

# 培育城市荒野

专栏编辑

蔡哲铭

加拿大多伦多大学约翰·H·丹尼尔斯建筑、景观与设计学院博士研究生

荒野唤起了人们对城市化影响之外原始自然的集体想象。尽管在北美地区，“荒野”（wilderness）概念的出现被视作殖民主义的产物<sup>①</sup>，但这并不影响“荒野”一词的流行——作为一种语义工具，它已然具备了某种象征意义。同样地，“城市荒野”（urban wilderness）一词将矛盾的“城市”与“荒野”并置组合，对景观设计师而言既是机遇也是挑战。一方面，城市荒野表达了公众对城市中非人工景观的惊叹——常被忽视的乡土物种及其生态绩效为人们所见，促使公众认知和欣赏丰富而富有韧性的城市生态环境形象。另一方面，唯有重整人们对城市景观的认知论，才能更加深入地理解城市荒野这个颇具挑战性的自然概念——如果我们仅仅将城市景观看作单纯的绿色背景或人类对自然的掌控，那么就很难真正成为城市生态系统的一份子。

城市荒野既存在于人们的想象之中，也兼具现实成效。身处气候变化和环境危机的背景下，我们需要通过“野性”来明确城市的生态绩效。在生态修复领域，野性可以理解为非人类生命的自主性<sup>②</sup>。这种自主性意味着生态过程是自然发生的，而不以人的意志为转移。吉尔·克莱芒曾提出“第三类景观”（le tiers paysage）概念，认为这种自主性体现了一种“生物智能”，即“不断重塑的能力”<sup>③</sup>。然而，这种自主性的内涵却很难在城市中实现：人造景观加剧了人类与自然的二元对立。如何才能通过景观设计体现并演绎城市生态系统的社会性价值？本期的两篇文章基于各自的实践提供了另一种思路：通过公众参与和切身体验来展示（城市荒野的）社会和生态价值。

在《日本大阪城市边缘的艺术与生态》一文中，帕特里克·M·莱登和姜受希分享了城市自然工作室的两个将自然与社区相融合的艺术项目。城市

自然工作室致力于探索生态艺术与传播，同时促进人们对自然的认识与尊重。工作室开展了一系列工作坊和艺术节活动，专注于推动建立人与生态系统的密切关系。相关活动包括土壤工作坊、寻觅野生草本植物、以“水”为主题的跨学科艺术节等。这些活动不仅将社区居民凝聚在一起，也让人们有机会观察自然现象和过程并与之互动。参与活动的过程让更多人意识到，人类是自然的产物，是生态系统的一部分。莱登和姜受希的实践准确传达了一种具身性体验；这种具身性极大推动了“心灵的再野化”和人与自然关系的建立。

在《呼唤野性》一文中，南希·西顿分享了位于纽约市布鲁克林区的景观设计公司未来绿色工作室的作品，展示了他们对城市自生植物的研究成果，以及该研究在设计实践中的关键作用。这些项目立足于城市生态学研究，提供了全新的研究模式。相关的调查方法包括街头漫走观察、物种识别、物种记录和表现传达（如人行道上的喷绘标识和社交媒体应用程序的使用）；更具交互性的研究模式可以让非专业人士也参与其中。工作室的研究促进了参与者了解植物生境及其在极端城市条件下的生态绩效；而这些极端条件普遍作为场地限制存在于城市景观设计项目中，由此看来，研究也间接提高了景观设计的绩效表现。此外，工作室研究与设计相结合的实践模式也将体验并理解城市生态的过程渗透学科内外。

上述两个各具特色的实践为人们从社会层面理解城市生态和生态绩效提供了新的思路：不依赖于单纯的文本和图像学习，而是积极参与到互动式学习和实践中。同时，这两个实践也强调了在培育未来韧性城市过程中专注力与具身性的重要价值——培育城市景观的过程亦是人类向景观寻求滋养的过程。LAF

① 很多文化都对“荒野”内涵有所探讨。本文中特指美洲语境下的“荒野”，它对日后的环境保护政策产生了重要影响。移民美洲的欧洲人提出“荒野”概念，将荒野理解为可以驯化开发的处女地（即北美大陆），他们将土地所有权合法化，却无视原住民的利益（来源：参考文献[1]）。

② The notion of wilderness can be found in multiple cultures, however, it is referring to the American concept here as it became instrumental for environmental and conservation policies. The American wilderness, led by Euro-Americans, understood as virginal land to be domesticated, legitimizing the land ownership while neglecting the indigenous people (Source: Ref. [1]).

# Cultivating the Urban Wilderness

COLUMN HOST

Taro Zheming CAI

PhD Student, John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape, and Design at University of Toronto

Wilderness evokes a collective imagination of the pristine nature independently of urbanization activities. The emergence of the idea in North America is considered an artifact of colonialism<sup>[1]</sup>. Nonetheless, the term “wilderness” has become a useful and popular semantic tool evoking symbolic meanings. As such, “urban wilderness,” a term of paradoxical juxtaposition, demonstrates both opportunities and challenges for landscape architects. On the one hand, urban wilderness illustrates the public awe of the uncultivated landscape in the city—promoting a particular image and appreciation of the rich and resilient urban ecology—shedding light on often overlooked native species and their ecological performance. On the other hand, the urban wilderness is a challenging conception of nature and requires an epistemological reorientation toward urban landscape—it is hard to be part of the urban ecosystem when considering urban landscape a mere green backdrop or mastery of nature.

Urban wilderness is both imaginary and performative. In the context of climate change and environmental crisis, we need to articulate the performative aspect of urban ecology by acknowledging wildness. In the realm of ecological restoration, wildness can be defined through nonhuman autonomy<sup>[2]</sup>. Such autonomy implies ecological processes that are not willed in an anthropocentric sense but occur spontaneously. Similarly, in his concept of the “third landscape” (*le tiers paysage*), Gilles Clément articulates this autonomy as a “biological intelligence,” which has an “aptitude for constant reinvention”<sup>[3]</sup>. However, this

notion of autonomy is conceptually tricky in the urban realm: the binary of human and nature seems even more distinguished in the designed urban landscape. How can landscape design visualize and represent urban ecology on a social level? The following two articles provide alternative approaches through the practice that embraces public participation and embodied experiences, demonstrating social and ecological values.

In *Art and Ecology at the Edge of Osaka*, Japan, Patrick M. Lydon and Suhee Kang share two projects from their ecological art and media studio, *City as Nature*, exhibiting art projects that bring together nature and the community. *City as Nature* promotes the public’s awareness and respect of nature. Through a series of workshops and festivals, it focuses on cultivating positive human relationships with the ecosystem. Programs from *City as Nature*, including the soil workshop, weed foraging, and an interdisciplinary festival on water, not only bring the community together but also make the natural phenomena and processes legible and interactive. These programs help participants recognize humans as ecological beings and part of the ecosystem. There is an excellent sense of embodiment in Lydon and Kang’s practice, and the embodiment is essential in the process of “rewilding minds” and building relationships with nature.

In *Invoking the Wild*, Nancy Seaton shares work from Future Green Studio, a landscape firm based in Brooklyn, New York, revealing their studies on spontaneous urban plants (SUP) and the critical role of research in their design

practice. Situated in urban ecology studies, these SUP projects offer a different mode of research. The research investigation, including walks of observation, identification, species documentation, and representation (such as the spray-paint frames on the sidewalk and the use of social media applications), is an interactive process that engages participants beyond the office. The research facilitates knowledge of plants’ habitats and their ecological performative benefits in extreme urban conditions which often are common site constraints for urban landscape projects, advancing the performance of designed landscape. Additionally, Future Green Studio’s research–design practice suggests an active process of experiencing and understanding urban ecology in the discipline and beyond.

Two distinct practices demonstrate alternative approaches in cultivating a social understanding of urban ecology and ecological performance through an interactive act of learning and doing, instead of mere texts and images. Both practices propose attentiveness and embodiment in cultivating a resilient urban future—cultivating the urban landscape is to ask the landscape to cultivate us. **LAF**

## REFERENCES

- [1] Callicott, J., & Nelson, M. (1998). *The Great New Wilderness Debate* (pp. 97-102, 652-690). Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- [2] Woods, M. (2005). Ecological Restoration and the Renewal of Wildness and Freedom. In T. Heyd (Ed.), *Recognizing the Autonomy of Nature: Theory and Practice* (pp. 170-188). New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- [3] Clément, G. (2015). *The Planetary Garden and Other Writings* (p. x). Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.