
1. Introduction: gender and cities

Linda Peake, Grace Adeniyi-Ogunyankin and Anindita Datta

INTRODUCTION

An inevitable looming cloud curtains the city, and at any given moment there may be a down-pour: we are just one ‘natural’ disaster or one incidence of violence or one pandemic away from displacement. Or death. We are seemingly running against time; and to this end, we borrow a little from Audre Lorde (1984, p. 37), who noted that “poetry is not a luxury” but a necessary component of living, a language giving way to thoughts and actions: we aver that feminism too is not a luxury. At least not when it comes to our understandings of, aspirations for and lived realities within the urban. And at the heart of feminism, in the way we take it up in this book, is the imperative to unveil and redress the depth, breadth and interconnectedness of the inequities and injustices that impact upon women’s everyday urban lives, taking seriously women’s hopes and dreams of living life differently—from the mundane ways we move around the city, to our everyday subsistence, to the existential and material ways we are affected by greenhouse gas emissions and artificial intelligence. These gendered injustices and inequities illustrate how hierarchies of privilege and oppression, coloniality, heteropatriarchy, racial capitalism, anthropocentrism and militarisation wreak havoc and pervert justice in cities across the globe.

Even as we began the task of putting together this book, the ordinary gave way to the extraordinary as the Covid-19 pandemic unfolded, taking hold of city after city and altering the very character of the urban. Viewing the city through the lens of the pandemic brought out unprecedented inversions whereby its rhythms altered; public spaces usually pulsating with city life fell silent and empty, making home spaces and care work the focus of daily life, as many areas of work and education shifted online. The contingency of the public and private spheres was revealed as practices of care stretched across their boundaries. Those on the margins, eking out a living in low paid care, health and service work—delivering food, working in care homes, administering vaccines, cremating infected bodies—were now at the forefront of city life, a life marked by a necropolitics in which their work and bodies were both essential and disposable. Through the phases of lock downs and recovery came the emergence of a new normal marked by the rise of authoritarian states and toxic masculinities and in the city, the expansion of precarity, increasing inequality and social polarisation, compounding already existing urban crises.

Throughout the book, we unpack these old and new crises and injustices that pervade urban life and processes of urbanisation, while centring the agency of the city’s gendered subject.

GENDER AND THE CITY

Despite ‘gender and the city’ being now a well-established and flourishing field, its existence as an academic field of practice was neither inevitable nor guaranteed. Notwithstanding the spatial turn in the social sciences and the humanities, for feminist scholars generally the urban is viewed as a niche field. Topics of interest to feminist scholars, such as the everyday and social reproduction, still rarely engage with the inherent spatiality of these concepts or their urban nature (see, for example, Tanyildiz et al. (2021) on the failure of social reproduction theory to address the urban). Urban policy and other applied fields—planning, architecture—are still most likely to show little or no connection to gender or feminist policy, especially at the global scale. And there has long been an understanding of the failure of the broader field of urban studies to take feminism seriously (Peake et al. 2019; Roy 2020; Katz 2021). Yet, the tenacity of those carving out space for gender and the city speaks to the work that feminisms contribute to understanding the urban.

As a recognised field of study, the ‘origins’ of ‘gender and the city’ have been traced back to the Anglo-American academy—to the social, cultural and political context of the mid-to-late 1960s and the gripping, sometimes prolonged, spasms of social protest from which the radical turns of the social sciences and humanities gained inspiration, purchase and momentum. And yet it would be an error to see this as its definitive canonical story. In the space afforded us we can do no more here than present a couple of lesser known stories from the mid-twentieth century—those of Thelma Glass and Ester Boserup—to unsettle understandings of gender and the city purely as an enterprise of the white ‘second wave’ feminism of the Anglo-American academy.

STORY 1: THELMA GLASS AND THE WPC

Directly involved in the civil rights movement, the geographer Thelma Glass grew up in the US South during the Jim Crow years (Monk, George with George 2004). Almost a decade before the arrest of Rosa Parks in 1955 sparked the Montgomery bus boycott and helped catapult civil rights to the political forefront, a group of women, many of them teachers at the historically Black Alabama State College (later Alabama State University) in Montgomery, Thelma Glass among them, formed the Women’s Political Council (WPC) in 1947. The WPC campaigned against the abuses and indignities of anti-Black segregation (Burks 1993) and the resultant racist geographies of Montgomery, including its segregated parks and transportation system. In particular, they highlighted the inequalities of its public bus system, characterised by the failure of the city to hire any Black bus drivers and segregated seating on buses, and despite Black residents being the majority of riders, by bus stops in Black neighbourhoods being farther apart than in white ones. The WPC achieved a small but significant victory when bus company officials agreed to have bus stops at every corner in Black neighbourhoods, as was the practice in white neighbourhoods. In March 1955, when the Black teen, Claudette Colvin, was arrested for refusing to give up her seat on a city bus to a white passenger, the WPC helped organise meetings between Black leaders, the bus company, and city officials, as well as starting to organise a boycott of the bus system. Although other Black residents also refused to give up their seats it was not until 1 December 1955, when Rosa Parks, known for her civil rights activism, was arrested for

refusing to give up her bus seat to a white passenger, that the WPC was ready to swing into action, mimeographing thousands of handbills calling for what became the Montgomery bus boycott. This was to last for over a year, until a supreme court decision (*Browder v. Gayle*, 20 December 1956) ruled segregated buses unconstitutional.

STORY 2: ESTER BOSERUP AND CITIES

The Danish economist, Ester Boserup, in her book *Women's Role in Economic Development* (1970) undertook the first comprehensive overview of women and the development process, examining the transformations in women's economic and social roles in the move to urbanisation in the global South in the mid-twentieth century. She analysed this move to the urban via the gendered division of labour within families, the intimate connection between urban and rural areas and gendered migration patterns. Although her work is still largely (mis)understood as an engagement predominantly with women's role in agriculture, Boserup engaged not only with urbanisation but also with urbanism through the gendering of public and private spaces and the gendered division of labour within urban places, producing the first typology of women's and men's presence in urban areas (Peake 2020). Her extremely rudimentary classification of 'male', 'male' and 'semi-male towns' (!), speaks to the absence or partial absence of women from the public urban realm in the global South with: 'male' towns in Africa and Asia based on extraction and colonial administrative centres in which colonial labour recruitment practices meant that men greatly outnumbered women, who could often only enter on a 'pass' system; 'male' towns that predated colonisation with much more balanced sex ratios but in which the "economic life of the town and all outdoor activities are taken care of by men, while women live in seclusion within the family dwelling" (Boserup 1970, pp. 74); and 'semi-male' towns, characteristic of African urban centres, in which streets and market places were dominated by women who ran the retail trade while men dominated the modern sector of shops, industries and offices.

These two all too brief 'stories' rarely surface in feminist urban studies and yet they are still of relevance to its contemporary study, speaking directly to the sections around which this book is structured: urban imaginaries, spaces and places; urban policy, planning and politics; the urban environment; the urban economic realm; the urban everyday; and feminist urban knowledge production. The activism of Thelma Glass and her contemporaries in the WPC spoke directly to Blackness and anti-Blackness as the ontological ground of colonial urban difference as well as to issues of urban social justice addressed through urban planning and Black women's counter imaginaries of the racial production of space, while their focus on everyday mobilities prefigures urban environment work on "people as infrastructure" (Simone 2004, p. 407). Several of Boserup's preoccupations also remain central to feminist urban agendas, not least her interest in transformations in the gendering of urban spaces and urban economies. Her work was prescient of the postcolonial call to account for the changing geography of urbanisation (Roy 2009) moving beyond the remit of white women's lives in cities of the global North. She was also interested in women's activities in the urban everyday, flagging that women were engaged in income-earning work, seeing beyond paternalistic proponents of modernisation, who could only view women as engaged in social reproduction.

Neither can the prescriptive reach and legacy of the activism of Thelma Glass and the research of Ester Boserup be underestimated. The activism of the WPC set the groundwork for the rise of Dr Martin Luther King Jr., then a preacher in Montgomery, who along with other soon to be prominent civil rights leaders quickly took the lead in the Montgomery bus boycott, forming the Montgomery Improvement Association (MIA). The boycott highlighted civil rights issues in the city, pushing the movement against racial inequality into full force and ultimately led to the signing of the Voting Rights Act in 1965 by President Lyndon B. Johnson (Monk, George with George 2004). And Boserup's work inspired the UN Decade for Women (1976–1986) and was critical to the emergence of Women in Development (WID) policy (Jain 2005).

Notwithstanding the huge impact of their work on the lives of millions of people, the stories of Thelma Glass and Ester Boserup remain as footnotes in the pages of feminist urban scholarship, indicative not only of the factionalised nature of feminist knowledge production that in the mid twentieth century focused on white women's lives in cities of the global North. The WPC was absorbed into the newly formed MIA with Dr Martin Luther King Jr. at its helm, only four days after the arrest of Rosa Parks. The decade-long organising work of the WPC on urban racial injustices was lost for many decades from accounts of the civil rights movement while the field of urban studies trampled this radical tradition of Black activism underfoot in the rush to Marxism. And while Boserup's work was prescient, her liberal feminism and engagement with the global South was of little interest to the Anglo-American socialist feminist urban scholarship that was beginning to dominate at that time. The problematic nature of her work was also noted by Beneria and Sen (1981), for example, who showed how Boserup failed to recognise women's engagement in social reproduction as a basis of women's subordination. And postcolonial feminists, such as Mohanty (1988), have called out the universalism of her work as a "western feminist discourse on women in the third world", via a discursive colonisation of women's "material and historical heterogeneities", and thus the production of a composite, singular "third-world woman" (pp. 61–62).

Storytelling, we thus note, is an imperfect discursive exercise, for in all such exercises we make choices about the stories we tell and don't tell, and the ends we hope to serve in telling our stories. These stories are offered in the spirit of addressing the fugitive ontological spaces of gender and the city, of only ever being able to produce less than definitive accounts, and of the need to leave open the space for other as yet unknown stories that fall outside its current circulation. Their partiality speaks also to the realisation that awareness cannot be exhausted; telling stories is not about reaching conclusions, but about the recognition that there's always more to learn. This book then is a provocation that can only be enriched by other accounts that speak to the multiple histories, geographies and situated knowledges of feminist urban studies, and that still await recovery.

If the gendering of urban subjects is the starting point for this book, then let us turn to how feminist urban scholarship engages in reflexive consideration of the categories of the urban, gender and feminism.

The Urban

Arguments for the importance of recognising the urban are well rehearsed. The twenty-first century is now supposedly the 'Urban Age' (but see Brenner and Schmid 2014). Demographically the planet's population is urban, with up to seven out of ten people expected

to be living in urban places by 2050 (UN 2019). The mainstream narrative is of an urban transition that has been taking place in the latter half of the twentieth century, with a stagnation of the urban population in the global North and high rates of increase in the urban populations in the global South, particularly in Africa and Asia. Many scholars are becoming increasingly concerned about the global urban condition, and what some have called the “turbulent cycle of urban change” (Hall and Burdett 2017, p. 5). As pointed out by Ruddick et al. (2019), the urban is more than the site of dense concentrations of people. It is also framed

as both cause and consequence of many contemporary planetary issues: the urban is both the instigator of and the solution to global climate change; it is the site of increasing inequality and the urbanisation of poverty even as it is also a crucible for innovation and creativity; and it is ground zero for a new era of global governance. (p. 388)

But the argument for a feminist focus on the urban goes beyond the urbanisation of the world’s population and the urban as the scale at which planetary crises are experienced. The consequences of urbanisation—a process that is determining our present and future as urban—are deeply gendered, whether through violence, migration or the organisation of everyday life. It is clear from the chapters in this book that gender in the early twenty-first century is still a major structuring force in the ways that the lives of individuals, households, family groupings and urban life are organised through the materialities and temporalities of the city, accounting for rhythms of endurance (Simone 2018) and collective agency (Poets 2020). We contend that the historical specificity of the long entanglement of gender and urban space—what Mohanty (1988, p. 62) calls “historical heterogeneities” and Ananya Roy (2021, p. 29) “historical difference”—lies at the heart of understanding the ways in which the urban is made and remade, broken apart and reassembled.

It is from such historical specificity that situated knowledge arises. Feminist urban scholars, including those in this book, have insisted on the situated nature of knowledge about the urban. Situatedness here goes beyond Haraway’s (1988) conceptualisation, which may imply locale but is most commonly constituted as a subject position, as Katz (2001, p. 1230) puts it “a space of zero dimensions”, located nowhere specifically. Haraway’s situatedness, Katz suggests, implies location in abstract location to others, but not any specific geography leading to a “politics of ‘sites’ and ‘spaces’ from which materiality is largely vacuated” (2001, p. 1230), erasing the effect of specific historical geographies and the difference that space makes. Katz’s response to the inherent universality of situated knowledge has been to redefine it as the “local particularities of the relations of production and social reproduction” (2001, p. 1230) and to employ the method of topography to show how social relations are far from abstract but rather “sedimented into space” (p. 1229). Turning from the abstract topological representations of space inherent to Haraway’s formulations she gives ontological priority to topographical (territorial) space.

While it is in the territorialities of the urban that the gendered inequities and injustices of women’s lives are understood, this does not imply that only place-based analyses of the local are sufficient. The national, regional and global processes that flow through cities constitute them as open, relational and porous spatialities (Massey 2005). Hence, feminist, and other critical urban scholars, have insisted not only on making analytical links between the global, the urban and the bodily but also on insisting on a constitutive outside to the urban (Roy 2020), whether this be the rural, the countryside, agricultural lands, hinterlands, deserts, forests, mountains, the wilderness, seas and oceans, unceded territories, or Indigenous lands (Ruddick

et al. 2019, p. 398), to which Roy (2020, p. 26) adds the “periphery ... the agrarian question ... the colony”. Until recently these constitutive outsides have been territorial and epistemological occlusions in feminist urban studies and yet their investigation opens up analytical routes to decolonising feminist urban studies. Hence, we also agree with Parnell and Robinson (2017) who note that “in addressing 21st-century urbanisation, attention to the specificity of places within and across the putative ‘global South’ (notably Asia and Africa), weakly presented in both theorisation and data analysis, should be at the forefront of the revisionist project of urban research” (p. 29). We add though, in conjunction with postcolonial scholars, that a shifting of feminist urban knowledge production from north to south—both a geographical and epistemic divide—is dependent on “relationalities of knowledge production” (Roy, A. 2021, pp. 25–26) and requires addressing the asymmetries structuring the political economy of academic research (see also Peake, Razavi and Smyth 2024).

Gender

Gender in feminist urban studies has had a predominant occupation with women (*vis-à-vis* men) and to a much lesser extent with girls although this is changing as non-essentialist conceptions of gender and moving beyond the preoccupation with white Anglo-American women as subjects and objects of knowledge are gaining widespread acceptance in the field. While some early feminist urban studies essentialised gendered norms and roles, understanding the biological categories of woman and man as ‘natural’ and as corresponding with gendered expressions of femininity and masculinity, since the 1980s feminist urban scholarship has gravitated away from a hypergendered binary world of women and men. Engagements with gender have taken place through a variety of lenses: as a power relation stretched over space; as performativity, that is, gender understood as embodied acts and gestures that when repeated come to take on the appearance of the ‘real’; and as always embodied. However, it is only since the late twentieth century that the central positioning of cis women’s lives in the global North, as empirical and conceptual starting and ending points of analysis, has been questioned and other women’s lives—queer and trans—have entered into analytical frames. The recognition of a vast range of gendered practices and identities has led to understandings of gender undergoing a transition from that of a stable binary construction to a fluid and mutable continuum, inclusive of those who identify as gender non-conforming and gender neutral. But while there is variation across place of the rigidity and force with which gendered norms and ideals structure behaviours, attitudes and beliefs, there is still the understanding that gender binaries remain a structuring principle of everyday life.

There have also been important inroads by trans, Indigenous and decolonial scholars that are further influencing and broadening understandings of gender. While cisgendered conceptions of womanhood still dominate the pages of feminist urban scholarship, the heated anti-trans and feminist debates (both within and beyond the academy), with their “boundary-policing discourses and reductive definitions of gender” (Oren and Press 2019, p. 9) based on a narrow biological framing, regarding the trans-misogynist conceit that trans women are not ‘women’, has been absent from feminist urban studies although it is important not to equate the lack of debate in urban publications with the troubled journeys for acceptance that trans scholars face in the academy (see the work of Petra Doan (2001, 2007) that served for many years as an outlier of trans work in feminist urban studies: see also Giesecking 2015; Rosenberg 2021; Sharp, *Chapter 39*).¹ Indigenous studies have also broadened appreciations of gender through

the introduction of people recognised as two spirit—an umbrella identity within many first nations communities that describes people who live within a spectrum of genders, gender expressions, gender roles and sexual orientations (Dorries and Harjo 2020; Merino et al. 2020; Jacobs 2022; Keovorabouth 2022). Black feminist and decolonial studies have also pointed to the way in which feminist urban studies has predominantly adopted Eurocentric understandings of gender in which white women, as fully human, serve as the measure against colonised and enslaved women who can thus only ever be less than fully human (Okoye *Chapter 37*; Nash 2019). While the chapters in this book are indicative of the progress that is being made in working towards addressing these stubborn injustices, there is much still to be done in recognising the enduring legacies of transphobia, racism and colonialism on feminist urban scholarship on gender.

Feminism

Defining feminism can be a fraught enterprise. The authors in this book address it as: a fluid and dynamic approach to social change, always in a state of transition; a political identity for working through disturbances and accommodations; and a set of values and beliefs that encompass ways of thinking, feeling and doing. As a political category it is seen as vital and necessary to address the various gendered injustices, local and global, that women face and that unites them in struggle. The commitment to feminism among the authors in this book across their differences of geographical locations and their gendered, classed, racialised and sexual identities point to its global appeal, with its capacity for self-critique and its own dissensions keeping it relevant. But the authors also have different relationships to feminism given its chequered history of insularity, its association with whiteness and its uneven lack of engagement with issues. For many of the authors, employing and privileging an intersectional feminist lens—the approach in which multiple forms of inequalities overlap, work together and exacerbate each other (Crenshaw 1991)—not only illuminates how gendered subjects are differently affected by compounding threats to urban life and environments but also proffers a pathway towards an ‘otherwise’. For some, an intersectional feminism that fails to engage with historical difference has led to it being only one of a number of allegiances in which they engage—queer, trans, anti-capitalist, anti-racist, decolonial—that work to achieve social, political and economic transformation.

These other allegiances have influenced our own paths to feminism in various ways: we are feminist scholars with academic backgrounds in geography and women’s studies who live in and across the global North and South:

- Grace: I am a feminist scholar who was born in the global South (Nigeria) but migrated to the global North (Canada) as a child in 1990. My lived experiences of anti-blackness and understandings of coloniality and heteropatriachal capitalism inform how and why I study the effects of the global political economy on urban spaces, subjectivities and policies in Nigeria.
- Anindita: A soldier’s daughter, I am a feminist scholar trained and located in the global South. A childhood spent travelling across the country and living in small cantonment towns has left me with a finely honed spatial imagination and ability to absorb local spatial stories and sense of place. My positionality of being trained and located outside the West and ‘speaking from the margins’ has shaped my disciplinary worldview making me aware of not only structural disadvantages and knowledge asymmetries

but also the power of being able to theorise from the ground, away from Eurocentric knowledge traditions, through vernacular and decolonised ways of knowing.

Linda: Various spatial trajectories have shaped my feminist politics. Born and brought up in the working-class world of Teesside, in the north-east of England, I moved to the middle-classness of southern England to do my PhD when feminism was just beginning to percolate into the field of geography in the mid 1970s. I left my lecturing post in 1988 for Toronto, Canada, but before that my head and heart had already left for Georgetown, Guyana. It was in the mid-1980s that I met the women in the Working People's Alliance, who later formed the Guyanese women's organisation, Red Thread. We have worked together in a partnership of transnational feminist praxis that has lasted till now.

Our different trajectories found us moving in the same global circulations of feminist geography. More specifically we came together to work in the GenUrb project (2017–2024) on urbanisation, gender and the global South (see Peake, Razavi and Smyth 2024). The invitation to edit this book came as the GenUrb network was solidifying and enabled us to work together. Our work in GenUrb touches on many of the considerations that we outline below as we turn to the chapters in the book and the dominant themes with which they engage.

THEMES IN THE BOOK

This book does not attempt, nor desire, to engage in the impossible task of being exhaustive in its coverage of the substantial and wide-ranging literature that now comprises feminist urban studies. It can do no more than offer a cross-section of contemporary feminist thinking across the range of theories and practices associated with urban space. In compiling the book, we set out to contest the well-established geographies and hierarchies of academic knowledge production, soliciting entries from authors across diverse racialised and gendered identities and global geographical locations, and across all stages of an academic career, from students to full professors. Balancing these factors was not always easily achieved—there are lacunae—and efforts to step out of the institutional hegemony of the white western academy, with its multiple resources, was not always doable. In addition, the Covid-19 pandemic disrupted production and post-Covid-19 fatigue prevented completion of all the chapters, with authors changing and 'balances' being disrupted as book sections morphed and the dust finally settled into what you now have in your hands, or more probably are now reading on a screen.

While the chapters all stand alone, you may choose to read them in clusters, in relation to the six sections in which we have placed them or thematically, as they are set out below. While we discuss each of these sections in their own introductions, we provide here an overview of a number of themes that travel across the book's sections. While a specific theme is sometimes addressed in a dedicated chapter or book section, a close reading of the chapters reveals it spilling out beyond them to permeate a large number of chapters. Together these themes—patriarchy, social reproduction, violence, women's agency and the everyday, and feminist and decolonial knowledge production—provide a snapshot across the empirical and analytical areas of investigation and the intellectual and political preoccupations of feminist urban research in the early twenty-first century. We start with one concept that has fallen in and out of fashion in the five decades that the field of gender and cities has been established and that is firmly back on urban feminist agendas, namely, patriarchy.

Patriarchy

Fuelled by ‘second wave’ feminism, through the early 1970s to the early 1980s, what may well have been the earliest theoretical debate by urban feminists, engaged the extent to which patriarchy or capitalism provided the ‘best’ explanation for the form of western cities (Bruegel 1973; Burnett 1973; Markusen 1980; Mackenzie and Rose 1983). Little consideration has been given since then to the causal nature of the relationship between the sexual division of labour, gender relations and city form and the patriarchal and/or capitalist values that shaped them. As socialist feminism came to dominate the theoretical study of the gendered spatialities of urban life in the 1980s, interest in patriarchy as an analytical framework dissipated. That male dominance at the expense of women, children and feminised others was globally ubiquitous—albeit differentially expressed through regional and local patriarchies and affecting women differentially—also led to dissatisfaction with the analytical capabilities of patriarchy. It was considered too blunt an instrument to capture the nuances of women’s oppression and it fell out of fashion in the western academy in the 1990s and early 2000s. In the twenty-first century, with the globalisation of neoliberalism and the resurgence of right-wing, authoritarian regimes, the reassertion of heteropatriarchal gender norms through sexist policies, alongside the criminalisation of LGBTQ+ people, has become common (Chenoweth and Marks 2022; see also Kofman *Chapter 15*; Silva, Ornat and Machado *Chapter 36*), leading to the reappearance of patriarchy in feminist thought. There is still little discussion, or appetite, however, for a return to earlier theoretical debates on how patriarchy is analysed vis-à-vis capitalism or colonialism. Authors in this book appear to address patriarchy as a broad theory of a societal structure characterised by male supremacy and responsible for the continued existence of social relations of gendered inequality. While the notion of patriarchy is threaded through the chapters in this book we agree with Higgins (2018), who argues that such general references to patriarchy speak less to a concern with its theoretical status and more to the need for a conceptual tool to mobilise action.

The role patriarchy plays in shaping the built urban landscape and its relevance to the analytical understanding of urban form is portrayed most forcefully in this book by authors writing from the global South. For example, Haas (*Chapter 14*) and Castañeda (*Chapter 33*) highlight how cities have been shaped by patriarchal values, norms and logics incorporated into institutions and legal structures, resulting in experiences of everyday life marked by hierarchical gendered inequalities. Patriarchal control, played out in male violence against women and the embedding of patriarchal values into city design, leaves women struggling to gain access to “employment, public infrastructure and services, and safety in public spaces” (Haas, *Chapter 14*). That patriarchy is a structuring, if not always stable, force crosscut with colonial and white supremacist socio-spatial systems of power is further evident in other chapters referring to urban landscapes marked by patriarchal-colonial inscriptions and policed by violence against women (Isoke *Chapter 43*; Laketa *Chapter 7*; Okoye *Chapter 37*; Silva, Ornat and Machado *Chapter 36*). These chapters serve to highlight the decolonial theoretical work that still needs to be done in relation to patriarchy and the urban. For example, tracing back how the gendered, racialised and classed relations underpinning colonial urban planning and housing projects emerged from the ideal of domesticity in nineteenth-century western contexts and its informing of patriarchal nuclear-family ideology (Bain and Podmore *Chapter 8*).

That urban form is still commonly designed along hetero-patriarchal principles is taken up in several chapters that pay particular attention to the professional practices of urban

planning, design, architecture, and policy making (Beall *Chapter 11*; Beebeejaun *Chapter 12*; Kofman *Chapter 15*; Parnell *Chapter 10*). Beebeejuan (*Chapter 12*), for example, asserts that far from diminishing, masculinist norms are being reasserted though the dominance of “techno-rational” approaches to planning. And Hardley (*Chapter 6*; see also Maalsen *Chapter 26*), claims that the “long-standing nature of the patriarchal exclusion of women from city spaces” is so deeply entrenched as to leave many women sceptical of the ability of smart city technologies and initiatives to ensure their safe access to the city. Others document how housing is primarily constructed for nuclear family units and public transport is structured radially to facilitate ‘male’ journeys to work from periphery to city centre (Bain and Podmore *Chapter 8*). Sotomayor (*Chapter 28*) shows how patriarchal gender norms are incorporated into housing not only through design and layout but also through financial structures and broader policies. Yet other chapters explore how patriarchal values underpin architectural and environmental design (Hardley *Chapter 6*) and planning conventions and ordinances (Tonkiss *Chapter 4*) or demonstrate how patriarchal norms are expressed through domestic relationships (Bain and Podmore *Chapter 8*), employment relations (Datta and Basu, *Chapter 24*) and transport-aided mobilities (Castañeda *Chapter 33*; Kara, Chaudhry and Adeniyi-Ogunyankin *Chapter 31*; Montoya-Robledo *Chapter 29*).

A number of chapters take up the anti-patriarchal struggles in which both cis and trans women engage. While patriarchal urban design can affect all women it works in intersectional ways, as does patriarchal violence, with trans women also facing trans as well as gendered violence. Specific experiences of patriarchal inclusions and exclusions for trans women, and the consequences of transgressing the hetero-patriarchal matrix—from poverty and vulnerability to death—are also addressed by Sharp (*Chapter 39*) and Silva, Ornat and Machado (*Chapter 36*). And various chapters point to the bravery of specific groups of women who, because of their vulnerability, are at the forefront of mobilising against patriarchal authorities (see Kofman *Chapter 15*, on migrant women and Kara, Chaudhry and Adeniyi-Ogunyankin *Chapter 31* on young women).

Social Reproduction

Social reproduction, understood as the foundation of social life, has also been on-and-off the agenda of western urban feminist scholarship over the years. Prominent until the 1990s, when socialist feminism’s hold on urban theorising began to slacken, social reproduction has undergone a major revival in the early twenty-first century, primarily via feminist political economy (Rai 2021; Hall 2016), the specific intervention of social reproduction theory (Ferguson, LeBaron, Dimitrakaki and Farris 2016; Bhattacharya 2017), and discipline-specific contributions, for example, from geography (Norton and Katz 2016; Winders and Smith 2019; Peake et al. 2021). The chapters in this book are in general agreement with the position laid out by Winders and Smith (2019), that arguments about the social reproduction-production nexus have moved on from an appreciation of their relationship as one of separate or equivalent systems, and beyond the household and questions of domestic labour, to an understanding of their complete conflation. Most recently, social reproduction theory has provided a unitary theory of oppression foregrounding the relationship between capitalist value-producing labour and non-capitalistically produced social reproductive labour, and hence is able to:

historicize the notion of patriarchy vis-a-vis specific modes of production and their attendant social formations; demonstrate that women's oppression is not a pre-capitalist residue that capitalism merely picks up, but is integral to the very logic of capitalism as a system, and is necessarily reinvented as regimes of capital accumulation change; and argue that historically specific forms of patriarchy and capitalism are not external to one another, but, rather, are co-constitutive of each other. (Tanyildiz et al. 2021 p. 9)

If it is not unsurprising that it is feminist political economy that has provided this elucidation, neither is it the case that it is urban geographical feminist scholarship that has provided analytical recognition of social reproduction as a profoundly spatial and scalar phenomenon and a feminist urban problematic: increasingly, urbanisation is the process, and the urban the site, through which social reproduction takes place. Based on the understanding that the urban is the 'conceptual knot mediating between the everyday ontological struggles of oppressed peoples, and the global spatial restructuring of hegemonic modes of production' (Tanyildiz et al. 2021, p. 12), it is urban feminist scholars who ask, "What happens to social reproduction when it steps out of the household into the streets of the city?"²

Castán Broto (*Chapter 21*) reminds us that in the (sub)urban it is still the model of the nuclear family as the primary social unit responsible for social reproduction that dominates institutional thinking by planners and policy makers (see also Bain and Podmore *Chapter 8*). Other authors underline that despite interventions by the state, private capital and technology, it is still primarily women who sustain families, households and communities through social reproductive activities (Dorries *Chapter 38*; Stenbacka and Forsberg *Chapter 9*), while Kara, Chaudhry and Adeniyi-Ogunyankin (*Chapter 31*) acknowledge the contributions of youth to social reproductive activities in the sense that they "form knowledge, meanings, bonds, social relations and shared identities that constitute the conditions and possibilities of life and future". Authors also pay attention to the ways in which women are increasingly involved in the reproduction of other households. In national and transnational flows and circuits the racialised and working-class bodily labour of women and feminised others carries the burden of care for white and middle-class women (Kofman *Chapter 15*; Silvey, Panganiban, Schwartz Ribero and Wu *Chapter 30*). The recognition of women's centrality to social reproduction leads other authors to speak of developing an economy centred on care. Stenbacka and Forsberg (*Chapter 9*), for example, discuss the formation of 'caring' urban regions, that is, a form of regionalism that makes visible and accessible all practices and institutions of social reproduction while also promoting political participation (see also Hudson and Rönnblom *Chapter 3*).

Several chapters address women's engagement in social reproduction through ideas of publicness and privacy, albeit their work denying an ontological status to the notion of separate spheres. While the private sphere is depicted as a space of social reproduction—a place of domesticity and household work, where nuclear family relations are nurtured—it is also shown to be a place where relations of patriarchy, capitalism and colonialism flourish—where remunerated work may take place, where male violence is meted out and where families can fall apart as their reproduction falls into disarray (Prouse and Arefin *Chapter 19*; Tayob and Hall *Chapter 5*; Veillette *Chapter 16*). Tonkiss (*Chapter 4*) discusses how the public/private divide is troubled both by typologies of urban space and by practices that cut across and recombine this divide in contingent ways. She draws on the Covid-19 pandemic to illustrate the spatial transgressions of social reproduction: meeting household needs depended on the infrastructures of urban public space, and care and caregiving were commonly permitted exceptions to spatial restrictions on movement in lockdowns. Several chapters support the

need to discard dichotomous conceptions of public and private realms in favour of multiple publics and privates (Beebejwan *Chapter 12*; Castán Broto *Chapter 21*; Budworth and Hall *Chapter 32*). Yet others argue the need to move towards analyses of affective embodiment in the everyday to enable more comprehensive recognition of the many different ways in which patriarchy, capitalism and colonialism play out in women's lives (Budworth and Hall *Chapter 32*), unfettered by societally imposed divides of public and private spheres.

That social reproduction is in crisis globally—that precarity and insecurity are now its primary material and affective registers—is witnessed by a number of chapters addressing the urban infrastructures supporting provision of energy, water, waste, sanitation, transport and housing (Beall *Chapter 11*; Beebejwan *Chapter 12*; Budworth and Hall *Chapter 32*; Khalid and Lemanski *Chapter 22*; McMillan, Mitchell and Parizeau *Chapter 23*; Montoya-Robledo *Chapter 29*). Sotomayor (*Chapter 28*), for example, depicts housing as a “physical infrastructure to care for, repair and maintain that simultaneously ‘sustains’ differentiated infrastructures of care and activities of social reproduction” (see also Federici 2020; Santoro *Chapter 27*). Adequate housing is a fundamental condition for the reproduction of labour and one that, in the context of financialisation, is becoming increasingly difficult to secure, with both ownership and renting becoming unaffordable. Datta and Basu (*Chapter 24*), Santoro (*Chapter 27*) and Smyth (*Chapter 25*) show how the financialisation of social reproduction has led to additional gendered responsibilities for women in accessing land for housing and “caring for debts” (Montgomerie and Tepe-Belfrage 2017). Other authors look beyond infrastructure and financialisation to colonial projects based on the exploitation of people and resources that undermine the sustaining work of social reproduction and care. Dorries (*Chapter 38*), for example, reminds us that settler colonial urbanism “consolidates a particular system of production and social reproduction that benefits white settlers”, indicating how an Indigenous ontology of social reproduction enables us to recognise not only women's labour and care but also their symbolic role in the reproduction of “Indigenous social and legal orders” (see also Simpson 2016).

Violence

In the field of urban studies, it is common for studies of violence in cities to consider the urban in relation to violence induced or sanctioned by the state, associated with the geopolitical issues of security, surveillance and urbicide (the latter referring to the process of subjecting a city to destruction through military violence via the urbanisation of warfare). Violence against women rarely surfaces in its pages, even though in modern urban-based warfare it is now arguably more dangerous to be a woman or child civilian than it is to be a soldier (Chemaly 2012). And, as authors in this book point out, in cases of extreme conflict and urbidal violence, gendered violence is integral to genocidal logics—rape and sexual violence are strategic weapons and tactics of war, rather than unintended by-products (Abu Hatoum *Chapter 18*; Laketa *Chapter 7*; Okoye *Chapter 37*), no more evident as we write than in the needless deaths, the majority of them women and children, in the cities of Palestine. It is clear moreover, with or without the context of war and militarisation, that in this book's chapters, violence is ubiquitous in women's everyday lives in the city. And as McIlwaine and Rizzini Ansari (*Chapter 34*) assert, violence against women is a particularly urban phenomenon (Parnell *Chapter 10*; Datta and Basu *Chapter 24*; see also Moser and McIlwaine 2014).

As feminist scholarship has shown the violence meted out by men through hetero-patriarchal and misogynist practices, which differentiate and punish femininity and other feminised gendered identifications, are enmeshed in the violent economic logics of racial capitalism, colonialism and imperialism, further perpetuating embodied violence (Hall 2016). That these logics are infused with inequalities and exclusions of gender, race, class and sexuality further speaks to the intersectional nature of gendered violence to which Black, Indigenous, racialised, differently abled, migrant, poor, queer and trans women are especially exposed. Sharp (*Chapter 39*), for example, addresses how for those gendered as other, heteronormative violence expressed through homophobia and transphobia is shown to discipline bodies into a binary gender, the “tyranny of gender” rendering the bodies of ‘others’ as objects of unwanted attention, discipline, and homophobic or transphobic violence (Silva, Ornat and Machado *Chapter 36*).

In feminist urban scholarship these expressions of violence are incorporated into what McIlwaine and Rizzini Ansari (*Chapter 34*) refer to as “gendered urban violence”. Levels of violence toward women increased during the Covid-19 pandemic, especially in lockdowns, and in noting this increase a number of chapters address how urban spaces can feed into women’s feelings of risk, fear and vulnerability to male violence (Kalms *Chapter 13*; McIlwaine and Rizzini Ansari *Chapter 34*; Tonkiss *Chapter 4*; see also Datta 2016). While the home is for many women a place of intimacy, comfort and security, it is also a space of pain, while streets too are places of gendered violence such as “sexual assault, sexual harassment, rape, unwanted sexual attention, unwanted touching, catcalling, and whistling” (Hardley *Chapter 6*). Like Hardley, Beall (*Chapter 11*) shows that violence, the threat of violence and the fear of violence serve to restrict women’s mobility, preventing their full and equal participation in city life. The extensiveness of the physical violence of men against women, including domestic and sexual violence, and its misogynistic logical counterpart, femicide, leads Kalms (*Chapter 13*) to propose that, rather than liveability, it is “experiences of heterosexism, gender bias, and racism as well as male violence” that provide a more accurate measure of women’s everyday lives in cities.

Investigations of how the materiality of urban space exposes women to physical violence focus in on infrastructure. The lack of sanitation infrastructure, particularly toilet provision, on a scale that affects millions of women has profound consequences for women’s exposure to violence (McIlwaine and Rizzini Ansari *Chapter 34*; see also Greed 2003; McFarlane 2023; Lewkowicz and Gilliland 2024). Transport is another form of infrastructure with strong connections to violence against women, with Castañeda (*Chapter 33*) asserting that public transport “accounts for the greatest share of sexual violence in public space”. Montoya-Robledo (*Chapter 29*) recounts how the long commutes of domestic workers in Latin American cities make them vulnerable to violent assaults, with harassment occurring not only in vehicles, but also in ‘access infrastructures’: “the journey to the bus stop, and the underground platform are also sites where women experience inappropriate touching, catcalling, exhibition of genitals, lewd glances and commentary, and even rape” (Quiñones 2020). And despite dominant urban imaginaries of smart, sustainable and liveable cities, authors argue that digital infrastructures of surveillance and ubiquitous mobile media usage have done little to prevent violence against women in cities (Hardley *Chapter 6*; Kalms *Chapter 13*). Smyth (*Chapter 25*) identifies mobile payment platforms and apps as sites of cyber violence, utilised by debt collectors to issue threats and engage in public shaming. And Santoro (*Chapter 27*) shows indebtedness to be a process of financial violence, the management and obligations of which falls primarily on women, leading to violence in the home and increasing the precarity of daily life.

A number of chapters show how the everyday gendered social and institutional violence of capitalism and colonialism in women's lives, meted out through the practices of state agencies in charge of policing and planning, shapes the production of urban space through neglect, incarceration, displacement, dispossession and erasure (Craddock *Chapter 20*; Tayob and Hall *Chapter 5*). Santoro (*Chapter 27*), for example, points to the increasing 'gap' for women in Latin American cities who have rights to urban land and property "but whose access, despite regulatory and institutional advances, remains restricted due to renewed and violent processes of slow dispossession". As Dorries (*Chapter 38*) observes, violence is produced "through multiple and compounding forms of structural racism, including in access to housing, employment, education, health care, as well as through child welfare and policing practices", systems that she further states "systematically neglect and over-police the needs of Indigenous women and communities". Such state-sanctioned urban violence is reinforced through processes of urban redevelopment, driven by austerity and neoliberalism, dismantling welfare and community resources, leaving a deficit of care and reducing individual capacities for survival. There are also crises that arise from urban 'growth' affecting "marginalised communities, the urban poor, and especially women who suffer the loss of community and displacement as well as infrastructural harm and violence" (Kapsali and Katsikana *Chapter 17*). And in the case of urbicide, urban re-construction, with its politics of dehumanisation and "differentiated citizenship" and distinctions between safe and unsafe spaces, separates out the irreplaceable from the expendable (Laketa *Chapter 7*).

Many chapters identify ways in which women have mobilised against violence. While Hudson and Ronnblom (*Chapter 3*) look to urban imaginaries free from fear of male violence, Levin (*Chapter 2*) engages with feminist performance artists "who use their bodies to unearth histories of gendered violence that haunt urban spaces" (see also Simpson *Chapter 42*). Others address the many anti-violence campaigns that women have organised, from Take Back the Night marches to the SlutWalk movement, the #MeToo campaign, #NiUnaMenos and *Un violador en tu camino* (A rapist on your path) (McIlwaine and Rizzini Ansari *Chapter 34*; Tonkiss *Chapter 4*). It is young women who often spearhead such movements: as they have done, for example, in the Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls movement in Canadian cities (Kara, Chaudry and Adeniyi-Ogunyankin *Chapter 31*) and in the Black Lives Matter and prison abolition movements (Haas *Chapter 14*; Silvey, Panganiban, Schwartz Rivero and Wu *Chapter 30*).

Women's Agency and the Everyday

From the hashtag activism of the digital realm (Maalsen *Chapter 36*) to a range of engagements with urban spaces— affective, material and symbolic—women's agency sheds light on the multiplicity of feminist imaginaries and practices that exceed and contest the multiple axes of oppression to address women's and feminised subjects' survival, struggles and futures in the city. Feminism reminds us that alongside violence there is also resistance and hope and that women's agency and their efforts to engage in making life better are "anchored in the everyday and the personal" (Kapsali and Katsikana *Chapter 17*; Craddock *Chapter 20*). In everyday life the mundanity of daily rituals oriented to capitalism, whether through waged work or the consumption of commodities, combine with the sociality of relating to others, with the latter holding the potential of transformative politics (Lefebvre [1968] 1984; Rankin, Adeniyi-Ogunyankin and Ninglehku 2022). Contributors to this book engage with a range of

different spaces—city centres, streets, suburbs and peripheries—where transformative struggles take place, and recognise, like Stenbacka and Forsberg (*Chapter 9*), that activism can be an expression of a genuine sense of attachment to a specific place (Kuppinger *Chapter 35*). However, it is with the everyday that the majority engage (Budworth and Hall *Chapter 32*); from its complex spatialities to the multiscale relations of power that flow through it; from its ordinariness, packed with routines and social interactions, to its association with violence, resistance and struggles for access, inclusion, safety, identity, recognition and dignity.

For a number of authors, engaging the everyday through the agency of women necessarily entails consideration of difference and the decolonial, allowing a fuller appreciation of how women's urban activism is fuelled by multiple ontologies, spatial and social epistemologies and politics and of how it can be generative of “new meanings and conceptualisations of urban space” (Kapsali and Katsikana *Chapter 17*; see also Abu Hatoum *Chapter 18*; Isoke, *Chapter 43*). Dorries (*Chapter 38*) points out, for example, how the disjuncture between settler colonial and Indigenous understandings of the city and the dominance of the former serves to cut off from analysis Indigenous territorial struggles that stretch beyond administrative city limits, thus obscuring the “violent logics, longstanding global dynamics, national and regional politics, and intersectional struggles that shape the production of urban space”. And as she notes, specifically in regard to urban Indigenous women but with a much wider resonance, these struggles “require attending to the multi-dimensional ways that relations to place are theorised and lived by Indigenous women”.

In this respect there is widespread engagement across the chapters with Kapsali and Katsikana (*Chapter 17*), when they suggest that feminist scholars address relations to place through an understanding that the struggles in which women and feminised subjects engage are not primarily class-based struggles against capital but rather struggles against the state and other institutionalised bodies, often in response to crises in social reproduction. These struggles serve to reveal how the city ‘works’, how it is unevenly, and often violently, experienced by women and how the intersectional nature of struggles inextricably links gender with race, class and sexuality (McMillan, Mitchell and Parizeau *Chapter 23*). Authors stress how the lives of specific communities and groups of women—including Black, Indigenous, racialised, differently abled, migrant, queer, trans and poor women—are embroiled in what Silva, Ornat and Machado (*Chapter 36*) call a “continuous and never ending process” of social encounters and activist practices (Budworth and Hall *Chapter 32*; Levin *Chapter 2*; Sharp *Chapter 39*). Migrant women, for example, are shown to engage in political activities that range from attending social and cultural events that can provide them with “an entry into the public sphere” and allow them to develop “skills and confidence” (Kuppinger *Chapter 35*), to engaging in overt struggles over claims to urban space (Kofman *Chapter 15*; Silvey, Panganiban, Schwartz Rivero and Wu *Chapter 30*).

The urban struggles addressed in the chapters speak to what Jonas et al. (2018, p. 2) call the “socio-distributional effects of capitalist urban development” and “the recognition and inclusion of diverse citizen voices.” They include what Oldfield and Selmeczi (*Chapter 41*) relate to as the everyday struggles of various groups of women “to make ends meet”, to anti-austerity activisms around inequalities in urban infrastructural provision and around services such as childcare and healthcare, and to movements demanding access to land and public places (Khalid and Lemanski *Chapter 22*; McMillan, Mitchell and Parizeau *Chapter 23*; Prouse and Arefin *Chapter 19*; Santoro *Chapter 27*; Tonkiss *Chapter 4*; Ustundag and Rose *Chapter 42*; Veillette *Chapter 16*). Sotomayor (*Chapter 28*), for example, discusses the

range of activities in which women play a fundamental role in relation to housing, including participation in solidarity economies, squatter movements, urban occupations, self-housing initiatives, social and co-housing arrangements, battles over rent control and community land trusts, and anti-eviction movements. Women's activism has also been important in attempts to increase climate change awareness, "resisting urban programmes that promote growth into environmentally protected or at risk areas" (Stenbacka and Forsberg *Chapter 9*) as well as seeing the city as pivotal in the global fight to restrict global warming. As addressed above, the city has also been the locus of struggles that directly address the bodies of women and other marginalised subjects, including those around women's reproductive rights, women's safety, violence against women by individual men and by state bodies, and racialised violence against women. And as Laketa (*Chapter 7*) observes, women have led practices promoting peace that have ranged from "the active re-appropriation of urban public spaces to openly contesting militaristic violence" to the reclaiming of "intimate and domestic spaces in the city to create places of safety amidst pervasive violence".

Feminist and Decolonial Urban Knowledge Production

Critiquing hegemonic, masculinist urban knowledge production, the universalism of which generates epistemic injustices, has been central to western feminist urban studies from its outset (Buckley and Strauss 2016; Parker 2017). Urban feminists have taken instead to counter-hegemonic knowledge produced from situated (*à la* Katz), embodied and always partial perspectives, foregrounding the subjugated ways of knowing and inhabiting the urban that emerge from women's experiences of struggle and its possibilities in the urban everyday (Craddock *Chapter 20*). White feminist urban knowledge production has also sought to go beyond its own "homogenising narratives, epistemologies and temporalities" in attempts to disengage from reproducing itself in its own image (Kapsali and Katsikana *Chapter 17*). Engaging with difference has meant counteracting practices of silencing, listening to and hearing the voices of women from 'elsewhere', of those outside western academic circuits of knowledge and of those marginalised by the western academy—racialised women, Black women, Indigenous women, trans women. It has meant adopting insurgent practices that result in structural changes to the academy and the field. Making the academy a place that welcomes difference and inclusivity, that actively challenges the "exclusion of marginalised groups from its practice", open to multiple futures, parallels Castán Broto's claim that the "feminist city" starts not from an epistemological positioning of all knowing, but from one of unknowability (Castán Broto *Chapter 21*; see also Levin *Chapter 2*).

Across the social sciences, and as demonstrated in numerous chapters in this book, the focus of this process of challenging knowledge production has moved beyond masculinism as the object of critique to that of colonialism, the relations and rationalities of which are deeply embedded in the present (Prouse and Arefin *Chapter 19*). As Okoye notes (*Chapter 37*), it is the "*longue durée* of colonialism [that] shapes the everyday production of urban space, from the ways cities are organised, inhabited and experienced to urban knowledge production". She situates feminist urban knowledge production not within its current context of the "global projects of colonialism, enslavement and enduring coloniality", but in the embodied and decolonising theorising work of Black, Indigenous, and global South scholars and feminists (see also Sweet and Ortiz Escalante 2017; Zaragocin and Caretta 2021). The "critical-corporeal methodology" she espouses allows for the racialised violences, exploitation

and exclusions of coloniality to be theorised through bodily trauma while also marking its differentiation from “white western Eurocentric ways of knowing urban space”. It serves not only to expose the historical present but is also a means to heal its ongoing traumas. Simpson (*Chapter 42*) also describes the range of methods used by racialised feminist urban scholars—across archival research, participant observation, statistical analysis, design research, as well as non-representational approaches—to address issues of epistemic justice and an engagement with the city as “care machine”. And in her account of feminist urban ethnography based on her own research on black women’s political activism in Newark, New Jersey, Isoke (*Chapter 43*), is clear about the strides that have been made as more studies are produced by “the ‘other’ the researcher would otherwise be had they not had access to the university as a pathway to a middle-class ethnographic profession”.

It is through adopting “other ways of knowing and doing” (Tayob and Hall, *Chapter 5*; see also Adeniyi-Ogunyankin 2019) that chapters engage in citational praxis, decolonial feminist epistemologies and “new geographies of theory” (Roy 2009). Okoye (*Chapter 37*) asserts that decoloniality “transforms the parameters of feminist urban research ... challenging enduring colonial legacies in urban space and ‘modern’ urban governance” (see also Abu Hatoum *Chapter 18*; Haas *Chapter 14*). Similarly, Dorries (*Chapter 38*) argues that reclaiming “Indigenous women’s knowledge and perspectives is an essential element of an anti-colonial project”. The situated and embodied urban knowledge and experience of Indigenous women, founded in storytelling and partnerships, challenges notions of the urban as spatially contained and thus links to other strands of critical urban scholarship that critique methodological cityness albeit from a radically different ontological position (Angelo and Wachsmuth 2014). As Ustundag and Rose (*Chapter 42*) note, feminist urban scholars have “expanded understandings of reciprocity beyond humancentric ontologies to include acknowledgement of inter-relationality with land, natural resources, and non-human animals”, with Okoye (*Chapter 37*) adding “kinship relations to earth, community and ancestors” to the list.

One approach to the recognition that knowledge is relational and that urban feminist scholarship engages with praxis—with knowledge that works towards social change—is taken up through the theme of collaboration with communities, with a number of chapters adopting an epistemology that is open to forms of non-academic knowledges (Beebejuan *Chapter 12*; Sharp *Chapter 39*). Oldfield and Selmezi (*Chapter 41*) writing from the context of urban South Africa, speak of “the ethos of Southern inquiry” and its insistence on collaborative praxis, which is “fundamentally shaped by the imperative of changing the cities they (we) speak from and speak of, and this requires thinking with partners beyond scholarly institutions”. Their collaborative approaches to knowing the city give rise to “the theoretical richness of everyday urban vocabularies”, enabling a move away from western concepts (see also Bhan 2019). Dorries (*Chapter 38*) refers to how engagement with Indigenous communities can help uncover ways in which they organise that may not be immediately visible but are vital to the flourishing of Indigenous life in urban space. Such subjugated knowledge brings to the fore questions of agency and resistance and the pivotal role of the everyday as a site of knowledge production about urban futures. Chapters also explore ways in which feminist collaborations result in a praxis that connects to, even if it is not always framed within, transnational feminism and cross-border activism constituted through “interconnected histories of colonialism, imperialism, and the uneven effects of development, globalisation, and neoliberalism in both the periphery and the metropole” (Roy, S. 2021, p. 72, in Kapsali and Katsikana *Chapter 17*). Commenting on the work of Perry (2013) with Black communities of Salvador de Bahia,

Brazil, Veillette (*Chapter 16*), for example, argues that Black women's engagement in urban social movements "must be seen as a part of a larger diaspora pattern of Black women's oppositional politics vested in property rights for both cultural and material gain".

The open-ended nature of collaborative praxis—between organisations, scholars and activists—and its associated ethics of care are necessary components of developing more relevant and "emancipatory and reparative" forms of knowledge and practice, whether through activism, community collaboration, planning or policy making (Silvey, Panganiban, Schwartz Rivero and Wu *Chapter 30*). Such forms offer an option for developing "new imaginaries of shared life in 21st century cities" (Oldfield and Selmeczi *Chapter 41*). Hudson and Rönnblom (*Chapter 3*) explore what the city would look like if oppressive structures of power—of patriarchy, capitalism and colonialism—were not there. Their study of feminist imaginaries of urban futures drawn from feminist utopian and dystopian novels provides counter-narratives that disrupt taken-for-granted urban spatial orderings and social relations of power, taking account not only of women's needs and interests but also their hopes and desires (see also Peake 2016; Koleth, Peake, Razavi and Adeniyi-Ogunyankin 2023). But feminist urban imaginaries do not offer closure; the undecidability of the urban prevents this (Roy 2013; Peake 2016; Kern and McLean 2017). As Kara, Chaudhry and Adeniyi-Ogunyankin (*Chapter 31*) note "every freedom struggle is unfinished". What is left in the balance, rather, is ambivalence and an always-in-the-making "across the urban, rural, peri-urban and the not-yet-urban" (Kapsali and Katsikana *Chapter 17*).

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

As the chapters in this book show, the field of feminist urban studies covers a broad range of thematics, having expanded widely since its inception. Feminist urban scholarship though is never just about demanding the recognition of gender as an axis of socio-spatial difference or of the critique of extant urban knowledge production. Its power lies in its insistence with starting from the realities of women's lives and gendered relational ontologies, its affirmation of activism, praxis, and solidarities, and its practice of questioning the foundation of urban spatialities, raising questions about the categories through which we can most thoroughly investigate and understand the urban. The chapters show how, in line with ontological turns within urban studies, the approaches and methods to understand the urban and its intersections with gender have resulted in a wide accommodation of diversity and difference together with a contestation of western led knowledge production about the urban. We hope they form a basis for discussion as well as inspiring new work about how we think and write about 'gender and cities'—a discussion that continues to open up to investigation what the urban is, accepts its undecidability, takes multiple approaches to its study, includes different genders and feminisms, and welcomes its decolonisation. While feminist approaches have deeply enriched the field of urban studies there is no time to rest on our laurels; the future is upon us.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We acknowledge the Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) Partnership Grant # 895-2017-1011 that enabled us to work together on this book. We thank Mantha Katsikana and Araby Smyth for their comments. Any errors remain our own.

NOTES

1. We thank Petra Doan, Jack Giesekeing and Wiley Sharp for their affirmation of this statement. Personal communications, 7 March 2024.
2. We thank Gokboru Tanyildiz for this pithy formulation.

REFERENCES

- Adeniyi Ogunyankin, G. (2019) “‘The city of our dream’”: Owambe urbanism and low-income women’s resistance in Ibadan, Nigeria’, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 43(3), pp. 423–441.
- Angelo H. and Wachsmuth, D. (2014) ‘Urbanizing urban political ecology: a critique of methodological cityness’, in N. Brenner (ed.) *Implosions/explosions: towards a study of planetary urbanization*. Berlin: Jovis, pp. 372–385.
- Beneria, L. and Sen, G. (1981) ‘Accumulation, reproduction, and “women’s role in economic development”’: Boserup revisited’, *Signs*, 7(2), pp. 279–298.
- Bhan, G. (2019) ‘Notes on a Southern urban practice’, *Environment and Urbanization*, 31(2), pp. 639–654.
- Bhattacharya, T. (2017) *Social reproduction theory: remapping class, recentering oppression*. London: Pluto Press.
- Boserup, E. (1970) ‘Women in a men’s world,’ in E. Boserup (ed.) *Women’s role in economic development*. London: George Allen & Unwin, pp. 73–93.
- Brenner, N. and Schmid, C. (2014) ‘The ‘Urban Age’ in question’, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38(3), pp. 731–755.
- Bruegel, I. (1973) ‘Cities, women and social class: a comment’, *Antipode*, 5(3), pp. 62–65.
- Buckley, M. and Strauss, K. (2016) ‘In, against and beyond Lefebvre: planetary urbanization and epistemic plurality’, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 34(4), pp. 617–636.
- Burks, M.F. (1993) ‘Women in the Montgomery bus boycott’ in V.L. Crawford, J.A. Rouse and B. Woods (eds.) *Women in the civil rights movement: trailblazers and torchbearers 1941–1965*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, pp. 71–83.
- Burnett, P. (1973) ‘Social change, the status of women and models of city form and development’, *Antipode*, 5(3), pp. 57–62.
- Chemaly, S. (2012) ‘Worldwide, it’s “more dangerous to be a woman than a soldier in modern wars”’, *Huffington Post*. Available at: https://www.huffpost.com/entry/rape-in-conflict_b_1501458 (accessed 4 March 2024).
- Chenoweth, E. and Marks, Z. (2022) ‘Revenge of the patriarchs: why autocrats fear women’, *Foreign Affairs*. Available at: https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/china/2022-02-08/women-rights-revenge-patriarchs?check_logged_in=1&utm_medium=promo_email&utm_source=lo_flows&utm_campaign=registered_user_welcome&utm_term=email_1&utm_content=20240215 (accessed 4 March 2024).
- Crenshaw, K. (1991) ‘Mapping the margins: intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color’, *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), pp. 1241–1299.
- Datta, A. (2016) ‘The genderscapes of hate: on violence against women in India’, *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 6(2), pp. 178–181.

- Doan, P.L. (2001) 'Are the transgendered the mine shaft canaries of urban areas?', *Progressive Planning*, 146, pp. 1–4.
- Doan, P.L. (2007) 'Queers in the American city: transgendered perceptions of urban spaces', *Gender, Place, and Culture*, 14, pp. 57–74.
- Dorries, H. and Harjo, L. (2020) 'Beyond safety: refusing colonial violence through Indigenous feminist planning', *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 40(2), 210–219.
- Federici, S. (2020) *Revolution at point zero: housework, reproduction, and feminist struggle*. New York: PM Press.
- Ferguson, S. LeBaron, G., Dimitrakaki, A. and Farris, S. (2016) 'Special issue on social reproduction: introduction', *Historical Materialism*, 24(2), pp. 25–37.
- Gieseking, J. (2015) "'Crossing over," again and again: lesbian-queer bodies producing and un/doing urban territories and borders in New York City, 1983–2008', *Area*, 48(3), pp. 262–270.
- Greed, C. (2003) *Inclusive urban design: public toilets*. London: Routledge
- Hall, R. (2016) 'Reproduction and resistance: an anti-colonial contribution to social-reproduction feminism', *Historical Materialism*, 24(2), pp. 87–110.
- Hall, S. and Burdett, R. (2017) 'Introduction: urban churn', in S. Hall and R. Burdett (eds.) *The Sage handbook of the 21st century city*. London: Sage, pp. 1–10.
- Haraway, D. (1988) 'Situated knowledges: the science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective', *Feminist Studies*, 14(3), pp. 575–599.
- Higgins, C. (2018) 'The age of patriarchy: how an unfashionable idea became a rallying cry for feminism today', *The Guardian*. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/news/2018/jun/22/the-age-of-patriarchy-how-an-unfashionable-idea-became-a-rallying-cry-for-feminism-today> (accessed 4 March 2024).
- Jacobs, M.R. (2022) 'The role of living traditions in decolonizing Indigenous gender in an urban environment', *Sociological Forum*, 37(1), pp. 177–199.
- Jain, D. (2005) *Women, development, and the UN: a sixty-year quest for equality and justice*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Jonas, A., Miller, B., Ward, K. and Wilson, D. (2018) 'Spaces of urban politics. An introduction', in A. Jonas, B. Miller, K. Ward and D. Wilson (eds.) *The Routledge handbook on spaces of urban politics*. London: Routledge, pp. 1–10.
- Katz, C. (2001) 'On the grounds of globalization: a topography for feminist political engagement', *Signs*, 26(4), pp. 1213–1234.
- Katz, C. (2021) 'Planetary urbanization', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 45(4), pp. 597–611.
- Keovorabout, S.T. (2022) 'The queer urban Indigenous city: understanding the impacts of the settler-colonial state on urban Indigenous and Two-Spirit identity', *Journal of Global Indigeneity*, 6(1), pp. 1–8.
- Kern, L. and McLean, H. (2017) 'Undecidability and the urban: feminist pathways through urban political economy', *Acme*, 16(3), pp. 405–426.
- Koleth, E., Peake, L., Razavi, N. and Adeniyi-Ogunyankin, G. (2023) 'Decolonising feminist urban futures', *Urban Geography*, 44(9), pp. 1843–1852.
- Lefebvre, H. ([1968] 1984) *Everyday life in the modern world*. Trans. S. Rabinovitch. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Lewkowicz, S. and Gilliland, J. (2024) 'A feminist critical analysis of public toilets and gender. A systematic review', *Urban Affairs Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10780874241233529>
- Orde, A. (1984) 'Poetry is not a luxury', in A. Orde (ed.) *Sister, outsider. Essays and speeches by Audre Lorde*. San Francisco: Crossing Press, pp. 36–39.
- MacKenzie, S. and Rose, D. (1983) 'Industrial change, the domestic economy and home life', in J. Anderson, S. Duncan and R. Hudson (eds.) *Redundant spaces in cities and regions? Studies in industrial decline and social change*. London: Academic Press, pp. 155–199.
- Markusen, A. (1980) 'City spatial structure, women's household work and national urban policy', *Signs*, 5(3), pp. S22–S44.
- Massey, D.B. (2005) *For space*. London: Sage.
- McFarlane, C. (2023) *Waste and the city: the crisis of sanitation and the right to city life*. London: Verso Books.

- Merino, M.-E., Webb, A., Radcliffe, S., Becerra, S. and G. Aillañir, C. (2020) 'Laying claims on the city: young Mapuche ethnic identity and the use of urban space in Santiago, Chile', *Latin American and Caribbean Ethnic Studies*, 15(1), pp. 1–22.
- Mohanty, C.T. (1988) 'Under Western eyes: feminist scholarship and colonial discourses', *Feminist Review*, 30(1), pp. 61–88.
- Monk, J., George, S. with George, J. (2004) 'Teachers and their times: Thelma Glass and Juanita Gaston', in J.O. Wheeler and S. Brunn (eds.) *The south's role in the making of American geography: centennial of the Association of the American Geographers (AAG)*. Columbia, MD: Bellweather Publications, for the Southeastern Division, Association of American Geographers.
- Montgomerie, J., and Tepe-Belfrage, D. (2017) 'Caring for debts: how the household economy exposes the limits of financialisation', *Critical Sociology*, 43(4–5), pp. 653–668.
- Moser, C.O.N. and McIlwaine, C. (2014) 'New frontiers in twenty-first century urban conflict and violence', *Environment and Urbanization*, 26(2), pp. 331–344.
- Nash, J.C. (2019) *Black feminism reimaged: after intersectionality*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Norton, J. and Katz, C. (2016) 'Social reproduction', in D. Richardson, N. Castree, M.F. Goodchild, A. Kobayashi, W. Liu and R.A. Marston (eds.) *International encyclopedia of geography: people, the earth, environment and technology*. New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 6236–6247.
- Oren, T. and Press, A. (eds.) (2019) *The Routledge handbook of contemporary feminism*. London: Routledge.
- Parker, B. (2017) 'The feminist geographer as killjoy: excavating gendered urban power relations', *The Professional Geographer*, 69(2), pp. 321–328.
- Parnell, S. and Robinson, J. (2017) 'The global urban: difference and complexity in urban studies and the science of cities', in S. Hall and R. Burdett (eds.) *The Sage handbook of the 21st century city*. London: Sage, pp. 13–31.
- Peake, L. (2016) 'The twenty-first century quest for feminism and the global urban', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 40(1), pp. 219–227.
- Peake, L. (2020) 'Gender and the city', in A. Kobayashi (ed.) *The international encyclopaedia of human geography, 2nd edition, volume 5*. London: Elsevier, pp. 281–292.
- Peake, L., Koleth, E., Tanyildiz, G.S., Narayanareddy, R.N. and Patrick, D. (eds.) (2021) *A feminist urban theory for our time: rethinking social reproduction and the urban*. London: Antipode Book Series, Wiley Press.
- Peake, L., Patrick, D., Reddy, R.N., Tanyildiz, G.S., Ruddick, S. and Tchoukaleyska, R. (2019) 'Placing planetary urbanization in other fields of vision', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 36(3), pp. 374–386.
- Peake, L., Razavi, N. and Smyth, A. (eds.) (2024) *Doing feminist urban research: insights from the GenUrb project*. London: Routledge.
- Perry, K.-K.Y. (2013) *Black women against the land grab: the fight for racial justice in Brazil*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Poets, D. (2020) '(Rhythms of) life in the uninhabitable', *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 10(1), pp. 76–78.
- Quiñones, L.M. (2020) 'Sexual harassment in public transport in Bogotá', *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 139, pp. 54–69.
- Rai, S. (2021) 'Beyond the coronavirus: understanding crises of social reproduction', *Global Labour Journal*, 12(1), pp. 39–53.
- Rankin, K., Adeniyi-Ogunyankin, G. and Ninglehku, S. (2022) 'The right to the city: "the slum" and informal urbanisms,' in A. Bain and L. Peake (eds.) *Urbanization in a global context, 2nd edition*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Rosenberg, R.D. (2021) 'Negotiating racialised (un)belonging: Black LGBTQ resistance in Toronto's gay village', *Urban Studies*, 58(7), pp. 1397–1413.
- Roy, A. (2009) 'The 21st-century metropolis: new geographies of theory', *Regional Studies* 43(6), pp. 819–830.
- Roy, A. (2013) 'Spectral futures', *City*, 17(4), pp. 493–497.
- Roy, A. (2020) 'The shadow of her wings: respectability politics and the self-narration of geography', *Dialogues in Human Geography*, 10(1), pp. 19–22.

- Roy, A. (2021) 'Decentering global urbanism: an interview with Ananya Roy', in C. McFarlane and M. Lancione (eds.) *The handbook of global urbanism: essays on the city and its future*. London: Routledge, pp. 25–33.
- Roy, S. (2021) 'Transnational feminism and the politics of scale: the 2012 Antirape Protests in Delhi', in A. Tambe and M. Thayer (eds.) *Transnational feminist itineraries: situating theory and activist practice*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, pp. 71–85.
- Ruddick, S., Peake L., Tanyildiz G.S. and Patrick, D. (2019) 'Planetary urbanization: an urban theory for our time?' *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 36(3), pp. 387–404.
- Simone, A. (2004) People as infrastructure: intersecting fragments in Johannesburg. *Public Culture*, 16(3), pp. 407–429.
- Simone, A. (2018) *Improvised lives: rhythms of endurance in an urban south*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Simpson, A. (2016) 'The state is a man: Theresa Spence, Loretta Saunders and the gender of settler sovereignty', *Theory and Event*, 19(4). doi: <https://muse-jhu-edu.ezproxy.library.yorku.ca/article/633280>
- Sweet, E.L. and Ortiz Escalante, S. (2017) 'Engaging territorio cuerpo-tierra through body and community mapping: a methodology for making communities safer', *Gender, Place and Culture*, 24(4), pp. 594–606.
- Tanyildiz, G.S., Peake, L., Koleth, E., Narayanareddy, R.N., Patrick, D. and Ruddick, S. (2021) 'A feminist urban theory for our time: rethinking social reproduction, the urban and its constitutive outside', in L. Peake, E. Koleth, G.S. Tanyildiz, R.N. Narayanareddy and D. Patrick (eds.) *A feminist urban theory for our time: rethinking social reproduction and the urban*. London: Antipode Book Series, Wiley Press, pp. 1–41.
- United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division (UN) (2019) *World Urbanization Prospects 2018: Highlights* (ST/ESA/SER.A/421).
- Winders, J. and Smith, B.E. (2019) 'Social reproduction and capitalist production: a genealogy of dominant imaginaries', *Progress in Human Geography*, 43(5), pp. 871–889.
- Zaragocin, S. and Caretta, M.A. (2021) 'Cuerpo-territorio: a decolonial feminist geographical method for the study of embodiment', *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*, 111(5), pp. 1503–1518.