

To Explore an Alternative Urbanization That Is Different From the Present Through Historical Environment Preservation and Regeneration—An Interview With Aya Kubota



Aya KUBOTA*

Urban and Territorial Design Studies Unit, Department of Civil Engineering and Architecture, Tohoku University, Sendai 980-8579, Japan

***CORRESPONDING AUTHOR**

Address: 6-6-06, Aramaki Aoba District, Sendai City, Miyagi Prefecture, 980-8579, Japan
Email: ayakubota@tohoku.ac.jp

ABSTRACT

Aya Kubota stands out in studies of community development projects ranging from small historical towns to major metropolitan areas, covering topics on urban planning, townscape preservation, and environmental improvement and conservation, etc. In this interview, she shares thoughts on historical environment preservation and regeneration, taking her practices in Japan for example. From her point of view, local subjectivity is essential. The dynamism of localization supports the preservation and regeneration practices, presenting an alternative way of urbanization. There might be conflicts between the local and non-local subjects in such practices, but the conflicts are healthy. Regarding the preservation and utilization of the “Legacy of Catastrophe,” she holds that city planning taking historical environments into consideration is an important progress. It is vital to engage local residents in the planning process and weigh up what should be preserved, how should they be conveyed, and to whom. For the regeneration of urban historical resources, the most challenging aspect is the need to examine the current situations, where our lives and ways of life have been completely influenced by external forces, and reevaluate our values. Although there are always risks associated with professional involvement, it is necessary to take some measures to preserve or repair the historical environments, in which process the ability to think as own self as the local residents is an important ability.

HIGHLIGHTS

- Local subjectivity is essential in historical environment preservation and regeneration
- Urban planning considering the historical environment is an important progress
- The lack of ways to avoid urbanization is probably the biggest obstacle to preserving historical environment
- The ability to think as the own self as the locals is important when engaging in historical environment preservation

KEYWORDS

Historical Environment;
Preservation and Regeneration;
Urbanization;
Localization;
Local Subjectivity;
Japan;
Cultural Landscape

INTERVIEWED DATE

2023-07-15

EDITED BY

Ying WANG, Yuting GAO, Xiang ZHOU

TRANSLATED BY

Ying WANG

Introduction of Aya Kubota

After working for a private urban design consultancy from 1993 to 1995, Aya Kubota held a master's degree in historical preservation at Colombia University and the doctoral degree in urban design at the University of Tokyo. She was associate professor in the Urban Design Laboratory and professor in Regional Design Laboratory of the University of Tokyo. Her interest ranges from community development projects in small historical towns to major metropolitan areas, with particular interest in creating sustainable living environments. She is the member of numerous municipal and administrative committees that cover topics as diverse as urban planning, townscape preservation, environmental improvement, conservation, urban development, and housing.

The conservation and revitalization of historical towns and cities is always a big concern for most countries and regions worldwide. How do you consider the significance of localization against the global urbanization? And what is the role of landscape architecture, as well as landscape-based approaches, in related research and practices?

Aya KUBOTA (KUBOTA hereafter): Why do numerous countries and regions show keen interest in preserving and regenerating their historical environments? It deserves our attention. Localization is the dynamism created by local autonomy and self-government of a community. Within that dynamism, the practice of preserving and regenerating historical environments has emerged and continues. Because it preserves the environment and supports our lives as a whole, rather than a single building, which is nothing less than trying to inherit the traditional life that is directly linked to such physical spaces. It presents an alternative way of life in global urbanization, or as the result of global urbanization.

However, local people's interests and methods of historical environment preservation and regeneration may differ from those of non-local subjects, such as countries and regions. Even, there may be conflicts between them, which to me are not negative, but rather healthy. In the midst of conflicts, the logic and intentions of each subject may become clearer and stronger, which is conducive to their self-correction and optimization or "aufheben." In the process led by the local subjectivity, the locals do not exist from the beginning. Through this process, a network is built between residents in the given area. Although the nature of that network may be constantly changing, the locals become a living network, including the process of change. The problem is that the local

people's efforts are usually one-sided and isolated, resulting in their failure in the conflict. On the contrary, the non-local sides are administrators and professionals affiliated to institutions or programs, with subsidies.

A more serious problem is that such conflicts are becoming increasingly less visible. If conflicts arise, administrators and professionals who question the reasons behind start to intervene, and then the situation begins to change. When a non-local subject repairs a building claiming the preservation or regeneration of the historical environment, it looks ostensibly like a local conservation effort, even if it has nothing to do with local autonomy.

In preserving and regenerating historical environments, landscape architecture expertise and specialists cannot become the subject. Landscape design is inherently local because of its inseparable nature to the context. I understand that the concept of architecture was combined with landscape after Frederick Law Olmsted, but that was the beginning of the conflict between landscapes, which are inevitably local, and architecture, which tries to universalize land as space. The accumulation of knowledge through such conflicts will be beneficial, and I would like to request that media like *Landscape Architecture Frontiers* journal present it to related fields to encourage more readers to share their experience.

How do you understand the dynamics and trends of heritage protection over time? Nowadays, are there any new ideas, methods, approaches or modes being employed for the conservation and rejuvenation of historical areas?

KUBOTA: My own interest lies in the preservation and utilization of the "Legacy of Catastrophe." As you know, the Genbaku Dome is all the remains of the Hiroshima Prefectural Industrial Promotional Hall, which was damaged and transformed into a skeleton by the atomic bombing of Hiroshima. In the draft plan for the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park, Kenzo Tange came up with the idea of connecting the park and the Genbaku Dome with an axis to make it a place of prayer and hope for peace. Since then, citizens, the Hiroshima City, and Hiroshima Prefecture have moved to preserve the dome and continued to send messages of hope for peace. Due to its special value, Genbaku Dome was designated as a World Heritage Site in 1996—Rather than the aesthetic or architectural value, it was recognized for its value as a symbol of both the tremendous destructive power that humans can use and the precious wish for peace afterwards.

In recent years, large-scale engineering technology has been

applied everywhere in our lives. One of such technologies is the nuclear power plant. In the Great East Japan Earthquake of 2011, more than 160,000 people (covering 1,150 km²) were instructed to evacuate^[1] and a vast area was affected, due to the hydrogen explosion at the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant. The plant, where there were broken nuclear reactors, was scheduled to be decommissioned due to no future in sight. It is an interim storage facility where vast amounts of diffused radioactive materials, contaminated soil, house materials, etc. have been brought in. We are facing the landscape or land use peculiar to the post-nuclear accident. Living was prohibited there because the area was too polluted for human habitation. Contaminant storage is supposed to be temporary, as indicated by the “interim” term. However, it has not been decided where the final disposal site will be. Due to the high concentration of contamination, a permit is required to enter the interim storage facility. On this site, there is an entire town where people used to live, with an elementary school, shrines, a community hall, and public facilities. Due to the high concentration of contamination, it is impossible to dismantle them. Buildings are deteriorating over time. It is a “legacy of catastrophe,” not as a single building, but as an area or a habitat.

Under these circumstances, the local town of Okuma in Fukushima begins to formulate a Regional Plan for the Preservation and Utilization of Cultural Properties and preserve them in some way (Fig. 1). I am participating in this planning process as a member of the committee, with many local residents who lived in Okuma before the disaster but cannot return their hometown yet.

The Regional Plan for the Preservation and Utilization of Cultural Properties was newly established with the 2018 revision of the Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties of Japan. It is both a static

plan and an action plan. As of July 2023, plans have been approved by the Agency for Cultural Affairs in 119 municipalities of Japan. Although it is too early to judge how this plan and method will work yet, considering that the master plan in conventional city planning had very little consideration for the historical environment, we should make it an important progress.

The attempt in Okuma is an unknown challenge of selecting, preserving, and utilizing cultural assets related to the nuclear accident by making use of new institutions in recent years. It is often treated as a catastrophic heritage, but we need to always consider the fact that there are also happy memories there especially for local residents. What should be preserved among a huge amount of remains, how should they be conveyed, and to whom?

According to your research and practice experience, what are the major obstacles for the regeneration of urban historical resources? And do you think there are misunderstandings when addressing the conservation and development of urban cultural heritages including historical landscapes?

KUBOTA: In the background of urbanization, there was, and still is, the idea that traditional lifestyle is a thing of the past and of low value. Urbanization is directly linked to modernization. Global urbanization is the progress of formation and construction of spaces based on such values, so these values are recursively internalized and become decisive among people who live there. Money is involved in the process. Values that evaluate new things are favored by capital because new things can be bought. The values of old things and preserving them are the exact opposite of urbanization. The act of buying is instantaneous, but the act of preserving the historical environment is continuous and possibly only when there is a subject who wants to protect it.

Furthermore, engineering technology is for creating new things. It is completely different from traditional techniques that are accumulated through experience rather than any academic system. Whether it is architecture, landscape, or urban engineering, the specialists are only from one certain engineering area. So even if they think that preservation is important conceptually, they do not have the knowledge to realize preservation in their daily life. In other words, the most challenging aspect is the need to examine the current situation, where our lives and ways of life have been completely influenced by external forces, and reevaluate our values.

More concretely, some citizens might argue that the catastrophic legacies of the nuclear accident mentioned earlier should be



1. The front of Ohno Station in Okuma, taken in March 2020. All buildings are left inside the difficult-to-return zone.

© Aya Kubota

regarded as negative and be locked away and preserved for lesson. However, this is a one-sided view for those who lived there before the disaster, which can be a new kind of damage as their past seems to be denied. Those citizens who make such claims may have been using electricity produced by nuclear power plants; he or she could have been one of the “perpetrators.” But meanwhile, they may still say that the disaster-stricken area has value (for instance, for public projects) and the new development may repeat another aggression.

However, it is true that today’s landscape is where the nuclear accident has happened, which is a fact that humankind should not forget, even if the residents refuse to preserve the houses on their land. In the sense that their hometown has already been converted into such a different value, it can be said that the local former residents have certainly suffered new damages. What should we protect in such situations? This is my ongoing question. The lack of ways to avoid urbanization is probably the biggest obstacle to preserving the historical environment. Of the elderly people I interviewed, many thought it would be impossible for them to continue farming, so they encouraged their children to migrate to cities. This will also promote urbanization in turn.

“Cultural landscape” was newly proposed in the 2005 revision of the Law for the Protection of Cultural Properties in Japan. According to the definition, cultural landscapes are formed by the climate of a given region where people live or work, and are indispensable for understanding the livelihood and work of the Japanese people^[2]. This category is focusing on the “livelihood” that is carried out in relation to the natural environment. It goes without saying that it is necessary to evaluate the cultural landscape, but simply because it is designated as a cultural property, which does not mean that the relationship itself will continue. No way has yet been found to avoid urbanization under the globalization. However, the historical environment itself tells us at least what the state of non-urbanization looks like. This is meaningful in preserving and inheriting the historical environment.

To your knowledge, what matters for the improvement of sustainable living environments in historical communities? And how residents can truly get engaged with and into the future development of their communities?

KUBOTA: Tsumago is a great example of what Japanese residents are doing to protect their communities and historical environment. It is a post town in Nagano Prefecture, located along the historic road “Nakasendo” in a mountainous area. Nowadays, it is no longer an administrative division, but a traditional unit called “aza”^① with

less than 700 residents. Transportation networks and industrial structures changed dramatically during the period of rapid economic growth, the decline of small non-urban villages from all aspects, including population and industry, was particularly severe. Although there was also a tourism boom, the tourism development by external capital also hit the community. In 1968, as a result of the heated discussion among local residents (including the local municipality), the Association of Tsumago Lovers was established, which later became the Public Interest Incorporated Foundation, and clarified three principles of “don’t sell, don’t rent, don’t destroy” for their wooden houses as a Residents’ Charter (Fig. 2). At a time when the concept of townscape preservation had yet to emerge, the residents took pride in their townhouses and were very aware that they were the ones to protect them (Fig. 3). Tourism is just a means to continue living in Tsumago, but the goal is not to make money from tourism. Half a century later, these principles are still practiced. The key is in-depth discussion among residents. Every time a problem arises, such as whether it is okay to serve coffee at small restaurants, which is not traditional in Japan, or where to locate parking lots that tourists can use, a huge amount of time will

- ① “Aza” represents an area similar to the administrative division “town.” Sometimes such areas are called “town” in Japanese, but in the Japanese addressing system, people prefer using “aza.”
- 2. This sign says “don’t sell, don’t rent, don’t destroy.” These are the words of the Residents’ Charter enacted in 1971 to preserve the townscape of Tsumago.
- 3. The unchanged townscape of Tsumago, which has been preserved for a long time.



be spent discussing them in a committee of residents. If necessary, they will use the institutions (local government and universities) and apply for subsidized projects. Here, the subject of historical environment preservation and regeneration is the local community.

A distinctive feature of the Tsumago community is their familiarity with the environment in which they live, including the mountains. Not only are they knowledgeable about history, but also they know, for example, which slopes are vulnerable to recent heavy rainfall trends. They live a life that feels the blessings of nature, such as extremely abundant water and wild vegetables, but at the same time they perceive that the mountainous area they live in is in danger. For example, when learning that there would be construction of a maglev Shinkansen line deep underground in their neighborhood, the committee of residents immediately held a study session to deepen their understanding of what was in danger. After their judgement, they began to deliver the necessary information to each household and the local government, and clarify their intentions. Due to the collaboration with other civic groups actively across the country, this community must be sustainable. Another characteristic is that they enjoy their daily life. They enjoy holding festivals where they dress up in old costumes and talk to overseas tourists. I believe that these are key to realizing the preservation of the historical environment.

As an educator, what abilities and capacities should students learn and comprehend through the classes or studios related with urban heritage conservation and regeneration?

KUBOTA: There are always risks associated with professional involvement in the preservation and regeneration of historical environments. I have already mentioned that local subjectivity is essential. However, if we wait until local independence arises, physical historic fabrics will deteriorate. So it might be sometimes suitable or necessary for professionals to take some measures to preserve or repair them. However, it is still important to understand what non-locals such as experts cannot and should not do. At the conceptual level, we can discuss this in the classroom, and I believe that it is very important.

However, the most important thing is to let students go to the site and experience the wonderful abilities of the local subjects while immersing themselves in the historical environment. Especially for students who grew up in urban areas, how to live locally is unknown. While directly interacting with the people involved in such situations, even if you are not a party concerned, you can share the sense of ownership, and live as a person concerned, and

seriously think about another way of life as own self. It can be said that the ability to think as own self is important when engaging in historical environment preservation.

It can be said that the destruction of the historical environment did not come naturally, but was a by-product of urbanization. Therefore, how to reexamine and achieve an alternative urbanization is an prominent issue. If we do not envision another form of “city” that is not so urbanized, we will not be able to escape from the current dilemma of preserving and regenerating the historical environment. Preserving and regenerating the historical environment cannot be done by oneself alone. Understanding this and being able to unite with comrades is a skill that I would like my students and myself to acquire.

REFERENCES

- [1] Japanese Red Cross Society. (2011). *Summary of the Great East Japan Earthquake and Tsunami*.
- [2] Agency for Cultural Affairs, Government of Japan. (n.d.). *Cultural landscapes*.
- [3] Kubota, A. (2020). Spatial planning as an impossible and necessary responsibility: Suggestions from the practice of the disaster-affected areas. *Municipal Problems*, 111(11), 42–48.
- [4] Kubota, A. (2020). Post-Fukushima space planning: Drawbacks with former disaster planning, and how the principle of subsidiarity could lead to better planning. *Research on Environmental Disruption*, 49(3), 22–27.
- [5] Ishiyama, C., Kubota, A., & Nishimura, Y. (2018). The establishment of the community initiative control system and the transition of issues for conservation: Focusing on community organizations and the preservation committee in Tsumago-juku from 1968 to 2003. *Journal of the City Planning Institute of Japan*, 53(3), 1239–1246.
- [6] Ishiyama, C., Kubota, A., & Nishimura, Y. (2017). The process of legislation on voluntary rule for the preservation of a historical village: A case study of the two-stage legislation for the Residents’ Charter in Tsumago-juku. *Journal of Architecture and Planning (Transactions of Architectural Institute of Japan)*, 82(740), 2637–2647.

基于历史环境保护与再生视角探索当前城市化的新途径——对话窪田亚矢

窪田亚矢*

日本东北大学土木工程与建筑系城市与国土设计研究小组，仙台 980-8579

*通讯作者邮箱：ayakubota@tohoku.ac.jp

摘要

关键词

在本次访谈中，窪田亚矢以自己在日本的实践为例，分享了对历史环境保护和再生的思考。在她看来，地方主体性十分重要。地方化所具有的活力不仅为历史环境的保护和再生提供了支持，也为城市化途径提供了另一种可能。在这类实践中，地方主体和非地方主体之间可能会存在冲突，但这种冲突是有益的。就“灾难遗产”的保护和利用而言，窪田认为，城市规划将历史环境纳入考量是一个重大进步。在规划过程中，应当让当地居民参与进来，共同探讨应该保护什么、如何保护，以及为谁而保护。在城市历史资源的再生方面，最大的挑战是需要审视我们的生活现状并重新评估我们的价值。虽然专业人士的参与难免有风险，但他们有必要采取措施来保护或修复历史环境，在这一过程中，能够从当地居民的视角来思考问题也非常重要。

历史环境；
保护与再生；
城市化；
地方化；
地方主体性；
日本；
文化景观

文章亮点

采访时间

- 地方主体性对于历史环境保护和再生至关重要
- 将历史环境纳入考量是城市规划的重大进步
- 无法有效避免城市化可能是历史环境保护面临的最大障碍
- 在历史环境保护工作中，应当站在当地人的角度思考问题

2023-07-15

编辑 王颖，高雨婷，周详 翻译 王颖

窪田亚矢简介

1993~1995年，窪田亚矢曾在一家私人城市设计咨询公司任职，而后在美国哥伦比亚大学获得历史保护方向硕士学位，并在东京大学获得都市设计方向博士学位；曾任日本东京大学都市设计研究室准教授、地域设计研究室特任教授等职。她的研究方向小到历史小城镇的社区发展项目，大到大都市地区的发展，尤其关注可持续生活环境的营造。她也是多个市政和行政委员会的成员，涉及城市规划、风貌保护、环境改善与保护、城市发展和住房等多个领域。

历史城镇的保护与振兴一直是世界上许多国家和地区非常关注的问题。在全球城市化的背景下，您认为本土化的意义是什么？在相关研究和实践中，景观设计学及基于景观的方法能够发挥什么样的作用？

窪田亚矢（以下简称窪田）：为什么许多国家和地区都对历史环境保护和再生议题如此感兴趣？这值得我们深思。所谓“地方化”，就是地方自治和社区自治所产生的活力。在这种活力中，历史环境的保护和再生实践得以涌现并不断持续下去。这类实践在保护环境的同时，维系着我们生活的方方面面——而非单个建筑，将依托于物理空间的传统生活传承下去。这是全球城市化进程下的一种另类生活模式；或者说，这也是城市化的表现之一。

但地方主体（当地人）和非地方主体（如国家和地区）在历史环境的保护和再生方面有着不同的利益，所采用的方法也必然不同，甚至可能存在冲突。在我看来，这种冲突是有益的。在冲突中，每类主体的逻辑和意图可能会变得更加清晰和有力，这有助于其自我修正优化或“扬弃”（aufheben）。就地方主体主导的实践而言，当地人并非从一开始就参与其中。随着保护工作的不断推进，特定地区的居民之间会形成一

个网络，这种构建于当地人之间的网络能够实现动态更新，以不变应万变。但问题在于，当地人常常容易陷入单打独斗的困境，以致在冲突中常常失利。因为非地方主体通常是隶属于特定机构或项目的行政管理者和专业人士，他们的工作更容易获取各方保障。

更严峻的问题是，地方主体和非地方主体之间的冲突越发不易察觉。一旦有冲突产生，那些质疑背后原因的行政管理者和专业人士就会开始干预，进而改变事件走向。当一个非地方主体以保护或恢复历史环境为由对建筑进行修缮时，乍看起来与地方主体实施的保护工作无异，但事实上却与地方自治毫不相关。

在保护和恢复历史环境的过程中，景观设计的专业知识及相关专家很难成为主体。从本质上讲，景观设计具有地方性，因为它与环境密不可分。受弗雷德里克·劳·奥姆斯特德的深刻影响，“景观”和“建筑”概念紧密相融，但这也正是景观与建筑之间冲突的开始——前者以地方性为核心，后者则试图将土地普遍转化为空间。幸运的是，我们在这种冲突中不断积累知识。也希望借《景观设计学》期刊等媒体在更多领域的传播，鼓励更多读者分享他们的经验。

您如何理解遗产保护的动态和发展趋势？如今，在历史区域的保护和振兴方面是否有一些新的思路、方法、途径或模式？

窪田：我本人的研究兴趣在于灾难遗产的保护和利用。众所周知，管理权归属于广岛县工业振兴厅的原爆穹顶是广岛原子弹爆炸区唯一留存下来的建筑，整个穹顶只剩骨架。在广岛和平纪念公园的规划草案中，丹下健三提出用一条轴线将公园和原爆穹顶连接起来，使之成为祈祷和平、寄予希望的地方。自此，市民、广岛市和广岛县开始采取行动保护这座穹顶，并不断传递企盼和平的信息。因其特殊价值，原爆穹顶于1996年被列为世界遗产——与其说它具有美学或建筑学价值，不如说它标志着人类能够产生的巨大破坏力和对和平的珍贵期许。

近年来，大型工程技术已经被广泛应用于日常生活中，核电站就是其中之一。在2011年的东日本大地震中，福岛第一核电站发生氢气爆炸，1 150km²土地上的16万余人接到疏散指示^[1]，另有大片地区受到影响。该核电站的核反应堆严重受损，由于恢复无望，已计划退役。核电站目前变成了一个临时储存设施，大量已扩散的放射性物质、被污染的土壤、房屋材料等被运到这里。我们面对的是一种核事故发生后特有的景观或土地利用类型——一片污染严重的禁居区。正如“临时”一词所传达的，目前这些污染物的储存应该只是暂时性的，最终的处置地点尚未确定。在这块土地上，有人们曾经生活过的小镇，有小学、神龛、社区礼堂和其他公共设施。由于污染高度集中，这些建筑都无法拆除，只能随时间推移逐渐老化。这种“灾难遗产”已不只是单个的建筑，而涉及整个区域或栖居地。

也正是在这种情况下，福岛县大隈町开始制定“文化财产保护与利用区域规划”，探索文化财产保护途径（图1）。我作为规划委员会委员，与许多灾前居住在大隈但目前尚不能返乡的当地居民一起参与了这项规划的制定。

文化财产保护与利用区域规划是随2018年《日本文化财产保护法》的修订而制定的一项新制度。它既包括静态规划，也包括动态行动计划。截至2023年7月，日本119个市町村的规划已获得文化厅批准。虽然现在判断这一规划和方法将如何发挥作用还为时尚早，但由于传统城市规划中的总体规划较少考虑历史环境，这已然算得上是跨出了重要一步。

大隈的这次尝试充满了未知的挑战，他们与近年来新成立的一些机构合作，共同选择、保护和利用与核事故相关的文化资产。很多人认为，这是一处灾难遗产，但我们也需要时刻认识到，那里也有人们幸福的回忆——尤其是对当地居民而言。我们仍需要思考如下问题：在大量的遗产中，哪些应该保存下来？遗产的价值如何传递，又将传递给谁？

根据您的研究和实践经验，城市历史资源再生的主要障碍是什么？您认为在保护和开发历史景观等城市文化遗产时存在哪些误区？

窪田：在城市化的背景下，不论是过去还是现在都有这样一种观念——传统的生活方式已经成为过去，并且价值有限。城市化与现代化密切相关，而全球城市化就是在上述观念的基础上形成和建造空间的过程，因此这类价值观被反复内化，进而逐渐开始在当地居民中发挥决定性作用。这是一个受金钱驱使的过程——大家看待新事物的价值观深受资本影响，因为新事物会带来新的交易。旧事物自身和旧事物保护所产生的价值则似乎与城市化进程背道而驰。然而，交易只是一时的，历史环境的保护却是持久的，且主体尤其需具有保护意愿。

此外，工程技术是用来创造新事物的。它与传统技术完全不同，传统技术是通过经验而非任何学术体系积累起来的。然而无论是在建筑学、景观学还是城市工程学方面，专家们可能只专注于某一工程领域。因此，即使他们已经认识到遗产保护很重要，却不具备在日常生活中开展保护行动的相关知识。换句话说，当下最大的挑战是要审视我们的生活现状——它们已经遭到了外部力量的深层影响——及重新评估我们的价值观。

更具体而言，有些人认为，前面提到的核事故灾难遗产是消极的，应该封锁起来，用以警示。但对灾难发生前生活在那里的人来说，这种观点相当片面——当地居民的过去似乎被否认了，这未尝不是一种新的伤害。要知道，提出这种说法的人们可能一直在使用核电站生产的电力；他们或许正是“肇事者”之一。但同时，他们又可能会说灾区对于开展公共项目而言尚有价值，而新的开发难免会产生另一种侵害。

事实是，我们眼前的这处景观的确就是核事故发生的地方，这是我

们不应忘却的，即使当地居民拒绝保留他们所拥有土地上的房屋。他们的家乡已经被赋予了完全不同的价值，从这层意义上讲，当地居民无疑已经遭受了新的伤害。在这种情况下，我们应该保护什么？这是我一直在思考的问题。无法有效避免城市化可能是历史环境保护面临的最大障碍。就我的个人经历而言，我走访的许多老人都认为他们不可能继续务农，因此鼓励子女移居城市，这种观念反之也会加快城市化发展。

“文化景观”概念是2005年修订的《日本文化财产保护法》中新提出的。根据该定义，文化景观是由人们生活或工作的特定区域的气候形成的，是了解日本人民生活和工作的重要途径^[2]。文化景观侧重于与自然环境相关的“民生”。毋庸置疑，我们有必要对文化景观进行评估，但这往往只是因为它们被列为了文化财产，并不意味着这种关系本身会持续下去。目前我们尚未发现在全球化背景下避免城市化的有效途径。但历史环境本身至少已经揭示了非城市化的状态，这对于历史环境保护和继承意义重大。

据您所知，改善历史社区可持续生活环境的关键是什么？居民如何才能真正参与到社区的未来发展之中？

窪田：妻笼宿堪称日本居民保护社区和历史环境的典范。这里是长野县的一个驿站，位于历史悠久的“中山道”沿线，地处山区。如今，它已不再是一个行政区划，而是一个被称为“字”^①的传统居住单位，居民不足700人。在经济快速增长时期，日本的交通网络和产业结构发生了巨大变化，非城镇类小型村庄在人口和产业等各方面衰落严重。尽管当时也曾出现旅游热潮，但外部资本的旅游开发对社区造成了冲击。1968年，在当地居民（包括当地市政府）的热烈讨论下，“妻笼爱好者协会”成立，该协会后来发展为公益法人基金会，并明确了写入《居民章程》中的“不出售、不出租、不破坏”木屋保护三原则（图2）。在城镇风貌保护概念尚未兴起的时代，居民们以自己的房屋为荣，他们清楚地认识到自己才是保护居所的责任人。发展旅游业只是妻笼居民维持生活的一种方法，而非为了赚钱。半个世纪过去了，居民们仍然在践行木屋保护原则（图3）。这其中的关键是居民之间一直保持着深入交流，每当出现问题——比如是否可以在小餐馆供应咖啡（这在日本并不常见），或者在哪里设置供游客使用的停车场——居民委员会都会花大量时间进行讨论。必要时，他们会通过地方政府和高校等机构申请补助项目。在这里，历史环境的保护和再生的主体即当地社区。

妻笼居民的一个显著特点是他们十分熟悉自己的生活环境（包括山区在内）。他们不仅了解当地历史，还知道哪些山坡容易受到暴雨的侵袭。他们在生活中感受到了大自然的馈赠——比如极其丰富的水源和野菜，但同时也意识到自己所居住的山区正处于危险之中。例如，当得知

要在自己住所的地下深处修建磁悬浮新干线时，居民委员会立即召开了学习会，加深了风险认识。在作出判断后，他们开始向各家各户和当地政府传达必要的信息，并阐明意图。基于与全国各地其他民间团体的积极合作，妻笼社区正在稳步发展。此外，妻笼居民非常享受他们的日常生活。他们喜欢在节日期间穿上传统服装，与海外游客交谈。我认为这些都是实现历史环境保护的关键。

作为教育工作者，在您看来，在与城市遗产保护和再生相关的课程或工作坊中，学生应当学习或具备哪些能力？

窪田：专业人士参与历史环境的保护和再生总是有风险的。我刚刚提到，地方主体性至关重要。但是，如果我们等到地方主体性凸显了才去行动，那有形的历史肌理就会消失。因此，专业人士有时可适当或有必要采取一些措施来保护或修复它们。当然，我们有必要认识到专家等非地方主体不能且不应该做什么，而一些概念层面的知识则是十分必要在课堂中进行讨论的。

不过，最重要的还是让学生到现场去，唯有置身于历史环境中，他们才能体验到地方主体所具备的独特能力。特别是对于在城市中长大的学生来说，他们并不知道地方的生活是什么样的。在直接与当事人交流的过程中，即使他们并不属于当地群体，但仍可以体会到主人翁意识，并以相关人士的身份来体验生活、认真思考与自身经历不同的另一种生活方式。可以说，“自我思考”的能力是从事历史环境保护工作的重要能力。

历史环境的破坏并非自然而然，而是城市化的副产品。因此，如何重新审视和实现另一种城市化就很重要。如果我们不去设想另一种形式的、不那么城市化的“城市”，我们就无法摆脱当前历史环境保护和再生的困境。单靠自己的力量无法实现历史环境的保护和再生。我希望我的学生，以及我自己，能够理解这一点，并能够与同行并肩前行。

① “字”和“町”在行政区划上基本属于同一层级，均指一定面积的区域。在日语中有时将这一层级统称为“町”，而在日常地址的书写中，往往会省略“町”，而保留“字”。

图 1. 大隈町大野站前方场景（拍摄于 2020 年 3 月）。这片区域目前已难以进入，所有建筑都保留了原样。

图 2. 一块写有“不出售、不出租、不破坏”的牌匾。

图 3. 经历了较长历史并得到完整保护的妻笼宿风貌