

INTRODUCTION

Uneven Development 25 Years On: Space, Nature and the Geographies of Capitalism

SCOTT PRUDHAM & NIK HEYNEN

This article, along with this special symposium, engages with the lasting significance of Neil Smith's *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space* 25 years after its publication. Few books have made such productive contributions to expanding the horizons of political economy, particularly the spatiality of political economy, as has *Uneven Development*. This introductory article explores some of these aspects of the book's significance for the readership of *New Political Economy*; it remarks on the lasting if not growing significance of Smith's intellectual and political contributions two and a half decades after one of his, and the discipline of geography's, crowning achievements. At the same time it foreshadows ways in which the text can continue to push our understanding of the interconnections among nature, capital and the production of space.

Keywords: uneven development, geography, nature

Describing the full impact and import of landmark books as they age and as their influence spreads can be quite difficult, particularly when such texts were originally written primarily from within and in response to eclectic and often poorly understood disciplines such as geography. This is certainly true of Neil Smith's *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space*, first published in 1984. This is not to say, however, that we lack indicators of the book's broad and significant influence beyond a strictly disciplinary register. For instance, speaking to the far-reaching and enduring relevance of *Uneven Development*, Edward Said (1990: 79) described the work as: 'A brilliant formulation of how the production of a particular kind of nature and space

Scott Prudham, University of Toronto, Geography and Centre for Environment Association, 5th Floor, Sidney Smith Hall, 100 St. George Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. E-mail: scott.prudham@utoronto.ca

under historical capitalism is essential to the unequal development of a landscape that integrates poverty with wealth, industrial urbanization with agricultural diminishment.' Such themes are hardly the exclusive purview of a field often seen as a bizarre and confusing assemblage of idiographic description on the one hand and abstract nomothetic spatial analysis on the other. But because the book deals enduringly with such fundamental issues, Smith's *Uneven Development* is a prominent example of the sort of geographical scholarship that Marxist literary critic Terry Eagleton (1997) no doubt had in mind when he wrote in the *Times Literary Supplement*:

Geography, which used to be about maps as history was about chaps, now looks set to become the sexiest academic subject of all. Ecological anxiety, a postmodern preoccupation with space and a post-historical weariness with time have conspired to shift this once rather shadowy discipline to centre-stage.

Indeed, the extremes of uneven social geographies in the context of an increasingly integrated world lurching from crisis to crisis juxtaposed with the disquieting implications of nature more and more transformed by human action from the genetic to the planetary scale, *Uneven Development* has never been more relevant than it is today. This is in large measure a consequence of the book's potent and provocative transcendence of its disciplinary heritage, synthesising and re-working the two most enduring themes in the history of geographical thought: (i) understanding the arrangement of human activities in space and (ii) understanding the human relation to the non-human or natural world. More specifically, *Uneven Development* is an attempt to fuse a conceptualisation of the uneven spatiality of capital accumulation with the quixotic and seemingly untenable claim that capitalism literally produces nature. Putting these together results in Smith's challenging, original, and in some ways unsettling core thesis which, when stated in the simplest possible terms, posits that capitalism in essence produces both nature and space in conjoined ways, unified by a conceptualisation that '[u]neven development is the concrete pattern and process of the production of nature under capitalism' (Smith 2008: 8).

It is important to note that that Smith clearly and repeatedly insists these be understood as simultaneously physical or material processes as well as ideological ones. That is, nature/space is produced via uneven patterns of spatial relations that emerge in the form of the landscapes of our lives, but also in the form of our ideas of these landscapes. In this latter register, Smith particularly emphasises the far-reaching ideological implications of the common sense (in the Gramscian meaning of the phrase) dualization of space and nature as distinct epistemological and experiential realms. Attacking this dualism head on, Smith's book presents a profound challenge to the core organising assumptions and principles of geographical thought. But *Uneven Development* reaches further by disrupting one of the core precepts of Western thought more generally, one that is constitutive of the entrenched institutionalised divisions among and between modern disciplinary sciences and social sciences, and, indeed, underpins the very supposition that these can be sustained as domains of inquiry with separable objects of analysis.

Such a book, no matter how challenging at times, can hardly remain a secret for very long.

And it is clearly no secret. A search on Google Scholar, for instance, suggests over 1,400 citations of the book.¹ A citation search on the less wide-ranging Scopus database restricted to the original 1984 edition yields 385 citations.² Somewhat predictably, many of these citations come from journals familiar to and frequented by geographers. Still, a much wider audience for the book (despite its highly theoretical and philosophical framing) is clearly evident in the form of a range of citations from articles in journals most closely associated with other fields of inquiry and/or with a broad, multidisciplinary audience. These include, for instance and in no particular order, *Ecology and Society*; *Sociological Review*; *Theory and Society*; *Current Anthropology*; *Annual Review of Anthropology*; *Studies in Political Economy*; *Historia Critica*; *Ethics, Place and Environment*; *Global Environmental Change*; *The Journal of Development Studies*; *Research in Political Economy*; *Environment and History*; *Feminist Theory*; *Environmental Politics*; *American Anthropologist*; *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism*; *Cities*; *Review of International Political Economy*; *World Development*; *Sociologica Ruralis*; *Organization and Environment*; *Ecological Applications*; *Biology and Philosophy*; *Cambridge Journal of Economics*.

Somewhat surprisingly, we did not find evidence that the book has yet been cited in *New Political Economy*. This is curious since the broad ambit of Smith's project – to theorise a political economy of capitalism in relation to the dynamics of environmental change and uneven spatial development – is a project seemingly of central interest to the broad readership of this journal, arguably central to any robust and substantive notion of a 'new' political economy, and, one would think, central to some of the previous work published here (e.g. Dryzek 1996; Bakker 2007). The rationale for this collection stems precisely from this lacuna and we are grateful to the editors of *NPE* for recognising and accommodating our initiative.

However, this apparent absence for us is an opportunity to present a symposium upon the 25th anniversary of *Uneven Development's* publication. In 2008, the University of Georgia Press issued a third edition, with a new foreword by David Harvey and a new afterword by Neil Smith himself. This collection of essays in *NPE* uses the occasion of the book's re-issue to consider some of its most important contributions and to reflect on some of the debates and questions it has raised and reinforced. At the broadest level, the essays point to an ongoing need for critical scholarship that is broadly concerned with the substantive and theoretical issues addressed by the book and that is willing to take up the considerable challenge of deepening and extending political and intellectual engagement with the conjoined dynamics of capitalism, the production of nature and the production of space.

By way of further introducing and contextualising the essays, we offer first just a bit of information about the author. There is no question of Smith's pedigree as a geographer, one he proudly displays. Indeed, Smith's grounding in geography and a sometimes rather inward looking disciplinary gaze is reflected in the text itself (written by a doctoral student trying to cut his disciplinary chops with a decided icon in the field for a supervisor).³ These are both strengths

and weaknesses of the text that, if anything, are more evident with the passage of time.

Smith was educated as an undergraduate in the broad, synthetic UK geographical tradition at the University of St Andrew's in Scotland, close to where he was born. This involved, crucially, not only instruction in humanistic geography, but also in earth sciences, including geology and geomorphology. After completing a PhD at Johns Hopkins University, Smith taught first at Columbia University, and then in the Department of Geography at Rutgers (the state university of New Jersey) for some years before relocating to the Graduate Centre at the City University of New York. He remains at CUNY where he is now Distinguished Professor in Anthropology and Geography and where he was the founding Director of the Center for Place, Culture and Politics.⁴

It is important in engaging stylistically and substantively with *Uneven Development* to appreciate that the book emerged as a revision of Smith's doctoral dissertation. This is important not only in coming to terms with a book that was, at the end of the day, written first as a dissertation but also in thinking through the context in which Smith was writing. In a recent interview, Smith (2009a) said this about his book:

The book is of its period, where we were actually discovering Marx, and I think that comes through in every dense paragraph, every dense sentence, every dense phrase in the book, for which I apologize. But, I think the density of it is very much about the voice, which was, how do you take Marx and make it relevant to geography and that was such a political project twenty-five years ago for us. In retrospect, I am going to defend that project tremendously! I think it was an extraordinary project to do. Because what Marx did for us was to give us was the ability to connect, among other things, a language of nature, and a language of space, and a language of uneven development in terms of people's lives, working, trying to be involved in social reproduction of their daily life. So, that's where the voice comes from, and I think if it doesn't quite get to the more concrete kinds of questions in 1984, you have to understand it was ingrained in this deep reading of Marx.

How do we then appraise the impact and significance of this book within the radical geography tradition, but more broadly, in the political economy tradition writ large? Clearly – and quickly – the book became a highly influential text in the emergent radical geography of the 1980s, tied closely to the so-called 'uneven development school' to which Harvey has also been a central contributor. This school broadly explored spatial dynamism and perpetually uneven spatial development as ongoing facets of capitalism as a mode of production, and also attempted to develop and elaborate on spatially explicit theories of capitalist crisis tendencies (exemplified by Harvey 1982).

And yet Smith's book, with its focus not only on the uneven geography of capital accumulation, but also on the interconnections among capitalist production

and exchange, space and the production of nature, emerged as a work apart from the uneven development genre. It tackled not only the space question close to the heart of most geographers, but also the nature question (also close to many of the same hearts and others besides) which was otherwise largely ignored by the Marxist uneven geography school, and particularly by Harvey until his 1996 book *Justice, Nature, and the Geography of Difference*. But in tackling the nature question, *Uneven Development* came to represent a clear and influential break not only with much of radical geography, but with mainstream scholarship (inside geography and more widely) on questions of environmental change, environmental politics and, at the most abstract level, how nature and culture are understood in relation to one another. It did so in part by de-naturalising nature. As Noel Castree (1995: 20) put it in reflecting on the book 10 years after its publication, one of the enduring insights of *Uneven Development* arises from Smith's view of how

[t]he imperatives of capitalism bring all manner of natural environments and concrete labor processes upon them together in an abstract framework of market exchange. Under capitalism humans relate to nature in a specific way, through commodification of natural products, and in so doing actively appropriate, transform, and creatively destroy it. The 'natural' regions of say, the midwestern United States, cannot be understood simply as pre-existent [*sic*] natural grasslands, as the traditional notion of 'first nature' would imply.

Central in all of this is a re-working of the relatively familiar categories of first and second nature. For Smith, these can no longer be sustained, respectively, as pristine nature and nature transformed by human action as they had often been presented (for a prominent example of this rubric, see Cronon 1991). Rather, the production of nature in a capitalist social formation gives rise first to nature as the concrete, material nature confronted as both product and object of the labour process, a set of use values in Marxist terms.⁵ In turn, second nature becomes nature as an ideological totality, rendered abstract by the dynamics of capital accumulation and rampant commodification as an exchange value. More and more for Smith, and drawing centrally on Marx's conceptualisation of fetishism and generalised commodity production under capitalism, nature is increasingly confronted as a commodity, and reified as an exchange value, so much so that this becomes the prevailing ideology of nature. In both of these ways, nature is increasingly a product of capitalism and, more importantly, cannot be understood apart from capitalist dynamics of production, circulation and exchange.

With his take on second nature, Smith comes close to, but also differs from, the prevalent social constructionist perspectives on nature that have taken hold in critical environmental studies and political ecology in the last two decades, influenced by post-structural sensibilities surrounding knowledge and power. For Smith, as for post-structuralists, nature can no longer be unproblematically represented or simply described as an object. Nature is not only out there, it is also in here, that is, it is us. Put in now familiar epistemological terms, there is no

nature independent of its representation. Smith's *Uneven Development*, in hindsight, is a relatively early intervention to this effect. However, Smith's perspective, while prescient, also diverges from the more Foucauldian and science studies influenced traditions that have flourished since by grounding dominant ideas of nature in the commodification of nature, thus rendering nature as ideology in terms of exchange values. For Smith, quite simply, capitalism makes nature a commodity, not only as the material circulation of all manner of discrete bits of biophysical stuff (oil, minerals, wheat and the like) but also in the guise of images, texts, narratives and ways of knowing that are saturated with the exchange imperative, made legible by reference to economic value, capital and wealth.

And despite the somewhat abstract and theoretical tenor of the discussion in *Uneven Development*, the implications clearly point towards perspectives on environmental change and environmental politics that are at once political – who produces nature, why and how – and, at the same time, radically historicist. Smith leaves behind the abstract edifice of a transcendental nature. In its place, he seems to say, should come careful, grounded attention to the particular forms that landscapes take through time in the broader context of uneven spatial development, and to the ways in which knowledge and meaning ascribed to these landscapes are simultaneously produced and circulated. Rather than asking 'what is nature?', Smith asks (and provides general answers to) how what we come to call nature takes on particular guises and how and why we come to know it as we do?

But perhaps the most ambitious and under-appreciated aspect of *Uneven Development* is that, having developed a theory of the production of nature by capitalism, Smith then fuses the production of nature with the production of space by means of dissolving the nature/space dualism. As he puts it plainly in the opening line of the third chapter, shifting his gaze to uneven spatial development proper, '[u]nless space is conceptualized as a quite separate reality from nature, the production of space is a logical corollary of the production of nature' (Smith 2008: 106). And for Smith, it clearly makes no sense at all to conceptualise space apart from nature, nor vice versa. This becomes the challenge of the second part of the book. It is fair to say that work remains to be done in developing and extending the fusion suggested by Smith. Yet the implications are certainly clear, including a critique of the historical emergence of notions of space abstracted from and universalised in relation to the concrete experiential space of everyday life. This in turn points to a renegotiation if not outright dissolution of the distinctions separating 'natural spaces' from 'social spaces', distinctions that, as noted above, constitute the very idea of social and natural sciences, as well as a politics of class (social space) and a politics of nature (nature space) apart from one another. What a different world it would be if such thinking were the norm!

Smith's ambition is somewhat more striking when we recall that, as he well knows and discusses in the book, the organisation of human activities in space, the characterisation and spatial organisation of earth systems, and the broad interrogation of the nature/culture nexus are all issues that run through the very heart of geography's intellectual history and yet have come to be pursued largely in isolation from one another over time. In seeking a rapprochement, Smith thereby wrote a book saturated in the intellectual and political history of geography

as a discipline that in the process rejects one of geography's enduring schisms. And in doing so, he wrote a book which has taken on a broader resonance with contemporary questions concerning the character, extent, causes and consequences of environmental change at every scale from the molecular to the global, and their relation to the uneven geography of capitalist development. If the era of sustainable development promises a mainstream and largely asserted (rather than theorised) fusion of economy and ecology, Smith promises the same via a more critical but also more rigorous and challenging conceptualisation. And as the list of journals above attests, this resonance is increasingly reflected across a range of areas of inquiry, scholarly and popular, including cultural studies, political economy, development studies and political ecology.

The implications for this particular journal would seem to be rather profound. Certainly the book is consistent with the view, espoused in the pages of this journal by Dryzek (1996) for instance, that there is a pressing need for a political economy whose scope includes environmental change and environmental politics, a view many would find uncontroversial. But Smith goes further. *Uneven Development* seems to *require* that a contemporary political economy deal squarely with what Martin O'Connor (1994) called the 'misadventures of capitalist nature' as a constitutive facet of capitalism in general. The book in this sense belongs amid more recent scholarship emerging variously from environmental sociology, interdisciplinary historical materialism, political ecology, anthropology and geography and positing in general terms a distinct metabolic relation governing the appropriation of nature (human and non-human) which lies at the very heart of capitalism, its politics and its reproduction (see e.g. Foster 1999, 2000; Moore 2003a, 2003b; Clark and York 2005; Huber 2009). Looking back at developments since the publication of *Uneven Development*, we can note variously on the likes of: the 1987 Brundtland Report; the Montreal Protocol; the critical Rio de Janeiro Earth Summit of 1992 and emergence of the Business Council on Sustainable Development; Kyoto and post-Kyoto developments in climate change mitigation helping give rise to the new carbon economy; internationalisation of life patents from the genetic to the whole organism scale coincident with the commercialisation of biotechnology; as well as pervasive attempts to reconcile capitalism with environmentalism via tradable permit schemes, payments for ecosystem services, green entrepreneurialism and the enterprising up of conservation initiatives as and for profit-making purposes. The list is hardly complete, but even so it is hard to escape the conclusion that this book is more necessary (and, indeed, increasingly more common sense than controversial) today than at any point since its first publication.

Ever looking forward, Smith's work over the last 25 years has both extended some of the main questions posed in *Uneven Development* and forged ahead with other projects of political economic import. Most notably, Smith's work has focused on questions of gentrification and urban space (see Smith 1996), questions of empire building and globalisation (2002) for which his book *American Empire: Roosevelt's Geographer and the Prelude to Globalization* won the *Los Angeles Times*' 'Book Prize for Biography', and questions of globalisation and neoliberalism (2005), a theme that can also be seen in the recent pages of this journal (2009b).

Castree (2006: 401) somewhat recently suggested in an article with a quite telling title ('Geography's New Public Intellectuals?') that:

Smith has been less forthcoming about his intended audiences [than others], but reading between the lines I'd suggest he now sees himself as having the profile to reach well beyond geography and even critical social science more generally. In this regard, it's arguably telling that playwright and essayist Tariq Ali is one of Smith's dust-jacket endorsers [on *Endgame of Globalization*].

No doubt, given his political inclinations, Smith is indeed keen to inject geographical ideas, especially those having to do with the unevenness of space, more firmly into public discourse. Looking back on having penned *Uneven Development* as one of the true classics produced by a discipline without many, and at such a young age, in talking to Smith today his own sense of wonderment about the book's success and impact becomes clear. It seems, and he readily admits, that he also now comes to the book as more reader than author. This is encouraging, given the intellectual motivation that *Uneven Development* has provided to so many of us, that he himself in re-reading it might find more provocative and stimulating things to say about *Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space*, just as we might continue to find ways to push his original thoughts to the proverbial 'next level'. That too – in seeking to realise more of the clear potential and ambitious agenda established by the book – is one of the central objectives of the collection.

To that end, the essays that follow take up the invitation and challenge offered by *Uneven Development* in various ways, looking back, but also looking ahead. Julie Guthman starts us off by attempting to extend the production of nature thesis to an examination of the ways that human bodies matter in the reproduction of capitalism. Working through the tensions involved in the subsumption, subordination and remaking of human bodies, she concludes that 'it is clear that bodies . . . flow through circuits of capitalism in ways that go significantly beyond the processes of producing and consuming commodities' and that '[w]hether as site of primitive accumulation or spatial fix bodies nevertheless seem subject to their own "see-saw effects"'. Nik Heynen, Peter Hossler and Andrew Herod maintain a focus on *Uneven Development* as at once resource, inspiration and foil in working through the dynamic tensions and contradictions at the nexus of the reproduction of capitalism and the reproduction of society more generally. Imploring us all to recognise but also develop Smith's specifically revolutionary geographical imagination, they argue that the book has aged well for such purposes. Emily Eaton provides a fresh and long overdue examination of the insights to be gained from working through *Uneven Development* in relation to the long-standing debates within a (sometimes) sprawling agrarian political economy concerned with the so-called Agrarian Question. For Eaton, the re-making of nature through metabolic relations caught up in the production of agricultural commodities and landscapes is a quintessential and almost intuitive site where Smith's ideas and insights have purchase. And yet, for Eaton, *Uneven Development* helps to deepen our understanding of the dialectics of equalisation and

differentiation, tensions that literally constitute the agrarian literature's sometimes schizophrenic fixation with the agriculture as a domain of capitalist expansion and yet at the same time as a site where the commodification of nature (human and non-human) encounters material, semiotic and political forms of obstacles, limits and resistance. Mazen Labban then provides something of a challenge to Smith and *Uneven Development* (albeit clearly inspired by each) in attempting to shift the focus from an abstract and philosophical register vis-à-vis the production of nature/space to an historical approach grounded (literally) in the dynamics of extractive industries as constitutive to capitalism, nature and space. It is safe to say, we think, that Labban's critique (however much one agrees or disagrees with it) speaks not only to *Uneven Development*, but in fact to the entire corpus of historical materialism and Marxism as both analytical and political projects. In this way, perhaps Labban more than anyone in this collection attests to the relevance – indeed the centrality – of *Uneven Development* to a 'new political economy'. The last word, fittingly, goes to Neil Smith himself who, though having written many subsequent reflections, think pieces, afterwords and the like on the subject of *Uneven Development* over these now 25 plus intervening years, maintains his inimicable enthusiasm and facility for fusing analytical rigour and revolutionary spirit. We can only hope at least some of this is infectious.

Notes

1. The search was conducted on 31 August 2009. Citations for the 2008 edition were listed as just under 780, which is clearly impossible unless these citations include many dating to the 1st and 2nd editions. Citations unique to the 1st edition totalled 370, so our estimate is a crude but conservative range arrived at by the sum of the two and assuming some duplication.
2. Search conducted on 31 August 2009 for Smith, N. (1984). *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space*.
3. Neil Smith's doctoral supervisor at the Johns Hopkins University was well known Marxist social theorist and geographer David Harvey.
4. Neil Smith also currently holds a post as Sixth Century Professor of Geography and Social Theory at the University of Aberdeen.
5. Smith is relatively silent on the question of specifically human nature, and thus the relation between capitalist production, labour, and the human body as a site where nature is produced. Julie Guthman takes up this theme in her article.

Notes on Contributors

Scott Prudham is an Associate Professor in the Department of Geography and the Centre for Environment at the University of Toronto. He is co-Editor of the journal *Geoforum*. His research is situated at the intersection of environmental politics, environmental change and political economy. His most recent books are *Knock on Wood: Nature as Commodity in Douglas-fir Country* (Routledge 2005) and, as co-Editor, *Neoliberal Environments: False Promises and Unnatural Consequences* (Routledge, 2007).

Nik Heynen is an Associate Professor in the Department of Geography and Adjunct Associate Professor in Anthropology at the University of Georgia. He is also Associate Director of UGA's Center for Integrative Conservation Research (CICR), an affiliate with UGA's Institute of Women's Studies and Institute for African American Studies and a co-Editor of *Antipode: A Radical Journal of Geography*. His research interests include urban political economy/ecology and environmental justice, social theory and social movement theory, with specific interests in environmental and food politics.

References

- Bakker, I. (2007), 'Social Reproduction and the Constitution of a Gendered Political Economy', *New Political Economy*, 12 (4), pp. 541–56.
- Castree, N. (1995), 'The Nature of Produced Nature: Materiality and Knowledge Construction in Marxism', *Antipode*, 27 (1), pp. 12–48.
- Castree, N. (2006), 'Geography's New Public Intellectuals?' *Antipode: A Journal of Radical Geography*, 38 (2), pp. 396–412.
- Clark, B. and York, R. (2005), 'Carbon Metabolism: Global Capitalism, Climate Change, and the Biospheric Rift', *Theory and Society*, 34, pp. 391–428.
- Cronon, W. (1991), *Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West* (New York: W.W. Norton).
- Dryzek, J.S. (1996), 'Foundations for Environmental Political Economy: The Search for Homo Ecologicus?', *New Political Economy*, 1 (1), pp. 27–40.
- Eagleton, T. (1997), 'International Books of the Year', *Times Literary Supplement*, 5, p. 11.
- Foster, J.B. (1999), 'Marx's Theory of Metabolic Rift: Classical Foundations for Environmental Sociology', *American Journal of Sociology*, 105 (2), pp. 366–405.
- Foster, J.B. (2000), *Marx's Ecology: Materialism and Nature* (New York: Monthly Review Press Books).
- Harvey, D. (1982), *The Limits to Capital* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Harvey, D. (1996), *Justice, Nature, and the Geography of Difference* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers).
- Huber, M.T. (2009), 'Energizing Historical Materialism: Fossil Fuels, Space and the Capitalist Mode of Production', *Geoforum*, 40 (1), pp. 105–15.
- Moore, J.W. (2003a), 'Capitalism as World-ecology: Braudel and Marx on Environmental History', *Organization and Environment*, 16 (4), pp. 431–58.
- Moore, J.W. (2003b), 'The Modern World-system as Environmental History? Ecology and the Rise of Capitalism', *Theory and Society*, 32 (3), pp. 307–77, 413.
- O'Connor, M. (1994), 'On the Misadventures of Capitalist Nature', in M. O'Connor ed., *Is Capitalism Sustainable? Political Economy and the Politics of Ecology* (New York: Guilford), pp. 125–51.
- Said, E.W. (1990), 'Yeats and Decolonization', in T. Eagleton, F. Jameson and E.W. Said (eds), *Nationalism, Colonialism, and Literature* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press), pp. 69–98.
- Smith, N. (1996), *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City* (London & New York: Routledge).
- Smith, N. (2002), *American Empire: Roosevelt's Geographer and the Prelude to Globalization* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press).
- Smith, N. (2005), *Endgame of Globalization* (London and New York: Routledge).
- Smith, N. (2008), *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital and the Production of Space* (Athens, GA: The University of Georgia Press).
- Smith, N. (2009a), Interviewed by W.S. Prudham and N. Heynen at the 105th Annual Meeting of the Association of American Geographers, Las Vegas, NV; 26 March.
- Smith, N. (2009b), 'Toxic Capitalism', *New Political Economy*, 14 (3), pp. 407–12.