

Gender, Identity and Place Understanding Feminist Geographies

Linda McDowell

Copyright © Linda McDowell 1999

The right of Linda McDowell to be identified as author of this work has been asserted in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

First published in 1999 by Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Reprinted 2004

Editorial office:
Polity Press
65 Bridge Street
Cambridge CB2 1UR, UK

Marketing and production: Blackwell Publishers Ltd 108 Cowley Road Oxford OX4 1JF, UK

All rights reserved. Except for the quotation of short passages for the purposes of criticism and review, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Except in the United States of America, this book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form of binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

ISBN 0-7456-1506-6 ISBN 0-7456-1507-4 (pbk)

A CIP catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

Typeset in 10½ on 12 pt Erhardt by Ace Filmsetting Ltd, Frome, Somerset Printed and bound in Great Britain by Marston Book Services Limited, Oxford

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Preface and Acknowledgements

Some years ago, before feminist work in geography was as well-established as it is now, I was asked in a job interview 'what is all this stuff about women and geography?' While a questioner might not be so offensive nowadays, it is still a common experience to be asked by all sorts of people 'what has gender to do with geography?'

This book is an attempt to provide an answer to that question. My aim is to outline some of the main connections between geographical perspectives and feminist approaches and to illustrate them with empirical work that I have read and enjoyed over the last few years. The emphases reflect, as is common in texts like this one, my own interests and some of the work I have been involved in. I work on gender issues in contemporary Britain in the main, and to a lesser extent in other 'advanced' societies. I am also an urban and social geographer, interested in the changing nature of work in global cities and so the examples that I draw on reflect this emphasis. I have tried to be eclectic, but there is still not enough in the pages that follow about, for example, gender relations in 'Third World' nations or about ecofeminist approaches and campaigns. One of the delights but also frustrations of our subject is its vast encompassing range and no one can be an expert across all its subfields. So this book will not provide you with everything you may want to know about geography and gender, but I hope it will prove an interesting and enjoyable place to start and will lead you to explore what is, in my view, some of the most exciting scholarship in our discipline at present. I have introduced the 'classics' and some recent work and I hope that the case studies will prove a stimulus to all those geographers thinking about doing feminist research.

Although my name is on the cover, a book like this one is the result of the development of feminist networks that link geographers in many countries. One of the great pleasures of my academic work has been participation in these networks and the academic enthusiasms and many friendships that I have made thereby. It's hard to mention all the people who have made such a difference, and perhaps invidious to single out a few, but I should like to mention and to thank in particular Gillian Rose whose astute comments on the first draft were just the right mixture of friendly support and scholarly criticism, Doreen Massey with whom I worked for several years and whose energy and enthusiasm have always inspired me to greater efforts, Joni Seager, both for her personal generosity and the example of her work, Sophie Bowlby, Jo Foord, Susan Hanson, Jane Lewis, Suzanne Mackenzie and Janice Monk who have been there from the start, Michelle Lowe for a long friendship, Jo Sharp for more recent pleasures of collaboration and five amazing feminists and graduate students with whom it is my pleasure to work at present: Dorothy Forbes, Flora Gathorne-Hardy, Rebecca Klahr, Paula Meth and Bronwen Parry.

An earlier version of chapter 9 was published in the Journal of Geography in Higher Education (1997) as 'Women/gender/feminisms'. I should like to thank the editors and publisher for permission to reprint parts of it.

The author and publishers also wish to thank the following for permission to use copyright material:

Black Rose Books for a table from T. Amott and J. Matthaei, Race, Gender and Work: A Multicultural Economic History of Women in the US (1991), p. 325, table 10.3;

Routledge for tables from S. Reinharz, 'Experimental analysis: a contribution to feminist research', in G. Bowles and R. Duelli-Klein (eds), Theories of Women's Studies (Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983), p. 168, table 11.1, and pp. 170-2, table 11.4, and material from J. Fiske, Reading the Popular (1992), p. 57;

Royal Geographical Society for a table from J. G. Townsend, 'Towards a regional geography of gender', *Geographical Journal*, 157 (1991), pp. 26-7, table 1;

University of California Press for excerpts from C. Enloe, Bananas, Beaches, and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics (1989), pp. xi-xii, 16, 17, 95, 97, 184, 189–90, 190–1. Copyright © 1989 Cynthia Enloe.

Every effort has been made to trace the copyright holders but if any have been inadvertently overlooked the publishers will be pleased to make the necessary arrangement at the first opportunity.

Contents

L	ist of Plates	vi
L	ist of Figures and Tables	vii
Pi	reface and Acknowledgements	viii
1	Introduction: Place and Gender	1
2	In and Out of Place: Bodies and Embodiment	34
3	Home, Place and Identity	71
4	Community, City and Locality	96
5	Work/Workplaces	123
6	In Public: the Street and Spaces of Pleasure	148
7	Gendering the Nation-State	170
8	Displacements	203
9	Postscript: Reflections on the Dilemmas of Feminist Research	224
Re	References	
Index		276

Plates

2.1	Urban art: depicting the male body	45
2.2	The Tattooed Woman	52
2.3	A celebration of birth: an urban mural	59
3.1	Rosie the Riveter: a familiar image of a woman worker	
	in the Second World War	80
4.1	Gay Pride flags in the Castro District, San Francisco	105
4.2	The Women's Restaurant, on the edges of the Castro	
	District, San Francisco	106
6.1	Contemporary shopping spaces: Brent Cross,	
	North London	161
7.1	The Broadgate Venus, London	198
8.1	Diasporic Chinese women in the US	211
Cred	dits	
Plate	e 2.2: The Tattooed Woman, original postcard c.1920, colouring Al Ba © Quantity Postcards, Tilt Works, San Francisco, California.	rna,
Plate	e 3.1: Rosie the Riveter, World War II poster, c.1942, the National chives/Corbis.	Ar-
All d	other plates are photographs by the author.	

Figures and Tables

5.1	Women's pay as a percentage of men's pay, Great Britain, 1996	131
	Tables	
3.1	Share of employed women working in private household service by racial-ethnic group 1900-1980, USA	85
9.1	Extensive data for a regional geography of gender	232
9.2	Contrasting claims of research methods	235
	A comparison of conventional and feminist research methods	237

• The control of t

1

Introduction: Place and Gender

The place of gender

How is gender linked to geography? Do men and women live different lives in different parts of the world? And if gendered attributes are socially constructed, then how does femininity and masculinity vary over time and space? What range of variation is there in the social relations between women and men? Are men usually centre-stage and women confined to the margins in all societies? What have geographers had to say about these issues?

These are the sorts of questions I want to examine in this book. They are issues that seem to have become important in a wide range of disciplines in the social sciences and humanities, where there has been a remarkable flowering in recent years of discussions and debates conducted in pre-eminently geographical terms. In all sorts of disciplines, scholars are writing about migration and travel, borders and boundaries, place and non-place in a literal and metaphorical sense. These debates reflect the huge disruptions and transformations in the links between specific peoples and particular places that have taken place in recent decades. Vast migrations of people and of money - labour and capital in the more abstract language of the social sciences - are a consequence of the increasingly global scale of those sets of social relations and connections that tie places together in the modern world. And these migrations have displaced and disrupted the lives of millions of people. Nationalist movements, wars, famines, as well as the development of transnational capital and global corporations have resulted in the enforced movement of many peoples, while hundreds of thousands of others have voluntarily, and usually temporarily, set off across vast geographic distances, travelling for pleasure and to broaden the mind.

Both types of movement have radically changed the relationships be-

tween individual and group identity, everyday life, and territory or place. It is becoming commonplace for increasing numbers of people to leave 'home': some to settle and make their lives far from where they were born, too many others to become 'placeless', 'dis-placed' peoples of the world, condemned to the limbo of not belonging, whether to a nation with a national territorial base, to a class or to a region. For many of the women involved in these journeys, movement has been associated with proletarianization, as local and multinational capital draws them in increasing numbers into the waged labour forces of the new international division of labour. The global reach of capital means that women in Korea, Kampuchea and Katmandu may end up working for the same corporation as women in Western Europe.

For some of these women, their travel may not involve vast geographical movement; it may involve only local travel or indeed no physical travel at all. Instead, the displacement experienced is the result of changing economic, social and cultural circumstances, as women enter factories or the homes of the elite as domestic workers, and as they are connected to other times and places through the penetration and cultural dominance of Western forms of information technology and popular culture. Whether the movement is physical or not, it is almost always associated with the renegotiation of gender divisions. These renegotiations are the subject of the chapters that follow.

Before turning to the ways in which these changes have been theorized and investigated at a whole range of spatial scales and at different sites in the home, the workplace and in public places, I want to look at how these huge material changes have affected our understanding of the links between place and identity.

Space, place and 'the local'

It is often assumed that the net result of the increasing scale of global interconnections and movement is a decline in the significance of 'the local' — in the amount of time people spend in a restricted geographical area, in the number of friends and family in the environs, and in the control that might be exercised at the local level, whether over political decisions and actions or the economic consequences of the actions of capital. The corollary is assumed to be the end of a sense of local attachment, of belonging to a place with all its local idiosyncrasies and cultural forms. While some of the former features are certainly apparent for some people for some of the time in certain parts of the world — most notably, of course, for affluent Western males — for many people in the world, everyday life

continues to take place within a restricted locale. Even for the most mobile — an international financier is perhaps the most extreme example — a large part of daily activities, both at work and at home, must inevitably be within a finite area. The global money trader may be moving money around the world at a fantastic speed, but he himself (and it usually is a he) is sitting in front of a screen in Hong Kong, London, New York or some other financial centre, and in the evening, more often than not, these traders presumably go home to somewhere within daily travelling distance of their office, rather than to the international airport to jet off to another part of the world.

While the 'localization' of most of everyday life is indisputable, a perhaps more interesting question to ask is how have the enormous changes of the twentieth century impacted on the notion and existence of a 'sense of place'? Do people any longer feel a part of and a responsibility to their local area? And has the loss of stability, or perhaps more accurately the immobility, that once rooted peoples to a particular place for the whole of their lifetime and for generations of the same families meant the decline of locally based customs and practices, of those local mores that created the particularity of one place and distinguished it from others?

While these are perhaps particularly anxious questions for anthropologists whose whole disciplinary raison d'être has been to investigate the distinctiveness of 'other' local ways of life and the differences from their own (Okely 1996; Olwig and Hastrup 1997), geographers too have felt some anxiety about the consequences of modernity, the growing dominance of global forms of capitalism and the assumed loss of belonging to a local place. Empirical evidence, however, has assuaged this anxiety, as there are many signs of a continued, and even intensified, sense of locality in many parts of the world. These signs vary from the revival of local customs, practices and languages, in more or less acceptable forms, to the appalling effects of ethnic nationalism and widespread poverty and deprivation that trap growing numbers in their place. Further, as growing numbers of geographers and anthropologists recognize, the consequence of all those changes summed up under the term globalization is not that the world is becoming one, reducing local differences, but rather that 'difference, diversity is generated not from the integrity and authenticity of the local community, rooted in tradition, resisting and accommodating a modern world system ever more powerful in its force, but paradoxically from the very conditions of globalising change themselves' (Marcus: 1994; 42).

One positive effect, however, of the anxiety about the meaning of place, and the understanding that globalizing forces reconstruct rather than destroy localities, has been a shift towards a more sophisticated conceptualization of the notion of locality or place itself. The commonsense

geographical notion of a place as a set of coordinates on a map that fix a defined and bounded piece of territory has been challenged. Geographers now argue that places are contested, fluid and uncertain. It is socio-spatial practices that define places and these practices result in overlapping and intersecting places with multiple and changing boundaries, constituted and maintained by social relations of power and exclusion (Massey 1991; Smith 1993). Places are made through power relations which construct the rules which define boundaries. These boundaries are both social and spatial — they define who belongs to a place and who may be excluded, as well as the location or site of the experience.

As Smith has recognized, 'the making of place implies the production of [geographical] scale in so far as places are made different from each other.' Scale, therefore, is 'the criteria of difference not so much between places as between different kinds of places' (Smith 1993: 99, original emphasis). Thus 'it is geographical scale that defines the boundaries and bounds the identities around which control is exerted and contested' (p. 101). In this sense, as the socio-spatial definition of difference between different kinds of places, scale has recently been adopted in a number of geographic texts about difference as a central organizing device. In our reader Space, Gender, Knowledge, Jo Sharp and I used scale as the organizer (McDowell and Sharp 1997), as did David Bell and Gill Valentine in their book about food, Consuming Geographies: We Are Where We Eat (1997). I adopt the same strategy here.

But defining places, distinguishing the difference between them by scale, does not imply that they are constituted by processes that operate at a single spatial scale. Thus a home, or a neighbourhood, is a locality that is bounded by scale – that is rules/power relations that keep others out – but its constitution is through the intersection of a range of factors that may coincide there but are not restricted to the local level in their operation. As Doreen Massey (1991) has argued, localities are produced by the intersection of global and local processes – social relations that operate at a range of spatial scales. This produces what she terms a 'global sense of place'. Places may no longer be 'authentic' and 'rooted in tradition' as Marcus suggested in the quotation above; they are instead defined by the socio-spatial relations that intersect there and give a place its distinctive character.

So in Kilburn, the example used by Massey in her paper, the peculiar or particular sense of place that is experienced by her and other local inhabitants is defined by, among other things, the combination of in-migration from Ireland and Pakistan, by the 'Chinese' chip shop that sells curry and baked potatoes as well as noodles, by an internationally owned clothing firm employing local women who may have moved to Kilburn from Cyprus, Southern Africa and the Indian subcontinent to finish garments for a high street chain store. The 'authenticity' of places in contemporary global

cities like London, therefore, is made up from flows and movements, from intersecting social relations rather than stability and rootedness. And even though a locality in inner London may seem an extreme example of the globality (globalness? glocalization? They are all horrid words but capture what I mean) of local places, at the end of the twentieth century there are few 'untouched' places.

Anthropologists, too, have come to a similar understanding of place. Thus Judith Okely, an anthropologist interested in the changing nature of place or localities in Britain and elsewhere, has recognized the relational nature of place and also noted that places are defined, maintained and altered through the impact of unequal power relations. She has argued that 'different groups inhabiting the same spaces can create and shift boundaries by subtle means' (Okely 1996: 3) and, of course, by less subtle means such as force or legal exclusion. New nations in Central and Eastern Europe are defined by excluding 'others' - Bosnians from Macedonia, for example. And at a smaller spatial scale, the nationalist and 'Loyalist' spaces in Ulster's cities are another extreme example of places defined by exclusion. In other places, different people do live together, but distance between them may occur. Social distance does not always imply geographical distance, and occupants of the same Cartesian spaces may live in very different 'places'. Further what have been termed relational places - locales constructed through social relations between groups and individuals - slip up and down the spatial scale as it were, as particular sets of social practices connect the local to the regional, or to the national and the global in different ways for different inhabitants.

This new sense of place and scale might perhaps be imagined diagrammatically as a double helix rather than an old-fashioned three-tier cake plate which maintains spatial separation. Feminist theorist Elizabeth Grosz, albeit discussing the body rather than place, has used a rather similar image – the Möbius strip, rather than a double helix – that also captures this sense of interconnection and change. It is important, however, not to be too carried away by the fluidity of this new conceptualization and representation of relational place, as customs and institutional structures clearly persist through time and 'set' places in time and space as it were. But rapid change is also possible, as the dramatic events in Central and Eastern Europe made clear when the map of this part of the world was redrawn between 1989 and 1991. Perhaps there are relatively established and stable regimes of places, or socio-spatial associations, which persist through time but which are then overturned and replaced in a period of crisis.

This notion of a regime to refer to a relatively stable set of social relations that are maintained despite minor alterations and variations, but which are subject to periodic upheavals, often in times of crisis which may be related

in particular to economic changes, is also a useful way to think about gender relations. In the next section of this introduction, I shall look at this argument in more detail. Before I do so, however, I want to briefly mention the argument of a French anthropologist, Marc Augé (1996), who has suggested that the extreme result of the sorts of changes we have experienced in capitalist societies is the replacement of places by non-places.

Non-places are those locations in the contemporary world where the transactions and interactions that take place are between anonymous individuals, often stripped of all symbols of social identity other than an identification number: a pin number for a cash card for example, or a passport number. Indeed cash points and airports are classic examples of nonplaces, according to Augé, where each of us interacts as an anonymous individual with a technological object or an official or employee who is not interested in us as a person but merely as a number or a statistic, an anonymized flow-through. In these spaces, our individual social attributes and our membership of a social group become irrelevant: as long as we have the money, of course, to make the cash transaction or purchase the ticket to travel. In non-places therefore, gendered attributes and perhaps even our sexed bodies become unimportant, opening up a paradoxical space of control and liberation. Although we might be able to escape our sets of personal connections and obligations momentarily or for a few hours, these transactions are also carefully monitored and controlled and our movements are subjected to various forms of electronic surveillance.

Augé's arguments are interesting, however, as they have parallels with the freedom and surveillance of cyberspace. As we surf the net, our bodily attributes become irrelevant, or rather, fluid and alterable at will. There is nothing to stop us entering the chat rooms of cyberspace in any form we like. The only limitation is our imagination, which, of course, tends to remain tethered to the limited subject positions available in 'real' space. But unless and until the exchange of views on the net becomes materialized, the gendered attributes that define us as feminine or masculine in other forms of interaction do not matter. Let's move on, then, to explore the material aspects of gender and gender relations, but keep in mind the idea of 'place' as the grounded intersections of a whole variety of flows and interactions that operate over a range of spatial scales: I shall return to this conceptualization of place at the end of the chapter.

Defining gender

If the conceptualization of place has become more nuanced in recent geographical work, then so too has the definition of gender. The focus of feminist scholars, geographers among them, has also changed, from a dominant emphasis on the material inequalities between men and women in different parts of the world to a new convergence of interest on language, symbolism, representations and meaning in the definition of gender, and on questions about subjectivity, identity and the sexed body. About ten years ago, in a review of the work of feminist anthropologists, Henrietta Moore (1988) suggested that the scope of feminist scholarship in her discipline included the analysis of 'what it is to be a woman, how cultural understandings of the category "woman" vary through space and time, and how those understandings relate to the position of women in different societies' (p.12). She suggested development of this understanding required the concept of gender and gender relations: that is the different ways in which women and men, and the accepted attributes of femininity and masculinity, are defined across space and time. Gender, she argued, may be seen from two perspectives: 'either as a symbolic construction or as a social relationship'.

These two aspects – gender as a set of material social relations and as symbolic meaning – cannot really be separated. In defining gender, and in the preceding discussion of the changing definition and understanding of place, it is clear that social practices, including the wide range of social interactions at a variety of sites and places – at work, for example, at home, in the pub or the gym – and ways of thinking about and representing place/gender are interconnected and mutually constituted. We all act in relation to our intentions and beliefs, which are always culturally shaped and historically and spatially positioned. What I feel about, say, young men is related to social assumptions about their behaviour, my own experiences as the mother of a teenage son and how local youths conduct themselves on the streets of Cambridge at night! This influences how I react to them and them to me, and these actions in turn have an effect on my attitudes, beliefs and future intentions, on my knowledge of and understanding of the world and different people's place in it.

So, what people believe to be appropriate behaviour and actions by men and women reflect and affect what they imagine a man or a woman to be and how they expect men and women to behave, albeit men and women who are differentiated by age, class, race or sexuality, and these expectations and beliefs change over time and between places. It is only as an icon or an image, as the Virgin Mary perhaps, that notions of femininity are universal (almost), untouched and unchanging. For everyone else, accepted standards change over time and space.

As well as a so-called 'cultural turn' in feminist scholarship and indeed in geographical research more generally (Barnes and Duncan, 1992; Duncan and Ley 1994) — that is a greater emphasis on symbols, meanings and

representations - there has also been a shift in the political aims of the feminist movement over the last three decades or so. My aim in this section is to give a brief summary of these changing emphases. It is brief because there are many other places to look for a comprehensive treatment of the history of feminism in geography (Bondi 1990, 1992; Duncan 1996b; Jones III et al. 1997; McDowell 1992a, 1992b, 1992c; G. Pratt 1993; G. Rose 1993; Massey 1994; Women and Geography Study Group 1984, 1997) and more widely (Alcoff and Potter, 1993; Gunew 1990, 1991; Jackson 1993; Lovell 1990; Barrett and Phillips 1992; Pollock 1996). The new book cooperatively written by members of the Women and Geography Study Group (1997) is an excellent place to start. But as well as the summary I provide in this chapter, in each of the substantive chapters that follow the shifting emphases of feminist geographers will be reflected in the concepts, theories and case studies that are discussed. And then in the final chapter, I also illustrate the changing emphases through a methodological lens, showing not only how research questions have changed but also the research methods that are used in approaching these new questions.

Feminist scholarship

The key aim of feminist scholarship in general is to demonstrate the construction and significance of sexual differentiation as a key organizing principle and axis of social power, as well as a crucial part of the constitution of subjectivity, of an individual's sense of their self-identity as a sexed and gendered person. One of the most interesting definitions of feminist scholarship that I have come across recently is that by Griselda Pollock in the preface to her edited collection Generations and Geographies in the Visual Arts:

Feminism stands here for a political commitment to women and to changes that women desire for themselves and for the world. Feminism stands for a commitment to the full appreciation of what women inscribe, articulate, and image in cultural forms: interventions in the field of meaning and identity from the place called 'woman' or the 'feminine'. Feminism also refers to a theoretical revolution in the ways in which terms such as art, culture, woman, subjectivity, politics and so forth are understood. But feminism does not imply a united field of theory, political position, or perspective. Feminism has been identified with a women's movement and it is important historically that it should be so; but at this moment, its autonomy as the place in which the question of gender is posed acquires a particular political and theoretical significance. (1996: xv)

So feminism is, as Pollock makes crystal clear, both a political movement and a theoretical field of analysis. Her definition, not surprisingly, reflects her training as an art historian and as geographers and social scientists concerned with everyday behaviours and political actions – the material as well as representational interventions – we might perhaps want to insert a phrase implying as much: perhaps after Pollock's second sentence. Otherwise her definition seems to me to be remarkably succinct and complete and, most importantly, as we shall explore further in a moment, she emphasizes the diversity of feminist theory. Indeed, many geographers now speak about 'feminisms' and 'feminist geographies', preferring the plural rather than the singular to emphasize the diversity of their perspectives and approaches. Notice that the title of the jointly written introductory book I mentioned earlier is Feminist Geographies: Explorations in Diversity and Difference, whereas its 1984 predecessor was more starkly titled Geography and Gender.

As Pollock noted, however, feminism within the academy is not only the place where questions about gender are posed – about its definition, variation and effects – but is also where political questions about who is represented within its walls, both as scholars and as subjects of scholarship, must be addressed. I want to postpone the question of women's position as scholars until the end of this chapter and discuss first gender as the subject of scholarship.

As Pollock argues in her book, 'feminism has had to fight long and hard to win an acknowledgement of the organizing centrality of sexual difference, with its effects of gender and sexuality as one of the planes of social and subjective constitution' (1996: 4), and this is no less true in our discipline than in others. As Susan Christopherson (1989) bitterly suggested in an article in Antipode - a radical journal of geography - questions about gender, justice and equality remained 'outside the project' for most geographers, even for self-identified radicals interested in class inequality and social transformation. It has been a long struggle to get mainstream geographers to accept gender divisions as a key axis of social differentiation, on a par with, for example, class and race/ethnicity. It is too often assumed that gender is only an attribute of femininity and therefore only of interest to women scholars and students. Those of us who teach a course, perhaps boldly titled gender and geography/ies, even feminist geography/ies, or introduce feminist perspectives into substantive courses such as economic geography, have too often had to compare notes about how to get our teaching taken seriously, and how to keep the men, as well as the women, in our classes on board.

To this misunderstanding about the audience for our work is added a further, and perhaps more crucial misconception. It is usually, but incor-