them to pay for cabs, ride shares, and buses, even for short distances.[218] Paying for a car, a cell phone, or a building with security are also added financial burdens. For men, these might feel like nice bonuses; for many women, they're necessities. And of course, access to these necessities varies greatly across income, race, ability, and citizenship status.

At the end of the day these limitations and costs and stresses amount to an indirect but highly effective program of social control. Our socially reinforced fears keep us from fully inhabiting the city and from making the most of our lives on a day-to-day basis.

Who benefits from all of this? Doesn't it seem outrageous and even illogical that society would limit women so much? After all, the losses aren't purely born by individuals. One could calculate the lost economic productivity of women due to fear-based choices and see its wider effect on society. But society doesn't function on a purely economic logic, or at least not a logic that supposes or desires an equal playing field for all. The economic logic of a sexist, racist, trans- and homophobic, ableist society operates on the unspoken assumption that economic and other forms of power must first be maximized for white, straight, cis, able-bodied men.

In case that seems a little abstract, think about the repetitive media profiles of the "economic anxiety" plaguing the white working-class man who voted for Trump. The outrage of this group—and the constant moves to appease them or restore some kind of imagined past to satisfy their longings—is premised on the idea that their whiteness and male privilege will always keep them at least one or two socio-economic rungs above women and people of colour. Their belief that this hierarchy is crumbling expresses itself in an often violent backlash against other groups, one that adds yet another layer of fear to the lives of many.

PUSHING BACK

Recognition of both the actual violence women face and the gendered social effects of fear have led feminists to push back in a variety of ways. Movements like Take Back the Night, India's "Pride Strides," Slutwalks, and the #Cuéntelo protests exemplify direct action campaigns insisting on the rights of women and other marginalized groups to urban space. From pushing for simple changes to urban architectural features to advocating for an overhaul of the entire field of urban planning, feminist geographers, planners, anti-violence workers, and others have made substantial, if incomplete, progress toward creating safer, less fearful, cities.

Examples of changes in urban design include alterations to improve lighting, clear obstructed sightlines, and create well-trafficked routes through housing and civic developments. Installation of emergency phone boxes and call buttons in parking garages, parks, and on university campuses can offer an increased sense of safety. In some cities, the widespread use of CCTV has been adopted as a measure meant to reduce crime, although its ability to reduce fear is questionable.[219]

The built environment can be challenging to alter. In old cities like Barcelona, narrow streets, dark corners, stone walls, poor sightlines, and overgrown vegetation create hiding places and a heightened sense of fear. Col-lectiu Punt 6, a feminist co-operative of architects, sociologists, and planners have been trying to increase visibility and remove obstacles in public spaces to increase women's use and enjoyment of space. In Kigali, Rwanda, women working as street vendors have seen their safety, and their economic conditions, improve with the building of secure, permanent mini-markets that include space for breastfeeding.[220]

Around the world, public transit systems are hot beds of harassment and assault for women. In their survey of girls and

young women in Lima, Madrid, Kampala, Delhi, and Sydney, NGO Plan International found that public transit was a critical "problem spot" where women reported groping, harassment, and being followed.[221] Although many systems have alarm buttons and "designated waiting areas" on subway platforms, which include call buttons, bright lighting, and CCTV, the crowded and anonymous nature of shared transit remains a problem. Some cities have gone as far as designating women-only train carriages. For example, Tokyo and Osaka have train lines with carriages set aside at particular times for women, disabled people, children, and caregivers. Mexico City, Cairo, and Tehran have similar accommodations. Of course, critics point out that simply segregating women doesn't require men to change their behaviour or attitudes.

Technology is also being used in the form of apps that make reporting harassment on public transit simpler. For example, Vancouver's "Project Global Guardian" app allows passengers to text police and public transit officers directly. In Melbourne, a safety app is being developed in consultation with girls and women who use public transit. Cities such as Stockholm and Geneva have banned sexist advertising and objectifying images of women in their transit systems, recognizing the harm of negative stereotypes and their role in creating harassment-prone environments.

These changes didn't come about naturally. Women were pushing for cities to take gendered concerns, especially safety, seriously. But getting municipalities and specifically urban planners to listen to the experiences of women and other vulnerable citizens has been an uphill battle. Planning considers itself an objective, rational, and scientific field of study and practice. It's oriented toward managing or encouraging growth and development and to providing services to a faceless imagined "citizen." The idea that social differences such as gender, race, and sexuality could and should be taken into account was literally laughed at when feminist planners and groups like Women Plan Toronto brought gendered issues to the planning table in the 1980s and 1990s.[222] Often, it takes a high profile public act of violence against women to spur cities into action.

In Delhi, the horrific sexual assault and murder of student Jyoti Singh on a bus in 2012 made international headlines and brought women out into the streets in protest, demanding attention to their safety. Women's organizations succeeded in getting some space in Toronto's municipal sphere only after several violent public assaults against women caught the city's attention in the 1980s, although city councillor Kristyn Wong-Tam notes that the safer city guidelines have not been updated since the late 1990s.[223] In most cases, women's organizations still have to take matters into their own hands to create change. In Delhi, Kalpana Viswanath created the SafetiPin app, which collects safety-related data from women and also allows them to have a trusted friend track their journeys. The app has spread to many other cities and is being used in coordination with city authorities in places like Hanoi and Bogotá.[224]

SafetiPin is like a high-tech version of the safety audit, a tool created by Toronto's Metro Toronto Action Committee on Violence Against Women and Children (METRAC) in an effort to figure out new ways to get planners and bureaucrats to listen to women's experiences. Critically, the safety audit insists that it's the people who live, work, study, and play in these spaces who are the experts on safety and danger. Community members go on "walkabouts," collecting information on factors like lighting and sightlines. They also record experiential elements

including how, where, and why feelings of danger may arise. Safety audits are used in cities around the world now, with the goal of empowering community members to generate specific recommendations for changes.[225]

How far can these changes to the built environment and new technological interventions take us? The "crime prevention through environmental design," or CPTED, school of thought suggests that since much crime is opportunistic in nature, reducing opportunities is critical. Oscar Newman's CPTED approach is well known for his concept of "defensible space," the idea that physical characteristics such as building architecture and site layout will allow residents to be active in crime prevention by giving them a sense of control and territoriality.[226] These kinds of approaches assume a tight link between the physical environment and human behaviour and a certain predictability in criminal behaviour that can be mitigated by design changes. If design was the answer though, surely, we'd have designed out crime by now?

Unfortunately, CPTED relies on a rather mechanistic understanding of space and fear, assuming that fear will follow a rational trajectory and decrease when safety improvements are made. Fear, however, is much more complex and people's emotions in general don't respond in easily predictable ways. Perhaps most importantly, feminist critics of this approach have highlighted the fact that "it is impossible to speak of reactions to the threat of crime in particular environments without taking into account the social and political relations which structure both the physical environment, and the daily lives, of the individuals involved."[227] In other words, we can't detach the social world from the built environment.

This complexity seems to stymy urban designers. Feminist qualitative work on women's fear in cities reveals what seem like

contradictory and insurmountable claims: women are afraid in enclosed and open spaces; in busy places and empty places; on transit and while walking; isolated under a bright light or invisible in the dark.[228] What's a criminologist or urban planner to do?

Whitzman recalls the brush-offs she received from city planners when presenting her research on women's fear in urban green spaces: "What do you want to do? Pave parks?"[229] And feminist geographers Hille Koskela and Rachel Pain's research revealed that planners were at a loss once their attempts to widen walkways and improve lighting failed to significantly increase feelings of safety: "What is there left to try?"[230]

When I teach this material, this is usually the point at which my geography students get really discouraged or really annoyed. They were so hopeful thinking about environmental and design solutions. And then they realize that no amount of lighting is going abolish the patriarchy. "So, what are the answers?" they sulk, frustrated that the authors we read are often just as discouraged by their research findings. It's true: there are no straightforward solutions. Any attempt to improve urban safety has to grapple with social, cultural, and economic elements as well as the form of the built environment.

The failure to imagine different kinds of interventions speaks to the disconnect between what typical fear of crime surveys reveal and women's everyday realities. Surveys tend to deal with a simplified and narrow concept of "fear of crime," and they either implicitly or explicitly assume crime that occurs in public spaces. As we know, though, women's fear of crime is informed by a much broader and deeper set of fears and experiences, from street harassment, childhood abuse, domestic abuse, socialization, media, and the specific nature of sexual crimes which are imbued with their own special horror. Fear is also contoured by

differences across age, race, class, sexuality, gender identity, and ability. So, while feminists have certainly campaigned for changes to the built environment, they've never lost sight of the fact that women's lack of safety exists within an interlocking network of domination that facilitates the social control of women and other less powerful groups in the city. Under these conditions, fear can never simply be "designed out."

BOLD WOMEN

It's hard to overestimate the effect of daily fear. Even when fear isn't actively present, the burden of a set of routinized precautions is always there, although they're so naturalized that we barely notice we're doing them. What's amazing, and typically overlooked, is the fact that women constantly defy their fears and act in ways that are brave, empowered, and liberating in cities.

Women still jog through Central Park. Women ride the bus at night. Women walk home alone at 3 a.m. when the bar closes. Women open their windows on hot summer nights. Yet women's fear is believed to be so deeply ingrained (even if some call it irrational) that discussions of courage, wisdom, and good sense are rare and easily discounted as false outward displays of bravado. Moreover, women find it incredibly difficult to acknowledge their own bravery and clear judgment.

Hille Koskela writes about what she calls "female boldness and defiance," asking "what can be gained by analyzing women's courage and their ability to take possession of space?"[231] Koskela's research with women in Helsinki demonstrated that women can act boldly and even without fear, however, even unafraid women frequently have a voice in the back of their heads that says, "maybe you should be afraid here," even when there are no signs of danger or threat.

Koskela notes another fascinating phenomenon: even when women's decisions to act bravely work out well (i.e., no harm comes to them), they don't interpret these moments as signs that they've made well-informed, rational choices based on experience, the data at hand, and their own gut instincts. Rather, they re-interpret the situation as one where they did something "stupid," but "got away with it."

Wow, did her observation ever hit home for me. I was blown away by its simple accuracy and its implications for how society views women's choices and how we understand our own capabilities, intellects, and instincts. Every story I tell of an urban adventure—staying out all night in the city with my friend, hitchhiking home during the great 2003 blackout—ends with something like, "That was so stupid! I'm lucky I'm not dead in a ditch!" When I was interviewing women for my master's thesis, they told me story after story of "taking possession" of urban space, only to dismiss their abilities as "luck," shaking their heads in disbelief at the risks they'd taken.

What if we reframed these experiences as moments when we correctly processed all the available information and made a wise, calculated choice? Women know how to use the instincts we've honed living in a hostile, patriarchal climate, as well as ultra-sensitive emotional and rational processing abilities. Having to navigate a male-dominated world cultivates these skills. Thinking this way completely shifts things. For the most part, women aren't walking around being lucky. We're walking around being smart, bold, experienced, and wise. If we reject or dismiss women's claims of bravery, we quickly run the risk