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From Civic Worker to City Planner

Women and Planning, 1890–1980

Eugenie Ladner Birch

We scorn this ill-conceived conference. While the profession claims to be trying to humanize its practice, the conference panel topics and the resource people are a denial of this claim. Discussions of the inner city, of minorities in the profession of land use policies and of neighborhood planning all affect women and community people intimately. Women who are a legitimate constituency and an invaluable resource have been dealt with by the conference only as “wives” of “delegates,” shunted off to . . . department stores and museums . . . (only) 15 to 20 percent of all planners and urban specialists are female. Why indeed are not all planning commissions 50 percent female to accurately represent the constituencies of the urban community? We deplore the planning that is done by men. It takes little account of the needs of women . . . (who) should be the guiding force for human communities.

This sharp critique, read at the 1970 annual meeting of the American Society of Planning Officials (ASPO) by a representative of the newly formed Women’s Caucus, was thoroughly predictable in its timing and content. Paralleling similar protest from women in other occupations, it reflected the impact of the mid-century fem-
ninist movement on the planning profession. Not since the presuffrage
days at the turn of the century had women been so vocal about their
needs and concerns. Much of the action resulted from a quiet
revolution in female roles, expressed by the increasing participation
of women in the labor force (by 1970 43 percent of all women were
working) and by a growing discontent with what some women
considered the forced domesticity of the suburbs (documented so
vividly by Betty Friedan in the Feminine Mystique). The National
Organization for Women (NOW), founded in 1966 and aided by the
antisex discrimination clause to Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights
Act, began to press for equality in education and employment.
Women defined themselves as an oppressed minority and shaped
their protests on the civil rights model. Part of their campaign was
to publicize evidence of sexual discrimination. This tactic gained the
attention of many professional groups, including the planners,
whose examinations of their own field led to organized outrage. The
statement of the Women's Caucus, then, grew out of this reformist
urge.

Aside from professional discrimination, a second and equally
significant theme in the Women's Caucus petition was the claim to
gender-related expertise. Women, they stated, should be the "guiding
force for human communities." In the tradition of the late
nineteenth century, the protesters listed activities where domestic
knowledge gave women dominance. Access to work for the now
heavily female labor force, for example, and questions of residential
planning should be included in women's issues along with more
conventional concerns: child care, community services, and
employment conditions.

While these two themes, professional access and gender-related
expertise, reflected the unique mid-century version of American
feminism, they had not appeared independently but were the product
of the previous eighty years. Furthermore, they echoed another
reform recently proclaimed in the planning profession: the need to
recognize the field's pluralistic nature, a view articulated by Paul
Davidoff and Thomas A. Reiner, whose 1962 essay, "A Choice
Theory of Planning," was well accepted in the profession by 1970.

The actions of the women planners of the 1970s reflected the
larger trends of society and their profession, just as did the work of
their predecessors who helped advance the cause of planning in the
early twentieth century. An evaluation of female participation in
planning must therefore draw both on the history of planning and
on general women's history. It also requires an analysis of two
phenomena in the history of planning: first, its rise as a profession
encompassing an area of expertise, an educational tradition, and a
self-regulating component; and second, its acceptance by the public
as a legitimate exercise of government power.

In the first area, professional development, women clearly had
little direct impact. Through 1940 only one woman held full
membership in the American Institute of Planners, the field's
credentialed society. (By the same token, few women participated
in the growth of any of the traditional professions, including law,
medicine, architecture, and engineering.) However, some individual
females did make important indirect contributions in shaping the
field. As librarians, executive secretaries, and in other positions,
they helped form the intellectual content and participated in the
administrative aspects of the field. The careers of Theodora Kimball
Hubbard, Charlotte Rumbold, and Elisabeth Herlihy illustrate this
type of activity. In the second area, acceptance by the public, women
played a far more important role, garnering community support and
providing financial backing at critical points. Into this category fall
club activity, philanthropy, and public relations, all open to women.
The work of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Russell
Sage Foundation and the Spelman Fund, and Harlean James of the
American Civic Association exemplify this aspect. Finally, the fact
that there were enough women to form a caucus in 1970 is evidence
that women did enter the profession during the postwar period.
They entered slowly, and despite equal training did not advance as
quickly as their male counterparts. They would provide the critical
mass of supporters for the call for reform.

Women and Planning at the Turn of the Century
Planning was the product of late-nineteenth-century progressive
reform efforts. Although it had many roots, one of its earliest
tangible forms was the 1893 Chicago World's Fair which many regard
as a visible precedent for the wave of civic improvement that
swept the country that culminated in the planning movement in the
early twentieth century. Drawing from many strands, from
municipal arts to sanitation, cities of all sizes sought to create well-
ordered, beautiful urban environments administered in an econom-
ic and rational manner. By the late 1920s planning which originated as a private-sector effort had become a legitimate exercise of local government power."

Its primary concern was to direct the physical development of the city. Several organizations promoted its aims—the American Civic Association (ACA) founded in 1904, the National Conference on City Planning (NCCP) created in 1909, the American City Planning Institute (ACPI) formed in 1917, and subsections of the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) and the American Institute of Architects (AIA)." The emerging field was explained to supporters and practitioners in periodicals such as The American City magazine, started in 1909, and The City Plan, originated in 1915, and its successor, City Planning Quarterly; and in several basic books, including Benjamin Marsh's An Introduction to City Planning (1909), Charles Mulford Robinson's The Improvement of Towns and Cities (1907), John Nolen's Replanning Small Cities (1912), and Carrying Out the City Plan (1914) by Favel Shurtleff and Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr."

At this time, the technical aspects of city planning practice were clearly in the male domain and were taught in schools of architecture or engineering. At first professionals in these areas purveyed their services to private groups, primarily chambers of commerce, the most notable example being Daniel Burnham's contract with the Commercial Club of Chicago to produce a comprehensive plan. Later, with the proliferation of planning commissions, they consulted directly with cities.

City planning spread rapidly because it was sought by urbanites, who by 1920 were the majority of the nation's population. The demand did not rise spontaneously but derived from multiple sources.

Historians have documented the role of businessmen's groups but few have outlined the quite substantial contributions of women. In the thirty-year span between 1890 and 1920, groups of women had become highly active in civic affairs. Predominantly college-educated, a rarity at the beginning of the period, they created clubs to recapture the intellectual life and companionship of their undergraduate years, to justify their education, and partly to seek the control over their environments that would ultimately lead to their enfranchisement in 1920.

The club network was vast." By 1909, for example, the General Federation of Women's Clubs claimed 800,000 members in more than 495 affiliates." In addition, women belonged to other groups, such as the American Association of University Women, the Women's Division of the National Civic Federation, local municipal art societies, and general civic improvement organizations.

Despite much public skepticism, the movement of women into public affairs gained momentum. In 1912, The American City magazine dedicated a complete issue to the phenomenon. In a lengthy preface, entitled "The old order changeth," the editor sought to reassure his subscribers (90 percent men): "How needless was the widespread fear that women's attempt to spell the task of civic work would work havoc to the social structure." In fact, he claimed, the opposite occurred because the distinctive feminine view, "often the reverse of man's," had made "the ideal city a practical reality . . . (for) we are coming to learn that the term city implies of necessity concentration of population but it does not of necessity imply ugliness, squalor or disease.""

At this time, a clear division existed by mutual consent between men's and women's civic activities. In the effort to gain acceptance, women had consciously claimed certain urban problems as their own. For example, likening the metropolis to "a home, clean and beautiful," Eva Perry Moore, longtime president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, maintained that congestion and competition, two earmarks of the early-twentieth-century city, particularly affected mothers because they hindered homemaking efforts. Therefore, she argued, women should extend their domestic roles to ameliorate the municipal environment. In specific terms, they should view their urban mission as achieving the "City Cleanly, City Sanitary, and City Beautiful." Although the "vast army" of club workers whom Moore addressed were essentially elite, they, like all good progressives, believed their efforts would reach across the social structure to provide "a future gain to every class of society.""

One of the first national efforts to be organized by women was at the 1893 Chicago World's Fair. The planning of the Exposition had been delegated by Congress to an all-male commission headed by Daniel H. Burnham. Nevertheless, women gained a foothold by forcing Congress to appoint a 115-member Board of Lady Managers, who were to award the site and an appropriation for a women's headquarters building on the fairgrounds. The Board, headed by Bertha H. Palmer (wife of a wealthy Chicago hotelier) who had been
long involved in civic work, soon expanded the women's narrow mission. With Burnham's consent they sponsored a national competition for the design of the Women's Building, as the project was bluntly called, awarding the commission to a twenty-two-year-old Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) graduate, Sophia G. Hayden, who later won the Fair's Artist's Medal for her design. All the work in the building was done by women. For example, the Board commissioned Mary Cassatt, the expatriate American artist, and Mary MacMonnies, the wife of Frederick MacMonnies who sculpted the Fair's fountain, to execute two massive murals for the main gallery.

Not content merely to sponsor a resting place for female visitors, as Congress had envisioned, the Board made their building as important as the other exhibition halls. They filled it with gender-related resources, including a seven thousand-volume library, a survey of women's social and economic position in forty-seven countries, and a model kitchen filled with appliances designed to lighten domestic chores. In addition, the Board financed the nearby Children's Building for day care. Once the Exposition opened, they scheduled lectures, conferences, and demonstrations.

Like their counterparts in the growing, locally based civic movement, the Lady Managers succeeded because of the personal influence of their leaders, their strong organization, and their care to frame their work in terms of women's domestic functions. Using a conservative definition of female roles, they brought their interests into the public view under the cloak of domesticity: in addition to examples of women's crafts, they also provided demonstrations about women's suffrage and the entry of women into the professions.

Male observers supported the women's claim that their civic work was merely an extension of their domestic duties. While The American City editor writing about the 1912 "women's number" implored his readers to "examine this issue with care," he bid them to "place it within the proper context." Every woman, he reminded them, "realizes that she cannot make an ideal home without the right kind of house."

This much the American woman has known for generations, [he continued] but a greater vision is now being raised before her... she has come to realize that no home liveth unto itself alone. She has come to see that the physical things of the city affect every home in it and that to her, as the homemaker, the improving of these municipal conditions is of vital concern.

Within municipal affairs club women of the time had diverse interests. The General Federation therefore devised separate departments (Civics, Health, Education). However, early on the whole Federation came to support city planning, believing that their independent efforts in sanitation, hygiene, playground construction, child welfare, and outdoor art could be accomplished only within a broader framework. By 1912, Alice Davis Moulton, chairman of the Federation's Civic Department, had articulated their position:

To designate any one phase as the fundamental requirement in a movement so pregnant with virtual issues as the civic movement is most difficult, but authorities on civics agree that a city plan is a fundamental requirement for comprehensive civic improvement.

Pledging the backing of the national Civic Department, she called for the local branches to contribute the grass-roots support necessary for the expansion of planning into municipalities. She bid her followers to "secure universal interest in city planning (and give) an impetus to civic betterment that ultimately would lay the cornerstone for the future."

Although the disenfranchised women had no direct political or economic clout, they argued that their impartial views on planning and other reform issues were untainted by selfish motives and therefore more impressive. Typical was the accomplishment of Whycheville, Virginia, women who despite having "to contend with man's tendency to subvert everything to a monetary basis," had successfully campaigned for a town park. In the same mode, Mildred Chadsey, chief inspector of the Cleveland Bureau of Sanitation, claimed "women can successfully divorce work from politics, thereby making their projects respectable. Many men concurred with this assessment. George B. Dealey, vice president and general manager of the Dallas News, attributed women's civic achievements to their "sincerity of purpose." Furthermore, he recognized a certain rationale in their choice of projects when he reported that they "have never undertaken an enterprise that was not vital, timely, and practical (which) did not appeal to the public as sane and just."
As women became increasingly secure of their place in civic affairs, they enlarged the scope of their interests and undertook increasingly sophisticated projects. Correspondingly, as their efforts grew more ambitious, their support for city planning became more significant. In the beginning, they had concentrated on high visibility and short-term, easily defined commitments. Cleanup campaigns were typical for these efforts: they organized parades, rallies, refuse collection days, and planting ceremonies for all citizens, young and old. They soon moved to more substantial endeavors, often raising funds for them. In 1914 Zona Gale reflected on the significance of this trend: "the most potent and least indirect way of cooperation at present in woman's power is actually to inaugurate and pay for the particular advances which they are advocating."

Using traditional means, such as holding bazaars, serving home-cooked meals at county fairs, and performing in "ladies minstrel shows" they raised thousands of dollars in countless communities to support their chosen causes.33

Park projects were a frequent choice. Observing that "only too often American villages have grown up into towns and become great cities before it was remembered to set aside suitable space for a community rallying center, the real-estate excesses having swallowed up every last vacant lot," they condemned the thoughtless greed of their male counterparts and called for more open space to relieve congestion and minimize the insidious effects of competition. These sympathies coincided with park schemes proposed by professional planners. For example, in Dallas, Texas, the women's clubs equipped two playgrounds and paid the salaries of recreation supervisors in two problem neighborhoods. In the process they created a recreation association which soon affiliated with the city's Park Board and Board of Education to promote the park system called for by George E. Kessler in his "City Plan for Dallas." In conjunction with the early-twentieth-century parks movement, they supported "social centers"—the use of neighborhood schools for off-hour recreational and assembly purposes—long before this idea became the nucleus of the neighborhood unit concept articulated by Clarence Perry and adopted by technical city planners in the 1930s.35

The unity between women and professional city planners is even more closely drawn in the analysis of civic beautification schemes. From Los Angeles to Tampa to Lock Haven (Pennsylvania), city residents moved to improve their town centers. Women's clubs frequently stimulated professional efforts to replan an area, often consulting with leading designers John Nolen and Charles Mulford Robinson.36

In later years Ladislas Segoe, longtime Cincinnati planner, related the continuity of the tradition of women's clubs' support for planning well into the twentieth century:

The typical start of a planning program in a community had its origin in some members of a garden club, who read something in a foreign publication about something called planning and next, taking the Cincinnati newspaper, they found out that there is a guy called Segoe in Cincinnati who was a planner. Now we had to have some speaker at the garden club . . . so why not call up this Segoe guy and see whether he is willing to come . . . and talk to us about planning? Well, the date had been agreed upon, the speech was dutifully made, and then nothing happened for several months, and then you got a call from the League of Women Voters . . . and after that . . . then came a call from the members of some other . . . club. . . . Then . . . somebody . . . suggested if I come down for a day that he could introduce me to somebody in the city hall. . . . Now by that time . . . the groundwork had been laid . . . and . . . planning had managed to take root.37

With increasing involvement in civic affairs, women gained recognition as legitimate forces in the community and participated in the activities and boards of local and national organizations. As early as 1909, Richard B. Warrour, secretary of the ACA, ascribed "to the enthusiasm, the untiring efforts and practical suggestions" of women the "splendid headway attained by general improvement propaganda." In his opinion, their most important accomplishment was to promote the vision of a desirable urban environment. "Hundreds of cities, that have distinguished themselves for notable achievements," he claimed, "can point to some society . . . of women that have been the first inspiration to do things."38

Additional examples of women's participation in a sphere wider than the clubs come from many cities. For example, at St. Louis in 1912 women had prominent positions on the program of a three-day civic conference. In Los Angeles, they occupied two slots on the five-member board of the Municipal Art Commission, the body that ordered the first city plan for the West Coast metropolis. And in
Boston, they contributed a major demonstration at the famed "Boston 1915" exhibition, sponsored by leading businessmen of the city.  

Although the general population unquestioningly accepted women's skill in specific domestic-related areas, popular sentiment strictly circumscribed their performance in the public arena, on the basis that their primary duties were familial and their services supplementary. Consequently, while women would provide the "head and heart" in municipal affairs, men were to be the administrators and implementors of urban policy. The most common view saw women contributing their leisure time to this work. In 1912, the editor of The American City clearly expressed this sentiment when he discussed the role of members of women's clubs. Noting that in American cities there were "thousands of women whose housework did not need all their time," he argued that such women had "time and ability for the research and experimental work which should usually precede any radical enlarging of municipal activities." When they had demonstrated "the wisdom of their pioneer work," he concluded, "they may properly turn over to the city the administration of the enterprise... and direct their energies to other community needs."

Most women agreed with this limited role. A few, however, did not, and turned their expertise into full-time professional positions. Caroline Bartlett Crane of Kalamazoo, Michigan, for example, marketed herself as a "municipal housekeeper" and consulted on street cleaning in over fifty cities. Wisconsin activist Zona Gale defined and promoted the paid position of "civic organizer" and in 1913 wrote a handbook, Civic Improvement in the Little Town, for those communities unable to afford a professional. Finally, by 1916 the ACA hired an energetic young woman, Maud Van Buren, as a community organizer. In this job she traveled widely, lecturing and giving advice on organizational strategy, and wrote extensively instructing women to become informed about town ordinances and municipal budgets. She urged them to participate in city planning decisions and to question public officials about the priorities set by their expenditures. Yet even she couched her pleas in familiar terms: "The budget, the city's financial measures for each year, is surely not beyond the comprehension of the woman who conducts her own household expenses on a systematized basis."

A few rare voices called for more women to join the professional ranks. In 1912 chief inspector of the Cleveland Bureau of Sanitation Mildred Chadsey observed that "town planning, transportation, street cleaning and lighting, water supply, sewage systems, and garbage disposal are all questions of 'domestic economy.'" It seemed only logical and fitting, she concluded, "to find women specialists along these lines, as well as men." Yet as the second decade of the twentieth century closed, although women were beginning to make some professional inroads, they did not gain entry to city planning.

By 1917, the city planning movement had divided into two wings: the citizen participants, who remained in the broad based NCIP and its affiliated group, the ACA; and the professionals—twenty-four men in all—who created the ACPI. The ACPI was consciously created to "study the science and advance the art of city planning" by means of discussions of technical subjects at meetings limited to qualified participants whose credentials had to include specified professional education, several years of paid city planning experience, and a vaguely defined "comprehensive view" of the city. Although torn by internal differences about the precise definition of these criteria, the original members were clear about one item: they were professionals, not reformers or citizen activists.

Women simply did not qualify for membership in the ACPI. They had no professional education, their practical experience was volunteer, their projects tended to be narrowly focused, not comprehensive in scale, and they were avowed reformers who always left technical decisions to the experts. Thus as the movement split into the two sectors, women continued to participate in the citizen wing. In fact, the ACA would soon hire a young woman, Harlean James, to head its daily administration.

As the practitioners adopted their professional stance, they tended to become more efficiency-minded and less humanitarian, being concerned mainly with overall land use issues, traffic engineering, and zoning. Perhaps the diminished attention to the social welfare and aesthetic aspects of the field could be related to the lack of female participation in the ACPI. More likely, however, was the overall decline of citizen participation in the public sphere. As the general move for reform in the progressive era petered out, would-be crusaders, male and female, turned to personal self-fulfillment rather than social change. After 1920 women tended to be far less active in the civic affairs of their clubs and their communities.

In the planning field, the emerging professionals focused on
differentiating between the layperson and the expert: seeking consulting jobs as well as professional standing, they identified a marketable product—the master plan and its implementing arm, the zoning ordinance—which only they could prepare. In this way they widened the gulf between the professional and the ordinary citizen, removing themselves from the arena of civic action and citizen input, and thrust themselves into the government advisory role which constituted most of their business in the 1920s.

Women and Planning in the 1920s

With the decline of interest in civic affairs in the 1920s, middle- and upper-class women devoted themselves to domestic issues, especially marriage and motherhood. A symbolic end to their earlier agitation for social reform was the achievement of female suffrage in 1920. The strategists for the enfranchisement campaign had early opted to keep their work narrowly focused on the vote, eliminating from discussion other issues relating to more basic structural reorganization of female roles, a policy wise in the short term but imprudent in the long term. Consequently, after the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment, the leaders declared victory and submerged their efforts by transforming their activist lobbying group, the National American Women’s Suffrage Association (NAWSA), into the nonpartisan League of Women Voters.6

Concurrently, other female club and organizational networks tended to focus on domestic issues. In 1929, for example, the American Association of University Women disbanded its ten-year-old National Housing Committee, which had supported a federal workers’ housing program, and replaced it with another more directly concerned with campus affairs.7 Despite this trend, the civic clubs did not completely die out. Some of them carried on with a narrowed focus and became more institutionalized by hiring executive secretaries to oversee their daily administration. Representatives from the previous generation of well-educated, single women frequently filled these low-paying although highly responsible positions.

Despite their lack of participation in the professional side of planning, women were not totally without influence in the planning movement. A few, such as librarians and executive secretaries or clericals who advanced in rank, participated through their positions as service professionals. The careers of four are illustrative of this activity: Theodora Kimball (1897–1935), librarian of the Harvard School of Design and later wife of Henry V. Hubbard, head of the first planning degree program; Charlotte Rumbold (1865–1960), lobbyist, administrative assistant, and citizen activist in Cleveland; Harlean James (1877–1969), executive secretary of the AGA (later the American Planning and Civic Association) for almost forty years; and Elisabeth Herlihy (1880–1953), secretary of the Boston Planning Commission from its inception in 1913 until her appointment to the chair of the Massachusetts State Planning Board, a position she held until 1950.

Theodora Kimball

More than a librarian, Theodora Kimball used her position as a vehicle to make major intellectual contributions to the newly emerging planning field. After education at the Girls’ Latin School of Boston and graduation from Simmons College, she joined the staff of the Harvard Library in 1908. At age twenty-nine, seeking additional professional training, she returned to Simmons to earn that institution’s first Master’s Degree in Library Science.8

Although involved in her field, she was clearly more interested in academic pursuits and turned to writing until her untimely death in 1935. By 1917 she had coauthored textbooks in city planning and landscape architecture. After that she edited two volumes of the professional papers of Frederick Law Olmsted, Sr.; produced the annual survey of city and regional planning, which had first appeared in 1912 in Landscape Architecture and later City Planning journals founded by Hubbard; assembled city planning bibliographies for The American City, the National Municipal Review, the U.S. Department of Commerce Advisory Commission on Zoning and the President’s Conference on Homebuilding and Homeownership; and produced numerous book reviews for City Planning, of which she was an editor.9

Kimball wrote her most significant book, Our Cities, Today and Tomorrow, an outgrowth of her annual surveys, in collaboration with Hubbard whom she had married in 1924.10 Both the book and the reports synthesized city planning progress in the United States and defined the central issues of the field. Kimball wrote not as a reporter but as a critic, assigning priority to topics she considered
crucial. The reports usually started with her assessment of current progress, based on the number of zoning and planning commissions founded, outstanding publications, and the status of special concerns: regional planning, transportation, parks and recreation, and civic center development. She favorably reviewed implementation schemes such as zoning and capital budgeting and provided ample illustrations of model projects. She compiled practical instruction material for practitioners and students of the new field.

Kimball established a scholarly tradition emulated by many women. Among them were Katherine McNamara, Kimball's protégé and successor at Harvard, whose career spanned several decades; Lucille Keck, librarian of the Charles E. Merriam Library at the Chicago offices of the ASPO and its sister organizations; and Mary Vance, former head of the Council of Planning Librarians who expanded the field's research potential by editing thousands of planning-related bibliographies.

**CHARLOTTE RUMBOLD**

A second group active in the field were executive secretaries of planning or civic organizations. While it is difficult to judge the influence of these women because of the ephemeral nature of their work, Charlotte Rumbold and Harlean James do stand out. Both had a strong commitment to citizen-based efforts, a personally based network of contacts in planning, a strong organizational legacy, and a series of legislative accomplishments. They were both unmarried college graduates who entered planning through an initial interest in housing reform.

Rumbold, born in St. Louis and educated at the University of Missouri, immersed herself in civic activities, including supervision of a pioneering housing study for St. Louis. She later became Supervisor of Recreation, a municipal position from which she resigned in 1915 after a battle with the city council who refused to pay her at an equal rate with a male counterpart.  

Following the unpleasantness in St. Louis, she resettled in Cleveland where she had moved to supervise a slum survey. Through this work she became interested in city planning and took an administrative position at the Chamber of Commerce, combining two functions, assistant secretary and secretary of the City Planning
Committee. In 1919, she helped found the Ohio Planning Conference (OPC), a citizen-based group dedicated to the propagation of planning. For more than two decades, Rumbold was the OPC’s guiding light. Serving in various capacities (secretary/treasurer 1919–25, vice president 1925–8, president 1928–30, and secretary 1938–43), her most notable efforts were as a registered lobbyist in the 1920s. Supported by contributions from OPC’s meager $500 annual budget, she successfully rallied support for the basic state enabling legislation to establish local planning commissions, comprehensive zoning, and subdivision regulations.

Although interested in local planning through the 1930s, as indicated by her tenure on the Cleveland Planning Commission, Rumbold devoted much energy to housing, working for the first laws authorizing public housing, state park development, and state planning. After her retirement in 1943 she continued to support the citizen role in planning until her death in 1960. Early in her career, she had made a clear distinction between citizens and technical planners, in which she emphasized the important role of citizens “who want to learn not to make a city plan ... but how to put a city plan in force.” It was to this constituency that Rumbold directed her efforts.

**HARLEAN JAMES**

Sharing Rumbold’s views was Harlean James, executive secretary of the ACA. She too believed that public education in city planning was crucial to the advance of the field. Many early city plans “lay unused on the shelves of public libraries or hidden in the back of desk drawers,” she observed. Planners tended to “despire the homely, everyday knowledge of the residents in the towns and cities in which they were working,” putting forth proposals which could “be easily challenged by ordinary everyday people with no special knowledge and little insight into the future.” She therefore urged the ACA to create linkages between citizens and professionals. Like Rumbold, she had developed these ideas from her own experiences as a long-time worker in civic affairs. Born in 1877, she graduated from Stanford University in 1898 and became the executive secretary of the Women’s Civic League of Baltimore. In this position she encountered a wide range of issues, from health to housing to public art. She
next served as executive secretary of the U.S. Housing Corporation, the wartime defense housing agency. After the Armistice, she took the same position with the ACA. Her interest in city planning, which had been stimulated in Baltimore and later enriched by her experience with the enlightened designs of the defense housing settlements, inspired her prior to her ACA assignment to write a popular book, *The Building of Cities.*

James was an energetic woman of executive ability who made the ACA an influential force in planning. Working closely with its successive presidents, particularly Frederic A. Delano, the wealthy Chicago businessman who was among the original sponsors of the Chicago Plan of 1909 and uncle of the rising politician Franklin Delano Roosevelt, she focused ACA activities on the major issues of local comprehensive planning and protection of natural resources. In furthering these efforts, James organized nationwide support for the passage of the federal legislation creating the National Capital Park and Planning Commission (later the National Capital Planning Commission) in 1926. She also urged U.S. Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover to form the Division of Building and Housing which issued the exemplary state enabling legislation for planning and zoning, and she actively supported the work of the National Park Service, the U.S. Department of Interior agency that the ACA had strenuously lobbied for prior to its arrival.

As executive secretary, James edited a steady stream of publications, including the monthly *Civic Comment* and the *American Planning and Civic Annual* which featured commissioned essays and an extensive annotated honor roll of civic achievers. She was a prolific author of articles, news notes, book reviews for sympathetic journals, textbooks, and other propagandistic materials. *Her Land Planning in the United States for City, State and Nation,* commissioned by noted land economist Richard T. Ely, was a factual readable book which blended the most current technical information with homely, practical advice.

James's most important work, however, was the least tangible. During her thirty-seven-year tenure at the ACA, she built an extensive network of legislators, planning professionals, and civic leaders by whom the force of her opinion would be felt in planning issues, most notably in land use decisions in Washington, D.C. In 1954, her long association with the ACA gained a measure of national recognition when ASPO gave her one of its three awards for that year.

---

**ELISABETH HERLILHY**

Among the other ASPO award winners in 1954 was Elisabeth Herlihy, also cited for her thirty-seven-year career as a Massachusetts planning official. Herlihy, who had the distinction of being for many years the sole woman member of the ACPI, had entered planning through an unusual route. The precocious daughter of Irish immigrant parents, she graduated as valedictorian of her high school class at age fifteen. After secretarial training in Boston she remained there to work. In her spare time she wrote short stories and essays, many of which appeared in *The Republic,* a publication owned by John F. Fitzgerald. When Fitzgerald became Mayor of Boston he hired her as his secretary. She quickly rose to chief clerk where she reigned over much of the city's administrative work. In 1913, she briefer Fitzgerald about newly passed city planning enabling legislation and persuaded him to make her secretary of the commission, a position she held until 1935 when she was appointed chair of the Massachusetts Planning Board. (She remained on the Boston City Planning Commission as a commissioner until her retirement in 1950.) In addition, in 1924 she became clerk of the Board of Zoning Appeals created to administer the city's first comprehensive zoning ordinance.

Through this administrative work, attendance at American planning meetings, and frequent study trips abroad, Herlihy taught herself planning. In 1927 the ACPI overlooked her lack of official credentials when it admitted her as a member, although many of her ACPI colleagues disagreed with her basic attitudes toward planning as summarized in a newspaper comment: "There's nothing sacred about planning... it's just common sense."

Over the years, Herlihy gained the respect of her colleagues, who admired her staying power through successive mayors. They also recognized her power as the confidante of the leaders who relied on her advice for planning and zoning commission appointments and other sensitive land use decisions. "Mayors came and went," one observer noted, "but Elisabeth Herlihy was as permanent as the planning board."

In addition to her administrative duties, Herlihy worked hard to publicize planning. "There is scarcely an organization in Boston nor a city or town in the metropolitan district she has not spoken to," was one contemporary description, and she was credible to realtor and women's clubber alike. Her faith in citizen support, akin to the approach of Rumbold and James, led her to be a founder and
executive committee member of the Massachusetts Federation of Planning Boards, which by 1929 had a membership of 107 towns representing four million people. She also operated on the national level, serving on committees for the ACPI and as a director of the ACA and ASPO. A contributor to City Planning and the American Planning and Civic Annual, she focused her writing on administration and public relations.

These three women, who based their activities on citizen organization, politics, and administration, had counterparts in many other American cities. Secretaries of city planning commissions were traditionally women. Anne Robertson of New Orleans, Edyth Howard of Des Moines, and Grace Bartlett of Honolulu are examples. Although they did not advance in rank as Elisabeth Herlihy had, they played important local roles in the functioning of the planning commissions. Executive secretaries and other civic employees were also frequently women. Edith Sampson's edition of Municipal Facts for Denver and the work of A. Edmire Cabana of the Buffalo City Planning Association quietly nurtured public support for planning. Finally, like Rumbold and Herlihy, women did have prominent positions on commissions or associations, as may be seen in the examples of Albion Fellows Bacon, chairman of the Evansville, Indiana, commission, and Gertrude Bosler Biddle, a director of the Tri-State Regional Planning Federation. All in all, women participated in planning in the 1920s not as technical practitioners but as publicists, administrators, and lobbyists. Barred from professional participation by social convention, they used rather low level or unpaid jobs to advantage in establishing a presence.

**Women and Planning in the Great Depression**

The 1930s saw a sharp decline in the advances made by employed women. Men were favored over women, particularly married women, for the few jobs available: the federal government refused to employ more than one wage earner in a family while twenty-six states passed legislation prohibiting the employment of married women. A 1936 Gallup Poll found that 82 percent of its respondents disapproved of spouses working when their husbands were employed. By 1940 the labor force was 25 percent female. Nevertheless, professional schools set quotas for female admissions, with medical schools, for example, restricting women to 5 percent of a class, and by 1940 women professionals fell to the 1920 level of 12 percent.

The planning profession reflected this trend. Until well into the 1940s, the ACPI had only one female full member (in 1932 Harlean James had joined Elisabeth Herlihy on the roster but only as an associate member).

Nevertheless, some slow changes occurred in the late 1930s, related to the evolution of the planning profession itself, which was beginning to have enough adherents to merit the creation of independent degree programs. In 1939, Harvard received funds from the Rockefeller Foundation to found a school of city planning. By 1937, MIT, Cornell, and Columbia had followed suit, establishing programs within their schools of architecture. MIT was the most significant program for women because it had regularly admitted women since its inception. (Harvard, in contrast, refused to admit women to its School of Design until a later date, directing females to the Cambridge School of Architecture which drew heavily on Harvard for its faculty.) Furthermore, in 1937, the exclusively female Luthorp School of Landscape Architecture, under the direction of a recent MIT graduate, John A. Parker, directed some of its students to the Institute when it moved from its Groton campus to quarters...
at MIT. In 1940 MIT granted master's degrees in city planning to Flora Crockett (c. 1914–1979) and Jane S. Rodman (b. 1914), its first female planning students.\footnote{490}

Crockett and Rodman typified women planners of the period. Crockett, who had earned an architecture degree at MIT in 1937, married a Briton, Gordon Stephenson, and returned to England with him. Stephenson held a series of government positions, including chief planning officer of the Ministry of City Planning, until he became professor of planning at the University of Liverpool in 1948. Subsequently he taught in Canada and Australia, Crockett, accompanying him on these ventures, not only raised a large family but practiced planning in a variety of forms. She supervised the evacuation of British children during the Second World War, collaborated with Stephenson in his written work, and coauthored two books and several reports.\footnote{491}

A similar pattern was followed by Rodman, who had an undergraduate degree from the Lothrop School/Seimmons College joint program and married Richard L. Steiner. Steiner's career took them to Washington, D.C., where he worked at the U.S. Housing Authority, while Rodman completed her master's thesis, a study of a multiracial community near Howard University. At the outbreak of the war they moved to Jacksonville, Florida, where Steiner was a housing officer in the U.S. Navy. In the five years they were there, Rodman held a variety of jobs, ranging from designing camouflage for the Corps of Army Engineers to working for a private planning consultant, George Simon. In this period the couple started a family. Following the war, they went to Baltimore where Steiner worked for the city's redevelopment agency and Rodman had her third child. Given the demands of domestic life, Rodman did not work until 1947, when she joined the Baltimore County Planning Department. She remained with the agency for fifteen years, her tenure broken for a five-year period with the birth and early childhood of her fourth child. In 1962 she retired again, deciding to spend a few years at home with her rapidly growing children, and in 1968 she and Steiner divorced. As a result of her disillusionment with planning for its failure to achieve the orderly development of the county, she did not return to work. In 1972, however, she joined the Peace Corps, which exploited her planning experience even though she did not request a professional position. Assigned to Gambia, she directed the national planning office until 1977 when she returned to the United States.\footnote{492}

A contemporary of the MIT graduates, Chloethiel Woodard Smith (b. 1910) represents a different career pattern. She trained in architecture at the University of Oregon and in 1933 earned a city planning degree at Washington University. After working in Seattle, Portland, and New York City, she became chief of research and planning for the Federal Housing Administration, a position she held for three years before entering private practice. Like many of her contemporaries, she married, bore children, and shaped her career to her husband's, but she differed in having a well-established reputation before her marriage. Resettling in Washington, D.C., in 1946, she opened her own firm, Chloethiel Woodard Smith Associates, which specialized in architecture, urban design, and planning.\footnote{493} Her work has included the award-winning designs for the Washington, D.C., South West Urban Renewal Area; new town plans for Algeria, the American Embassy in Paraguay, and the Crown Tower and Crown Court in St. Louis, Missouri.\footnote{494}

Unlike the single or childless career women of the previous generation, these women planners sought to blend marriages and children with their work. Although they often collaborated or worked in fields related to their husbands', in the interest of family solidarity they took secondary positions and compromised their employment opportunities. Their professional accomplishments, though notable, were accordingly less dramatic than they might otherwise have been.

Other well-educated but not professionally trained women continued to participate at the periphery of the profession, taking leadership positions in areas defined as female concerns, in particular aesthetics and housing. The case of aesthetics is seen most clearly in the campaign to regulate highway construction and roadside improvements in the 1930s. By the middle of the decade, when car ownership had risen to 25,000,000, middle-class Americans had become increasingly reliant upon automobiles. The rush to build a satisfactory highway network resulted in uncontrolled land development characterized by the ugly, chaotic strips bordering the roads so graphically recorded in the 1939 movie, The City.\footnote{495} In 1933, Mrs. John D. Rockefeller gave a grant to the ACA to support the general improvement of the highways.\footnote{496} Overseen by Harlean James, the
project soon caught the interest of professional planners. The ACPI created a Committee on Roadside Improvements whose members included Alfred Bettman and Robert Whitten, noted Ohio zoning experts, and E. P. Goodrich, a principal in the Technical Advisory Corporation, a consulting firm. This group made substantive legal and design suggestions which were taken up by the ACA.

Concurrently, Elizabeth B. Lawton (1873-1952), a Vassar graduate long interested in conservation, created the National roadside Council and worked with the ACA and ACPI. She directed extensive roadside surveys to gather data for planners and legislators, edited the Roadside Bulletin, lectured widely, and aided lobbying efforts to restrict billboards and require landscaping. Harlean James committed the ACA's resources to the cause in order to integrate the work of the professional planners, the Council, and citizens' groups. She purposely defined the issue as one where women, the backbone of the ACA membership, could claim superiority. Although clearly delineating their role, she nonetheless viewed it in essentially the same manner as had been set forth a generation earlier. "The addition of women voters should bring their influence to bear in projects involving beauty," she thought, for women "seem to observe in harmonies of color more generally than men. . . . There seems to be a very good promise that we may advocate projects in city planning because they add to the beauty of a city or because they protect the natural beauty of the landscape."

The roadside campaign received generous attention at regular ACA meetings. In addition, Rockefeller funds supported conferences for the three special interest groups—citizen activists, lobbyists, and planners. The tradition of delegating this issue to women would be continued a generation later when President Lyndon B. Johnson's wife, Lady Bird, gave strong personal support to highway beautification.

In a second area, housing reform, women had more success relating their work to the planning profession, but the linkage did not occur until the 1930s. Leaders in the field included Edith Elmer Wood (1871-1945), Mary Kingsbury Simkhovitch (1887-1951), and Catherine Bauer (1905-1964). Although they had always considered housing a major part of comprehensive planning, professional planners regarded the subject as too narrow and refused to rank it with transportation, recreation, or city center development. Thomas Adams, Director of the Regional Plan for New York and Its Environ (RPNY&E) and an active policy-making member of the ACPI, reflected this view in a letter to Wood during the late 1920s. In response to her criticism of the preliminary RPNY&E reports, which gave little attention to housing, Adams wrote that housing was regarded as inherent in the whole physical structure of the city and not a separate question. Wood considered this stance absurd. "The city planning and housing movements in most European countries are so closely intertwined," she observed, "that this relationship is taken for granted. In the U.S. they have had separate origins and run generally parallel courses without making much contact." This was a perceptive diagnosis. Although both the movements had their roots in the progressive era, the "house"s of the 1930s tended to be social workers associated with settlement houses who promoted general welfare issues, whereas the planners tended to be technicians associated with the design and engineering professions and were interested in urban order and efficiency.

One small segment of the professional planners, the Regional Planning Association of America (RPAA), attempted to connect the issues. Not surprisingly, the RPAA members, who included Clarence Stein, Lewis Mumford, and Robert Kohn, practiced in New York City and were more closely involved with local housing than the planning movements. Propagandists for the British garden city principles, they built two communities, Sunnyview Gardens, New York, and Radburn, New Jersey, as model residential prototypes.

The wide gap between the housers and the planners, which the RPAA began to narrow, continued to close in the 1930s. The passage in 1932 of the National Industrial Recovery Act (NIRA), with its provisions for housing and slum clearance, aroused the interest of the technical planners. By 1934, they helped create the National Association of Housing Officials (NAHO), a group financed by the Spelman Fund, a Rockefeller subsidiary. At the first annual NAHO meeting old-time planners Harland Bartholomew, Jacob Crane, and Walter Blucher, pulling slum clearance and housing into their sphere of interest, sought the counsel of housers. Among the experts consulted was Catherine Bauer, author of the encyclopedic Modern Housing and head of the Labor Housing Conference, an American Federation of Labor lobbying group. Bauer was a vocal advocate for the next thirty years, as planners wrestled with the implementation of housing and renewal policy.

Untrained in planning, Bauer had come to her influential position through an unconventional route. After graduating from Vassar
resolved with massive layoffs of the female workers, the war effort left an important legacy. Women, by demonstrating that they could be responsible, reliable workers, had begun to break down discriminatory employment barriers; by 1952 two million more women were employed than at the peak of the war. Most were relegated to low-paying, low-level jobs, however, and although in the professional arena female participation increased in some fields, the overall picture was negative. By 1960, women held only 11 percent of professional positions, and most professional schools retained some form of quota on female admissions.  

Opportunities in the planning field paralleled these trends. During the war women had gained some new positions. For example, with a high percentage of the AIP membership in the armed forces, Barbara Terrett, assistant to the director of the ASPO, became executive secretary of the AIP and editor of the Planners' Journal, a position she held for two years. Women also found jobs in planning, drafting, and survey work associated with the war-stimulated growth of urban areas, such as Hampton Roads, Virginia.  

Finally, with ASPO's 1946 declaration that a “desperate shortage of planners” existed and “that if all the planners still in service were released tomorrow there still wouldn't be enough of them to fill the available jobs,” the number of planning schools proliferated. One consequence was that this provided additional opportunities for entry but the increase was small.

For example, from 1941 to 1960 the MIT program graduated fifteen women, 7 percent of their total, while the University of North Carolina had twelve female graduates between 1946 and 1960, 10 percent of the total.  

During the 1950s, the female graduates of the postwar planning programs began to show up in the AIP membership roles as women jumped from two in 1940 to seventeen in 1951. The male representation rose from 170 in 1940 to over 900 in 1951. The female growth rate was proportionately much higher, but of course their absolute numbers remained low. Furthermore, in comparison to other professionals, such as lawyers, doctors, and even engineers, women planners still constituted a much smaller percentage of the total.

Although the number of women was too low to allow statistical analysis of their career patterns, the records of a few demonstrate the nature of their participation in the field. They were often encour-
aged to specialize in areas such as housing where they were presumed to have credibility. For example, in 1948, a U.S. Department of Labor publication, *The Outlook for Women in Architecture and Engineering*, noted that "in the field of home and apartment design . . . and in public housing, women have shown special interest and facility."

The women had a mixed reaction to such career prescriptions. Being a minority, they wanted to prove themselves as professionals equally qualified as their male counterparts. Yet some were not averse to use their specialized gender-related knowledge to appear more expert in certain planning situations. Carol J. Thomas, founder of her own consulting firm, Thomas Planning Services, is representative. She entered planning by an indirect route and was an early example of a type which became increasingly important in later years, the returning housewife. A Vassar College student who majored in political science, Thomas married early, had two children, and accompanied her college professor-husband on various assignments, eventually residing permanently outside Boston. In 1950 she was denied admission to graduate training in public administration at Harvard because the school was reluctant to admit an older married woman seeking a part-time program. She then took planning courses at MIT, and at joint MIT-Harvard gatherings, she met a number of prominent planners, including Arthur C. Comey, who offered her part-time work, a proposal she accepted because she had children at home (and subsequently her husband had contracted a serious illness that required her presence at home). Thomas eventually parlayed her freelance work into a steady business and she established her own firm in 1956. In forming the company, Thomas blended her technical expertise as a planner with her prior domestic experience. Capitalizing on her seventeen years as a suburban housewife—"Who knows her community better than a woman?"—she claimed—she specialized in land use and environment planning.8

Dorothy Muncy, a Washington-based planner, represents a woman who defied the feminine stereotypes. When she graduated from high school in the midst of the Depression, she could not afford to attend college. She worked at the newly formed New Jersey Housing Authority and later at the county offices of the Works Progress Administration (WPA) until she saved enough money to attend the University of Chicago where she studied social sciences. After two years she took a job with the national WPA Women's and Professional Division where she was exposed to planning-related projects including the Real Property Inventory. During the war she worked for the National Youth Administration, undertaking a study of service needs for women in the event of their official draft into the labor force.

After the war, Muncy married and moved with her husband to Boston, where she completed her education. She was the first woman admitted as a planning student at Harvard's School of Design and subsequently earned three degrees, including a Ph.D. in city planning. She specialized in industrial land use issues because she believed that postwar economic growth would be tied to industrial expansion, which in turn would generate the tax revenue to subsidize public housing. Like most married women of this period, she shaped her career to the needs of her family. When her husband was transferred to Philadelphia, she went to work under Edmund Bacon in the Planning Department; when he was moved to Washington, D.C., she followed, wrote her doctoral dissertation, published articles based on her findings, and developed a consulting practice built on her industrial location expertise.8

The tradition of nonprofessional women making a critical intellectual contribution to the field, in the manner of Kimball and Bauer, was continued into the 1960s by Jane Jacobs (b. 1916), the author of *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*.8 An associate editor of the *Architectural Forum* and married to an architect, Robert H. Jacobs, Jr., she had long been an observer of planning practices and source of community opposition to several ill-conceived Greenwich Village projects. Stimulated by a concern over what she considered the major failures of planning (slum clearance, urban renewal, and public housing) she tried to educate the professionals in urban dynamics. Her highly personal book defined the essence of city life as human interaction in the haphazard, physically disordered, but socially workable, small-scale heterogeneous neighborhood. Much of her evidence came from matters to which she, as a woman, was especially sensitive: childhood development, community ties, neighborliness, aesthetics, and issues of personal physical safety.) Her vision was rapidly adopted by the profession, which integrated her views into its own theory and promoted federal legislation favoring neighborhood preservation.8
Planning and Women in the 1970s and 1980s
A massive entry of women into the work force began during the late 1960s. Stimulated by the resurgent feminist movement and the consequent affirmative action legislation, it was bolstered by federal enforcement programs and sympathetic judicial decisions. Concurrently, the national economy had so eoded that by the mid-1970s the "second paycheck" became necessary for maintaining the expectations generated in earlier years. By 1976, 47 percent of all women and 50 percent of all mothers with minor children were in the labor force. Nevertheless, women workers did not achieve a commensurate economic advance, and their overall economic position actually declined. In 1973 women's earnings were only 57 percent of men's. This trend was repeated in the professional arena as well, where the median income for women was $9,093, compared to $14,106 for men. Professional women earned only 66.6 percent as much as men.

The planning profession followed the same pattern. Women entered the field in great numbers and with relative ease. The changes in public opinion which had generated the movement of women into all areas of the labor market held for planning as well. More important, however, was a dramatic transition that had occurred in the profession: by 1976, 97 percent of planners were employed in the public sector; the remainder earned their income as publicly funded consultants. This employment pattern forced the planning profession to be more responsive to governmental affirmative action pressures than others, such as medicine or law. In 1976 women earned 28 percent of all planning degrees, up from 7.5 percent in 1968.

Despite their high rate of entry, female planners, like their counterparts in other professions, encountered discrimination. In 1971, ASPO reported: "At no point are female planners' median salaries equal to their male counterparts' despite equal educational background and the same amount of planning experience." Three years later ASPO reported that only eight women planning directors were recorded in their survey of 670 planning agencies. Although the figure reflected to some degree the small pool of female planners who had enough seniority to reach the highest executive positions, when combined with the earnings figures it demonstrated the pattern of discrimination described by the Women's Caucus whose protest was recorded at the beginning of this chapter.

On the basis of this evidence, women convinced ASPO and the AIP to endorse employment and salary guidelines designed to redress the inequalities. In 1974 the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and ASPO sponsored a publication, Planning, Women and Change, which outlined the feminist issues that had arisen in the profession: conditions of employment and definition of specific feminine concerns to be incorporated in the planning process.

By 1979 women constituted a large enough block in the AIP to create a technical department, the Planning and Women Division. This had been preceded by the formation of a Women's Rights Committee in 1971 whose members contributed to the later effort. In 1980, the Division received HUD funding to sponsor a competition entitled "Planning for the Changing Needs of Women" and produced a book documenting demonstration projects for child care, housing design and finance, transportation access, and other issues reflecting basic female concerns. This inaugurated an effort to include a new perspective in planning practice, a view that had been lost years before in the separation of the NCCP and the ACPI in 1917.

By 1980, then, women had been brought into the profession through the dissolution of educational barriers. General societal trends, not simply indigenous movement from within the profession, had caused the change. When women gained access, some used their position to articulate the gender-related concerns which they had formerly voiced in other vehicles, such as civic organizations and reform associations.

Women and Planning: An Overview
Clearly, women as a group had few representatives among professional planners until the postwar period. Barriers to their entry were the same as those that prevented all women from having professional careers in the first half of the twentieth century: the socially approved custom of denying or limiting admission to advanced training programs; public opinion which defined the proper female role as domestic-centered and thereby restricted employment possibilities through formal and informal mechanisms; and women's own views of their societal position as wives, mothers, and volunteer workers. The long careers of Elisabeth Hill, Flora Crockert, Jane...
Rodman, and Chloethiel Woodard Smith were unusual.

In the nonprofessional arena, women had a much longer and more significant record of activity. Their presence as allied professionals or volunteers was in keeping with societal norms, and they used this convention to participate in planning. As librarians, writers, lobbyists, and propagandists they helped to create a receptive public opinion for planning and to define the field for the professionals. The work of Kimball, Rumbold, and James is representative of these efforts. Others built their credibility by claiming areas of presumed female expertise, such as housing reform, neighborhood design, and billboard control, to inject their perspective into segments of the field. Thus the writings of Bauer and Jacobs, based on domestic knowledge, were adopted and translated into professional concerns, particularly in the area of urban renewal.

In the postwar period, women who formerly would have supplied the armies of volunteers or allied professionals gained entry to the field. The feminist movement and federal government affirmative action policies stimulated major changes in all female employment patterns and were clearly reflected in the planning profession. In some instances, the new entrants brought a consciousness of their heritage of gender-related expertise and bid their male colleagues to integrate this perspective into planning practice.

A new era of women’s history has begun, as documented in the statistical evidence of educational attainment, employment, wage scales, and professional association membership. An assessment of other impacts on professional practice will have to wait until women have been involved for a longer period.
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