implications for collaborative watershed approaches. In *Swimming upstream: Collaborative approaches to watershed management*, edited by P. Sabatier, W. Focht, M. Lubell, Z. Trachtenberg, A. Vedlitz, and M. Matlock. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gender and Planning: A Reader, edited by Susan S. Fainstein and Lisa J. Servon. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press. 2005. 313 pages. \$27.95 (paperback).

DOI: 10.1177/0739456X05279186

Reviewed by Judith Allen

Principal Lecturer

Department of Urban Development and Regeneration

University of Westminster, London

Fainstein and Servon hope that one day this book will be obsolete because a concern with gender will permeate all planning and public policy texts. Until that day comes, they have put together a collection of the best contributions by feminist scholars relevant to planning.

The first section is rooted in urban theory and addresses the problem of delineating the boundaries between public and private spaces. Spain and Hayden establish how the dominant model of planning after World War II created a suburban sprawl that confines women to their homes and limits their participation in the labor market. Reichl, at a different spatial scale, compares the treatment of sexuality in Las Vegas and Times Square, exploring the moral boundaries that distinguish between urban, sexual, immoral women and their suburban, reproductive, moral sisters in the suburbs. The second section addresses planning theory. It contrasts Sandercock and Forsyth's classic article and a piece by Fainstein, both of which focus on planning, with the wider theoretical foundations for feminism drawn from Nussbaum and Young. The last three sections look at specific areas of practice within planning. In the section on housing, both Wright and Ockman emphasize how the design of suburban houses was associated with a strong ideology of women, family, and home, extending themes introduced in the first section. The section on economic development includes Markusen's analysis of how the urban structures that isolate suburban housewives are economically dysfunctional, Servon's work on women and microenterprise programs, and Massey and MacDowell's analysis of women's position in four very different regional labor markets in England. The final section on transportation is stunning. It starts with Rosenbloom's argument that not including gender in transportation modeling leads to defective technical work. This links with Wekerle's account of the politics of putting gender into the work of the Toronto Transit Commission. The most striking piece in the whole collection, however, is Hutchinson's sociologically and historically based reflection on the role of transport in the Black experience of migration from southern rural areas to northern and western cities.

This book is firmly addressed to American planners, which means that it accepts as unproblematic ways of conceptualizing planning that are grounded in American planning practice. Living in England, I was initially puzzled by the dominance of the isolated suburban housewives model, which runs through many of the essays. Only 21 percent of the British housing stock consists of detached housing (Wilcox 2002), and even suburban densities are typically around twelve units per acre. Nearly 69 percent of women in the United Kingdom are economically active, compared to 82 percent of men (Eurostat 2005). A much larger problem in the United Kingdom is the markedly

JPER Fall 2005 Volume 25, Number 1
Journal of Planning Education & Research

lower labor force participation rates for black and minority ethnic groups, ranging from 45 percent for Bangladeshis to 76 percent for black Caribbean people (International Centre for Migration Policy Development 2003). The general European context is also different. Promoting gender equality is firmly on the European Union's agenda because it is seen as a labor market issue. All member states are required to have gender equalities commissions. Welfare states throughout Europe are rooted in a sense of national, although often ethnically inflected, solidarity that distinguishes them from the liberal-residualist model of the United States (Allen et al. 2004). Generally, European cities are more dense than American cities and have much better, if somewhat centripetal, public transport systems. This means that urban forms and the experience of women within them are different from the United States.

I have laid out these differences not because women are treated better in Europe but because clarifying the different contextual situation helped me to focus on the conceptual issues that run through the book as a whole. The moral-practical argument that informs most of the articles is rooted in concepts of *difference* and *equity*. Effectively, men and women are cast as separate and different groups: equity demands that they be treated similarly in some ways and differently in others. This form of argument tends to submerge issues of differences among women and direct attention to documenting the differences between men and women, differences that then become sufficient grounds for challenging the ways in which women are treated.

I am more familiar with arguments around diversity and equality. In this form of argument, difference is taken for granted, and the notion of solidarity is used to raise the following questions: "What groups are to be admitted to the social whole so that we are obligated to treat them equally?" "What social processes construct groups as 'other,' as outside the obligation to equal treatment?" In the case of gender, this refers us directly to concepts of patriarchy, within which men and women are not seen as separate groups but as two groups within a single whole, whose relationship to each other is patriarchally structured. As Massey and McDowell show, these relationships vary from place to place. By seeing place-based differences as variations within patriarchal social relationships, it is possible to see how gender, class, race/ethnicity, and age work together within a wide variety of urban forms. A very good example is how Hutchinson lays out the very different experiences of black women within cities. Nussbaum's piece on women in India and Reichl's discussion of sexuality and public space also add to this perspective. I would have liked to see

these four articles next to each other since between them, they begin to construct a women's-eye view of cities. From this perspective, it is possible to see that underpinning the suburban isolation model is a physicalist approach to planning that occludes issues of class and race in shaping different women's experiences of urban forms.

Overall, the book raises two important issues. The first is how the problem is to be constructed. Do we want to use a feminist perspective to construct a critique that can be used to improve planning practices? Rosenbloom and Wekerle show how critique can generate very effective political practices to make transport more woman friendly. Servon shows how women may take different things from microenterprise programs than men. Or do we want a feminist theory of planning? The evidence in this book suggests that critique serves us better than theory. If this is the case, then we might need to start with improving physical planners' understanding of social relationships.

The second issue raised by the book is perennial: how do we construct the subject, women? Do we see women as the passive victims of planning practices, or do we see them as active social agents, challenging patriarchy and planning by constructing their own life practices, using the tools available to them within cities? It seems to me that in privileging *planning* in looking at the intersection of gender, planning, and the city, the editors have framed their overall approach within the patriarchal practices that they wish to challenge. I understand the usefulness of this tactical maneuver—it always helps to put a political argument in terms that the opponent can understand—but it seemed to me to devalue women's active construction of their own urban identities.

The final issue for me in reading this book may be personal. I would like to know how women's thinking about planning has developed intellectually and how it might have changed planning practices. Because the articles in this book are not arranged chronologically and the introduction is sketchy, I was left with the distinct impression that little has changed since I studied planning in the United States, except that now women can openly point to a problem that could not even be articulated forty years ago.

Overall, this should be a useful book. A stronger editorial contribution and a different way of organizing the articles could have resulted in a more robust feminist critique of planning, but in the hands of a skilled teacher, these problems can be overcome. In the meantime, the book serves well as an introduction to feminist scholarship in North American planning.

► References

- Allen, Judith, James Barlow, Jesús Leal, Thomas Maloutas, and Liliana Padovani. 2004. *Housing and welfare in southern Europe*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Eurostat. 2005. *Statistics in focus: Main results from the EU Labour Force Survey*. Brussels, Belgium: European Commission.
- International Centre for Migration Policy Development. 2003. *Migrants, minorities and employment: Exclusion, discrimination and anti-discrimination in 15 member states of the European Union*. Vienna, Austria: European Monitoring Centre for Racism and Xenophobia.
- Wilcox, S. 2002. *UK housing review 2002/2003*. York, UK: Joseph Rowntree.

Urban Planning/My Way: From Baltimore's Inner Harbor to Lower Manhattan and Beyond, by David Wallace. Chicago: American Planning Association. 2004. 285 pages. \$49.95 (hardcover).

DOI: 10.1177/0739456X05279187

Reviewed by Ileana Apostol

Ph.D. candidate

University of Southern California

and

Tridib Banerjee

Professor

School of Policy, Planning, and Development

University of Southern California

Most of what we know about the work of planning practice is grounded in the observations of outsiders (see, e.g., Fischler 2000). Insider accounts—practitioners telling their own stories—are few and far between. Allan Jacob's *Making City Planning Work* (1978) and Jonathan Barnett's *Urban Design as Public Policy: Practical Methods for Improving Cities* (1974) are the best known of this small genre—now extended by the publication (shortly before his death) of David Wallace's *Urban Planning/My Way*. The author was a former member of the city and regional planning faculty of the University of Pennsylvania's School of Design. The book is a personal account of Wallace's forty-odd years as a principal of the internationally acclaimed, Philadelphia-based planning and design firm Wallace Roberts & Todd (previously Wallace, McHarg, Roberts, and Todd). This book project began in 1961 with a grant from the Ford Foundation, ostensibly to document Wallace's Baltimore. A busy practice both enriched and delayed the book. It is worth the wait.

The title of the book captures its spirit: assertive, immodest, heroic, and nostalgic, if not heretic, in this postmodern era of communicative and participatory planning. Yet many practitioners may consider David Wallace's self-proclaimed planning heroism both refreshing and inspiring. It is a collection of planning and urban design stories, told from the author's personal vantage point as a participant in these tales. With the exception of a few projects—notably the Jones Fall Valley Plan and the Baltimore County 1979 Growth Management Plan—Wallace's stories are mainly about the typical inner-city redevelopment projects intended to stimulate languishing urban life and rejuvenate abject urban spaces. These are stories of personalities, power, politics, and profits, but also of networking, negotiating, and deal making that inexorably engage developers, politicians, architects, and urban planners in the process of getting a project off the ground. When considered in tandem with another recent book on urban design also written by a member of the Penn Design faculty—Jonathan Barnett's (2003) *Redesigning Cities*¹—the pair collectively offers complementary perspectives on urban design: retrospective (Wallace) versus prospective (Barnett), process (Wallace) versus principles and products (Barnett).

The books offer different but complementary keys into the “kingdom” of urban design.² Barnett's (2003) approach is one of combining normative theories and principles with best practices; Wallace relies purely on personal experience and insights. If Barnett's book is ideal for classroom pedagogy of urban design, Wallace's book may serve well to cultivate planning savvy for the neophyte, even though the context of practice has no doubt changed. Wallace devotes considerable space defining what constitutes successful practice of urban design by critiquing ideas of well-known designers. But in the end, Wallace does not offer the kind of performance criteria and normative standards of good design that Barnett offers; he only emphasizes planning and the criteria of success in a pragmatic and situational sense. By looking backward to his half-century career in planning, David Wallace constructs *Urban Planning/My Way* as a self-reflective inquiry into the decades of postwar American city planning. From his perspective, planning is an action-oriented and problem-solving process according to the values that “give us a measure of what the client likes and doesn't like about the situation” (p. vii). In many ways, the Wallace book opens a historical window to the political culture that shaped the planning of the core of major American cities in the second half of the twentieth century. Wallace argues that in the Baltimore of the late 1960s, community leaders were considered “the clients” of inner-city redevelopment. But he concedes that this leadership did not include any African American representatives from the inner-city neighborhoods. By his own account, planning was a top-down practice,