

1) Session 1 : Variation of order and disorder in the patterns of thought, historical and comparative perspectives

Moderating : **Stéphane Jonas**, Emeritus Professeur in city planning, Université de Strasbourg

The two ages of the modernization of allotment gardens: Changing aesthetic and moral models

Arnaud Frauenfelder (Professor of Sociology, University of Applied Sciences Western Switzerland, HETS, Geneva)

During roughly the entire first half of the twentieth century, allotment gardens (in French *jardins ouvriers*) were heralded in Western societies as a response to the social question (Weber, 1998), on the fronts of hygiene (open vs. noxious air), diet (vegetables vs. alcohol), economics (a profitable pastime), politics and morals (a group of working-class families vs. a group of working-class men). In the second half of the twentieth century, these gardens experienced sweeping changes (Corbin, 1995). This paper evidences two ages in the modernization of allotment gardens based on a synthesis of historical and sociological research and on content analysis of written sources (documentary analysis) and oral ones (qualitative interviews with reformers of allotment gardens and representatives of associations in Romandy, the French-speaking part of Switzerland). It focuses on two pivotal periods: the first modernization of the 1950s, and the turn of the 2000s, which might eventually be seen as the 'second' period in the modernization of allotment gardens. I show that aesthetic and moral standards experienced considerable transformations in the dominant formulation of public discourses during these periods of urban reform involving the bodies representing the gardens and public authorities. First, an aesthetic of the garden emphasizing order was promoted in the mid-twentieth century, in response to the fear of 'rural slums' in urban areas and to the authorities' call for order. At the turn of the 2000s, the *propre en ordre* aesthetic ('clean and in order') became anathema to the urbanists and architects involved in the creation of new forms of allotment gardens. Secondly, the ethical and moral virtues extolled by the authorities at the time when Geneva's cantonal legislation was adopted in the 1960s placed much emphasis on family, to the extent that term featured in the new names of the bodies representing the 'cause': federations of *jardins ouvriers* (workers' gardens) were renamed federations of *jardins familiaux* (family gardens). This promotion of the working-class family is now criticized for encouraging insularity. In the face of accusations of privatism, the urban reformers' promotion of new forms of allotment gardens that are more 'open' to the outside world changes the boundaries of their target audience. The much more recent experiments with shared gardens (Baudelet et al, 2008) – urban vegetable gardens, community gardens, called *plantages* in Switzerland) – have turned this spirit of openness into an ethical imperative and a sign of distinction (Bourdieu, 1979). In a curious ideological twist, some of what were once virtues of allotment gardens in the mid-twentieth century are now considered as vices. This process of symbolic disqualification puzzles some associative representatives – as Mr Jeanneret, a 55-year-old pensioner and active member of the *Fédération suisse des jardins familiaux*, told me: 'They blame us for what they made us do'. Ultimately this paper seeks to show how present urban reforms currently focusing on allotment gardens are laden with a

sedimented past that we need to bring to light in order to have a more reflexive approach to these gardens and to the symbolic and spatial struggles surrounding them.

« Orders and disorders in the roman garden » through modern historiography (19e-21e centuries)

Ilse Hilbold (Phd in ancient history, Post-doc, Historisches Institut, Berne Universitat, chercheur associated-researcher at Archimède)

Paper abstract

This paper briefly presents some findings of my PhD thesis in Ancient history (defended in July 2015 in Strasbourg). It analyzes the construction and effects of a widespread concept in Ancient studies, the so-called “Roman gardens”. The phrase was translated in the 1990s by the anachronism “horti romani”, which is nowhere to be found in ancient texts and has no basis in antique reality. On the contrary, the “Roman gardens” are the product of a historiographical tradition which has applied contemporary concepts to antique gardens. These concepts include “Roman naturalism” (“*naturalisme romain*”, developed by Pierre Grimal in 1943, which attributes a “feeling of nature” (“*sentiment de nature*”) to the Romans. This has been influential in the establishment of a historiographical order in the study of gardens, along with the strong emphasis on visualizing their space and aesthetics. A radically different approach has consisted in focusing on political and social practices in the gardens, unveiling other types of gardens in Rome in contrast with classical approaches discussing luxury, otium, apolitical activities... Those “other Roman gardens”, seen as elements of a social history of Rome, were political venues in Roman society. Crucially, in Rome, one’s residence contributed to social legitimation, especially for the aristocrats. The horti of Rome, which were dwellings, were part of this social order, and, like the domus, they were used by their owners for purposes of representation, to assert their status and power.

PhD abstract

During the last decades, research on Roman aristocracy has largely moved beyond the well-trodden fields of political and prosopographical analysis and branched out into new themes such as the elite's forms of communication, the semiology of power, and the relation between space and political practices. This PhD follows these paths and brings a significant contribution to this area of research: while the space of aristocratic life has long been considered as a dichotomy between urbs and rus and between domus and uilla, here I document the relevance of a third long-neglected place, the residential horti of Rome. By studying gardens as aristocratic residences, located in green spaces outside of the city yet within close proximity, this PhD replaces the traditional domus-uilla dichotomy with the domus-horti-uilla triptych and uncovers a lesser-known place of political action with its own way of life, possibilities and limits. The study of horti is based on a systematical analysis of literary sources; it deals with archaeological data when available. A review of the historiography of gardens precedes the conceptualization of the theoretical framework and of the material.

From urban Creole garden to food sovereignty: challenges and perspectives

Jean-Valery Marc (University lecturer in Geography and Urban Planning, University of the French West Indies and Guiana, Martinique)

Since the nineties, the sugarcane industry crisis has spread to most of the Caribbean Islands running on a plantation economy. It has been a key factor in the rural exodus of thousands of people who moved to the Lesser Antilles' capital cities, hoping to find better living conditions. Most of them were country people with low-wage jobs, and they had no choice but to show good will and put up with the problems related to the city. The Creole garden remains one of the most evident forms of this adaptation. It refers to a small spatial unit adjoining one-family houses; it has no official delimitations and is dedicated to agricultural production. It is common in the Lesser Antilles, not only in the rural but also in the urban areas. The "Creole" garden gets its name from cultivation and cultural methods dating back to the colonial and pre-colonial eras, and focuses mainly on self-consumption. Most of the competent authorities are located in the Lesser Antilles' capital cities (such as Fort-de-France), and their inhabitants make up a significant part of the island's urban population. However, they bear the marks of a lingering rurality (Martouzet D., 2001).

With its Human Development Index, Martinique ranks among the richest Caribbean countries. Yet, on second glance, it shows wide disparities: a substantial portion of its population lives well below the poverty line and is constantly forced to squeeze between precarious and informal employment, welfare income and a good dose of resourcefulness. At the crossroads of culture, heritage, ecology and self-consumption, the Creole gardens in Martinique also embody a strategy of economic survival for disadvantaged people in an ever expanding affluent society, which is falling under the increasing influence of urban reality. This logic of survival through the Creole garden (called "backyard garden" on the English speaking islands) is even stronger in cities like Castries or Roseau, which belong to independent Caribbean countries.

Within the city, the Creole garden has proven its virtues, not only because it produces food, but also because it has numerous ecological and social advantages. Moreover, it plays an aesthetic role (Marc, 2007, 2011; Marc & Martouzet, 2012; Marc & Martouzet, 2014). But today, we have to think beyond food self-sufficiency and to make sense of the Creole garden as the basis of food sovereignty, which will allow us to determine the challenges at stake on an island territory where 90 % of the goods consumed are imported.

On these territories, space remains the most precious resource. The Creole garden raises numerous issues in terms of spatial planning, biodiversity conservation in urban areas, social and cultural patterns or political arbitration.

***Vorgarten* and private green spaces in Strasbourg's Neustadt: A century of uses in the heart of the city**

Cathy Blanc-Reibel (PhD candidate, Laboratory AMUP - Architecture, Urban Morphology/Morphogenesis and Planning, Strasbourg), **Olivier Haegel** (Researcher at the heritage inventory service in Strasbourg)

Vorgarten (front gardens) are green spaces found in front of some residences in Strasbourg. The word used to describe them is German because *Vorgarten* emerged in the streets of the Neustadt area that was built during the annexation of Alsace (1871-1918).

Inspired by nineteenth century hygienism, they were designed to bring some greenery into these modern urban buildings, like the green spaces surrounding villas and detached houses. They were part of a green corridor that had been mapped out in the city's urban planning scheme. Regarding the extension of the urban area, the *Bauordnung* regulations (1892 and 1910) had a crucial influence, promoting compliance with rules relating in part to hygienism – on air circulation, the need of light and green spaces – and it made small gardens mandatory in some residential streets.

These *Vorgarten* are for the most part located near parks, serving as green corridors and extensions of larger green spaces. Some are found along the botanical gardens and behind the imperial palace's park. Overall that part of Strasbourg has numerous green spaces: parks – Orangerie, Contades, Jardin de l'Université and Palace of the Rhine, tree plantations along streets such as the rue Oberlin and the avenue de l'Orangerie, and *Vorgarten*. The resulting succession of gardens and parks constitutes a ca. 1.5km-long green path.

A century after their creation, this paper presents the roots and evolution of these private gardens. It investigates whether they have retained their original appearance or become denser, and considers how residents occupy these spaces and take care of them.

A collaboration between members of the heritage inventory service and a PhD candidate, this presentation draws on recent work done by the inventory service on the Neustadt neighbourhood since 2010. The findings of this research allow us to map out private green spaces in the German part of the city. Significant examples are highlighted to document the evolution of these spaces, from those that have remained largely unchanged to others that have experienced more changes. We document the paradoxical impact of green modes of individual transportation and waste collection measures, as bikes and numerous waste bins increasingly take space in *Vorgarten* alongside cars.

The quality of urban soils as part of the political agenda: from disorder to new sociotechnical arrangements in urban community gardens

Marine Canavese (doctoral student, and Marie Grenet, field researcher in Anthropology, Université Lyon 2), **Dorine Bouquet** (doctoral student) and **Thierry Lebeau** (teacher, Université de Nantes), **Béatrice Béchet** (research officer, IFSTTAR-IRSTV), **Cécile Le Guern** (research officer, BRGM), **Francis Douay** and **Emilie Pinte** (teachers/researchers, ISA Lille), **Nathalie Berthier** and **Philippe Branchu**, (design and research engineers, Cerema), **Philippe Cambier** (research supervisor), and **Elisabeth Rémy** (research engineer, Inra-AgroParisTech)

Urban community gardens are often set up on lands which, due to their location, are or have been exposed to organic or inorganic contamination (Douay F., 2008 ; Schwartz C., 2013 ; Jean-Soro, L. et

al, 2015). A growing number of local authorities, as well as some associations, use soil science in order to characterize the contamination of soils and garden produce (which can affect not only the gardener's health, but also his family's).

This paper compares different experiences related to gardens in three big French cities and analyzes how soil contamination upsets both the gardeners' community (Mandon, 2014) and the local authorities' philosophy - based on action.

There are big differences in management techniques: in the older gardens, the bond to the soil and vegetable gardens was very strong, and contaminations were always discovered after the facts. In recent gardens on the contrary, the concerns about soil quality and its potential contamination can be taken into account at the earliest stages, when the garden is created or the site developed.

We show the fact that soil contamination in a garden causes not only an emotional shock, but also the reconsideration of the site as a place compatible with gardening practices. We examined the gardeners' opinions, practices and lines of action in order to emphasize the different attitudes towards the approach regarding urban contamination (Grenet et al., soon to be released). Neither exhaustive nor frozen, these attitudes show different forms of prioritization of the risks and uncertainties linked to urban community gardens.

We also analyze the local authorities' responses to the announcement of a contamination. We describe the strategies set up by three local authorities in order to anticipate or manage health and environmental hazards, as well as associated uncertainties. The local authority's internal organization, as well as its services' (urban risks, soil contamination, and pollution of green areas) and its skills and experiences - in this particular field - condition the way these contaminations and the procedures to address them are taken into account, according to the policy that is defended by the city.

In view of the wide variability of local contexts, we must choose a pragmatist approach (Dewey, 2010). It enables the local authority to follow a step-by-step process towards a fair decision (one that is correct but also legally accurate), so they can choose together how to use these gardens and how to plan their future. Through a variety of modes, this decision involves several actors - for example the Agences Régionales de Santé (Regional Health Agencies) - in order to conciliate risk assessment, risk management and the gardeners' attitudes (whether assumed or studied) regarding those risks. The challenge is now to come together and discuss "what is at stake and where" (Lévy, 2013: 341). The quality of urban soils has become an item on the political agenda.

Session 2: Gardening as activism

Moderating : Rémi Barbier, Sociologist, Professeur at ENGEES, Irstea et Gildas Renou, politologist

SAGE, ANR Symbios

Formes de jardinage et production d'un ordre négocié

Laurence Granchamp (Maître de conférences en sociologie, DynamE, Strasbourg)

***Bostan* in Moda Gezi and Kuzguncuk: Political disorders and imposition of social order in Istanbul**

Agathe Fautras (PhD candidate in geography at the University Paris-Sorbonne (Paris IV), associate member of the Laboratory Spaces, Nature and Culture (ENeC) (Paris) and of the French institute of Anatolian studies (IFEA) (Istanbul))

The Turkish word *bostan* refers to a millennial productive agricultural space of fairly small size where various types of fruit and vegetable are grown year-round.

In Istanbul, the *bostan* in Yedikule and Kuzguncuk, which are respectively 1500 and 700 years old, are the last remaining traces of the market gardens that used to provide the city with fresh food. Most *bostan* began disappearing in the 1950s due to urbanization.

Yet, between July 2013 and March 2014, new *bostan* appeared in some neighbourhoods of Istanbul. They were offshoots of the Gezi Park protests that took place between late May and mid-June 2013. These protests were spurred by an urban planning project that included the destruction of Gezi Park for the purposes of building a mall, and brought together a wide range of opponents to Erdoğan's government (Pérouse 2013). The protesters' demands included giving more of a say to citizens in the making of the city (or 'right to the city' – see Lefebvre 1968)).

Protestors created a *bostan* during the occupation of Gezi Park. To some it was a symbol of the ecological revolution, and to others it was a cornerstone of the Gezi Commune's self-sufficiency. In any case the *bostan* was clearly a political project, and an experiment that had to be reproduced elsewhere in the eyes of its makers.

After the movement was repressed, protesters dispersed into other city parks to build on the democratic impulse of Gezi Park. These gatherings saw the emergence of informal associations of citizens called Solidarities (*dayanışma*). They seized undeveloped public lands in the city – without the municipality's approval – to set up *bostan*.

Bostan are in this sense activist gestures and objects of political expression, which may be better understood in light of the political context in Turkey. The country's history has been marked by military coups and several army takeovers in times of political instability. The army has systematically preyed on civil society's means of expression, by dissolving all associations and hunting down oppositional political movements, starting with the radical left. This has caused new forms of politicization to emerge: activists moved to apolitical associations, like Solidarities, to make their

political engagement less risky (Massicard 2012). This applies to *bostan*: they convey positive and universal values (by embellishing the city and nurturing its inhabitants) (Baudry 2012), and as such are outwardly apolitical.

Different actors with varying degrees of politicization attribute various values and representations to the *bostan*. Through their physical and symbolic appropriation of space, *bostan* are a means to combat urbanization. Through the ecological practice of agriculture, the exchange of farm-saved seeds and plants from villages (*köy*), they are an expression of green values. Through their collective, shared organization, they challenge the dominant model of production and consumption, serving as a local implementation of a global thought specific to radical left and anarchist movements.

Enclosed by the spatial boundaries of the garden, *bostan* are nevertheless open spaces, where anyone can contribute by planting and harvesting. They forge social ties between sometimes opposed groups, and can serve to pacify social life.

Still, these protest gardens can be subjected to institutional ordering. Such is the case of the *bostan* in Kuzguncuk. The garden was set up in 2011 by neighbourhood residents after a legal battle. In 2014, the municipality and the Association of Kuzguncuk, which represents the neighbourhood, presented a project for developing the space. The project elicited heated debates: its detractors (*bostan* Solidarities) saw it as the creation of a leisure garden (*hobi bahçesi*) – a tool for the introduction of an urban moral order (Montabone 2013). The project crystallized the opposition between two representations: the neighbourhood's overriding interest (local) vs. the ecologist discourse (global); domesticated vs. wild nature. The newly completed project has in effect amounted to social control, materialized by the imposition of an aesthetic, spatial and security order.

Due to their informal character, *bostan* are also the cause of territorial struggles between activists and authorities, in which plants play an important role. In Kuzguncuk, the biodiversity present on the site earned it the status of protected space. In order to avoid eviction, no trees are planted in *bostan*, as they are traditionally legal markers of property.

Gardens at the centre of urbanity conflicts: vegetable gardens vs. ecodistricts in the urban area of Dijon

Eric Doidy (Associate Professor in sociology, INRA (National Institute of Agricultural Research), joint research unit (UMR) CESAER), **Emmanuel Dumont** (Engineer Assistant, INRA, UMR CESAER)

Our general approach consists in unpacking the mechanisms of a reinvention dating back to the beginning of the nineteenth century: the idea that nature is full of beneficial properties. We previously showed how the emphasis on gardening's "therapeutic" virtues allowed the setting up of new framework structures for populations described as being "vulnerable" or "excluded", as well as the emergence of new professional careers (Doidy, Dumont, 2013 and 2014). We also showed how the emphasis on personal fulfilment in farming could be combined with collective mobilization and social critique (Doidy, 2012). We examine the contemporary idealization of "nature" in terms of the relationships to politics.

This paper analyses the way - or rather the different conflicting ways - “nature” embodies common property within the city (Dubost, Lizet, 2003). How do social actors draw on the development of “little pieces of nature” in the city in order to enter the public debate? How do these different developments of nature in the city contrast with each other? Far from this urban ideal which portrays a “social demand for nature in the city” or “citizen’s desire for nature” as a consensual reality, this paper shows that the actual enhancement of nature in urban spaces is neither self-evident nor socially shared. On the contrary, it is socially distributed and each different actor has his own definition of the term “nature”. First and foremost, it expresses itself through conflicts. We argue that conflicts in which gardening and urban planning projects find themselves on opposing sides (concreting works, infrastructure etc.) can be described as “urbanity conflicts”, that is to say conflicts which mobilize actors claiming their “right to the city”. Without them, a city would be nothing but a place performing social relationships which would pre-exist any other experience (Cefaï and Joseph, 2002). These conflicts regarding gardens allow us to grasp the limits of the urban experience.

This paper (focusing on controversies surrounding two ecodistrict projects in the urban area of Dijon) is based on observations and semi-directive interviews conducted in early 2013. The first project is peri-urban: a residents’ association was formed to denounce the threat an ecodistrict would pose to family gardens, orchards and vineyards. The second project is planned in a neighborhood which used to serve as the city’s “market garden belt” but which lies fallow today. An anarchist group is currently occupying the wasteland, planning to set up an activist vegetable garden. We describe how various actors develop different concepts of “nature” or relation to “nature” within the city to weigh in the controversy: institutional actors pushing development projects, residents standing up for “quality of life” and against the building of council flats, and an anarchist group relying on guerrilla tactics. We underline the opposition between different “urban natures” (ecodistricts’ green spaces, the activist vegetable garden and family gardens don’t look the same, they are not meant for the same use or for the same users). In the process, we contribute not only to the understanding of the emergence of the “social demand for nature in the city” (in urban-planning projects as well as in protests), but also of the promotion of diverse forms of attachment to different places.

Making his garden : the pleasures of self-production to ecologie of self

Camille Adamiec (Phd in sociology, ATER, Université de Franche Comté, research scientist of DynamE)

For the eaters interested to health-food, produce plants are an economic issue. But, mainly, allows to develop a more sustainable social model. This elaboration includes a new qualification of quality and safety foods, an ecological qualification. In this context, the garden become “a compensatory space, an ideal food, combination plenty and variety, fresh and sweet, and personal control of supply” . How these eaters choose their food? How they adjust their domestic space? How they revive and secure their relationship with nature and with the planet? Minituarization of earth, plants on a balcony, connects the local to the global. Develop a comprehensive and reflective thinking about individual actions and incorporations. This reflexion affect all of life and gives them the sensation of control the future. In a society of risk, worried and reflective, the control of knowledge is a major challenge. Perfect and claim deep knowledge of what we eat takes a character at once distinctive

and selective. Aware of the consequences of each incorporation, the act of eating becomes an act militant or political. Eating position itself in the present with the past and the anticipation of the future.

Militant Gardeners or Passionate Citizens? Critically Exploring the Global Guerrilla Gardening Movement

Michael Hardman (Lecturer in Geography, University of Salford)

Guerrilla gardeners are hiding beneath the radar of authority – they are individuals and groups who colonise land without permission and who aim to green often dull urban environments. The term is, deliberately, somewhat militaristic and mirrors the actions of typical group who often practice at night to avoid detection. The movement brings together a variety of actors, with students, academics, planners, architects, chefs, community workers and many more individuals – a real cross-section of society. Generally speaking, guerrilla gardeners either aim to beautify a neglected patch of land or (increasingly) some are pursuing the cultivation of space. Many meet virtually first, through the guerrillagardening.org forum or social media, before venturing out to partake in their planned actions.

Reasons for guerrilla gardening vary, from actors who are merely angered with the perceived lack of local authority care of land, to those merely pursuing the activity for fun: gaining a ‘thrill’ or the feeling of ‘naughtiness’ from their perceived illegal actions. Whilst guerrilla gardening is often through of as illegal, to date there has been no arrests, with guerrillas merely moved on by authorities instead. The expansion of guerrilla gardening can be partially linked to Richard Reynolds’ efforts to bring the movements into the 21st century. Reynolds pioneered the practice within the UK and connected guerrilla virtually through his guerrillagardening.org forum. His book ‘On Guerrilla Gardening’ is a ‘bible’ on how to go about the practice and tips for success based on his many years of experience; a must read for any budding guerrilla. It was through his efforts that guerrillas shared knowledge and pushed each other’s boundaries: exploring concepts such as urban agriculture and moving beyond beautification.

More recently, the concept of urban agriculture is being explored by these actors: at its most fundamental levels, this involves bringing food production into the cityscape. Examples of UA range from community gardens and allotments, to radical vertical cultivating systems and rooftop farms. A core argument for the practice is often based on the need for greater food security; with populations rising and cities growing, the way we cultivate crops needs to be reconsidered. Whilst there is a nascent literature base on formal urban agricultural practice, the informal side of the activity is severely underexplored. Nevertheless, the guerrilla gardening movement, which stretches from Africa to Europe, North America and beyond is leading the informal side of the urban agriculture movement.

Through drawing on an array of international and European case studies, this presentation provides a critical exploration of guerrilla gardening. The talk analyses the practices and impact of guerrilla activities before investigating the public’s views of several informal agricultural projects; questioning their value and need in the various contexts. Ultimately, the piece argues that whilst guerrilla

gardening often benefits the areas in which it is performed, there is a darker side to the activity which requires more investigation.

Metropolitan metamorphosis, subversive agriculture in Rome

Victoria Sachsé (Independent researcher), **Beatrice Del Monte** (Independent researcher)

This text is inspired by a research entitled “Metropolitan Metamorphosis: Urban Agriculture and Sharing Economy in the city of Rome”. The issue of gardening in the city is to show how some forms of urban agriculture can become an instrument of protest. This research analyses different practices of urban agriculture carried out in the city of Rome. It is based on a research survey made in Rome between September 2014 and February 2015.

The research was conducted using an anthropological qualitative approach, through unstructured interviews and direct observation. The analysis focused on the different actors, human and non-human, involved in the urban public space. The investigation was developed starting from the theories of Philippe Descola and Bruno Latour (Descola 2010; Latour 2000), two French anthropologists who question the cultural and social construction of the relation between humans, nature and environment. We explored how urban agriculture could become an important instrument to conceive and build new spatial and social interactions and configurations. In this perspective, Bauman’s reflections (Bauman 1998) about metropolis’ new spatial orders offer an interesting frame as well as the historical vision of urban spaces’ evolution developed by Bevilacqua (2007).

We investigated the activities that took place in several urban plots and gardens in different areas of the city. We also followed the works carried out by the Collective Urban Fruit and the Group of Subversive Gardeners, who are active in guerrilla gardening around the city.

Most of the research results will be further developed. Firstly, we will explain the results regarding gardens, then we will expose the issues linked to the “roaming green” meaning the Subversive Gardeners as a guerrilla gardening practice and the Collective Urban Fruit.

The three gardens we studied have recurrent issues, mostly regarding their context of creation. The gardens of Garbatella and eXSnia were both a way of resisting to real-estate speculation. The first one was resisting to projects of parking lots and buildings and the second one against a commercial center project. The second aspect, which is present in the three areas, is the will to take care of abandoned and degraded land. It shows how the inhabitants of these neighbourhoods choose not to wait for the local authority to take a decision but decide spontaneously to manage collectively the area. A third aspect that is visible is the creation of social tie in many ways. For instance by including a broad range of people (migrants, ex-prisoners, disabled people, etc...) but also by creating spaces for children with didactic gardens and raising awareness about environment issues (Garbatella and Tre Fontane). The last main aspect is the collective management of the gardens. Each one has its own rules but the general trend is to make decisions collectively, by a majority or unanimously.

Another side of the presence of “nature” in the city are nomadic actions. For instance, the Collective Urban Fruit organises activities that take place in many areas of the city. At first, they established a cartography of fruit trees on public soil. Then, they organise regular fruit harvests and redistribution

of fruits to associations. Their purpose is also to question the vision of public soil, its use and how urban planning is defined.

In a more militant way, the Subversive Gardeners express a strong criticism of urban planning by sowing plants where there are not and reclaiming public space belonging to everyone. They also encourage the inhabitants to be part of the process and to cure the area in the long term.

Summing up, each of these experiences, with their own characteristics, takes back some space in the city. They reclaim the taken spaces and, through these actions, promote a collective and public use of it, creating criticism of the broadly spread vision of private property and also of the processes of “decision making”, especially in the city. All these initiatives question the conception of nature, its meanings, its frontiers and the interaction between humans and their environment in a broader way.

Community gardens: hybrid spaces between contestations and standardizations. Overlapping perspectives between Île-de-France and Kazan (Russia)

Camille Robert Boeuf (doctoral student in Geography, Université Paris Ouest Nanterre la Défense, joint research unit (UMR) LAVUE)

Scientific research about gardens has recently experienced resurgence; today, they are considered as relevant research subjects which allow the understanding of social, economical and environmental evolutions in our societies (MENOZZI, 2014). A number of recent analyses describe gardens - which used to be seen as particular natural spaces - as multifunctional spaces with food-giving capacities as well as major ecological and social properties (POURIAS, 2014; HERVOUET, 2006). As we question urban agriculture and sustainable cities, gardens can either emerge as subversive territories or as places of standardization (DEN HARTIGH, 2013; GUYON, 2008).

In order to match the program of this conference's third session, this paper describes gardens as means of contestations, but also as “clean” green patches. Our interpretation of gardens is based on the study of one particular type: community gardens. We define community gardens as a grouping of individual patches where urban residents garden for leisure or for the improvement of their eating habits. In French, such gardens are called “jardins familiaux” – family gardens – (formerly “jardins ouvriers”, or workers’ gardens). This definition doesn't include newer gardening practices, such as shared gardens or gardens which favour social integration (among others).

This research about traditional and popular gardens enables us to understand them over the long term and to study the evolutions of their different functions throughout the ages. Community gardens were first used in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries to offset food shortages in the cities, before they reappeared in the nineties with new environmental and social functions. The evolution of these functions and the more or less important value given to them by the different actors involved tend to turn gardens into hybrid and complex spaces. Indeed, the functions related to food production, environment and society vary from one actor to another; this variation also depends on the scale.

We see gardens as hybrid spaces enabling the actors to develop complex and multi-scale strategies. They are multifunctional and often oppose different actors with different (sometimes even

conflicting) ideas. Within these relationships between the different actors, effects of pacification, social control or subversion can emerge.

Originally, in Russia as in France, community gardens were more or less seen as a way to control poor urban populations. Moreover, the importance of aesthetics regarding gardens induced standardization processes in gardening practices. These forms of control and standardization didn't prevent the emergence of diversion strategies. Indeed, a garden is a place of subversion which encourages the emergence of food and social alternatives (it offers the possibility to make other, unconventional choices). It favours the construction of an alternative food system (beside the traditional system) which is mostly used during shortages or crisis situations. It also generates social networks which are different from traditional urban social networks. In this context, it seems important to diachronically analyze the gardens' subversion and standardization procedures in order to determine whether these procedures differed throughout time, and how they coexist or follow one another.

With our understanding of gardens as hybrid spaces within a long-term perspective, we offer a new definition of the word "garden": neither frozen nor timeless, it is rather extremely evolutive and has different functions emphasized by different actors. The study of the garden's structure through the strategies of its actors enables us to analyze it as a space which generates both order and disorder. Thus, we can question the garden's dissenting role, since it also creates standards.

Our methodology is based on analyses conducted at different scales, combining sociological methods (interviews and observations) and geographical ones (mapping studies and aerial photographs). It allows us to underline the different opinions resulting from standardization, as well as the garden's subversive effects. Our overlapping perspective between France and Russia encourages a broader reflexion on gardens and points out to their mirroring and dissymmetrical effects. Even if our two lands are very different from each other, they still bear great resemblances – depending on the different time periods at stake.

Activism for urban gardens spearhead for heritage of social housing. The cases of the garden city of Stains and Maladrerie in Aubervilliers

Géraldine DJAMENT-Tran (Lecturer in geography at the University of Strasbourg, UMR SAGE associated with the Interdisciplinary Research Team on Tourism of University Paris 1)

This communication, which is part of the theme 3 "Gardening in town: militant act, means of protest" and especially in the sub-theme "Promoting gardening in housing projects, tool to appropriate space or new hygienism ?", considers thinking together three topics that are radically dissociated in the collective imaginary and frequently in the scientific literature: social housing, urban gardens and heritage.

It will wonder how some urban gardens contribute to the difficult heritage status of social housing (Veschambre 2000; Pouvreau, 2011; Auclair, Hertzog, 2015), as an object of mobilization and as an emblem. Contrary to the consensual and depoliticised view of "sustainable" city, it will seek to politicize the issue of urban gardens and analyze the conflicts that are tied around their sustainability or their renovation. If eco-activism and/or social-activism for urban gardens, for example around the

shared gardens (Demailly, 2014), is the most obvious dimension, we would address the issue through the prism of heritage activism. Our proposal is to show that some urban gardens, thanks to a heritagisation by appropriation (Rautenberg, 2003), contribute to the undermining of the neo-liberal evolution of social housing (Desjardins, 2008) and the construction of a heritage not only in the suburbs but also typical of suburbs (Jacquot, Fagnoni, Gravari-Barbas, 2013).

The analysis, grounded on semi-structured interviews with local actors of heritage, tourism, urban planning and on participating visits, is based on two case studies in northern suburb of Paris, on the territory of Plaine Commune. The garden city of Stains, built by G. Gonnot and E. Albenque between 1921 and 1933, corresponds to the distribution in France of the international flow of garden cities (Pouvreau et al, 2007). Natural site legally protected since 1976, it is the subject of an active and proactive heritage and tourism development policies of Plaine Commune since 2004, which resulted in the creation in 2015 of an association of garden cities of Ile de France. The study will include the recent renovation of hearts islets planted of the garden city. The area of the Maladrerie built in Aubervilliers in 1975 by Renée Gailhoustet and labeled "Heritage of the twentieth century", is meanwhile a typical utopia of proliferative architecture, characterized politically by the desire to offer an alternative to social housing towers and bars and architecturally by its many green spaces and tree-lined terraces. Heritage militancy of the association *Gardens at all levels*, in conflict with the urban renewal projects, will be at the heart of its review.

Session 3: Urban gardens as instruments of production of a sanitary, social and ecological order

Moderating : **Roberta Borghi**, Architect, PhD in Architecture, Lecturer about city and territories Ville, l'Ecole Nationale Supérieure d'Architecture de Versailles

Garden-based mediations between protest utopia and construction of local identity: The case of the Bauges mountains

Claire Delfosse (Professor of Geography, University Lumière Lyon 2, Laboratory of rural studies),
Cyprien Durandard (Second year master's student, University Lumière Lyon 2, Laboratory of rural studies)

For a few decades, issues related to gardens, regarding such subjects as food safety, environmental awareness or development of sociability, have been considered within the scope of urban projects (Duchemin et al., 2010; Aubry et al., 2010). Their role in rural areas has however been less investigated.

This paper considers garden-based projects in rural and peri-urban areas. Because they contribute to constructing a social space and a shared horizon around the garden, these projects are mediations – here we call them garden-based mediations. Drawing on completed fieldwork conducted in the Bauges mountains (Durandard, 2014) and on an ongoing study of the Bourg-en-Bresse basin (both in Eastern France within a short distance of the Swiss border), we consider divergences and overlaps between political projects and grassroots initiatives. This reflection builds on previous work on the relationship to heritage in the Bauges mountains in both groups of actors (Palisse, 2006).

The institutionalized mediation of parks and local authorities is shaped by an effort to develop a local identity. In the Bauges mountains, the heritage of agricultural biodiversity (old fruit varieties) is being reinvested by the regional natural park. The latter, working alongside local fruiticulture associations, is seeking to raise awareness among residents (by organizing initiation days on pruning and grafting, conferences...). It also promotes the landscape integration of private gardens (with booklets offering advice on planting, a tree fair, etc.). These policies are aimed at establishing a moral and material order based on the idea of a continuum between past and present. In that respect, they are conformist.

Conversely, the mediation performed through grassroots initiatives (seed and plant exchanges, training programmes, screenings, conferences...) promotes a utopia that extols the re-enchantment of nature and the emancipation of individuals and local communities from consumer society. As it upsets the dominant order in gardening, characterized by individualism and the dependence on commercial gardening, it provides a protest model of gardening.

These two forms of mediation are far from mutually exclusive, and actually overlap if not merge, as actors are simultaneously involved in both. This does not mean, however, that their experiences are similar. In order to understand how the two models interact, we examine the representations of the

garden at work in these initiatives. Ultimately each works as a response to one of two major trends in contemporary society: interest in the past as a marker of identity as local and cultural roots are widely redefined; the search for a model of development other than modern capitalism. These two models of garden-based mediation arguably illustrate the tension between increasingly rigid attitudes towards local identity and the universal vision of a new ecological order.

Chaos or emancipation? Community gardens as a tool for social mixing and taking ownership of public spaces. A reflexion on Gennevilliers.

Angélique Dupont (Chargée de mission agriculture urbaine, ville de Gennevilliers), **Emmanuelle Faure** (Doctorante en Géographie de la Santé, UMR LADYSS, Université Paris Ouest), **Corinne Luxembourg** (Maître de conférences en Géographie, EA Discontinuités - Artois.)

This communication proposal relies on both a theoretical analysis of community gardens as a tool for emancipating women and observations of concrete examples in the town of Gennevilliers (Hauts de Seine, France). Being interested in a suburb, or *The* suburbs, through the transversal gender question often comes back to considering women as insecure, if not even sometimes abused figures, in a public space that is controlled, whether by tacit or explicit means, by a patriarchal society. The suburbs are the place where the question of order and chaos are inherent. It seems that this same simplified process also occurs in the analysis of the development of urban agriculture in one of its forms: community gardens. They are often reserved for large metropolises, where a community gardens role is one of creating community links and/or a tool for gentrifying the last few low-income districts. In the older industrial suburbs, the initiatives are seen more as being linked to the need to feed oneself, to be able to resist the economic crisis by transforming waste land into vegetable plots.

Our proposal is to understand the development and functioning of community gardens as participatory elements in a wider project in a supportive town, that respects the environment and well-being, but also as a potential lever for emancipation and social mixing. We will ask ourselves how urban agriculture can take the shape of a collective accountability and become one of the concrete vectors for change of relation of the inhabitants of the town and construction of urban society. Starting from questioning urbanism that is too monofunctional, the reflection will look towards androcentricity of the town and its consequences. If the community gardens are considered as new tools for connecting with the town, are they not also instruments for connecting inhabitants. (male and female)

How does this movement, attentive as it is to local production, imagining the town as producing and not productivist, reinvesting the public space, attract the attention and engagement of mixed gender groups, even mainly female groups? Can these new methods of struggle and alternative practice, through directing asking the question of the rights to the town, such as the right for all, male and female, to transform the town, be a tool in the fight on sexism? Finally, can appropriating these agricultural production spaces allow for another form of production space.

We will show, in the first phase, how the recent development of several community gardens is inscribed in a particular context (longstanding allotment spaces, political will...). However, it emerges that in Gennevilliers, while men have been the majority in the management and use of traditional

allotments, this is not the case in these new projects. In fact, the community gardens are almost exclusively organised and used by women. In a second phase, we will analyse these gardens as a paradoxical place of expression of stereotypes of gender as places of resistance and reversing of these stereotypes. Finally, we will show that these experiences of urban agriculture in Gennevilliers are contributing to the renewal of the relationship of men and women to their town and its districts. We will ask ourselves in what measure the implanting of a garden can be a marker for chaos, in that it upsets the traditional organisation of the town and the life of a district, but it can also be the tool for creating a new order, a new way of accessing and constructing the town. The notion of change will be at the heart of our questioning: are the community gardens recently put in place if the different districts of the town of Gennevilliers factors of well-being, or even better, wholeness, in the town?

Our remarks will draw on concrete examples of different configurations (closed, individual allotments and open, collective community gardens) apprehended thanks to our observations and semi-directed interviews with the main users of these spaces (the associations that have set up and manage the gardens, users (male and female), inhabitants, etc.).

Young gardeners of the Prinzessinengarten: an engagement on the edge of politics

Karin Parienti Maire (Doctorante en sociologie et membre depuis 2012 du collège de gradués 1288 de l'Université de Friburg en Brisgau)

This paper aims to explore interactions and modes of existence of young community gardeners who are working in some German community gardens. The first one, the 'Prinzessinengarten', is located in the former workers neighborhood and now gentrified district of Kreuzberg in Berlin; the others are in the 'green city' of Freiburg im Breisgau. This analysis is grounded on an immersion inquiry which began in spring 2013. This inquiry is mainly constituted of non-directive interviews and ethnographic observations during the every day life of the gardeners, volunteers, employees and trainees. I will show which feelings these young gardeners evoke during this practical activity that is near to the ground. I will retrace the discourses they conceive about gardening in the purpose to build a reflexion on the subjectivity regimes in which this community participates. We will determine which collective engagement form these activities create by considering the relationship with politics.

When they are asked about the reasons of their engagement, these young people between twenty and thirty, often come remarks about the peaceful atmosphere and human relationships that sound to be prevalent in these areas. These gardeners pose them in the same way to the world of labour with its hourly rigidities, its target of production and its social hierarchies.

This 'other space' (Foucault) that is a green space of 3000 m² in between a very dense „creative quarter“ seems to embody for these gardeners a choice for limitation and small dimension. The political engagement seems to express itself from the body and with body gestures (for example watering with facility, pushing the wheelbarrow without being exhausted, daring to touch the compost without disgust...), the political horizon that is emerging there, seems to be extremely centered on the topic of food production and the need to short food supply chains. It is to note that

the political discourse as statements about visions of the world or utopias to come is missing from the discursive space of these young gardeners.

However, in a paradoxical way, the „doing“ seems to replace the articulated political norm. As a newcomer in the garden, you are incited to experiment the new ideas you have concerning the garden with the encouraging motto: 'einfach machen' (= 'just do it now'). Through the daily 'doing', the capability to dare and concretise experimentations, subjectivation forms are taking place. One of its major features seems to be the integration of limits as a way to achieve self-fulfillment. Recycling, composting, making its own seeds, repairing a bicycle look like a form of acceptance and internalization of the idea that the world is limited. This can also be interpreted as a voluntary asceticism, some technologies of the self that change radically the forms of political actions until it makes disappear the classical distinction between conservation and emancipation. Labour and work seem therefore to be undifferentiated through these very individualised practices and political action might be directly grafted on them or rather in their gaps.

The nomadism of Parisian community gardens: Disorder or new urban order?

Kaduna-Eve Demailly (PhD in Geography, Laboratory of Social dynamics and spatial reconstruction, UMR LADYSS)

Community gardens appeared in France in the late 1990s. They have been described as new, fashionable green spaces that manifest concern for the environment and a desire for leisure, togetherness and grassroots involvement in the management of urban spaces (Baudelet, Basset and Le Roy, 2008; Bourdeau-Lepage, 2013). Their rise in French cities has been largely encouraged by municipalities, which have placed land, including wasteland, at the disposal of associations.

In response to the success of these collective gardens, the city of Paris offers replacement sites to associations in cases where gardens have only been loaned temporarily. The displacement of these gardened sites has led to the emergence of the 'nomadic' garden, which is the central focus of this paper. Here the nomadic garden is defined as a moving urban space, gardened by urban residents under a contract agreement with the landowner. I draw on the study of three Parisian nomadic gardens characterized by different trajectories (Charmante Petite Campagne Urbaine and P'tit bol d'air in the nineteenth *arrondissement*; la Goutte Verte in the eighteenth *arrondissement*). I present findings based on a methodological corpus that includes observations, questionnaires and interviews conducted between July 2010 and May 2013 during my doctoral fieldwork (Demailly, 2014).

This presentation first examines the nomadic garden as a channel of various forms of disorder(s):

- Semantic disorder: the very phrase 'nomadic garden' appears contradictory.
- Territorial disorder: the nomadism of gardens induces a displacement of plants and gardeners, which causes tensions and questions the continuity of these territories.
- Political disorder (governance): community gardens are the outcome of a co-production between municipality, associations and residents. However, the latter see the mobility of these gardens as a constraint imposed by municipal actors.

Having discussed these disorders, the paper will investigate nomadic gardens as territories of the sustainable city and tools of the 'malleable city' (Gwiadzinski, 2013). Indeed, the emergence of temporary uses and the nomadism of these gardens suggest we should rethink the territorial and temporal dynamics of the contemporary urban production and consider the implementation of a new urban order. While adjusting to the short-term demands of urban development, the mobility of community gardens might enable the long-term perpetuation of temporary uses.

The garden as form and/or productive space: Collective gardens as landscaping projects?

Cloé Jareno (Landscape engineer, PhD candidate under the CIFRE industrial agreement programme, University Aix-Marseille, Interdisciplinary Laboratory on Environment and Urbanism EA-LIEU, environmental association Scop SaluTerre), **Brice Dacheux-Auzière** (Government-licensed engineer, PhD candidate at the national landscaping school, Marseille, Laboratory for research on landscaping LAREP), **Jean Noël Consalès** (Urbanist and geographer, senior lecturer at the Institute for regional urbanism and planning, University Aix-Marseille, Laboratory of Time, spaces, languages, Southern and Mediterranean Europe, UMR TELEMME, CNRS)

Ecosystem functions and services are essential to our understanding of the social, cultural, economic and environmental impact of collective gardens (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, 2005). However, they do not alone enable us to grasp the conception of these rapidly expanding spaces in cities on the path towards sustainability. Beyond their utilitarian dimension (Maris, 2014), the concepts of functions and services reduce collective gardens to the status of mere tools or props. They promote garden forms that have little to do with creativity and the creation of unique places, instead highlighting tried and tested and reproducible methodologies and techniques design to fulfil specific expectations. In the process, they favour content over container, and the productive dimension of the garden over its form. The ontological dimension of gardens (Assunto, 1973) is not limited to practical, efficient, material and concrete effects. In practice, form is often a blind spot in collective garden projects. Functions and services are leitmotifs that are considered both as means and ends of these actions, often leading contractors to propose conventional designs that they must implement with meagre funds. In the absence of urban and landscape quality, functions and services, important as they may be, cannot alone foster the common good in gardens. It is therefore up to the professionals, starting with landscapers, to fill this gap and turn the rise of collective gardens into actual landscaping projects (Corajoud, 2000). This paper examines how landscapers work on collective gardens and seeks to establish whether they develop specific projects to suit their needs. It asks if and how they manage to reconcile form and content in the conception of a single place bringing together the immaterial and material dimensions of the garden. In order to address these questions, we provide reflexive elements allowing us to distinguish between the *jardin* (i.e., the garden as a place and a concept) and the *potager* (the garden's contents; vegetables, fruit, etc.). Beyond this distinction, we most importantly endeavour to define collective gardens as places of hybridization requiring adapted approaches. We study this hybridization in landscaping project (*projet de paysage*) terms. This theoretical and practical framework is indeed particularly conducive to the analysis of the approaches developed by some designers of collective gardens and their evolutions. We observed the growing impact of considerations relating to biodiversity (ecological engineering) and the concept of *maîtrise d'usage* (consulting residents on projects; *médiation*

paysagère or landscape mediation). The paper draws on studies conducted within the framework of the French national research agency's JASSUR programme (ANR-12-VBDU- 0011 on urban community gardens) in seven French urban areas (Lille, Greater Lyon, Marseille, Greater Nancy, Nantes, Paris/Ile-de-France, Greater Toulouse) and on ongoing PhD fieldwork in Toulouse, Bordeaux and Marseille.

Community gardens in Strasbourg as places of limited sharing

Kenjiro Muramatsu (Associate researcher, Laboratory of Social dynamics and spatial reconstruction, UMR LADYSS)

In Strasbourg, community gardens (*jardins partagés*) have emerged in parallel with the so-called *politique de la ville* (urban policy addressing unemployment, isolation, insecurity). They belong to a French and Alsatian tradition of policies supporting gardening for social purposes such as family gardens (*jardins familiaux*) and *jardins d'insertion*, designed to promote social integration (Jonas, 1980; Cérézuelle, *Les jardins d'aujourd'hui*, 1999). Forms of social intervention have become increasingly diversified and localized since the 1980s, relying on civil society actors and associative circles (Estèbe, 1998). Community gardens are now informed by other societal concerns, including forms of consumption, the environment and nature in the city. This has resulted in the diversification and hybridization of garden forms since the late 2000s in Strasbourg (Muramatsu, 2016 forthcoming). This paper considers how community gardens respond to these demands from politicians and grassroots actors alike, and how they are developed (or not).

Different gardens will be compared, classified according to their socio-spatial settings (in social housing estates, mixed areas, and gentrified neighbourhoods). While each garden strongly reflects its social and local setting and social inequalities, the theme of ecology often put forward by the actors tend to overlook these realities. Some gardens that might be perceived as 'successes' are actually places where sharing is socially quite limited, while others I consider as 'failures' may even worsen social inequality in their neighbourhood.

This paper argues that the key factor in social performance is the commitment of grassroots actors, encouraging local social interaction around the garden. This social 'work' has a high cost in terms of human involvement.

In the past few years the city of Strasbourg has mostly focused on offering small, monitored family gardens called 'collective urban vegetable gardens' (*potagers urbains collectifs*). This appears to be an implicit reflection of the difficulties encountered by associative community gardens. The latter's social and ecological performances seem too weak and ambiguous to be fully recognized. As their ecological and community ideals tend to clash with the need to adjust to social and local realities, they face the challenge of finding how to use these discourses as pertinent tools for desirable social and environmental change.

Session 4 : Order and disorder in the garden through the prism of biodiversity

Moderating : **Michel Hoff**, botanist, University lecturer, Université de Strasbourg

The concept of ecology in a historical orchard/vegetable garden: The King's vegetable garden in Versailles

Pauline Frileux (ethnologist and botanist, university lecturer, LAREP, Ecole nationale supérieure du paysage de Versailles (National School for Landscape Studies))

Jean-Baptiste de La Quintinie (1624 – 1688), gardener and agronomist, sowed a great deal of inventiveness during five years before the transformation took place: the "Stinking Pond" ("le Marais Puant" in French), a marshland on the outskirts of the Palace of Versailles, turned into a vegetable and fruit garden which was not only productive, but also innovative and aesthetic. The King's vegetable garden, undoubtedly influenced by architecture, has barely changed since it was created in 1683: there is a central pond, sixteen vegetable "patches" surrounded by terraces (for visitors to walk on), vaulted passageways (for the gardeners and the storage of gardening equipment), and high light-coloured walls which demarcate small fruit gardens and protect them from the wind. The thoroughness of the general design is reinforced by the trees' architecture (in espalier and free-standing espalier). The aim of fruit tree pruning is not only productive (efficiency, precocity, tasting value), but also aesthetic: "the sight of a pruned tree must be more enjoyable than the sight of an unpruned one" (La Quintinie, 1690). Today, the King's vegetable garden holds 68 different sorts of fruit; it is one of the most remarkable vegetable gardens in France.

As the city of Versailles expanded, the garden retained its primary purposes (production and leisure). Since the creation of the Ecole d'Horticulture in 1874, it also has a teaching mission. Since 1991, sightseeing tours are organized for the general public. Visitors are expecting to see old varieties, delicious fruits, ecological and innovative cultivation practices. Still, due to decades of intensive and polluting cultivation, the soil suffered, and the trees planted by La Quintinie are now long gone. Most of the varieties that are currently cultivated are modern creations. Some of the fruits cultivated during the seventeenth century were recently reintroduced, for example the Poire Bon Chrétien d'Hiver (a sort of pear), one of La Quintinie's favourite fruits.

In the King's vegetable garden, ecology has only recently become a concern. These new perspectives come from a new generation of gardeners and a law which bans the use of synthetic fertilizers on a short-term basis. This paper analyses the evolution of both cultivation practices and what the gardeners in the King's vegetable garden think about nature, in relation to the emergence of an agro-ecological model.

The ecological cultivation of a historical orchard/vegetable garden is not self-evident. Like La Quintinie, the new gardeners explore new growing methods, new varieties and new landscape forms. The "green carpet", emblematic of the French formal garden, has now been replaced by mixed cultures (flowers and vegetables). The diversity of the vegetable garden reminds us of a theatre stage, a profusion of plants which finds its origins in permaculture. Which forms should we prioritize if we want to reconcile the conservation of biodiversity and the conservation of our historical heritage (shady gardens)? What cultivation practices can we implement without risking the original

design's disappearance? In Versailles, a new aesthetics is taking shape under the landscapers' knowing and questioning glance.

Gardening and Ecology : the look of the press, on 1950-2000

Stéphane WANDRIESSE (Doctorant en 3e année Histoire contemporaine Université d'Angers, Centre de Recherches Historiques de l'Ouest)

During the second half of the XXth century in France, the domestic garden is characterized by profound transformations in its design as well in its practice. For instance the kitchen garden is a totally artificial place where you produce for yourself and by yourself vegetables, aromatics herbs and small fruits. The kitchen garden offers to the gardener a context of permanent interaction with an environment to be adapted, transformed and modified.

During the second half of the XXth century, the practices of gardening are questioned by the new representation of the relations between man and nature, proposed by ecology which etymologically has to do with home and garden. The garden is indeed an extension of the house. The gestures of the gardener, the inputs and the harvested products of the kitchen garden evolve under the influence of the ecology.

The change is neither abrupt nor linear but occurs in a dialectic of "the order" and the "disorder", the former and the new, the healthy and the harmful...The confrontation between the opposite elements finds itself in the press magazine and the daily press dedicated to gardening. These media are not only vectors of information and advice. They are also influencers of standards for the readers. They can indeed embody a kind of benchmark model for their readers.

This communication would like to show how the press magazine and the daily press seized the ecology between 1950 and 2000. The hypothesis of our approach is that these media appropriated the green dimension in variable proportions and spread new standards on the subject without escaping editorial paradoxes which can be explained by the diversity of their readerships. We want to question the historic construction of these ecological standards from their social, scientific and medical contents. We want to know whether these standards are traditional or new. In other words, we will study how these magazines and newspapers maintain some forms of "order" or on the contrary which "disorders" they come to propagate, to answer their sensitive or probably (becoming) sensitive readerships to the ecology. Our sources mobilize a corpus of gardening magazines aimed at the general public ("*Rustica*", "*Mon jardin et ma maison*" and "*L'ami des jardins et de la maison*") and also articles of daily press or publications of municipalities.

Three periods can be distinguished. The first one shows shy attempts in a context little concerned by the ecology (from the 1950s at the end of 1970s) when the obsession of the productive profitability and the rationalization dominate. Indeed, this period is marked by "the order" and the tradition. The cultivated spaces are very strict. Some articles deal with hygienist questions about food and health. The media maintain representations relative to the distribution of the social roles and their sexual cleavages (Sir in the kitchen garden and Madam in the kitchen cooking, keeping or transforming the harvested products). At the same time, the family gardens are perceived as a source of esthetic disorder by town planners. That can plunge municipalities in embarrassment. These are taken in a

certain contradiction between their wills of development and their social concern (the elderly who cultivate the collective gardens have only few or no retirement pensions).

The second period (in the hinge of 1970s in 1980s) is marked by the emergence of the ecology in articles and rising columns, carried by new collaborators worried about an organic production and to answer a part of the readership. It is the questioning of an established tradition, a contesting or a critic of the consumer society and its limits. So, alternative practices appear from 1968 and especially during the end of 1970s.

Finally, the third period, after 1990, is marked by the sustainable registration in the editorial landscape of an open meaning of the ecology through a generalization of the columns dedicated to the organic gardening. A new editorial "order" becomes established, succeeding certain temporary "disorder" to result in a composite order, synonymic of a typical editorial compromise of "green-light" France. The practices of organic gardening are often connected with numerous educational and social projects of integration with nature among which magazines and daily press offer a developing vision. The actions stamped of a certain militancy are presented as possible outcomes for multiple problems affecting the society (unemployment, social destruction, social exclusion bound to the handicap, the break with the living world for the urban).

In the edge of the XXIth century, the ecology joins reasoned practices, spread by the various forms of press used by this research.

Community gardens in the city: diversity and potential regarding urban biodiversity

Francesca Di Pietro (University Lecturer, joint research unit (UMR) CITERES), **Lotfi Mehdi** (UMR LIVE and UMR CITERES), **Marion Brun** (Teaching Assistant, Ecole de la Nature et du Paysage (School for Nature and Landscape), Blois), **Christiane Weber** (Research Supervisor, CNRS UMR LIVE), **Wissal Selmi** (Doctor in Development Science, UMR LIVE)

In France, individual housing represents 1.6 million hectares. According to P. Girardin, lawns cover 30 % of this surface, vegetable gardens 14 % and ornamental gardens 12 % (Girardin 2002). Vegetable or ornamental gardens are vectors for potentially invasive alien species, but they can also serve as biodiversity reservoirs. To analyse their effects on plant communities, we should consider managing them on a wider and more practical scale (Goddard et al., 2010).

We are currently working on community gardens, as they are bigger and potentially more efficient in terms of preserving urban biodiversity. From a town planning point of view, community gardens (this designation evolved throughout the twentieth century: "workers' gardens" at first, then "family gardens"...) have been used in a culturalist urban planning approach to palliate the industrial city nuisance (Werquin & Demangeon 1997). Although they gained popularity in the last few years, their ecological and landscape characteristics remain largely unknown (Consalès 2003), mainly because urban ecology decided to focus on individual gardens (Goddard et al., 2009).

As part of a research project sponsored by the CNRS (French National Centre for Scientific Research), community gardens in urban areas have been selected as one of three elements with a strong development potential (the two others being river spaces and peri-urban agricultural areas) with

regard to a form of environment conducive to urban development. We chose the mid-sized urban area of Tours, through which two rivers run (the Loire and the Cher), as our study site.

Our work consists in defining the community gardens' space diversity. To do so, we need to assess the situation of these gardens in terms of location (in reference to their position next to geographic features within the urban area, such as the river corridor or the city centre), managing organization, land status, spatial structure (block size, diversity of the existing plant formations, equipment, well-travelled roads). They also need to find their place in town planning documentation. We will also address these spaces' recent history and outlook for development.

We first give a definition of the term "community garden". We then present our fieldwork, during which we inventoried community gardens in the urban area of Tours, their diversity - and its main results. In Tours as in other cities, urban pressure, a mix of redensification of the existing fabric and extension of the urban spread, is driving community gardens back to the city margins. However, we show that the location of family gardens (for example in flood-prone areas or near a fast lane) is still linked to the quality of some plots of land, unfit for construction (housing or industrial areas). We confirm that family gardens, which are temporary accommodations subject to the strength of the urban pressure, serve as a land reserve. A thorough analysis of community gardens' contribution to urban biodiversity could help put an emphasis on this habitat's benefits.

Residents/gardeners in private gardens, source of biodiversity / Case study in three municipalities at the heart of the urban area of Paris

Mathilde Riboulot-Chetrit (Doctoral Student in Geography, Université Paris I, joint research unit (UMR) LADYSS)

Managing and preserving biodiversity is easier thanks to urban private gardens. On one hand, they are potential spaces for interesting species and environments (Goddard et al. 2010). On the other hand, they are also very popular among the residents (Bhatti and Church 2000).

The domestic gardens' design and maintenance are influenced by their relationship to the resident. The way they use it is also particularly important. The residents lay out their gardens and contribute to their emphasis. On these patches of land - to which they fully commit themselves -, residents are both actors and users. The gardens' layout as well as their composition can be influenced by the role they are given by the residents. First and foremost, the residents wish to create a space where nature is both "beautiful" and brought under control. It has indeed been proven that aesthetics are a decisive factor regarding the organization of a domestic garden and planting decisions (Clergeau 2011). Another factor related to social dynamics (for self and others) adds to this natural and aesthetic factor. Several projects underline the fact one's garden is directly linked to the representation of self. The garden is a space for other people to see; therefore, the resident/gardener has to care for it (Dubost 1997). Furthermore, individuals often compare their garden to their neighbours'. The garden's organization can be the result of an invisible pressure and a homogenization effect between gardens, a way to match the maintenance standards of a group of residents living in the same residential area (Frileux 2013).

Thus, can the combination of residents' usages and gardening activities be compatible with the management of biodiversity? In other words: can the garden's functions (originately, a space often considered as a "clean" territory) be compatible with biodiversity conducive to gardening practices? Finally, what do the residents think about these practices?

The results presented in this paper come from a doctoral research focusing on the residents of three municipalities at the heart of the urban area of Paris (Paris, Sceaux and Champs-sur-Marne) and their private gardens - adjacent to individual housing. This research is based on a database containing (among other things) 585 questionnaires and 110 pictures taken by the respondents themselves.

First, we will discuss the multidimensional relationship between a resident and his garden, in which cleanliness and aesthetics are two decisive criteria. Furthermore, the garden's functions and uses condition gardening practices: the resident has to tend his garden regularly if he wants it to look neat. Some gardening practices are conducive to biodiversity: maintaining an uncultivated patch in the garden, mowing less, keeping more spontaneous vegetation etc. However, the residents see them as disorder-prone, antithetic to the "clean" nature they want to take care of. Finally, thanks to an indicator set up as part of this thesis, we were able to measure the potential biodiversity of these private gardens. At the crossroads of social and ecological issues, we can assess whether the domestic gardens under study - territories seen as neat patches tended by residents/gardeners - are potential spaces for the development of biodiversity.

Urban gardens trapped in the frame of ecological corridors? ("TVB" in French, blue and green corridor)

Sandrine Glatron (Research scientist, CNRS, DynamE lab., Strasbourg)

In France, the green corridors' policy - issued from the Grenelle de l'environnement (an open multi-party debate) - focuses on spatial planning in order to fight against the weakening of biodiversity while preserving or restoring ecological corridors. The planners want these corridors - whether in rural or in urban areas - to offer as much continuity as possible. This green corridors design is based on the identification of "reservoir" zones and potential vegetal links (whether they already exist or need to "be completed"): when it comes to natural elements, urban areas don't necessarily present comprehensive resources, and the green corridor has to build itself upon potentially tenuous natural spaces. If we want to analyze the entirety of the spaces which can be used to design the green corridor - for example a cash cycle without any distinction between private and public - , the consideration of agricultural spaces in this design seems to be important. We refer to Strasbourg as an example, and we show the difficulties that can emerge if the gardens are not taken into account in the planning of an urban green corridor (whether or not they are classified as "agricultural spaces", which are always part of the "subframes" identified in the characterization of the urban green and blue corridor). Even if its description is almost self-evident, the integration of gardens and agricultural spaces in natural areas creates several difficulties - in terms of classification but also in terms of functionality - : are gardens able to participate in preserving biodiversity (and relevantly so)? First, we show that this integration remains limited, before we present the potential solutions to this problem and the way they can be implemented.