SHORT TERM SCIENTIFIC MISSION
SCIENTIFIC REPORT:

DEVELOPING A TRAINING MODULE ON
GENDER & SPATIAL JUSTICE

LIDEWIJ TUMMERS

INSTITUT FÜR LANDSCHAFTSPLANUNG,
UNIVERSITÄT FÜR BODEN KULTUR;
VIENNA (AUSTRIA)

OCT-NOV 2015
List of Figures

Figure 1: PPP as shifting concept. (Source: Phttp://www.projectaccelerator.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Value-Triple-bottom-Line.png)

figure 2: dimensions of spatial planning

Figure 3: workspace made available at BOKU (picture: L.Tummers)

Figure 4: mental map for the training module (picture: L.Tummers)

Figure 5: training school at Istanbul Technical University (picture: L.Tummers)

Summary

Justice is more than a legal matter: it has spatial and environmental implications and is related to engineering. The concept of ‘spatial justice’ was introduced in 2010 in planning by Eduard Soja. It indicates the accessibility of urban resources such as education and healthcare. Under democratic governments, planning territorial development is supposed to do ‘justice for all’. This position has been challenged by feminist scholars arguing that ‘all’ do not have the same point of departure in society, and Gender-aware planning propose alternatives approaches to integrate diverse uses in spatial planning. It has however not addressed the concept of spatial justice explicitly. The aim of this STSM was to develop a gendered perspective on spatial justice, and to design a training module for spatial justice and gender equality. The STSM has been used to discuss the literature, didactics, key-notion, topics and case-studies. Taking an international perspective we can establish different issues to emphasize in the training. Part of the module has been implemented in the GenderSTE training school in Istanbul, November 2015. Its evaluation allowed to finalise the modules design, which is now available for further implementation.

1. PURPOSE OF THE STSM

1.1 Research Question

It is generally accepted that sustainable development calls for a convergence between the three pillars: economic development, social equity, and environmental protection [Elkington 1994]. Each of the pillars are contextualized concepts, that fluctuate over time.

Figure 1: PPP as shifting concept. (Source: Phttp://www.projectaccelerator.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/Value-Triple-bottom-Line.png)
At all times, the concept of ‘social equity’ implies that the responsibilities as well as the benefits are distributed fairly in societies. For the purpose of our module we distinguish four elements in the gender dimension of equity as:

1. Equal distribution of power
2. Economic equality
3. Care without subordination
4. Physical integrity

A balanced distribution of burdens and benefits is seen as ‘just’. But justice can have many faces (after Reinwald 2015):

The question we address here is related to spatial planning: Soja re-introduced the term ‘spatial justice’ (2010) which indicates the accessibility of urban resources such as education and healthcare. Under democratic governments, planning territorial development is supposed to do ‘justice for all’ in other words give all inhabitant equal access to urban resources. This position has been challenged by feminist scholars, arguing that ‘all’ members of society do not have the same point of departure. Inequalities are visible for example in gender-segregated statistics on the division of labour, and access to urban resources.

Therefor in this STSM we are concerned not only with developing a gendered perspective on spatial justice, but also how it can help to make gendered approaches in spatial planning operable.

The gendered approach of spatial justice proposed here is only a start. The training module is conceived as a form of exchange that will not transfer knowledge in a one-way model, but instead facilitates exchange that can develop the concept further.
1.2. Conceptual basis

The idea of ‘justice’ has evaluated over time, together with other major philosophical concepts. In the middle Ages, justice is part of a “Hermeneutic-ethical” concept: Justice as moral. Historical, biblical and religious views on (social) justice prevail: it is to the grace of God.

In “Modern” concepts of justice Human replaces God in the center of thinking. Justice becomes a product of human reason that can understand the social benefits of justice (Humes): the freedom of choice is introduced. In consequent “Libertarianism”, Justice is related to the Market, introducing the positive and negative values and seeking to maximize the sum. Utilitarianism (utilitarian) Justice is seen as a utility maximization: individuals or minorities may suffer if the interest of the common good or the majority is served. This has become a widespread approach within (spatial) planning and development.

In our times, this is increasingly perceived as ‘injustice’ because it may lead to structural marginalization of certain ‘minority’ groups. New “Anti-utilitarian” theories of justice emerge: Justice as fairness, the Fair shared city in which the accessibility for each individual prevails over the maximization of the sum. John Rawls is the fundamental reference on Justice as fairness. Rawls raises the question what principles of justice would individuals agree to when designing society and postulates: "Each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive basic liberty compatible with a similar liberty for others." [Rawls 1979] Relevant to gender theory is Rawls' recognition that inequalities can actually be just, as long as they are to the benefit of the least well off. In practice, this supports policies for equal opportunities that may (temporarily) disadvantage others, such as gender quota.

Sojas book re-introducing spatial dimension of ‘justice’ was inspired by the writings of Henri Lefebvre. Lefebvre introduced the idea of the social production of space: „(Social) space is a (social) product” (Lefebvre (1974) 1991:26) and nowadays the understanding that social processes and spatial forms are related directly is underlying many spatial theories. Around the same time, David Harvey wrote ‘Social Justice and the City’ in which he theorized the idea that everything must take place in the space somewhere, so also justice must take place in space [Harvey 1973]. He defines Social justice as „… a particular application of just principles to conflicts which arise out of the necessity for social cooperation in seeking individual advancement” (Harvey 2009:97). Feminist scholars such as Massey, Deutsch and hooks have critically built on this idea to investigate how unequal class, race or gender relations are reproduced in space.

The time restrictions of an STSM did not allow further exploration of the philosophical background; we decided to focus primarily on the implications for planning and the applicability for gender-aware planning.

“Understanding that space - like justice – is never simply handed out or given, that both are socially produced, experienced and contested on constantly shifting social, political, economic, and geographical terrains, means that justice – if it is to be concretely achieved, experienced, and reproduced - must be engaged on spatial as well as social terms.” (Bromberg et.al 2007:2).
1.3. Planning Context

This STSM is not related to a specific planning context, but tries to explain how spatial justice is contextualised and how it can be related to local planning practice, and gender-aware approaches to planning.

In her book about the just city, Susan Fainstein elaborates on three hallmarks of urban justice after Rawls: (material) equality, diversity, and democracy [Fainstein 2010]. If planners want to contribute to spatial justice, Fainstein argues, they need to go beyond egalitarian concepts and re-think participation and diversity. Moreover, spatial justice needs to be defined within the context of the planning practice. Practically there are constraints for planners to operate in the projection of housing, space for public use, mega-projects, transport, zoning and so on. In connecting the philosophical concepts of justice to the performance of planning practice, Fainstein builds on the work of Marion Iris Young, who was amongst the first to connect social justice, gender and spatial development [Fainstein and Servon 2005: 9]. Amongst other aspects, Young writes that

“The territorial separation of workplaces from residential communities divides the interest of working people between the shop floor, on the one hand, and consumer and neighborhood concerns, on the other.” [Young 1990: 246].

Youngs’ observation on territorial separation of work and home corresponds to a key-element in Gender Mainstreaming: the reconciliation of ‘waged work’ and ‘domestic or care tasks’. The potential of Youngs’ work for gender-aware planning and spatial justice should be further investigated.

This approach starts to point the way towards a planning practice based on principles of spatial justice and including gender and diversity.

Fainstein understands planning practice in three major components that need equal attention: processes, context and outcome (substance). We specify the fields further in distinguishing the organizational quality from the material quality in each component (see figure 2). This provides a framework to analyse case-studies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logistics (organisation)</th>
<th>Planning process</th>
<th>Planning substance</th>
<th>Planning context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How plan- or project-related decision-making is organised</td>
<td>How functions are distributed in space; priorities given to movements and activities</td>
<td>Main stakeholders and driving forces behind planning activities; legal context; role of the state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality (design)</td>
<td>Quality of information, participation; target group selection and representation</td>
<td>Quality of place; design criteria; priorities given to material qualities (aesthetic, maintenance, accessibility,...)</td>
<td>Main aims and responsibilities ascribed to planning; zoning and building regulations; (economic) prosperity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2; dimensions of spatial planning (Source: author, 2015)

In each of the fields, the question how ‘inclusion/exclusion’ takes place can be raised. Of major importance for planning context is the (perceived) role of the state
or public authorities and in how far they act as provider or enabler. The framework is integrated in the design of the module to help participants analyse their own planning situations.

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE WORK CARRIED OUT DURING THE STSM

Thanks to the hospitality of the Institute of Landscape Planning of BOKU, the following research activities have been carried out:

- Compile a list of key publications on spatial justice (appendix 1)
- Literature review (see bibliography): leading to conceptual introduction and presentation
- Module design; study examples of equivalent modules [Hodgson, Friedman]; defining the Learning objectives; selecting the workforms and didactics; and drawing a realistic time-schedule.
- Applying the conceptual framework and part of the module design as a pilot in the genderSTE early career researchers training school, held at Istanbul Technical University November 2015.
- Evaluating the training pilot and fine-tuning the conceptual framework and module design.

3. DESCRIPTION OF THE MAIN RESULTS OBTAINED

The first result consists of the design of the training module, preferably for a mixture of academics, professionals and stakeholders from spatial planning related fields (landscape; civil engineering; urbanism; planning; infrastructure; urban studies; ...). However, it can also be held for early stage researchers or practitioners...
specifically. Students bring their own cases (planning situations) and through presentations learn about different planning systems and spatial structures. Furthermore, the comparison in different contexts produces knowledge on the contextual nature of spatial justice and gender (in)equality.

As learning objectives we formulated the aim that after following the module, participants will be able to:

- Understand the main concepts of spatial justice, and how it relates to environmental justice;
- Identify issues of spatial justice in concrete locations at different scale levels;
- Identify the connections between gender and spatial justice;
- Implement gender and spatial justice in planning projects and decisions.

In terms of ECTS credits, the module requires 2 hours of preparation, 3-4 hours meeting and 2 hours of report and evaluation.

Secondly the theory was introduced as part of the Istanbul training school. This lead to two major By-products: a Literature list and a powerpoint presentation on spatial justice.

Two web sites on environmental justice from Istanbul training school participant:
www.ejolt.org
www.ejatlas.org

Thirdly we became aware of the qualities of gender aware planning not only as a solution, but also that the „Gender lens“ makes injustice visible. While (in)justice is socially produced, it become visible in space.

It can therefor be assumed that lessons learned from practices dealing with gender and space (Theory, methods, tools, instruments...) help to implement “spatial justice”. For the future training modules, relevant instructive practices will be selected and added to the documentation.

The evaluation of the ITU training school indicates that the didactic choices we made are justified. Especially the interactive learning parts and the international comparison were appreciated [see appendix 2, based on evaluation forms November 2015].
4. FUTURE COLLABORATION WITH THE HOST INSTITUTION (IF APPLICABLE)
   As a result of the SMST we will be offering the spatial justice module for GenderSTE training schools. BOKU and TU Delft also continue to collaborate in research on spatial justice and gender in spatial planning and urban development.

5. FORESEEN PUBLICATIONS/ARTICLES RESULTING FROM THE STSM (IF APPLICABLE)
   Besides this scientific report, the results of the Training School are published online through genderSTE. Publication of a scientific paper is the next step. A follow-up STSM at TU Delft will be applied for by Florian Reinwald. This will permit us to write a draft and identify target journals.

6. POTENTIAL RESEARCH GAPS IDENTIFIED
   There is so far no gendered perspective on spatial justice. We have identified the following aspects that need further questioning:
   - The role of the state regarding spatial development
   - The interaction theory-practice
   - How the „Gender lens“ – makes injustice visible
   - Lack of segregated statistics on urban use and accessibility
   - An overview of Feminist critique on social and spatial justice concepts (specially Levebvre and Harvey)

7. POTENTIAL FUTURE PROJECTS FOR STSMS
   To make accessible the literature on spatial justice for gender-aware planning practitioners
   It is recommended that the training module is offered both to practitioners and PhD candidates, but it could be further developed for specific groups.
   Training modules so far cover mostly areas of transport planning and urban development. Similar structured modules need to be developed for other GenderSTE related topics such as energy-transition, Climate Change, disaster risk-management, and so on.

8. OTHER COMMENTS (IF ANY)
   Special THANKS TO: Florian Reinwald for the inspiring scientific exchange; Doris Damyanovic and the ILAP for their hospitality; Sue Buckingham for reminding us of Young and compiling a synthesis of the Training School evaluation; the organizers of the ITU training school for providing the opportunity to test our work; and the ITU training school participants for their patience and feedback.

9. CONFIRMATION BY THE HOST INSTITUTION OF THE SUCCESSFUL EXECUTION OF THE STSM
   This is to confirm I have received and approved the above scientific report of the STSM

Dipl.-Ing. Florian Reinwald, Vienna, 26.11.201
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APPENDIX 2: recommendations based on Evaluation Forms responses by participants (prof. S. Buckingham, November 2015)

Training School in Istanbul

This is a gratifyingly overwhelmingly positive evaluation, which largely chimes with our trainer impressions: the strongest elements were when interaction was facilitated; the weakest were the guest lectures which, with the exception of the transport field trip, were too distant from the focus of the workshop. If/when running similar training in the future it would be useful to:

Before the event:
Provide context/reading materials a week or two earlier, and ensure that all of these are relevant to what will be discussed/presented.
Put participants in contact with each other (with their permission)
Provide hotel recommendations closer to the venue

Take more into account the research fields of participants, either by narrowing explicitly the focus of the workshop, or by including examples and fieldwork for different subject-matters represented by the selected participants.

The event:
Ensure that local presenters giving some local content either restrict themselves to context or present research with gender as its main focus.

Maximise interaction time
Maintain at least one field visit/exercise to provide a sense of the area and some gender related issues relevant to it – it is also good at building relationships between participants.
Build in more time on tools and techniques, and also on gender theory.
Ensure lunch is provided – or allow more time for lunch break.

Following the event:
Provide an expanded list of readings/resources
Make a decision about how to create a network (eg facebook page; circulate emails)
Consider how we might invite participants into the relevant WG, and to participate in 2016 conference.