4 Urban nature and the ecological imaginary

Matthew Gandy

INTRODUCTION

The artist Lucian Freud is perhaps best known for his striking figurative representations of the human body. In the recent retrospective of his work held at the Tate Gallery in London, however, we find an intriguing exception to these studio portraits represented by a painting entitled *Wasteground with Houses, Paddington* (1970–2). This intricate tableau, which reveals a remarkable glimpse of London from the window of his studio, is framed by the rear elevation of a typical Victorian terrace. The drab greyish-brown brickwork and stained cornices are enlivened by ranks of chimney stacks with their jumble of fulvous earthenware chimney pots. Cutting through the middle of the scene is a mews of former stables now appropriately converted into a row of smart garages and in the foreground is an expanse of rubble-strewn waste ground. Despite the twisted remains of abandoned furniture and rusted metal this former bomb site is now brimming with botanical interest: the faded spikes of the ubiquitous *Buddleia davidii* are interspersed with other characteristic colonizers of London's post-war landscape such as ground-elder *Aegopodium podagraria* and rosebay willowherb *Chamaenerion angustifolium*. This, then, is an urban landscape, a seemingly unremarkable fragment of urban nature yet a critical reminder of the intricate combination of nature and human artifice which has produced urban space. An "urban ecology" is by definition a human ecology and is no more or less "natural" than any other kind of modern landscape whether it be a managed fragment of wild nature in a national park or those accidental pockets of nature of the type that Freud observed from the window of his studio in West London.

The interaction between nature and the modern city raises a series of conceptual complexities. If we understand the city to be a special kind of nodal point within an extending hyphal mesh of urbanization this still leaves the idea of urban nature as a somewhat ill-defined entity. The urbanization of nature, a transformation that has gained accelerated momentum over the last few decades, is clearly much more than a gradual process of appropriation until the last vestiges of "first nature" have disappeared. The production of urban nature is a simultaneous process of social and bio-physical change in which new kinds of spaces are created and destroyed, ranging from the technological networks that give sustenance to the modern city to

ABERRATIONS AND UTOPIAS

From the middle decades of the nineteenth century onwards, the urban experience became increasingly synonymous with the experience of modernity itself. In Britain, for example, the urban population increased from just under a quarter in 1800 to over 75 percent in 1900 so that urban life had changed from a minority experience to the majority experience. London, for instance, had a population of around 1 million in 1800 rising to 4.5 million by 1881. Similarly, Berlin saw its population of 200,000 in 1800 rise to 1.5 million by 1890 and Paris experienced a five-fold increase in population over the course of the nineteenth century to reach over 2.5 million by 1900. Other cities growing dramatically during the nineteenth century include Chicago, Glasgow, Manchester, New York, Naples, Rome, St Petersburg, Vienna and Moscow. These industrial cities necessitated a new synthesis between nature and culture extending from the construction of urban technological networks to the establishment of new modes of municipal governance. The modern metropolis that emerged out of the chaos of the nineteenth-century city was driven by a combination of factors: advances in the science of epidemiology and later microbiology which gradually dispelled miasmic conceptions of disease; the emergence of new forms of technical and managerial expertise in urban governance; the innovative use of financial instruments such as municipal bonds to enable the completion of ambitious engineering projects; the establishment of new policy instruments such as the power of eminent domain and other planning mechanisms which enabled the imposition of a strategic urban vision in the face of multifarious private interests; and the political marginalization of agrarian and landed elites so that an industrial bourgeoisie, public health advocates and other voices could exert greater influence on urban affairs (Gandy 2004).

From the nineteenth century onwards, we find that the urban experience begins to take an increasingly dominant place in modern culture. It is paradoxical that although modern cities were frequently evoked in organicist terms as bodies or organisms in their own right, cities were at the same time widely perceived to reside outside nature or the "natural order" as parasites or monsters. Thomas Hardy, for example, described London as "a monster whose body had four million heads and eight million eyes" and a spate of nineteenth-century novels such as James Greenwood's *The Wilds of London* (1874) dwelled on the poverty, darkness and danger associated with the industrial metropolis. Yet, developing in parallel with these eschatological responses to urbanization, we can also detect a different set of discourses focused on the implications of urbanization for modern consciousness. By the early twentieth century we find a proliferation of interpretations of the jarring and disorientating quality of urban life: Georg Simmel, for example, explores the "blasé outlook" of the city dweller in Berlin as a means to handle the "rapidly shifting stimulations of the nerves"; Virginia Woolf describes the atomism of urban life in the seemingly vast and alienating expanse of metropolitan London; and James Joyce conceives of early-twentieth-century Dublin as a series of fragmentary encounters between different characters struggling to make sense of their lives. In these literary and sociological evocations of the modern city the urban experience

new appropriations of nature within the urban landscape. The word "nature" is used here to encompass two somewhat different clusters of ideas: on the one hand, the term nature is used to denote a menagerie of concrete forms ranging from the human body to parks, gardens or complete ecosystems; and on the other hand, nature is evoked as an ideological and metaphorical schema for the interpretation of reality. In practice, however, these abstract and concrete elements are often interwoven to produce a densely packed urban discourse within which the origins and implications of different conceptions of nature are often afforded only cursory reflection.

The rise of the modern industrial city necessitated a refashioning of relations between nature and culture. Yet to refer to this transformation simply as the production of "urban nature" does not fully capture the complexity of this transition. The term "metropolitan nature" is probably more apposite since it can be deployed to signal recognition of the specific ways in which cultures of nature evolved in response to the socio-economic development and technological complexity of the modern city (see, for example, Green 1990). The urbanization of nature – and the concomitant rise of a metropolitan sensibility towards nature – encompasses not just new approaches to the technical management of urban space such as improved housing and sanitation but also extends to different kinds of cultural interactions with nature as a source of leisure. The transformation of nature in the modern city thus extends from new modes of urban governance or "governmentality" to use Foucault's term to changing modes of cultural perception so that both the strategies and techniques of negotiating urban space become inseparable.

Conceptions of the modern city have often been framed in terms of degrees of deviation from a supposed "natural" mode of living or in terms of analogies made with the body of a living organism. Ideas drawn from nature have played a significant role in developing an "ecological imaginary" in which ideas or metaphors drawn from the bio-physical and medical sciences have been used to understand the form and function of the modern city. The dynamics of urban change have been conceived, for example, in terms of processes such as ecological succession, the metabolic transmutation of nature or even the post-industrial impetus towards putrescence and decay. Underlying many formulations of the ecological imaginary, however, there is an implicit naturalization of urban processes so that urbanization is no longer conceived as the outcome of historical change but rather as a cyclical dynamic alterable through technological modifications rather than by political contestation. By developing a conception of urban nature as a medley of different elements we can begin to critically dissect some of the nature-based metaphors which have played such an influential role in the development of critical urban discourse. This chapter seeks, therefore, to explore a hiatus between the conceptual stasis emanating from organicist conceptions of urban form and an alternative set of readings of urban space which place greater emphasis on the malleable, indeterminate and historically specific dimensions to the urban experience.

enables the development of new forms of social, political and sexual awareness. As the city played a role in the enlargement of identity, we find that modern consciousness finds expression through intensified pleasures of nature within the industrial metropolis. With the gradual distancing of the body from the fatigue, illness and malnourishment of the past, new cultures of metropolitan nature developed including excursions into semi-wild fragments of nature at the urban fringe and the development of new aesthetic sensibilities towards landscape. As the social and political possibilities engendered by the modern metropolis unfolded, however, the progressive potential of the city began to increasingly conflict with traditional conceptions of urban order. The idea of "nature" was to play a defining role in this emerging tension between modernity and tradition as an ambiguous motif capable of underpinning both radical approaches to urban design and at the same time questioning the very foundations for urbanism itself.

The increasing association of the industrial city with the destruction of rural life sharpened the perceived antinomy between "city" and "country". The modern city was widely characterized as an aberrant spatial form that threatened to undermine existing ties of social and communal solidarity (see Williams 1973). The perceived superiority of rural life forms part of a powerful anti-urban sentiment connecting between the Jeffersonian ideals of small-town America and a succession of later writers on cities from Ferdinand Tönnies in the 1870s to Louis Wirth in the 1930s and Jane Jacobs in the 1960s. In a contemporary context, anti-urban views have resurfaced as part of an ecological critique of modernity which has a wide ranging influence on architecture and urban design. The so-called "New Urbanism", for example, owes much to the perceived superiority of small-town life within which ideological motifs of stability and sustainability draw heavily on nature-based conceptions of urban design. A determinist conception of spatial form as a dominating influence over human behaviour is combined with a form of ecological nostalgia for an imagined past.

In contrast with reactionary visions of the modern city as an aberration we can find an alternative lineage of urban thought originating within the Renaissance ideals of the city-state which drew inspiration from the designs of Hippodamus, Vitruvius and other early advocates of symmetrical urban form. Renaissance scholars such as Leon Battista Alberti asserted that beauty in architecture was derived from the mimesis of nature but he went beyond neo-Platonic conceptions of creativity to emphasize the critical role of human skill in the full realization of aesthetic perfection (see Bacon 1967; Forty 2000). Urban design becomes an extension of beauty in nature whether reflected in the geometric arrangement of space or the embellishment of urban life through gardens, fountains and other meticulous appropriations of nature within the fabric of the city. The cultural utilization of nature is thus both an aesthetic quest to change the urban landscape but also an attempt to foster greater degrees of social and spatial order. The emergence of the nineteenth-century urban beautification movements, for example, sought to reintroduce nature into cities in order to prevent urban space from becoming an uninterrupted vista of development. A myriad of new organic spaces began to appear as a means to re-establish contact between nature and urban society.

With the introduction of features such as public parks, botanical gardens and tree-lined boulevards we find the explicit inclusion of a designed nature within the heart of the modern city.

The city beautiful movement evolved into the garden city movement of the early twentieth century and the search for a more ambitious synthesis between nature and urban form. The garden city brought together what was at best an inchoate mix of different ideas ranging from the utopian planning ideals of Ebenezer Howard to the naturalistic landscape designs of Frederick Law Olmsted who drew a stark contrast between the cultural vibrancy of industrial America and the "rustic vice" of plantation agriculture. The various approaches to the garden city as it diffused through Europe and North America combined an eclectic mix of influences including romantic and Beaux Arts traditions but transcended the earlier ad hoc interventions through the articulation of a comprehensive approach to urban planning and design. Yet this apparent reconciliation between "city" and "nature" masked the actual transformation of nature under the impetus of capitalist urbanization. The principal legacy of the city beautiful and garden city movements was not the creation of utopian fragments in the urban landscape, important though these were, but the linking of landscape design and city planning ideals with burgeoning middle-class aspirations. In subsequent decades this earlier attempt to find a synthesis between nature and culture would in fact lead towards ever greater degrees of spatial polarization through the growth of suburbs, peripheral housing estates and other twentieth-century efforts to dismantle the inner core of modern cities.

FROM DESIGN TO FUNCTION

Developments such as the urban beautification and garden city movements were largely tangential to the underlying dynamics of capitalist urbanization, yet they remain one of the most influential dimensions to urban design. If we shift our attention, however, towards the function rather than the design of urban space we find that the transformation of nature is far more pervasive and complex than it might first appear. The production of urban nature is inseparable, for example, from the development of urban technological networks which served to bind the modern city into a more integrated spatial form. The central cores of older cities were modernized to make way for roads, railways and speculative land development forcing the working classes into ghettos and industrial districts of intense poverty. The "Haussmann approach" of comprehensive reconstruction pioneered in Second Empire Paris was also extended to Amsterdam, Barcelona, Cologne and many other cities (see Centre de Cultura Contemporánia de Barcelona 1994). Yet this impetus towards spatial rationalization was not without its critics. In Vienna, for example, Otto Wagner attempted to create a modern city based around light, space and ease of movement, but his vision was challenged by Camillo Sitte with his rejection of utilitarian rationalism (see Harvey 1989; Schorske 1981). Wagner's disavowal of nature as an organizational impetus for urban design was not shared, however, by all of the leading figures within the modernist movement: Le Corbusier and Frank

Lloyd Wright, for example, continued to place nature at the centre of their work even if their conception of the modern city conflicted with the more vernacular urbanisms of the past.

From the late nineteenth century onwards urban planning emerged as a clearly defined discipline accompanied by the growing role of technical elites in the institutions of modern governance. From the 1880s onwards, for example, innovations such as land use zoning and regional planning gathered momentum. Technical and administrative expertise played an increasingly significant role in the modern repertoire of "governmentality" and the management of complex urban societies. By the early twentieth century we find increasing emphasis on the "scientific management" of cities in the segregated and hierarchical ordering of urban space. Earlier attempts to create a utopian synthesis of nature and culture were gradually supplanted by a more radical technologically inspired vision. Progressively greater emphasis was placed on the radical separation of land uses in the "hygienic city" so that light, air and movement took precedence over the congested mingling of land uses in the nineteenth-century city. The idea of "speed" became the focal point for a new urban imaginary rooted in the creative destruction of the past. These technological fantasies reached their apogee in the designs of Italian futurists such as Antonio Sant'Elia with his emphasis on multi-level roadways as a means to perfect the circulatory dynamics of urban space. The sketches and plans for these technological utopias depict towering new buildings and virtually empty roads in an era before post-war congestion and the grassroots political challenge to the excesses of technological modernism.

The ideology of "hygienism" in twentieth-century urban planning belied the persistence of environmental and miasmic conceptions of the healthy city in combination with the post-bacteriological revolution in the scientific management of space: free circulation of both air and people was both a utopian gesture towards the horrors of the nineteenth-century city but also an attempt to create a new kind of organic unity within the modern metropolis. The early decades of the twentieth century saw attempts to forge closer links between urban nature and the public realm so that the earlier innovations of municipal parks, improved sanitation and pedagogic displays of nature in zoos and museums could be extended to encompass a more ambitious conception of the role of nature in the modern city. Under the American New Deal, for example, we can discern a shift towards an expanded conception of urban nature to encompass a wider programme of social reform including improvements in health, housing and urban infrastructure. The reshaping of nature on behalf of the modern city also encompassed vast engineering projects to provide water and power so that the new landscapes of dams and aqueducts in the American West, for example, cannot be conceived independently from the vast urban agglomerations with which they are connected. Yet the earlier associations of water engineering projects with a progressive political agenda, whether in Roosevelt's America or Nehru's India, have now waned to the extent that many of these engineering projects have become a leitmotif for the rapacious impact of modern cities on impoverished and politically marginalized rural communities (see, for example, Cutler 1985; Roy 2002).

In the twentieth century the changing relationship between nature, technology and urban space was driven to a significant degree by the spread of car ownership. This technological dynamic transcended national differences to the extent that we can discern striking similarities between the landscaped highways of Germany, Italy and the United States. In Martin Wagner's plans for 1920s Berlin, for example, the need for regional mobility was combined with the development of new peripheral housing estates. Wagner attempted to re-organize urban space in order to promote the greatest possible human happiness so that the rationalization of social and economic life and the rationalization of space became inseparable facets of the same process (see Scarpa 1986). Similarly, in Fritz Schumacher's plans for Hamburg (1909) and Cologne (1920) the centres of these cities were to be opened out with parks and public spaces to foster a new kind of leisure-oriented metropolitan culture (see, for example, Centre de Cultura Contemporània de Barcelona 1994). And in the United States, Robert Moses brought a distinctively car dominated vision to the modernization of the New York metropolitan region within which middle-class aspirations would play a decisive role. During the late 1950s and early 1960s, however, the construction of urban highways began to open up a conflict between the centralized engineering dominated ethos behind infrastructure development and growing demands for greater public participation in urban planning. The ideal metropolis conceived by technical experts and urban managers was increasingly in conflict with the lived reality of the modern city. Urban planning faced the disintegration of the kind of putative "public interest" which had sustained the ideal of comprehensive urban renewal. Planners themselves increasingly recognized that the ideal of "master planning" was illusory and began to explore ways of bolstering their legitimacy through wider public consultation. Patterns of infrastructure investment that had previously been conceived as integral to urban revitalization had now become directly implicated in post-war urban decline and the destruction of city life (see Gandy 2002). In the US, for example, the collapse of the consensus over highway construction in the 1960s mirrors the broader dissolution of the New Deal bipartisan consensus in public policy. The close interrelation between discourses of urban planning and the progressive impulses of modernist thought gradually began to unravel in the face of combined fiscal and political challenges. As urban planning became increasingly dominated by massive state subventions for corporate sectors such as cars and real estate we find an increasing polarization in space between grim housing projects for the working classes and the burgeoning suburbia of middle-class consumer aspirations. With the rise of the fragmentary metropolis the designed landscape was increasingly an adjunct to corporate atria, speculative housing developments and other market-led responses to the urban crisis of 1960s and 1970s. In a sense, therefore, the ideological resonance of nature had come full circle to emulate the ad hoc interventions of the past: the role that metropolitan nature had played in the building of a functional public realm had been gradually supplanted by a more piecemeal emphasis on the decorative contributions of nature to the design of urban space.

ECOLOGY, MODERNITY AND THE POST-INDUSTRIAL METROPOLIS

Urbanization has now become synonymous with the globalization of economic and cultural life. In 1900 there were no more than a dozen cities in the world with more than a million people and agriculture remained the dominant economic activity except for a relatively small number of industrialized nations. By the end of the twentieth century, however, over 500 cities had populations exceeding 1 million people and over half of the world's population was urban. The contemporary "urbanization revolution" dwarfs the experience of nineteenth-century Europe and North America yet is distinct from this earlier transition in a number of critical respects. The so-called "brown agenda", which dominated the rancorous UN environmental summit held in Johannesburg in 2002, reflects the scale of the public health challenge facing contemporary cities but the current housing and sanitation crisis has originated in a fundamentally different context to that of the nineteenth-century city. These rapidly growing cities in the global South reflect an urban dynamic which is unrelated to the classic paradigms of city governance and planning whether in the sprawling slums of São Paulo or the construction frenzy underway in China's Pearl Delta. It is increasingly difficult to talk in terms of any general or identifiable model for urban development as each element takes shape within its specific context and parameters. The place of technical expertise has been superseded by a new entrepreneurial vista ranging from the most precarious slum settlements to the latest generation of immense skyscrapers that dwarf those of twentieth-century Europe or North America. The scale and complexity of this global urban transformation militates against any teleological extension of past experience and necessitates new insights into the urban process. The need to connect policy deliberation with the establishment of effective and legitimate forms of urban governance remains as important now as it was in the past but such arguments can no longer rely on either the scientific logic of public health advocacy or rationalist conceptions of urban space promoted by a coterie of technical experts.

The gathering critique of modernist planning and design from the 1970s onwards has fostered new intersections between urban design and the bio-physical sciences. In the place of a cogent critique of the inequities engendered by capitalist urbanization we find a growing engagement with socio-biological ideas such as "defensible space" which were eagerly incorporated into critiques of public architecture and urban design. Increasing emphasis on individual property rights and demands for fiscal independence from the urban poor gradually coalesced around a new kind of urban agenda exemplified by the latest surveillance strategies and the rise of gated communities. These developments have intensified the ambiguity of urban nature as both an inherent element within a functional public realm but also as a means to enhance property values as the management of hitherto public spaces has been increasingly taken over by quasi-public agencies or private foundations dependent on the whim of individual or corporate benefactors.

The post-war crisis in the rationale and impact of urban planning has been a central element in the ecological critique of modernity yet a closer inspection of

urban environmental discourse reveals the innate ambiguity of "ecological politics" as the basis for any progressive response to urban problems. The emergence of anti-nuclear movements in Europe and the environmental justice movements in the USA reflect a very different appropriation of ecological and environmental discourses to the reactionary anti-urbanism of the past. The impact of urban environmental disasters such as Seveso (1976) and Bhopal (1984) as well as the chronic ill health experienced in the poisoned cities along the US–Mexican border and other toxic locales has spurred a new synergy between the politics of social and environmental justice (see, for example, Hofrichter 1993; Hurley 1995). Though these radical political challenges to militarism, industrial negligence and the productivist logic of consumer capitalism share important elements with the ecological critique of modernity they nonetheless embrace a more dialectical, inclusive and culturally determined conception of nature.

The return to nature in the post-industrial metropolis also denotes a conscious rejection of the kind of aridity engendered by the concrete landscapes associated with technological modernism. The understanding and utilization of urban ecosystems has become more sophisticated to embrace a more holistic conception of the interaction between bio-physical processes and urban society. The development of new approaches to "ecological restoration", for example, marks a self-conscious attempt to recreate the bio-diversity of ecosystems that preceded the growth of the industrial metropolis in order to foster a different kind of synthesis between nature and culture. In the case of river channels, for instance, we can find examples of ecological restoration efforts which not only add aesthetic interest to the landscape but also contribute towards improvements in flood control and waste water treatment to produce a post-industrial or late modern synthesis between advances in ecological science and new approaches to landscape design (see Gauzin-Müller 2002; Gumprecht 1999).

These developments have in part been fostered by the return of nature to post-industrial cities so that the inner areas of some formerly industrial cities such as Baltimore, Detroit or Pittsburgh have taken on an increasingly Arcadian feel. In the photographic essays of Camilo José Vergara, for example, we can observe how inner urban areas have been reclaimed by nature through a mix of abandonment, neglect and structural change to produce "green ghettos". "In many sections of these ghettos", notes Vergara, "pheasants and rabbits have regained the space once occupied by humans, yet these are not wilderness retreats in the heart of the city" (1995: 16). The growing presence of nature within former industrial landscapes can be conceived as a kind of urban entropy whereby the distinction between human artifice and ecological succession becomes progressively blurred. In the literature of J.G. Ballard, for instance, the fragility of the modern city is repeatedly portrayed through a tendency towards dilapidation and decay. In the post-industrial landscapes of Ballard, Iain Sinclair and other authors we find that elaborate highway interchanges, hi-rise apartments and other characteristic features of the twentieth-century city take on the form of urban ruins set amidst a complex palimpsest of new social and technological structures (see Davis 2002; Picon 2000). A similar topographical trope of urban decay is also reflected in cinematic representations of

the post-industrial metropolis. In Terry Gilliam's *12 Monkeys* (1995), for example, we encounter a post-apocalyptic Baltimore that has been taken over by elephants, lions, spiders and other organisms. This eerie spectacle is hardly an example of ecological restoration but rather a futuristic zoöpolis where urban space is controlled by animals rather than by human beings. The post-industrial metropolis, and its cultural representations, is suggestive of a very different kind of city to that of the nineteenth-century metropolis but it is a city for which we are still searching for an appropriate conceptual vocabulary. The characterization of urban segregation in terms of "ecological zones" by the Chicago School of urban sociology, for example, has more recently been reworked, albeit somewhat ironically, for example, in Mike Davis's exploration of the "ecology of fear" in contemporary Los Angeles. The nineteenth-century metabolic insights of Karl Marx and Justus von Liebig have been reprised in order to provide a counterfoil to the functionalist emphases of "industrial metabolism", "ecological footprints" and other static conceptions of the modern city (see Swyngedouw 2004a; 2004b). And the dystopian genres of monstrous urbanism originating in romanticist reactions towards the nineteenth-century industrial city have been widely appropriated within more savvy examples of science fiction cinema and literature as a means to provide allegorical critiques of contemporary social and political developments.

CONCLUSIONS

The politics of urban nature is characterized by a range of "political ecologies" that can be differentiated from one another on the basis of their contrasting approaches to the conceptualization of nature. Any critical engagement with urban environmental change must contend with problems of terminology and historicity so that although many aspects of contemporary urban discourse derive from the nineteenth-century city we can nonetheless identify a critical break since the 1960s in which the "ecological imaginary" has played an enhanced yet deeply problematic role. The ecological imaginary, which comprises a cluster of dichotomous, ethological and neo-romantic readings of nature, remains rooted in organicist conceptions of urban space. The dynamics of urban change are widely conceived in terms of an adjustment towards a notional "equilibrium state" or as a set of processes that must be forcibly realigned towards a putative set of "natural" parameters. Yet this appeal to nature as something that resides outside of social relations is a corollary of fragmentary conceptions of cities as discrete entities that remain unconnected with wider processes of social and political change.

Ranged against the organicist lineage of the "ecological imaginary" we can identify alternative approaches to the understanding of urban nature that recognize the cultural and historical specificities of capitalist urbanization. The urban ecology of the contemporary city remains in a state of flux and awaits a new kind of environmental politics that can respond to the co-evolutionary dynamics of social and bio-physical systems without resort to the reactionary discourses of the past. By moving away from the idea of the city as the antithesis of an imagined bucolic ideal we can begin to explore the production of urban space as a synthesis between

nature and culture in which long-standing ideological antinomies lose their analytical utility and political resonance. Thus far, however, the development of more fluid and mutually constitutive conceptions of urban nature have had relatively little impact on popular discourses of "ecological urbanism" where the emphasis has tended towards the functional dynamics of metabolic pathways or the promotion of new forms of bio-diversity as a corollary of social and cultural complexity. It is perhaps only through an ecologically enriched public realm that new kinds of urban environmental discourse may emerge that can begin to leave the conceptual lexicon of the nineteenth-century city behind.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bacon, E.N. (1967) *Design of Cities*. London: Thames and Hudson

Centre de Cultura Contemporània de Barcelona (1994) *La Visions Urbaines*. Barcelona: Centre de Cultura Contemporània de Barcelona

Cutler, P. (1985) *The Public Landscape of the New Deal*. London and New Haven, CT: Yale University Press

Davis, M. (1998) *Ecology of Fear*. New York: Metropolitan Books

Davis, M. (2002) *Dead Cities and Other Tales*. New York: The New Press

Forty, A. (2000) "Nature", in *Words and Buildings: A Vocabulary of Modern Architecture*. London: Thames and Hudson

Gandy, M. (2002) *Concrete and Clay: Reworking Nature in New York City*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press

Gandy, M. (2004) "Rethinking urban metabolism: water, space and the modern city", *City*, 8: 371–387

Gauzin-Müller, D. (2002) *Sustainable Architecture and Urbanism: Concepts, Technologies, Examples*. Basel: Birkhäuser

Green, N. (1990) *The Spectacle of Nature: Landscape and Bourgeois Culture in Nineteenth-Century France*. Manchester: Manchester University Press

Gumprecht, B. (1999) *The Los Angeles River: Its Life, Death and Possible Rebirth*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press

Harvey, D. (1989) *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Inquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Oxford and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell

Hofrichter, R. (ed.) (1993) *Toxic Struggles: The Theory and Practice of Environmental Justice*. Philadelphia, PA: New Society

Hurley, A. (1995) *Environmental Inequalities: race, class, and pollution in Gary, Indiana, 1945–1980*, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press

Picon, A. (2000) "Anxious landscapes: from the ruin to rust", *Grey Room*, 1: 64–83

Roy, A. (2002) *The Algebra of Infinite Justice*. London: Flamingo

Scarpa, L. (1986) "Martin Wagner oder die Rationalisierung des Glücks", in *Martin Wagner 1885–1957. Wohnungsbau und Weltstadtplanung: Die Rationalisierung des Glücks*. Berlin: Akademie der Künste

Schorske, C.E. (1981) *Fin-de-siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Swyngedouw, E. (2004a) *Social Power and the Urbanization of Water: Flows of Power*. Oxford: Oxford University Press

Swyngedouw, E. (2004b) "Circulations and metabolisms: hybrid natures and cyborg cities",

paper presented to the research colloquium *Re-naturing Urbanization*, held at the University of Oxford, 30 June 2004 (see Chapter 2)

Vergara, C.J. (1995) *The New American Ghetto*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press

Williams, R. (1973) *The Country and the City*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press