

Gardens of Resistance

Gilles Clément, New Poetics, and Future Landscapes

Translator's Introduction to Gilles Clément

JONATHAN SKINNER

According to the authors of a text on “Wild Plants in the City,” published by the Arnold Arboretum, “The curious gardens of wild greenery that penetrate cracks in city pavement and grow lushly on old building lots are produced primarily by plants which have immigrated from overseas. . . . This continual invasion of seeds helps explain the speed with which weeds can colonize a bare site, even when there are few other plants in view. . . . Within three or four years, an undisturbed lot will be wildly overgrown.”¹ In his paradigm-shifting essay on (so-called) weeds, *Éloge des vagabondes* (In Praise of Vagabonds), French gardener Gilles Clément encourages us to adopt something of the perspective of wild, opportunistic plants (sometimes called ruderals) that are quick to colonize disturbed and abandoned spaces and are, Clément insists, the emissaries of life itself.²

Clément's reframing—through which a parking lot and an alpine talus field are seen as having more in common, for the ruderal species, than either does with “nature”—is more functional than romantic and comes from decades of practice as a gardener. Clément is one of France's most successful gardeners, responsible for the gardens in the Parc André Citroën and of the Grande Arche at

La Défense, in Paris, the gardens of the Château de Blois, the Parc Henri Matisse in Lille, the Mediterranean Gardens of the Domaine du Rayol, and his own garden La Vallée (in the Creuse), among other celebrated creations. Clément is also France's foremost theorist of gardening, or certainly its most provocative—ever since he proposed that gardeners add the seemingly paradoxical cultivation of fallow or “waste” lands to their repertoire.³ In the same essay, “La friche apprivoisée,” Clément suggests that in order to work with (rather than against) the powerful flux of life, gardeners might have to part ways with ecology, which encloses itself in a “vacuum of native plant groups,” a thought developed at further length in his short book *Éloge des vagabondes* (30).⁴

Éloge des vagabondes might be read as a manifesto of vitalism, or a plea for humanist values in the sphere of ecology; there are good arguments for and against either reading. (Ever since the presidential campaign of Nicolas Sarkozy appropriated the phrase “humanist ecology,” Clément has backed off from this approach—in 2007 he even renounced all engagement with public and private service in France, except for “overt projects of resistance.” One could even argue that Clément's practice is posthumanist, if by that term we mean something other than the uncritical “trans-humanist” celebration of technology.) What Clément has to say about weeds is neither cynical nor ironic, nor is he an idealist: his thinking about the natural world is grounded in patient and steady observation. Clément writes out of his experimental practice in La Vallée, an abandoned farmland he has been gardening since 1977, as well as his extensive experience collaborating with city planners, architects, and private commissions on a range of scales, from the intimate pocket garden to the massive city park. He also writes as an inveterate traveler, a “planetary flâneur” whose information on plants comes from a dauntingly global range of references. He also *writes*.

It is hard to say how my own interest in Clément might have been sparked had I not run across his writings—specifically, his *Manifeste du tiers paysage* (Manifesto of the Third Landscape) in the bookstore of the Jardins des Tuileries in Paris. Clément has published novels, fables, and philosophical dialogues, as well as es-

says on a variety of subjects in addition to gardening: insects, dogs, clouds, economics, land art, politics, and so forth. It is my hope that the translation from *Éloge des vagabondes* (which follows this essay) communicates something of the playful, and not always literal, spirit of his writing. Clément's movement between his writing and his interventions in a living, changing landscape points the way toward a poetics of the *khora* (interstices) crossing disciplinary boundaries as well as that boundary, so sacred to academia, between theory and practice.⁵ *Movement* is the key word here, as the boundary remains charged and dynamic in Clément's crossings—not a mimetic mirror of didacticism and moral example, but an engagement with life-forms as inventive as they are amoral. This is not the practice of a “return to the land,” but a human-centered commitment to landscape beyond the human, beyond the pastoral dyad of rural and urban.

Landscape artists who write, and who write well, with a poetics (Frederick Law Olmsted, Robert Smithson, Ian Hamilton Finlay, Gilles Clément), make a compelling case for the extension of writing by other means—as if their landscapes, gardens, and earth works were poems without books, written in the elements and in living matter, merely extended or refracted onto the page of the essay. Their works and writings encourage us to *read* landscape, a critical step in the ecopoetics of making ourselves at home in the world, with alternative (Clément would call them *humanist*) grammars, counter-texts to the interpretive grids of Western taxonomic knowledges. Poets who push at the limits of the (Western alphabetic) book and who reject poetry's commitment to the “interior” life of the mind, who might even consider such obsessive interiority a kind of illness, also approach poetry as the extension, perhaps, of gardening by other means. From William Carlos Williams's “Sunday in the Park” (*Paterson*) to Charles Olson's “composition by field,” from John Cage's mesostics to the wordscapes of the Noigandres poets, from Louis Aragon's *Paysan de Paris* to Edouard Glissant's *errances*, from Raul Zurita's sky and ground writings to mIEKAL aND's hypercultural Internet-based “plant languages,” from Christopher Dewdney's *The Natural History* to bpNichol's and Steve McCaffery's *Rational Geomancy*, the book is

ready to meet the Planetary Garden, through highly varied practices of space in writing. (Clément's notion of the Planetary Garden, emerging from a recognition that the earth is finite, calls for more involved forms of responsibility and for collaboration with the global wanderings of species rather than for bioregional control.) The practices of some poets, such as those of Cecilia Vicuña or Susan Howe, seem to emerge from the very space between books and the earth, not an extension of writing to sculpture, or vice versa, but a poetics that refuses to settle on either side of the boundary.

If gardens can be healing, one might say that many gardens begin with a diagnosis. Clément notes that preservationist efforts assimilate "what humanity does with culture to its deep roots," revealing a perverse investment of energy "entirely directed against its own biological bases" (*EV*, 22). The "event" of biology teaches us that taxonomic orders make little sense without an understanding of what happens *between* their living elements. The gardener's response to the extinction crisis is to seek to preserve or increase the number and diversity of functionalities and agencies, not "species." Formalism and a persistent return to architecture, as the first resort of spatial thinking, prolong the illness, with their rearguard action of holding back natural disorder and the dynamic processes of entropy.⁶

Clément's work is ahead of its time yet also belongs to the "Deleuzian century": in its sympathies with the return to materials and process of the 1970s (post-Robert Smithson) art movements, the validation of difference as an active constituting principle of identity, post-Bergsonian emphases on a metaphysics of time (rather than or as much as space), and the recovery of a non-reductive Darwinism. Currently, as I will discuss, he seems to be engaged in an institutional critique of mainstream ecology. Darwin himself, according to immunologist Pierre Sonigo, was the first to return "the history of life to an adventure where the subject does not designate an isolatable individual but heterogeneous populations of agents with entangled interests, interdependent and always at risk."⁷ The subject can only find itself in displacement, just as humanity might best be located in the places where it seems most out of step with its environment, in the lagging temporalities of vacant

lots. Clément's response to the diagnosis of human morbidity is to pursue the "management of movement as a mode of investigating displacement," which will, he asserts, lead one "to integrate existence into biological movement and to a more fully competent struggle with self" (*EV*, 30).

In the entropology of cultural contact, where disorder increases as cultures migrate away from their centers, a map of cultural locations might resemble a garden in movement, teeming with differential times and spaces. As we zoom in, the most compelling critiques of the Planetary Garden may emerge from poets writing in displaced languages—poets of postcolonial resistance and diaspora who refuse preservation, the fusion to roots, yet who also refuse displacement, without an investigation or counter-practice. As I will discuss, the Planetary Garden entails a certain hospitality to "invasive" species, whose displacements are neither culturally nor politically neutral. Myung Mi Kim's "kind of strange autobiography," *Dura*, avoids the "I" in clashing interlingual valences.⁸ Craig Santos Perez's map poems in *from Unincorporated Territory [saina]* weave a pattern of Chamorro words at schematic points of erasure, where U.S. military bases occupy the map.⁹ The language refuses to go away. What is the brown tree snake—whose devastating assault on Guam Perez also documents—but biological movement weaponized? Perez's and Kim's spatial, page-based, interlingual poetics offer strategies for what Clément will call "gardens of resistance."¹⁰

Clément's response unfolds on plateaus that he has developed, successively and fully, in dimensions as pedagogical and political as they are poetic: the Garden in Movement, the Planetary Garden, and the Third Landscape. The Garden in Movement was discovered when Clément noticed, in gardening his fallow field, "that one sometimes had to interrupt the course of certain strata to maintain the richness of the environment and prevent its systematic progress toward a forest" (*OEL*, 28). The Garden in Movement gets its name from "the physical movement of plant species over the terrain. . . . Flowers sprouting in a path present the gardener with a choice: to conserve the path or the flowers" (*GC*, 19). The gardener works *with* this movement (evidently choosing, as far as pos-

sible, to conserve the flowers). Rather than plan the garden ahead of time on a drafting table with lists of species, she helps the garden to emerge in collaboration with the functional inventions of plants.

Is this the gardening equivalent of Robert Creeley's "Form is never more than an extension of content"? If New Formalism and the confessional lyric locate poetry in the aesthetics of green ideology, a nature leased to suburb planners and the National Park heritage system, then open poetics of the New American lineage may have found their match, or be outmatched, in these unfinished moving landscapes and vacant lots.

Where do the plants come from? Enter the Planetary Garden. Clément proposed an "austral garden" for the *Domaine du Rayol*—a property on the Mediterranean coast acquired by the *Conservatoire du Littoral* to be opened to the public—that collects landscapes (rather than specimens) from the Southern Hemisphere. *Domaine du Rayol* features landscapes from South Africa, New Zealand, Chile, and Australia, in addition to flora from California, the Canary Islands, and China. What these landscapes all have in common is their association with a "Mediterranean biome"; together, they make up a "planetary index," one of the biomes mapped on Clément's "theoretical continent," which groups the planet's major climate areas and their vegetation.

The Planetary Garden signifies both Earth seen from space and the "garden" that crops up on a bit of vacant land, welcoming "vagabond" species. The Planetary Garden means that the earth is finite and its humans need to get over their alienation, to learn responsible gardening (doing more by doing less). *Parc André Citroën* includes a Garden in Movement, whose temporary designs are improvised on the spot, in a collaboration between gardener and the plants of the Planetary Garden.

Clément qualifies this kind of terrain as Third Landscape: a space of indecision where humanity steps back from the evolutionary process—the Third Landscape includes abandoned terrain, transitional zones, wastelands, swamps, moors, bogs, but also the edges of roads, shores, railway embankments (GC, 23). They are in-between spaces—neither the first landscape of preservation nor the cultivated second landscape—that host the genetic reservoir of

the planet, spaces of the future: “Third Landscape refers to third estate (and not to third world). Space expressing neither power nor submission to power.”¹¹ As the authors of “Wild Plants in the City” demonstrate, when we notice the Third Landscape we begin to see the wild greenery of the city, and vice versa. (New York City’s new High Line Park, a project of Field Operations and Diller Scofidio + Renfro, offers, in places, the paradox of a *designed* Third Landscape.) Clément points out that species occupy niches in time as well as space.¹² Christopher Dewdney’s *The Natural History*, with its “Bibliography of Creatures,” its cross-kingdom and phylum erotics, attends to nocturnal and interseasonal niches of the Third Landscape.¹³

In “Ambient Alternative,” a fourth plateau sketched on his website, Clément rejects ecology and distances his planetary federation, or Planetary Garden, from the neoliberal free trade zone (and from the social muzak of “world culture”) by leading a call for “gardens of resistance” (“AA,” 10–11). Clément rejects ecology but not natural history: landscape architect Kathryn Gustafson, who studied with Clément, has remarked on “his knowledge of plants, far superior to that of other *paysagistes* or landscape architects” (GC, 256). To cultivate the Planetary Garden is to aid forces that would undermine, circumvent, and ultimately tear down a formidable wall between the economic north and south, the wall that girds the developing carbon economy (a wall dramatically exposed in the collapse of the 2009 climate change talks in Copenhagen). Similarly, Edward Burtynsky’s photographic work, in its extractions from the canon of the Western landscape sublime, helps us visually to connect “wilderness areas” and “nature preserves” with massive hydropower projects, coal fields, open pit mines, and industrial installations halfway around the globe.¹⁴ The insidious flows of “sustainable development” (i.e., development, pure and simple) link these areas. The Third Landscape subtracts from development with a precarious hold on terrain. The “ecobarrier” that Rio de Janeiro’s state government has begun to build around the city’s favelas—allegedly to prevent development in what remains of the original Atlantic rain forests (5 percent)—besides whatever else we might say about the practice (and about that word “ecobar-

rier,” symbolizing the wall of “sustainable development”) is also an attempt to reclaim abandonment and effectively to wipe out the Third Landscape.¹⁵

For Clément, the future is shaped not by global consciousness (the neofascist deep ecology at one extreme) nor by sustainable development (the neoliberal growth model at the other) but by a *global conscience*, cultivated in the face of the Third Landscape and the Garden in Motion. The resistance entails an atomized “system” of increasingly self-sufficient, local economies—whose strength lies in their subtraction from the network, traded for an “ambient” connectedness. These differ from temporary autonomous zones in their symbiotic relation to landscape, a reversible dependency between gardener and garden: “Symbiosis refers to the absolute interdependence of two beings or of two linked biological systems. Humanity depends entirely on the diversity it exploits but in the course of evolution it reaches a stage where the environment itself—hence diversity—becomes dependent on humanity” (“AA,” 14). We must face the thought that the garden will only ever be as diverse as its gardeners. Clément’s vision opens, on the one hand, to the betweenness of atmosphere, an ambient heavenly connection predicated on radical availability, and, on the other, to values of local, sustained and reciprocal offgrid communication (see his cloud journal, *Nuages*). Poetry of global conscience is committed locally, to gardens of resistance beyond affiliations of avocation: have you done some poetry in your community lately?

Éloge des vagabondes presents an early draft of Clément’s critique of ecology. In some respects, the essay is a first attempt at a synthesis of the different plateaus of Clément’s practice. While there are some good summaries of Clément’s work—most notably *Gilles Clément: Une écologie humaniste* and the associated selection of writings, *Où en est l’herbe: Réflexions sur le jardin planétaire* (both assembled and edited by Louisa Jones), and, in English, *Planetary Gardens: The Landscape Architecture of Gilles Clément* (edited by Alessandro Rocca)—Clément’s thought, like his gardens, seems most itself when in movement. *Éloge des vagabondes* offers a good introduction to this movement.¹⁶

Clément’s attack on bioregional purism has earned him his share

of enmity amid the landscape, gardening, and scientific communities—as well as, one should note, increasing fame and influence; the French national prize for landscape architecture was finally bestowed on him without his consent in 1999. There is no doubt that, simply doing what they have evolved to do well, weeds can be noxious. The giant hogweed, for instance, has been charged with blinding and disfiguring children, among other crimes (also known as the giant cow parsley, or *Berce des caucases*, it heads up Clément's list of beloved vagrants in *Éloge des vagabondes*). The tough yellow starthistle, covering 22 percent of California, surely limits species diversity in the state. One can speak of “successional degradation” of biodiversity in some abandoned spaces, though not without specifying the time scale used to judge “degradation.” Sea lamprey and Asian carp in the Great Lakes, Nile perch in Lake Victoria, rosy wolfsnails in Oahu, and brown tree snakes in Guam have wreaked havoc on endemic species. As always, in the short run, it is the subaltern, the economically and socially disadvantaged, and the occupied who will have the least to gain from a spread of weeds.

The counter-text to *Éloge des vagabondes* can be found in “Planet of Weeds,” a bleak assessment by David Quammen that depicts how the converse trends of habitat fragmentation and global transport of weedy species will combine to redouble the loss of biological diversity for a sixth extinction event: “human activities are likely to take their heaviest toll on [the many] narrowly endemic species, while causing fewer extinctions among [the smaller number of] species that are broadly adapted and broadly distributed.”¹⁷ The biological diversity of remaining forest patches, including warblers, those “shy creatures that can't tolerate edges,” will collapse. These forest patches will “essentially be tall woody gardens, not forests in the richer sense.” Quammen calls this “unavoidable prospect” a “Planet of Weeds”: “a crummier place, a lonelier and uglier place, and a particularly wretched place for the 2 billion people comprising Alan Durning's absolute poor” (“PW,” 69).

Quammen's essay is required reading for the curriculum of weeds. But I am more persuaded by Clément's rejection of the politics, economics, and ecology of fear. While Quammen leaves me

depressed and suicidal, Clément asks me to garden, to cultivate a “mental terrain” of hope in the Third Landscape—a mental reserve for resistance, standing up to the fear-mongering of the carbon economy. Quammen reifies the Western scientific denaturing of humanity, or dehumanization of nature, an object we do things *to* as it complies to human laws. Clément asks me to live *with* other species, ready to be surprised by them and to aid in their inventiveness.

Where and how does the Planetary Garden meet guerrilla gardening? Clément has integrated the Planetary Garden, to greater or lesser degrees, into most of his garden designs, whether on his own property of La Vallée, in the Parc André Citroën (Paris), or in the Parc Henri Matisse (Lille). As in the “Derborence Island” of Parc Henri Matisse, it can be an island preserve, separated from the rest of the park by several feet of elevation and left completely undisturbed (GC, 140–49). Or it can be the pell-mell meadow at the back of the property you “knock down” once a year, and maybe selectively influence with the scattering of certain seeds and the uprooting of certain undesirables. Or it can be a corner of a garden you leave open to the opportunists and pioneers, whose “invasive” propensities you limit through well-timed interventions, such as cutting the fading flowers before they drop their seed. The Planetary Garden, as I have noted, is anywhere vacant land is—also the preferred site of guerrilla gardening.

Except in some of its more permaculturally radical “bewilderings,” guerrilla gardening seems almost exclusively focused on the counter-productions of seeding, planting, and growing. From the guerrilla gardener’s perspective, weeds are the guardians of capital’s malign occupation and neglect. Every bit of weedscape cleared is so much garden planted and speculative capital reclaimed from exchange for use.¹⁸ But the weeds, I suggest, are miscast in this Manichaean mystery play or liberation narrative. They are our future and can be part of the resistance. Weeds can help us “increase our capacity to live the given materials of time and space less materially.”¹⁹ I suggest that guerrilla gardeners approach their abandoned spaces in a spirit of response rather than zealous occupation and recolonization. Leave a bit of room for the Planetary Garden. Like-

wise, I can imagine pure planetary gardeners, tending to patches of invasives through an intuitive mix of aesthetic, alimentary, and pharmacopoetic criteria. Gardens of resistance (short-loop circuits of production) will shape the landscapes of our need, but with the Planetary Garden let pleasure and response lead the way.

Lisa Robertson, in her essay on the blackberry, "*Rubus Armeriacus*: A Common Architectural Motif in the Temperate Mesophytic Region," gets us thinking about this introduced vagabond, which knows how to invent: "surface morphologies, as *Rubus* shows, include decay, blanketing and smothering, shedding, dissolution and penetration, and pendulous swagging and draping, as well as proliferative growth, all in contexts of environmental disturbance and contingency rather than fantasized balance."²⁰ Robertson's description of the "chaos of surfaces" is neither flippant nor without irony (she also calls *Rubus* the "dystopian epitome of the romance of botanical pattern as applied architectural decoration"); it is playful, "in a serious manner always however, and under a sense of responsibility." Planetary gardeners are "naturalists of the inessential," working a zone where "affect invades the center," in a "serious calling of style."

In Yedda Morrison's *Girl Scout Nation*, "Circles go uphill and down, making a pattern independent of statistical contours and abandoning patches in the corners of square fields to unwatered desolation. Rest stops and vistas arrange to make coherent events of car travel."²¹ Morrison's displacements and rearrangements excavate the fear factors of "bioperversity," singing the exploited body and its abandonments—perhaps the ultimate "third landscape," an occupied, claimed, counter-claimed, and abjected chaos of surfaces, functionalities, and unscripted, socially mediated (especially gendered) responses. It would seem that, in his exhortation that we "increase our capacity to live the given materials of time and space less materially," Clément calls for a conceptual practice. But can the conceptual poets learn to garden?

What might Clément's reception be within the literary community? As Clément writes of a field of *Oenothera* (evening primrose): "Some poets might find happiness contemplating them. Poets have round shoulders and a solid spine. We can clothe them with ir-

responsible desires" (*EV*, 176–77). Having worn an irresponsible desire for the happiness of a field of flowering weeds—or even just one “gray Sunflower poised against the sunset, / crackly bleak and dusty with the smut and smog / and smoke of olden locomotives in its eye”—I wondered how images of landscape function in poets’ happiness.²² Does the pastoral cliché that aligns green country landscapes with poetry (and, presumably, poetry’s dreams with green landscapes) hold any truth? Pursuing this question leads one to *Oenothera*, and eventually to Third Landscapes, even to Clément, whose Planetary Garden overgrows the co-dependent dyads of garden/wilderness, production/preserve, workweek/weekend, office/park, and others perhaps, including . . . prose/poem?

As a poet, amateur naturalist, and social thinker I am attracted to the Third Landscape, in its state of abandon. I wonder if others like me are compelled to document the here now/gone again life of vacant lots. If poetics (in the broadest sense, all-of-making) be the province of unsearchable documents and unclassifiable descriptions, might its uselessness find an application here?²³ What are our responsibilities in the production of space? Is it possible to resist this production (and consumption) by producing works? Or do the emphases then shift from the production of consumables to the production of eco-social spaces? What can poets, for instance, do by *not writing*? Like Clément’s “planetary gardener,” should we observe more and plant less?

Such commitment to life owes as much to Thoreau’s “wildness” as it does to Darwin’s “entangled bank.” I choose to think of Thoreau as an early poet of the Third Landscape, of the railway cut, his Walden no wilderness, his own social blindness a kind of cutaway on the social dimensions of landscape. But despite the fact Thoreau wrote about wildness rather than wilderness, “the wild” has become an obstacle to the development of global conscience. The remoteness of the wilderness ethic can feed technological and scientific mastery on a frontier of sublime abundance, whereas the Planetary Garden calls for daily responsibility, in a relation of reversible dependency. In *The End of the Wild*, Stephen Meyer makes a convincing case for retiring “the wild” as a framework for landscape management, emphasizing instead (as Clément

does) “biomes”—like an updated version of Wallace’s biogeographical “realms.”²⁴ We might even include “involuntary parks” like the DMZ on the Korean peninsula or Chernobyl’s “zone of alienation.”²⁵

Languages need to be a part of this gardening, especially the problem of English—out-of-control invasive or petrochemically, biotechnologically sustained monocrop? Or both? Aspects of the Internet (the “user friendly” face of a network that accelerates and stratifies flows of bodies and resources around the planet) might be viewed under the lens of Clément’s plateaus: how is that virtual “Planetary Garden” responding to English? I like that Cecilia Vicuña does not translate certain sections of her book-length drawn poem *Instan*, including the “explanatory” notes—pressing on an intermediate language, between Spanish, Quechua, Latin, English; between drawing and writing; and making the English reader do the work of coming halfway.²⁶

The Planetary Garden has to be a place of many languages, where the gardener is instructed by “mestizo poetics,” drawing strength from the tension between different views of poetry (avant garde marginality vs. social centrality; liberating language vs. effective speech; writing vs. multidimensional integration of the arts; colonial heritage vs. indigenous resistance) and from the clash between an ethos of separation and an ethos of interconnectedness. There is space for indigenous culture neither in the landscape of production nor of preservation. Hybridity but also a poetics of resistance emerge from the Third Landscape, “where dissonance operates through a clash perceived as unity.”²⁷ The spread of the network is inseparable from the feverish vigor of English, whose movement cannot be arrested but investigated, complicated in the space of its displacements, an entropology to the dissonant tones of life, which for Clément comes down—in a nonessential mode open to futurity—on the side of biological movement.

In this decade many indigenous cultures and languages around the world quite literally are making their last stand, as first landscapes fall with the languages that protect them (and vice versa); but cultures are also returning to sites abandoned by the extraction machine, as if to sound the left-behind, through Vallejo’s “aes-

thetics of dissonance,” shaping “the new chords that will produce those tones” of recovery, of human justice and reversible ecological dependency (*OB*, xxx). Not all these tones are on the page, and not all occur in the realm of aesthetics, nor of “environment” or “nature,” in the Western sense. The Third Landscape is a place of futurity on ancient ground writ by other languages: “when syllables do not connect, there’s room for the ancestors to be present.”²⁸

Vicuña’s *Oxford Book of Latin American Poetry* includes the *amereida*, “a collective of architect-poets that set out on a poetic journey traversing South America,” eventually to launch what has become the Open City, in Ritoque, Chile (*OB*, 362–65). The Planetary Garden, an assemblage of plants that has set out on a journey across North America, launches in our decaying inner cities “curious gardens of wild greenery that penetrate cracks in city pavement and grow lushly on old building lots” (“WPC,” 137). Who are the gardener-poets ready to join their tongues to these intermediate landscapes of the future?

Notes

1. Nancy Page and Richard Weaver, “Wild Plants in the City,” *Arnoldia* 43, no. 4 (1974): 137. Hereafter cited as “WPC.”
2. Gilles Clément, *Éloge des vagabondes: Herbes, arbres et fleurs à la conquête du monde* (Paris: Nil Éditions, 2002). Hereafter cited as *EV*. Unless otherwise attributed, all translations are my own.
3. Gilles Clément, *Où en est l’herbe* (Paris: Actes Sud, 2006), 28–29. Hereafter cited as *OEL*.
4. Gilles Clément, “La friche apprivoisée,” *URBA*, no. 209 (September 1985). See also *EV*, 30.
5. Among other disciplines, Clément is also an agronomic engineer, a botanist, an entomologist—he discovered the butterfly *Bunoeopsis clementii* in 1974 in Cameroon—and a professor who teaches landscape design at the École Nationale Supérieure du Paysage.
6. David Gissen’s proposal that architecture accommodate what he calls “subnatures”—the “other,” entropic natures embedded in our sometimes aggressively ecological and vitalistic designs—offers a welcome correction. Gissen, *Subnatures: Architecture’s Other Environments* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2009).

7. Louisa Jones, ed., in *Gilles Clément: Une écologie humaniste*, by Gilles Clément (Geneva: Aubanel, 2006), 14. Hereafter cited as GC.
8. Myung Mi Kim, *Dura* (1998; New York: Nightboat Books, 2008), x, 106.
9. Craig Santos Perez, *from Unincorporated Territory [saina]* (Richmond, CA: Omnidawn Publishing, 2010), 17, 38, 67, 83.
10. Gilles Clément. "L'alternative ambiente," *Carnets du Paysage*, no. 19: *Ecologies à l'oeuvre*, Spring/Fall 2010. Also available as a "copyleft" PDF at <http://www.gillesclement.com>. Hereafter cited as "AA."
11. Gilles Clément, *Manifeste du tiers paysage* (Paris: Éditions Sujet/Objet, 2004), 13.
12. Alain Roger, ed. *La théorie du paysage en France (1974-1994)* (Seysel, France: Éditions Champ Vallon, 1995), 394.
13. Christopher Dewdney, *The Natural History* (Toronto: ECW Press, 2002).
14. See Burtynsky's work at <http://www.edwardburtynsky.com> and also *Edward Burtynsky: Manufactured Landscapes*, dir. Jennifer Baichwal (2006, DVD; Zeitgeist Films, 2007).
15. Antonio Regalado, "Walls around Rio's Slums Protect Trees but Don't Inspire Much Hugging," *Wall Street Journal*, June 15, 2009.
16. Alessandro Rocca, ed., *Planetary Gardens: The Landscape Architecture of Gilles Clément* (Basel: Birkhäuser Verlag AG, 2008).
17. David Quammen, "Planet of Weeds: Tallying the Losses of Earth's Animals and Plants," *Harper's Magazine*, October 1998, 67. Hereafter cited as "PW."
18. Richard Reynolds, *On Guerrilla Gardening* (New York: Bloomsbury, 2008), 78, 83.
19. Gilles Clément, "Ralentir la ville: Un espace-temps recyclable" [Slowing Cities: A Recyclable Space-Time], PDF document, January 2010, 4, <http://www.gillesclement.com>.
20. Lisa Robertson, "Rubus Armeniacus: A Common Architectural Motif in the Temperate Mesophytic Region," in *Occasional Work and Seven Walks from the Office for Soft Architecture* (Astoria, OR: Clear Cut Press, 2003), 130.
21. Yedda Morrison, *Girl Scout Nation* (Chicago: Displaced Press, 2008), "Domination Pollen," 4. Hereafter cited as GSN.
22. Allen Ginsberg, "Sunflower Sutra," *Howl and Other Poems* (San Francisco: City Lights, 1956), 36.
23. See Oda Projesi's "Please Don't Step on the Green" (Istanbul), <http://yesillikler.blogspot.com>.

24. Stephen Meyer, *The End of the Wild* (Boston: Boston Review of Books, 2006).
25. See Mary Mycio, *Wormwood Forest : A Natural History of Chernobyl* (Washington, DC: Joseph Henry Press, 2005); and Alan Weisman, *The World without Us* (New York: Thomas Dunne Books, 2007).
26. Cecilia Vicuña, *Instan* (Berkeley, CA: Kelsey Street Press, 2002).
27. Cecilia Vicuña and Ernesto Livon Grosman, eds., *The Oxford Book of Latin American Poetry* (London: Oxford University Press, 2009), xxix. Hereafter cited as *OB*.
28. Cecilia Vicuña, "Weaving without a Given Direction," interview with Suzanne DuLany, *Bombay Gin* 36, no. 1 (2010): 133.