THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN PRESS
JOURNALS DIVISION

Public and Private: Rereading Jane Jacobs

Author(s): Elissa Rosenberg

Source: *Landscape Journal*, Fall 1994, Vol. 13, No. 2, SPECIAL ISSUE: WOMAN — LAND — DESIGN (Fall 1994), pp. 139-144

Published by: University of Wisconsin Press

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/43323290

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at https://about.jstor.org/terms

University of Wisconsin Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Landscape Journal*

This content downloaded from 149.10.125.20 on Thu, 17 Feb 2022 17:19:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Public and Private: Rereading Jane Jacobs

Elissa Rosenberg

Elissa Rosenberg received an M.L.A. degree from Cornell University and a B.A. degree from the University of Toronto. She is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Landscape Architecture at the University of Virginia, where she teaches studios and seminars on the urban landscape. She is currently engaged in research on the role of grading and topography in landscape and urban design.

Abstract: *Jane Jacobs's concept of mixed use, developed in her 1961 work,* The Death and Life of Great American Cities, *can be seen not only as an attack on the functionalist separation of uses, but as a challenge to the split between domestic and public life. Mixed use implicitly subverts notions held deeply since the 19th century—the home as "refuge" and its corollary, the street as "dangerous"—with all of the gender associations that have historically been embedded in this imagery. While gender is not an explicit theme in this work, Jacobs's critique of modern planning and zoning implicitly addresses the issue of separate gendered spheres of public and private life, alluding to an alternative, inclusionary vision of public life.*

A significant consequence of 19th century industrial capitalism was a growing separation of the public and private spheres: as production moved outside the home to become organized by principles of the market, the family became increasingly differentiated from the economic sphere. Women, as a result, were to become more closely identified with the domestic sphere of the family, while men dominated the public world of politics and production.

It has been argued that the issue of "separate spheres" raises a central problem in the depiction of the modern city.[1] In her discussion of this question in 1985, Janet Wolff concluded that the literature concerning the modern urban experience "describes the experience of men." She explains that "by equating the *modern* with the *public* [influential writings] have failed to describe women's experience of modernity" (1985, p. 37). Thus the culture of modernity has been traditionally described in male terms; women's lives, associated predominantly with the private realm, have been left out. Wolff notes that "this silence is not only detrimental to any understanding of the lives of the female sex; it obscures a crucial part of the lives of men, too, by abstracting one part of their experience and failing to explore the interrelation of public and private spheres" (p. 44).

But what can be said of women's experience of the city? And further, what does the experience of women in the city have to tell us about the city itself? It is from the context of this discussion—of the interrelation of public and private spheres—that Jane Jacobs's seminal work, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities,* reemerges as an important work deserving of closer examination. Published in 1961, it has long been recognized as a fundamental challenge to the orthodox planning ideas of its day. Jacobs rejected the modernist functionalism that underlay zoning practices and instead promoted the idea of "mixed use," claiming that the vitality of the city depends on "a most intricate and close-grained diversity of uses that give each other constant mutual support, both economically and socially" (1961, p. 14). Her intention was to "attempt to introduce new principles of city planning and rebuilding" (p. 15), which, I will argue, arise from a very different representation of the city. The landscape of Jacobs's city includes grocers, laundry rooms, neighborhood parks, and playgrounds; her observations map a very different terrain from the city streets of Baudelaire's *flâneur,* the stroller-observer of the urban spectacle of the streets of 19th century Paris, the archetypal modern urban figure to which Wolff refers. Jacobs's representation of the city clearly emerges from a woman's experience of the domestic scale of everyday life.

The issue of gender is not an explicit theme in Jacobs's work; however, I will argue that the reimaging of the city from a *domestic* perspective is critical to her development of the idea of mixed use. The mixed-use argument can be seen not only as an attack on the functionalist separation of uses, but as an implicit challenge to the split between domestic and public life in the city. To promote a "close-grained diversity of uses" is to acknowledge the mutually supportive role of the private residential domain and the public life on the street; that is, to recognize the fundamental interconnectedness of the domestic and public realms. As such, mixed use not only represents a new spatial pattern in the city; it also powerfully alludes to an alternative definition of public life whose boundaries with private life are more fluid and complex than previously envisioned. While Jacobs's argument is expressed essentially in spatial terms, this paper will examine the social implications of her model: specifically, how the remapping of public and private space according to a mixed-use model results in a more integrated vision of the roles played by both men and women in the life of the city. Jacobs provides a model whereby the modern urban experience no longer describes only "the experience of men." By challenging the separateness of the two spheres and proposing a new synthesis, her work implicitly redefines the meaning of "public life."

This content downloaded from 149.10.125.20 on Thu, 17 Feb 2022 17:19:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

A second, related theme in this paper concerns Jacobs's methodology as an integral aspect of her thought. Her ethnographic method is employed as a vehicle of critique, stemming from a deliberate rejection of theoretical models of the city and their associated ideologies. Jacobs relies on techniques of observation—of how space is *actually* used—in order to reveal the fallacies of modernist planning. Her empiricism, therefore, serves a clear polemical purpose: to debunk the planning ideas that she believed were destroying American cities.

Jacobs's empirical method is inherently double-edged. Her reliance on the naked observing eye provides an openness—a new inclusionary vision in which the objects of study are not predetermined by any ideological purpose. Her detailed observations reveal new dimensions of the public life of the city, which, not surprisingly, provide a vivid portrait of women's participation. However, her very empiricism—the insistence on what *is* and not on what *ought to be*—restricts her conception of the political dimension of public life. This paper will explore Jacobs's restatement of the public and the private in order to identify the shift suggested by her rich evocation of modern city life and, finally, to assess its limitations.

The Argument for Mixed Use

Jacobs describes the great failures of modern planning through a brief recapitulation of 20th century planning ideas that variously trace their roots to the City Beautiful Movement, Ebenezer Howard's Garden City, and the modernist city of Le Corbusier. For Jacobs, the three traditions share a common foundation: a rationalized zoning diagram in which primary land uses are spatially separated and a fundamental rejection of the street. These principles are at the heart of what Jacobs terms the "planning mentality," which, according to her argument, has ultimately produced isolated, crime-ridden housing projects set in dangerous green space, unused civic centers, and expressways that have "eviscerated city neighborhoods." Writing in 1961, the early period of urban renewal, Jacobs prophetically stated: "This is not the rebuilding of cities. This is the sacking of cities" (p. 15).

Jacobs challenges these visions because they "tell lies" (p. 23), that is, they do not reflect the way cities actually work. Planning, for Jacobs, has concerned itself with how cities *ought* to work, rather than how they actually work. But more fundamentally, her critique turns on a basic difference in attitudes to the city. She rejects the underlying antiurban sentiment of these utopian traditions; not only does she clearly embrace the city, but she also celebrates the very complexity and diversity that planning has sought to rationalize and simplify. "Complexity" is seen here as the key to understanding cities and as a requisite for both urban vitality and modern public life.

It is against this backdrop that Jacobs's idea of mixed use takes shape—as a critique of the overly reductive conceptions of the city that had so influenced the planning ideas of the day. But for mixed use to gain currency, Jacobs must first make the case for "complexity," which here grows out of a reevaluation of the city street. Much of her polemic is devoted to reinstating the importance of the street as the locus of public life. Through nuanced observation and great attention to detail, she portrays the city's "ordered complexity" by describing the intricacy of ordinary neighborhood events, "the daily ballet of Hudson Street." In an almost cinematic portrait, we are walked through the small rituals of urban life and introduced to the cast of characters that populate the neighborhood. The subtle choreography of the street demonstrates the ways in which distinct groups interact in casual public ways, drawn together by diverse and mutually supportive land uses. Jacobs's detailed observation of "how cities work" presents new imagery of city life and leads to a discussion of planning principles that reflect this synergistic view of the city. Central to her thinking is the interrelatedness of uses: "To understand cities, we have to deal outright with combinations or mixtures of uses, not separate uses, as the essential phenomena" (p. 144). The great mistakes of 20th century planning can be traced to an emphasis on individual uses, which led to an erroneous composite understanding of the overall city—like the "blind men who felt the elephant and pooled their findings. The elephant lumbered on, oblivious to the notion that he was a leaf, a snake, a wall, tree trunks and a rope all somehow stuck together" (p. 144).

The Ideology of Separate Spheres and the "Cult of Domesticity"

The gender implications of the separation of land uses are made explicit in Jacobs's discussion of the socialization of children. Here she makes the point that to isolate the home from other facets of life effectively results in the isolation of women:

> Most city architectural designers and planners are men. Curiously, they design and plan to exclude men as part of normal, daytime life wherever people live. In planning residential life they aim at filling the presumed daily needs of impossibly vacuous housewives and preschool tots. They plan, in short, strictly for matriarchal societies. *The ideal of a matriarchy inevitably accompanies all planning in which residences are isolated from other parts of life.* (p. 83; italics added)

This comment arises in the context of her argument to reestablish the street as a setting for play, instead of isolated and often dangerous playgrounds and "green spaces." Sidewalks can provide a setting for unspecialized play, as well as exposure to diverse adults who informally double as the children's supervisors in the course of their daily work. The informal contact between children and adults takes on added importance when the adults are men: ". . . play on lively, diversified sidewalks differs from virtually all other daily incidental play offered American children today: It is play not conducted in a matriarchy" (p. 83). Jacobs uses the term "matriarchy" to refer to a separated female sphere. Her argument for the need to expose children to an integrated world of men and women introduces the gender issue of separate spheres into the discussion of the city. It is only at this point that the separation of housing from the commercial and institutional uses of the

This content downloaded from
149.10.125.20 on Thu, 17 Feb 2022 17:19:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

city becomes framed in terms of this deeper underlying problem.

The "ideal of a matriarchy," which Jacobs claims to accompany "all planning in which residences are isolated from other parts of life" (p.83), has historically been a powerful force supporting the spatial zoning of the city. Even preceding the rise of suburban development in the 19th century, the home was to become idealized as a refuge from industrial society, closely identified with women and the family. Gwendolyn Wright has discussed the ways in which the "cult of domesticity" prevalent in the early 19th century—that is, the "celebration of home, family and womanhood" (1980, p. 99)—later found architectural expression in the middle-class suburban house of the 1880s and 1890s, where "a richly symbolic architecture and a pure protected womanhood would keep domestic values intact" (p. 99). In the suburbs this domestic ideal was to become more sharply counterposed to the image of the immoral commercial city by fusing the rhetoric of picturesque nature with that of the house as "retreat." As Wright notes: "The spheres of men and women, city and suburbs, were cast as fiercely antagonistic to one another in every way" (1981, p. 108).

Jacobs only briefly introduces the idea of "matriarchy" to describe the overlap of the separation of men and women with the separateness of home and workplace. It is clearly not central to the book's argument. Yet this point, arising from a discussion of children's play, highlights the challenge posed by mixed use to the ideology of separate spheres; the objective of this strategy is to collapse the distinction between the private residential female realm and the public male world. The integration of the private residence within a mixed-use neighborhood promises to realign the boundaries of female and male worlds. No longer conditioned by the rhetoric of "refuge," family life is thrown back into the street, as it were, to participate in all of the dimensions of urban life. The protagonists of the vital urban neighborhood on which Jacobs models her vision of the city are locals and strangers, men and women: part of "normal daytime life wherever people live." The public life of the city is fundamentally implicated with private life.

The Street and the Rhetoric of Danger

It is this implicit relationship of family life to the public life of the city that underscores the profound transformation of the street in Jacobs's conception. Just as the idea of mixed use subverts the rhetoric of "refuge" associated with the home, so does it equally challenge its corollary, the rhetoric of "danger" associated with the street. The force of the Victorian idea of home as a retreat from the city and its corrupting influence drew in part on the powerful imagery of danger associated with city streets, evident in the popular literature of the time. This imagery became increasingly complex as it reflected new anxieties associated with social change. In her documentation of this literature to discover the "cartography of gender" in the 19th century city streets of New York, New Orleans, and San Francisco, Mary Ryan (1990) analyzes the social meaning contained in the various symbols of danger in the popular imagination.[2] Noting the exaggerated emphasis in popular urban writing on the threat of the prostitute and beggar (usually referred to as female), she remarks that women were not only seen as "endangered," but now also as "dangerous." Ryan quotes from 19th century literary accounts, noting that "the readers of this lurid literature were instructed to see the streets as a sexual battlefield, even more dangerous for men than women" (p. 74). The fear of sexual danger, however, is often a metaphor for broader anxieties associated with general social disorder: ". . . sexuality was perhaps the most powerful metaphor for the interplay of diversity and proximity in the big city" (p. 75). Andreas Huyssen (1986, p. 52) makes a similar point: "The fear of the masses in this age of declining liberalism [late 19th century] is always a fear of woman, a fear of nature out of control, a fear of the unconscious, of sexuality, of the loss of identity."[3]

Given the extent to which the rhetoric of danger has vividly shaped the urban imagination, it is not incidental that Jacobs's first chapter is entitled "The Uses of Sidewalks: Safety." She recognizes that a true public life on the street depends upon a sense of accessibility and openness, which in turn presupposes a basic perception of safety. The story of Hudson Street not only establishes the concept of an underlying "ordered complexity," but also serves to emphasize the role of diversity in making this street *safe*. She turns the popular image around: the stranger is not viewed as a source of anxiety and danger, but rather as a necessary and integral part of the safe neighborhood. The delicately calibrated ebb and flow of people on the street—both locals and *strangers*—provide the surveillance, the famous "eyes on the street" that serve to maintain a sense of safety. In this way, the street is reconceptualized as the domain of locals, while it also remains open to the larger city and its diverse population. The domestic life on the street provides a new context in which to view the stranger; Jacobs's recognition of the complementarity of insiders and outsiders at once defuses the fear of the stranger and permits her to celebrate her presence.[4]

The Street and Public Life

While the concept of mixed use suggests important continuities between public and private life, Jacobs is aware of the need for a clear spatial definition of these realms. The street is seen as a critical seam between the two spheres; a vital and safe street is one in which there is a "clear demarcation between what is public space and what is private space. Public and private space cannot ooze into each other as they do typically in suburban settings or in projects" (1961, p. 58). She is particularly perceptive in understanding the necessary conditions for social interaction to occur, noting that the casual contact made in the street is the basic foundation of public life in the city. It is this informal public life that acts to mediate between private family life and formal public organizations. The street offers a neutral ground with a sense of boundaries that is critical for this kind of contact to occur, and thus serves to encourage broader, more inclusive social participation.

This content downloaded from
149.10.125.20 on Thu, 17 Feb 2022 17:19:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

Throughout the book, Jacobs uncovers the meaning of public space as it is negotiated not only in the street, but in other previously unexplored sites: the neighborhood park, the public space of the apartment laundry room; the corner grocery store. She approaches the broad questions of the city by examining everyday life, and it is this pervasive domestic imagery that effects a fundamental shift in her urban conception. The city is not portrayed in the heroic terms of early modernism, but is celebrated in *antiheroic* terms through the exuberant documentation of the ordinary. By focusing on the close-up view, the "small" details of everyday life, Jacobs breathes vitality back into the city, celebrating the very contingencies of the urban routine. The meaning of urban space is transformed as it becomes inhabited by the familiar.

Just as the details of daily life take on a new importance in revealing and explaining urban experience, so do new subjects emerge to articulate this experience: mothers in the park, children playing in the street; the shopkeepers, bartenders, and other previously unnoticed custodians of the neighborhood. The emphasis on common everyday experience writes women back into the city not because Jacobs deliberately sets out to, but because the city itself is now viewed through a different lens. Because her vision of the city is elaborated from the starting point of her own subjectivity, from the realm of experience and intimate knowledge drawn from her day-to-day world, a new importance is given to women's experience of the city. But this is not merely to record the female private sphere—"the experience of the modern in its private manifestations"—which Wolff decried as absent from the literature of modernity. Jacobs's city posits an altered relationship between women's *and* men's private and public lives. Hers in an inclusive vision of the city populated by men and women, whose public world inevitably grows out of the domestic life of family and neighborhood. In this way, there is an implicit recognition of the mediating role of urban space in negotiating the public meaning of domestic life.

The Reciprocal Construction of Private and Public Life

The reciprocal construction of private and public life in the everyday uses of the street forms an underlying theme in this work in ways that anticipate later feminist analyses of space: "Social space, especially the everyday uses of city streets, serves as a scaffolding upon which both gender distinctions and female identity are constructed" (Ryan 1990, p. 59). Jacobs's work argues against a simple interpretation, such as Wolff's, of the dichotomy of public and private by recognizing that the relationship of the domestic world of family and neighborhood to the city's public life is not *fixed,* but *dynamic.* This understanding, implicit to Jacobs's depiction of the city, has generated new theoretical questions for urban historiography. Ryan, for example, writing about the formation of 19th century urban public space and its associated issues of gender, reevaluates the public-private relationship as defined by the "spheres dichotomy": "To search for women in public is to subvert a longstanding tenet of the modern Western gender system, the presumption that social space is divided between the public and the private and the men claim the former while women are confined to the latter" (p. 4). Rather than reject the model completely, Ryan proposes an alternative strategy: "to retain the concept of the public but shun its gender correlate; that is to go defiantly in search of women in public" (p. 4). This search, which is carried out through a documentation of emergent public spaces in three 19th century American cities with their "real and imagined gender boundaries,"[5] uncovers the complex construction of gender in the urban public realm. Ryan argues that the historical record of "women in public" illustrates two opposing dynamics:

> [M]ale-female distinctions are put to a severe test in a public space. On the one hand, the behavior of men and women in public can be orchestrated so as to lend a special legitimacy and sharper definition to gender differences. On the other hand, gender distinctions might be corroded by the informal, everyday uses of public space by real men and women. The spontaneity, diversity and volatility of life on the streets of the big city might not be so easily corralled into neat distinctions between the dualistic classifications of male and female. (p. 16)

This argument addresses the complex role of public space in legitimating an ideology of gender, while recognizing that this ideology is constantly contested by what she terms the "corroding of distinctions" that are effected by the dynamics of "informal, everyday use."[6]

It would seem that Jacobs implicitly understood this effect of the everyday life in the street and therefore focused on it as her object of study; it is presented as a corrective to the ideological construction of space by ideological planners. Her rejection of theoretical models of the city in favor of empirically based observation is thus clearly polemical in intent; her methodology is integral to the reframing of the discourse of the city. It is precisely her journalistic eye set on the "microscopic view" of the city's fine-grained, everyday components that permits whole new areas of urban life to come into focus. In this way Jacobs valorizes domestic experience vis-à-vis public life: first, by *observing* the subtle details of everyday life and, second, by uncovering complex meaning in these everyday acts in terms of their impact on other facets of urban life.

"Context" and "Systems": the Case of the Urban Park

A closer analysis of this second point—that Jacobs's dynamic model of the city is predicated on the interrelationships of its parts—reveals several of the difficulties that emerge from her empiricist method. It also suggests the point at which the argument for a feminist reading begins to break down.

A consequence of the view of the city as a system of "organized complexity" is that individual uses are not considered in isolation, but instead are understood within a "systems" approach. This conceptual model of the city draws heavily from an ecological analogy whereby the city is seen as a self-regulating system. The very idea of diversity resonates as a biological metaphor: the

This content downloaded from
149.10.125.20 on Thu, 17 Feb 2022 17:19:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

social mix of diverse cultures and classes that Jacobs advocates is as necessary to stability as is the diversity of species to the mature ecosystem.

The design implications of this "systems" idea are revealed in Jacobs's analysis of the urban park. Her contextual approach to urban design significantly reconceptualizes the landscape of the city and, at the same time, raises fundamental questions regarding the cultural meaning of design.

Jacobs's first point is to demystify the park, arguing against its power as a "magic fetish" for planners:

> Too much is expected of city parks. Far from transforming any essential quality in their surroundings, far from automatically uplifting their neighborhoods, neighborhood parks themselves are directly and drastically affected by the way the neighborhood acts upon them. (1961, p. 95)

Parks are not the "lungs of the city"; they are not necessarily real estate stabilizers or community anchors. Parks have no inherent power to revitalize the city on their own, but depend on the interaction with the surrounding city context for their success. Without this consideration, the park runs the risk of becoming a "border vacuum," a kind of no man's land of deserted and dangerous space.

The park, then, is assessed as one element among others in the city, stripped of any intrinsic meaning: landscape is no longer privileged in any sense. Jacobs's intention is to challenge the Corbusian pastoral vision of nature in the city in which green open space, the flowing neutral ground to the new technological city, is invested with iconic meaning quite apart from its actual use. Her argument stands in even sharper contrast to the view of nature that propelled the 19th century public parks movement: nature as a repository of moral values and hence a civilizing force in the city. But even if we can no longer believe in the moralizing agenda of nature in this way, Jacobs's altered understanding of the social potential of the environment—that is, not inherent in nature itself, but contingent upon social use—ultimately militates against the possibility for meaning in the landscape: landscape created as a work of art. In her strenuous effort to demythologize the workings of the elements of the city and to peel away the deceptions promulgated by the rhetoric of architects, art and design are ultimately neutralized, and thus naïvely devalued.

However, there was an important lesson for urban designers in Jacobs's synthetic view, in which the city was conceptualized as a totality of its parts, a continuous fabric. These ideas anticipated the critique of the modernist disintegration of the city by urban design critics, most notably that of the "contextualism" of Colin Rowe, as well as the "traditional city" of Leon Krier and Aldo Rossi. While Jacobs's writing can be seen as part of a wider critical response to the modernist city, what sets her work apart is her ahistorical construct of the city as a self-regulating system—which effectively preempts the role of art and design. The elements of the city are viewed strictly instrumentally; that is, as a means to an end that is defined in purely social and functional terms.[7] Aesthetics have no autonomous status; aesthetic discourse, in fact, is specifically attacked when it is seen to obscure social issues with a formalistic emphasis. Jacobs's adherence to this neutral scientistic model displaces culture and history as meaningful forces in the city.

The City as a "Self-Regulating System"

It is this limited regard for the role of culture in shaping the physical environment that restricts the feminist reading of Jacobs's work. Such a reading assumes a fundamental relationship between space and social processes. In this view, according to Daphne Spain, space is socially constructed: "... spatial relations exist only because social processes exist" (1992, p. 5). In her work *Gendered Spaces,* Spain clarifies how the social construction of space is a critical concept for feminist analysis:

> According to feminist geographers, a thorough analysis of gender and space would recognize that definitions of femininity and masculinity are constructed in particular places—most notably the home, workplace, and community—and the reciprocity of these spheres of influence should be acknowledged in analyzing status differences between the sexes. Expectations of how men and women should behave in the home are negotiated not only there but also at work, at school, and at social events. (p. 7)

She notes that "while it would be simplistic to argue that spatial segregation causes gender stratification, it would be equally simplistic to ignore the possibility that spatial segregation reinforces gender stratification and that modifying spatial arrangements, by definition, alters social processes" (p. 6). Spatial segregation can be seen as a mechanism of power: to control space is to control access to knowledge and resources. As Foucault has written: "A whole history remains to be written of spaces—which would at the same time be the history of powers— ... from the great strategies of geo-politics to the little tactics of the habitat" (cited in Spain, p. 2).

Foucault's notion of space as a "container of social power" is contradicted by the neutrality of Jacobs's model, in which, it has been noted, relations of power go unrecognized. Thomas Bender has remarked that her underlying appeal to an idea of the city as a natural system serves to depoliticize the city in a fundamental way:

> For all her celebration of a vital public life in cities, Jacobs has a non-political sense of the public realm. Her underlying assumption is that justice inheres in a natural order of things rather than in politics. ... It is striking how infrequently questions of social structure or the relations of power, fundamental products of human history and facts of city life, find a place in Jacobs's basic model of the city. (1984, p. 678)

The physical environment alone appears to shape social relations in Jacobs's city. While her observations allude to the complex negotiation of cultural meaning in everyday public space, the full political implications of such a relationship are denied by her emphasis on the causal effects of

This content downloaded from
149.10.125.20 on Thu, 17 Feb 2022 17:19:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms

the physical environment and its embodiment of what Bender terms "the natural order of things." Her model of the city as a "self-regulating system" based on an underlying tendency toward equilibrium overlooks the forces of culture, power, and human agency; it therefore offers no political language with which to analyze the relationships of gender and space.

Jacobs's critique of modern planning and zoning is based in part on a feminist argument that addresses the gender implications in the separation of land uses, recognizing the ways in which this ideology has served to isolate women in the domestic sphere. Her methodology implicitly acknowledges Spain's assertion that "gendered spaces themselves shape, and are shaped by, *daily activities*" (1992, p. 24; italics mine), but stops short of recognizing "how relations of power and discipline are inscribed into the apparently innocent spatiality of social life" (Soja 1989, p. 6). The full political implications of Jacobs's reorganized city—based on an understanding that "the reorganization of space is always a reorganization of the framework through which social power is expressed" (Harvey 1980, p. 255)—are absent from this work, and indeed could be said to be contradicted by the assumptions underlying her conception of the city. Nonetheless, *Death and Life* constitutes a significant revision to the monolithic depictions of public life—which only describe "the experience of men." Jacobs gave currency to a new imagery of the city, a pluralistic landscape, of women and men, that bridges the gulf between domestic and public life and gives new voice to the experience of women. The concept of mixed use has not only changed the course of urban redevelopment; it has opened the door for a critical reevaluation of private and public life as shaped by the spatial order of the city.

Acknowledgments

I am grateful to Mary McLeod, Daphne Spain, Elizabeth Meyer, and Rachelle Taqqu for reading and commenting on earlier drafts of this paper.

Notes

1. Much feminist scholarship has been concerned with the issue of separate spheres. For a historiography of the "spheres" concept, see Linda Kerber (1988) and Carole Pateman (1987). Kerber credits Aileen Kraditor (1968) with identifying the question of the spheres as central to an understanding of American feminism. Considerable debate has since ensued within feminist writing on the meaningfulness of this model. See also Dorothy Helly and Susan Reverby (1992), who clearly chart the course of this debate. For a review of the "spheres" issue in planning literature, see Gerda Wekerle (1980).
2. See the chapter "The Cartography of Gender: The Endangered and the Dangerous" in Ryan (1990, pp. 68–75).
3. See Andreas Huyssen's essay "Mass Culture as Woman: Modernism's Other" (1986) for a discussion of Gustave Le Bon's 1895 work, *The Crowd* (La Psychologie des Foules), where the urban crowd is likened to a devouring sphinx: "The male fear of woman and the bourgeois fear of the masses become indistinguishable" (p. 52).
4. For a discussion of "difference" or diversity as a theme of political discourse, see Thomas Bender (1989). Bender contrasts the model of New York, which has historically represented cosmopolitanism and diversity, with what he claims are the dominant American models derived from both Puritan New England and Jeffersonian Virginia. While the latter two models are quite distinct, they share a common rejection of heterogeneity as a positive cultural-political value, which therefore "distances them from the condition of modern life" (p. 24). Marshall Berman (1988) also discusses the issue of diversity as a fundamental aspect of modern experience, noting Jacobs's seemingly paradoxical identification of the traditional street and neighborhood with modern culture: We must strive to keep this "old environment alive because it is uniquely capable of nourishing modern experiences and values: the freedom of the city" (p. 318). See also David Harvey (1980, pp. 68–76) for an assessment of Jacobs's argument for diversity, which for Harvey anticipates a postmodern position, inasmuch as it constitutes a critique of modernist style and ideology.
5. These include new gendered public spaces (the male domain of theaters, cafes, merchant exchanges, public halls; the female domain of department stores, ladies' hotel parlors, theater matinees), as well as the less clearly gender-defined public spaces of the street. See Ryan (1990, pp. 58–95).
6. See Mary Poovey's discussion of ideology in 19th century England: "To describe an ideology as a set of beliefs or a system of institutions and practices conveys the impression of something that is internally organized, coherent and complete. The middle class ideology we most often associate with the Victorian period was both contested and always under construction; because it was always in the making it was always open to revision, dispute and the emergence of oppositional formations," in *Uneven Developments: The Ideological Work of Gender in Mid-Victorian England* (London, 1989), cited in Elizabeth Wilson (1992, p. 98).
7. See Alan Colquhoun (1981) for a general discussion of critiques of the modern city. Colquhoun suggests two general categories of approaches: the city as "process" and the city as "form."

References

Bender, Thomas. 1984. "Jane in the Cities." *The Nation* 283(June 2):677–679.
———. 1989. "New York as a Center of 'Difference': How America's Metropolis Counters American Myth." In *In Search of New York,* edited by Jim Sleeper. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction.
Berman, Marshall. 1988. *All That Is Solid Melts into Air.* New York: Viking Penguin.
Colquhoun, Alan. 1981. "The Superblock." In *Essays in Architectural Criticism.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
Harvey, David. 1980. *The Condition of Postmodernity.* Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.
Helly, Dorothy, and Susan Reverby. 1992. "Introduction." In *Gendered Domains: Rethinking Public and Private in Women's History.* Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
Huyssen, Andreas. 1986. "Mass Culture as Woman: Modernism's Other." In *After the Great Divide.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
Jacobs, Jane. 1961. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities.* New York: Vintage.
Kerber, Linda. 1988. "Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Woman's Place: The Rhetoric of Women's History." *Journal of American History* 75(June):9–39.
Kraditor, Aileen. 1968. *Up From the Pedestal: Selected Writings in the History of American Feminism.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Pateman, Carole. 1987. "Feminist Critiques of the Public Private Dichotomy." In *Feminism and Equality,* edited by Anne Philips. New York: New York University Press.
Ryan, Mary. 1990. *Women in Public.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Soja, Edward. 1989. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory.* London: Verso.
Spain, Daphne. 1992. *Gendered Spaces.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
Wekerle, Gerda. 1980. "Women in the Urban Environment." *Signs* 5(3): supplement (Spring).
Wilson, Elizabeth. 1992. "The Invisible Flâneur." *New Left Review* 191(January–February):98.
Wolff, Janet. 1985. "The Invisible Flâneuse: Women and the Literature of Modernity." *Theory, Culture and Society* 2(3): 37–46.
Wright, Gwendolyn. 1980. *Moralism and the Modern Home.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
———. 1981. *Building the Dream.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

This content downloaded from
149.10.125.20 on Thu, 17 Feb 2022 17:19:53 UTC
All use subject to https://about.jstor.org/terms