

# 莫森·莫斯塔法维的生态都市主义

## Mohsen Mostafavi's Ecological Urbanism

编译：周明艳，余依爽，田乐  
Editor: Mingyan ZHOU, Yishuang SHE, Le TIAN

莫森·莫斯塔法维（Mohsen Mostafavi）是一位建筑师和教育家，现任哈佛大学设计研究生院院长，曾担任英国伦敦建筑联盟学院（AA）院长等多所著名院校的院系领导，在建筑、景观设计教育界声名卓著。同时，他的诸多著作与理论在业界广受关注与好评，如《表皮建筑》（麻省理工学院，2002）、《景观都市主义：景观实用手册》（AA，2004）等。

2010年3月，在北京还是一派冬日景象的时候，莫森与助理一行步履匆匆地到来了。14日的下午和晚上，北京大学景观设计学研究院俞孔坚院长陪同莫森参观了北京大学及景观设计学研究院，和北京各专业媒体及北大师生进行了座谈。最后，莫森以一场反响热烈的讲座结束了短暂的北京之行。

Mohsen Mostafavi, an architect and educator, is the dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Design, who was the Chairman of the Architectural Association School of Architecture in London. He is prestigious in worldwide architecture and landscape architecture fields while the works and theories have been highly praised by the professionals, such as *Surface Architecture* (2002), and *Landscape Urbanism: A Manual for the Machinic Landscape* (2004).

This March, the city still presented its winter sense by a heavy snow to welcome the guests from the lands beyond the ocean. Mohsen and his assistant visited the Peking University and the GSLA (Graduate School of Landscape Architecture) accompanied by the dean of GSLA, Professor Kongjian Yu in the later of the 14th, as well as communicated with the students and media. And his trip of Beijing was ended by a wonderful and passionate lecture of the Ecological Urbanism.

W

北京大学讲座

时间：2010年3月14日19:00

地点：北京大学英杰交流中心阳光大厅

主持人：俞孔坚

承办方：景观中国（www.landscape.cn）

《景观设计学》



W  
的主要创始人。生态都市主义，这是最新的名词，他是发明者，同时也是推动者。今天我们非常荣幸请到他来做报告。尽管下大雪，大家还是这么多人到场，非常感谢！）

非常感谢大家冒雪前来！我更希望今天晚上大家可以以一种对话的方式共同探讨生态都市主义，而不单单是一个讲座。

哈佛设计学院对中国的发展非常重视，特别是中国近几年的城市化发展。就今年的这个

学期，在哈佛设计学院有3个设计课程是关于中国的，其中一个研究中国的建筑，另外两个研究北京的城市设计。中国的城市化进程是史无前例的，无论从它的速度还是它的规模来说，都是世界历史上从未有过的。所以我们不能采用常规的方法来探索中国城市化发展、中国城市化的设计之路。无论是大尺度，还是小尺度的发展都为我们的研究提供了无限的可能性，我们应该抓住这次难得的机遇。

我想用3个小故事来开始今天的讨论。这些故事都来自英国卫报同一天刊登的报道。第一个是加拿大记者纳奥米·克莱恩（Naomi

Klein）报道的石油再利用与土地被破坏的故事。伊拉克战争发生后，加拿大艾伯塔油价激增，为了开发石油，加拿大人决定从油渣中提炼原油，然而这个过程既复杂又昂贵，大面积的森林被铲平，表层土壤也被特别设计用来挖掘沥青的大型机器所破坏。接着采用化学的方法进行蒸馏、稀释，直到原油上升到顶层。在此过程中，倒入池坑中的废弃产物足以填满该地区的天然湖泊。

第二个故事发生在印度孟买，一位事业有成的富人自己及家人打造了一栋60层的精美住宅，而这座“豪宅”引发的的问题是：我们



的城市是否必须提供“个体共享（Individual Share）”的资源？评价城市建设影响的标准是什么？这个标准不仅仅是建筑外观的审美，而且也涉及到其道德表现？人到底需要多少东西？

第三个故事是一个英国利物浦的心理学家 的真实故事，现已经被改编成了电影。这个心理学家为了帮助那些居无定所、受伤的难民，在城市中心开辟了一系列小面积的农田分给他们耕种。可这种情况不仅限制了难民的生活，同时也使当地的社区陷入困境——不同文化背景和不同的种族，难免产生摩擦与冲突。为了看管好紧挨着邻居的自家蔬菜，难民们共同合作，开辟出了“充满交流”又丰产的土地。

这3个故事都是我们生活中不同方面的真实事例，它们展示出我们的个人及集体行为会对现代城市产生的影响。它们涉及到哲学家费利克斯·瓜塔里（Félix Guattari）在《三大生态》（*The Three Ecologies*）一书中的论点。在这一理解深刻而简洁的著作中，他将我们理解一致的生态问题，分为生态的3个“方面”：环境、社会关系及人的主观性。我们可以从这3方面的交互作用思考生态都市主义。

我在英国开设景观都市主义课程时，似乎很难探讨如何从景观及城市学的关系来创造新的城市形象、城市内容。所以当时的部分工作就是建立起进行这些研究的新基础。你可以把城市看做是生产性景观，例如城市中的农田、果园不光是生产食物，同时也成了城市公共空

间。所以这就是景观都市主义，研究景观与城市的关系。

帕特里克·布朗克（Patrick Blanc）和其他人想出使植物垂直生长的概念，为景观和建筑创建“绿色墙体”。我们如何把日常见到的元素转变为景观，尤其是那些基础设施，使其成为兼具审美功能的生产性景观？我们能否重新利用这些我们认为是垃圾的东西？比如积攒大量的罐子将之变为景观。再比如，下雪时我们用大量的盐撒在地上化雪，而有一个项目则关注于如何将生产盐的地方变成一种可供人欣赏的新的公园或盐田景观。

从一个更理论的层面，西班牙的建筑师及艺术家安德烈·布兰齐（Andrea Branzi）在农业和艺术之间进行创作，在城市实践的框架下创作了一系列的项目。受启发于意大利哲学家詹尼·瓦狄默（Gianni Vattimo）的“柔软思想（Weak Thoughts）”，他提出“柔软都市主义（Weak Urbanism）”的概念。“柔软都市主义”并不指我们要变得软弱，而是我们不要特意地把一些事物变得“坚硬”。这种都市主义的主要特点是其自身的可逆性、发展性和附带性。在人们的认识随着社会需求不断发生变化的今天，这些特点是非常必要的。

在中国有许多这样的城市基础设施，比如我们在街上看到的可移动、可变形的设施，它们不像高速公路、立交桥那样固定。不同尺度上所谓的生态都市主义常常涉及到移动性，这

1. 莫森·莫斯塔法维在北京大学英杰交流中心阳光大厅演讲现场
2. 盐田景观
3. 帕特里克·布朗克的植物垂直生长概念，为景观和建筑创建了“绿色墙体”。
4. 让·勒诺迪在1960~1970年设计的低收入群体的住宅，住宅阳台和花园是复杂的几何形状。
1. Mohsen Mostafavi lectured at the Sunshine Hall, Yingjie Communication Center, Peking University
2. Landscape of salt site
3. The concept of cultivating plants to grow vertically from Patrick Blanc, creating "green walls" that operates between landscape and architecture
4. Jean Renaudie developed the anonymous high-rise block social housing based on a dense organic arrangement of building clusters in the 1960s and 1970s, with complex geometric pattern terraces and gardens.

在建筑内部及生态的实例中举不胜数。例如，UN工作室为奔驰汽车展览馆空间设计注重了室内外关系的表达，设计师创造了室内的感官氛围，而不仅是建筑本身的外观。

这一关系也包含于社会的其他方面。法国建筑师让·勒诺迪（Jean Renaudie）在1960~1970年设计了一个低收入群体的住宅，它不像以往那些在规划有续、高密度建筑群中的常见高楼。这个住宅从视觉上与目前流行的现代主义高楼大厦大相径庭，勒诺迪的设计基于一个复杂的几何模型，目的在于创造更多的室外空间——在住宅中的阳台和花园。

最初，这一新奇的建筑并没有得到潜在住户的赞誉，他们认为勒诺迪设计的这个住宅不符合工薪阶层。现在它变成了理想的多功能社





5. “柔软”的“体验式”景观  
6. 室内和室外的界限得以模糊  
7-8. 可移动的城市基础设施  
5. Experiencing landscape of "Weak Thoughts"  
6. The blurred articulation between the inside and outside  
7-8. Mobile urban infrastructure

区，该建筑本身也成为自然与高建筑群结合的典型实例。这种结构展示了内部与外部空间关系的灵活性及多样性的益处，同时也展现了他们同政策的不可分割性。

最后一点是关于城市感觉，这和过去有形及无形的思想有些联系。我们使用的电话、网络等通讯技术会影响到城市的物质环境，所以我们的部分责任，以及景观都市主义的部分思想是要研究产生这些因素的可能性。

艺术家西斯塞勒·图拉斯（Sissel Tolaas）做了一个关于墨西哥城市的嗅觉研究，她想了解我们能否通过空气中的气味来感受城市，而不是用眼睛去观察墨西哥城市的空间形态。通过从城市的各个角落收集味道，并将其分类，在各个展览（包括在哈佛设计研究生院）中让人们去嗅，这类分析的重要性在于它挑战人们用视觉感受城市的主导方式。

最初我们讨论了3个故事，并强调了环境、社会性及人的主观性。我希望大家能够从这3方面全方位地思考生态都市主义。刚才提及的多数项目及研究方法都是对我们去年在哈佛设计学院举办生态都市主义大会所探讨的，这些案例以新主观性为基础，同时也是自发实践和审美实践。所以当我们开始设计新的都市主义形式时，我们不仅需要考虑如何节约能源，而且应该创造一个新的空间，创造一个新的景观与环境，创造一个新的美学。

## □ 提问环节

问题1：您能为我们阐述一下低碳城市与您主张的生态都市主义两者有什么差异？

莫森·莫斯塔法维：“低碳城市”，这听起来是把重点主要放在了减少碳排放上，而这并不等同说你减少了碳排放量就会挽回什么损失。我赞同减少碳排放量，但我更想阐述的是生态都市主义并不着重于在数量上发生的变化，它更基于城市日常生活的各个层面。

问题2：根据您刚才所讲的有关可持续性建筑和技术 的方面，我想问，众所周知在当今城市化发展进程中，人们更多地关注城市微观层面的问题，而非从城市整体的角度去考虑，您是如何看待这一问题的？

莫森·莫斯塔法维：这也是我们出版《生态都市主义》一书的原因。的确，我们有一些测评建筑物可持续性的方法，可是却无法测评我们整个城市环境的可持续性。时下，大家都追求发展，追求改进，但我们需要在可持续发展的背景下考虑城市化发展。我们面临的挑战是如何在城市化进程中避免损失。作为市民，我们有义务共同参与其中，遵守政治法规，协助领导者从各个方面共同促进城市的发展。目前的困难在于人们意识到应该以更加生态或更加可持续的方式建设，但这通常会增加投入成

本。人们也逐渐意识到了走可持续化道路的代价或许会耗费更多资金。

问题3：在您讲座中提及的全是国外的范例，那您如何评价中国的现代建筑呢，比如鸟巢和CCTV新大楼？因为人们对它们的褒贬不一，所以很想听听您的看法。

莫森·莫斯塔法维：我认为鸟巢和CCTV大楼都是耗费巨资的建筑。由于这两个建筑复杂的工程构造，其建筑材料也随之发生了改变。从审美角度来讲，它们都创造出了非常漂亮的结构形式。然而在欣赏它们的同时，我们也应该思索一下到底我们的欲望何时能够得到满足？何时我们才能以“少”为乐？我想这些项目提出了一个关键的问题，因为它们的建造方式是有可选择性的。在以生态都市主义为背景的讨论中，我们应该反复思考如何以更少的资源来建造更美好的事物。

在中国，我认为目前的挑战不是要依赖于西方丰富的知识，而是要在本土文化的基础上以求发展和进步。传统与现代化之间的转变是我们目前还不能解决的。我们不得不更多得考虑不同类型的环境，这也正是我希望你们将来努力的方向。希望你们这一代人在未来能够将此项事业发扬光大。

## A lecture from Mohsen Mostafavi in Peking University

Time: 19:00, March 14th, 2010  
Location: Sunshine Hall, Yingjie Communication Center, Peking University  
Presider: Professor Kongjian YU  
Presented by: LA China (www.landscape.cn), *Landscape Architecture China*

(Kongjian YU: Mohsen Mostafavi is one of the major initiators and motivators of Landscape Urbanism, which is developed into Ecological Urbanism.)

Thank you very much for being here in this snowy weather. I hope that this is more a discussion than a lecture on the topic of ecological urbanism. At the Harvard Graduate School of Design, we are very interested in what is happening in China. This semester, we have three studios based in different locations—one working on architectural issues, the other ones on urban design in Beijing, focusing on landscape urbanism. Your country is going through rapid urbanization at a scale that makes it impossible to use the conventional models of planning and landscape. One has to use this incredible opportunity to think about the potential ways of dealing with both large- and small-scale development. I will begin my talk by sharing three stories with you. All are from a single issue of the Guardian newspaper, published in England. The first story, written by Canadian journalist Naomi Klein, explored the connections between the invasion of Iraq and the oil boom in Alberta, Canada, giving a glimpse of a large territory being laid to waste in the search for oil. The processes involved in turning tar sands into crude oil are both complex and costly: one method involves open-cast mining. For this, great forests have to be leveled and the topsoil removed before huge, specially designed machines dig out the bitumen. The tar is then

chemically diluted and spun around until the oil rises to the top. The waste products are dumped in ponds that are larger than the region's natural lakes. The second story is about a successful businessman in Mumbai who was building an elaborate 60-story home for himself, his mother, his wife, and his son. This enormous “house” raises the question: is there such a thing as our “individual share” of the resources that our cities have to offer? What are the guidelines for evaluating the impact of a building on the city, not just in terms of its aesthetic appearance but also in relation to its ethical performance? The third story is about a movie based on the true account of a psychologist in Liverpool, England, who developed a series of small agricultural plots in the center of the city for immigrants suffering from dislocation and trauma. The story of these allotments is not simply limited to the lives of the refugees but is in turn entangled with the local community—with the tensions and conflicts between people of diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds. In tending to their vegetables on the plots, alongside their neighbors, the participants constructed a collaborative and productive ground for communication and integration. These three stories are all facets of the multiple realities that our individual and group actions shape in the context of the contemporary urban domain. They relate to the argument of the philosopher Félix Guattari in The Three Ecologies. In this profound yet concise manifestation of a holistic approach to our

understanding of ecological issues, he identifies three ecological “registers”: environment, social relations, and human subjectivity. The interplay of these registers informs our thinking about ecological urbanism. When I established the landscape urbanism program in London, it was hard to say how the relationship between landscape and urbanism would produce new models. So part of the work has to do with the establishment of a new kind of ground for these investigations. You can think about the city as a productive landscape—for example, an orchard, a garden for food—that can also be a public space. This is one solution to the tension between agricultural territory and urban territory that creates a new form of space. Patrick Blanc and others have developed the concept of cultivating plants to grow vertically, creating “green walls” that operate between landscape and architecture. How can we take other daily elements of the city, especially the infrastructure, and turn those into new kinds of productive landscapes, with a new kind of aesthetics? Can we make something out of the things that we throw away? Many people collect cans, and the collection of cans can actually become a site of opportunity for a new kind of landscape in the city. Another example: when we have snow, we use of a lot of salt on the roads; one project is focusing on how to transform the site where the salt is produced into a place that people can visit—a new park and landscape. In a more theoretical realm, a series of projects by Italian architect and artist Andrea Branzi operate between the territory of agriculture and artistic practices, as framed in terms of urban practice. Branzi speaks about the concept of “weak urbanism”, an idea inspired by Italian philosopher Gianni Vattimo, who writes about “weak thoughts”. “Weak urbanism” does not mean that we are being weak—it’s about deploying something that is deliberately not strong. A key feature of this type of urbanism is its capacity to be reversible, evolving, and provisory. These qualities are necessary in response to the changing needs of a society in a state of constant reorganization. In China you have many kinds of urban infrastructure that are mobile or transformable, unlike conventional fixed





infrastructure. What I would like to claim is that the ecological urbanism we talk about works at multiple scales of the city and often involves mobility. There are numerous examples of the relationships among movement, the architectural interior, and the question of ecology. UN Studio's project for Mercedes-Benz, for instance, explores movement and also the articulation of the relationship between the inside and outside. It considers the atmosphere of the inside—how it feels, instead of thinking only about what the building looks like. This relationship can have implications for society. For example, French architect Jean Renaudie developed an architecture of social housing in the 1960s and 1970s that instead of the typical, anonymous high-rise block was based on a dense, organic arrangement of building clusters. These buildings present a visionary departure from prevailing modernist ideas. Renaudie designed his buildings according to a complex geometric pattern that placed as much emphasis on the outdoor areas—the terraces and gardens between apartments—as it did on the apartments themselves.

At first, such novel care and attention to the design of low-income housing was criticized by potential inhabitants, who argued that Renaudie's design was not in keeping with the ethos of the working class. Today the buildings represent a desirable community of mixed-income residences. The buildings themselves are also one of the best examples of the use of nature in a high-rise context. Their organizational structure demonstrates the benefits of the flexibility and diversity of relations between the inside and the outside as well as their inseparability from politics. My final point has to do with sensing the city. Part of this goes back to the idea of physical and virtual: today we are using mobile phones, the web, etc., and this communication technology has an impact on the physical environment of the city. So part of our responsibility, part of the idea of ecological urbanism, is to explore the potential generated by these elements. Sissel Tolaas is an artist and smell researcher who did an interesting documentation of the smells of Mexico City. Instead of seeing this city, she wondered, can you experience it through its smells? She collected and categorized smells from locations throughout the city, which she shares with people in exhibitions such as the

one we hosted at the GSD. The importance of analysis of this kind is to challenge the dominance of the visual by considering other ways of experiencing the city. At the beginning, I mentioned three stories that highlighted issues of the environment, society, and subjectivity. I hope my remarks have demonstrated that if we are to think about ecological urbanism, we need to consider all three dimensions. Many of the given examples and approaches were explored at a conference held a year ago at the GSD on the topic of ecological urbanism, which relies on this idea of new subjectivity and is also a spontaneous and aesthetic practice. When we began to design new forms of urbanism, new forms of landscape, it is not enough to be just more ecological with the use of resources—we must imagine new landscapes and new urban environments.

## □ Interlocution

Q1: Could you compare the two concepts, the low-carbon city and ecological urbanism?  
Mohsen Mostafavi: The concept of “low-carbon city” obviously places emphasis on the reduction of carbon, with success registered solely in quantitative terms. I am for the reduction of carbon, of course, but ecological urbanism is less about counting something and more related to qualitative assessments, to the daily experience of the city.

Q2: You have mentioned issues such as sustainable architecture and technology, and we all know that the governance of the city tends to focus on such micro issues, rather than the urbanization of the city as a whole.  
Mohsen Mostafavi: That's partly why we made the book Ecological Urbanism. There are metrics for the sustainability of buildings, but you have very few measurements for the sustainability of the entire urban environment. People desire growth, people desire development, people desire betterment, but urban expansion should be considered in the context of sustainability. The challenge is what we can learn from this expansion, how we can avoid damage. Part of

our responsibility as citizens is to work together, to be politically engaged, to work with our leaders, to create different bases of urban development. One difficulty is that if they are to do things in a more ecological or more sustainable fashion, there is often more expense. People are beginning to realize that you may need to spend more money to produce greater sustainability.

Q3: Your examples are all from outside of China. What do you think of projects such as the Bird's Nest or the CCTV Building? Since some people criticize them and others praise them, I'd like to know your opinion.  
Mohsen Mostafavi: I think that the Bird's Nest and the CCTV Building are both examples of projects that are about the expense. With the engineering of these massy buildings, there's also something happening with the materials, just in terms of the idea of the structure—it's about the aesthetics, and it can be very beautiful. But at the same time, I think the question we have to ask ourselves is: when will something be enough, when will we be happy with having less? I think those projects raised a critical issue, because part of their approach is about their very possibility. In the context of this discussion of ecological urbanism, the idea of using fewer resources but producing beautiful things needs to be thought about more. In China, I think the challenge is one of not relying too heavily on Western knowledge, but to respond to your own culture to realize development, to see progress. The dynamic between tradition and modernization is something for which we don't have a solution; we have to think more about different kinds of environments, and that is something I hope you're working on. It is up to your generation to develop this idea in the future.

9-10. 西斯塞勒·图拉斯关于墨西哥城市的嗅觉研究。她试图通过不同地区空气中的不同的气味感受城市。  
11, 13. 莫森·莫斯塔法维参观北京大学景观设计学研究院  
12. 莫森·莫斯塔法维在对话现场  
9-10. Sissel Tolaas with her interesting documentation of the Smells of Mexico City. She collected and categorized smells from locations throughout the city.  
11, 13. Mohsen Mostafavi visited GSLA  
12. Mohsen Mostafavi communicated with the GSLA students



## W

时间：2010年3月14日16:00

地点：北京大学科技园创新中心505

主持人：俞孔坚

参与人员：媒体、北京大学景观设计学研究院师生

## □ 开场序言

莫森·莫斯塔法维（以下简称莫森）：我很荣幸来到这里，参观北京大学和北京土人景观与建筑规划设计研究院实践和研究的情况。在这里把我的见闻与你们分享——这也算得上是一种新形式的研究探讨。

哈佛大学设计研究生院（GSD）在探索一种辅助性实验型的教育模式；与此同时，我们也将把社会参与性的、创新性的教育模式纳入考虑范畴当中。我认为这对未来的规划十分必要，这也是我对和中国大学间的交流合作感兴趣的部分原因。在中国，社会发展的快速调整重组把许许多多令人欣喜的可能性带给了研究人员。

哈佛大学设计研究生院从事于建筑、景观设计和城市规划与设计的研究，这些学科都各自具有独特的发展历史，在我们努力促进学科发展的同时也发现，这些学科间总能碰撞或摩擦出很多新鲜而有趣的火花。所以一方面我们要继续推动学科的进一步发展，另一方面，我们也要思索不同学科间的适当关联。而有意思的是，并不是所有事物都能被联系在一起，也不是所有的事物都可以相互协作。就像当我们审视一件与景观相关的建筑作品时，其建筑的本身特性是不会模糊的。因此在面对学科调整的同时，如何增加学科间合作渗透的新型模式也成为了我们的挑战。

我对学科间交流的成果颇感兴趣，这种在学科间的结合协作过程中产生出的创新与变革。正因为它们的跨学科性，这种创新形式才更具备互通性，也更具有活跃性。因此，我们尝试在学院中建立这种模式，这就意味着过去几年我们的教学方式正在发生着改变。对于参与到这问题中的每一个人都面临着这样的挑战：如何来组织学院的结构，使其产生新的认



识，创造出新的变革。

哈佛的学生们开始变得更加关注课题与社会参与的结合程度，关注校园内外的联系，关注如何把校园里的研究工作融入社会环境当中；在同一范畴中，怎样才能使学生课题对校园外的社会产生影响呢？反之：社会的参与又会怎样影响到校园里的研究和教学呢？

很多年前，大家都关注“签名实践”（Signature Practices）<sup>①</sup>，在当时，独立建筑家的作品也备受推崇。我认为现如今一些景观师仍在一定程度上钟情于“签名实践”，但时下人们实际上考虑得更加全面，并不仅仅是“签名实践”的问题，而是怎样使人与社会形势相结合，继而为个人实践活动创造新的机会。

在城市规划史中——就拿第二次世界大战后的欧洲来说——当时人们很强调社会公益的某些方面，但现在我们考虑的是社会公益的不同方面。也是由于这个原因，所以哈佛设计研究生院正致力于这些逐渐变得重要的课题。其中之一便是我们今天下午将会讨论到的有关生态都市主义的话题。这其中主要是关于城市的未来发展方向，新的实践形式和设计中新

感，这些都产生于跨学科实践，它涉及到生态与都市主义。我希望稍后可以讨论这些。

## □ 问答部分

提问1：如果您回到在AA建筑学院学习的学生时代，您最看重哪种技能的训练？您是怎样选择研究范围的？

莫森：哦，那是在20世纪70年代的事，我当学生的時候，你们中的大部分人还没有出生呢。我在欧洲度过了一段很美好的时光，那个年代真正建造起来的建筑很少，许多优秀的学院都重视于“纸上建筑”——由于当时还没有电脑，所以我们都是在纸上进行创作，作品并不会被建造。

也正是因为我们的建筑作品不会被真正建造起来，所以便可以对建筑的结构和构造问题“放心”。从某种程度上说，这也是一种创新式的实验方式，因为你可以不必完全考虑实用性问题，因此你能做得更加“随心所欲”。所



以在AA学习的那段时间，我所看到的很多作品都更像是一种实验性的尝试。而现在就很难再有这种机会了。

同时，那也是第一代电脑刚刚起步的时代。初次接触电脑，我们与搞控制学理论的学生在一起，不知你们是否了解控制论，但计算机运算和设计思想间的相互转变是令我非常兴奋的体验。此外，在20世纪70年代，“城市”这一话题频见笔端，而我也对景观或花园设计与城市设计关系的研究产生了更浓厚的兴趣。

现如今的建筑行业拥有很多机遇，了解建筑的潜在本质是我们创新与变革的方向。这些变革而来的新模式会通过塑造原型和研究探索的方式得以实践。所以说，不同时代下有不同的方法，这是令人兴奋的，并充满了机遇。

**提问2：您如何看待景观都市主义和生态都市主义中的理论与实践工作？**

**莫森：**从某种程度上讲，有关景观都市主义的讨论可以说是在批评声中进行的。当在处理景观的时候，我们的确需要考量环境敏感度、考量时间与时势、考量时间与空间的关系。我认为，我们在做城市规划时并没有像做景观一样处理得那么细致。

从来说，景观都市主义已经把自身的感知及处理方法融入城市发展、城市设计和城市规划当中。例如，在法国，许多城市规划的方案都出自景观设计师之手，他们在寻求一种在宏观设计上的总体规划。

另一方面，花园设计与城市设计有着长久的关联传统，这可以追溯到16世纪——这也是我个人非常感兴趣的课题——16世纪末期的“反宗教改革”（Counter-Reformation）时期。在16世纪末，有许多的教会领袖开辟了花园，建造了带花园的私家别墅。这些花园变成了“景观试验田”。我曾着重研究过一位红衣主教，他后来成为了罗马教皇（西克斯都五世，Pope Sixtus V，1585~1590年），他一上任就开始推崇这种花园式景观，使得罗马城的面貌也随之变化。在反宗教改革时期，你可以清楚地看到花园设计在城市设计与城市规划发展当中是如何发挥影响作用的。

因此，景观都市主义并不是凭空而来，而是对源自16世纪的规划设计传统的修正。因此我在伦敦建立研究项目时，我试图设置一些不同之处，与其说是一个景观项目，我觉得那更像是一个城市化的项目，一个说明景观如

何影响城市化进程的项目。所以，景观都市主义并不是简单地将景观与城市化定位，并不是用大大小小的公园绿地来把城市填满，而是需要我们为城市化发展出一套切实可行的方法和理论。学术环境对这些理论发展已产生了影响。而学术环境的变革致使当代的景观都市主义实践理念的回归，并开始对城市进行新一轮的思索。虽然那些传统的实践准则已经存在，但它们依旧可以从新的方式中重新发掘并再度使用。

**提问3：请问您为什么会选择俞孔坚作为哈佛的客座教授？您能否介绍一下哈佛设计研究生院的教学体制与其他院校，比如康奈尔大学和AA建筑学院有何不同？**

**莫森：**我认为俞孔坚教授与众不同（俞笑），在于他是一位少见的能够从全盘角度出发，思考如何与时俱进的学者。我在对景观都市主义进行研究，并在一本已出版的书里曾提到——这也是我将来在今晚与大家谈及的话题——景观的维护。在美国和欧洲有设立很多小公园的传统，这些公园由政府部门管理，他们来对公园进行花木管理和养护，但我们从来没有思考过景观的重要性，以及它与城市的相互关系。从这个尺度上讲，这并不是像政府管理养护公园之类的事情。

我个人对“零维护”的景观十分感兴趣。根据我对当代景观师们的接触了解，我认为俞孔坚是一位把景观的维护运用到实践中的景观师，他的方式最为清晰简明，并运用了他自己独特的景观建造形式。他勇于创新实践，同时也将这些实践与城市化进程和城市发展紧密联系在一起，不是把景观仅仅视为建造花园，而是从地域性的尺度来思考景观，关注城市的基础建设、水系管理、高速公路等等诸如此类的问题。他的这种大尺度的规划掌控才能非同一般；而在美国，很多景观师则把更多的重心放在小尺度的设计上——当然，他们中的一些作品相当出色，因为景观尺度不同，所以在处理手法上也显得更为精细。

据我所知，俞孔坚教授创建了自己的团队，这也成了他的智囊队伍。这就回到了教学与实践的老问题，我认为这也是一种很好的方式，不再只是源自导师的知识传授，团队中的每个人都各有专长，分工协作，这样的组合形式在实践活动中非常奏效。我们可以称其为“一体化设计方式”。这种方式不仅可以运用

在景观建造和城市规划当中，这样的团队模式在建筑设计方面也会处理得更加得心应手，更加丰富全面。

关于学院间教育体制的问题，首先来说，AA建筑学院和康奈尔建筑、艺术和规划学院都设有本科，尽管他们近来开始重视研究生的教育。哈佛大学设计研究生院是研究生级设置的院校，所以氛围与AA和康奈尔有很大不同。我们以研究作为教学的核心，这是非常不同的一点。而AA是一所建筑学院，没有其他的专业，所以人们只在关注建筑。从好的层面说，AA的学术氛围更加纯粹，但这也使其失去了与其他专业，比如景观、城市规划与设计、工程，或是生物医药、法律、管理等学科的关联性。

我认为当我们进行调查研究时，如果不注重加强与其他学科平台的交流与联系，研究是无法达到全面及权威的。我认为设计必须和调查研究进行系统地结合，需要通过图书馆、展览、出版物等形式与大学里不同的学术领域进行调查交流，从而获得真正的研究成果。

令哈佛大学称傲的另一重要方面是它的生源品质和师资力量。哈佛大学的学生们与众不同，他们非常优秀，而这里的教师人员更是来自世界各地，并在各自领域都有着卓越表现。

总的来说，我经历过的不同学术阶段都带给我不同的快乐体验。而我想我们应该好好地把握现在，而不能总是抱着一种怀旧的心情。（俞孔坚：所以说激情和热忱对你来讲最为重要？）的确。如果你在工作当中找不到乐趣，或许你就不该做这种工作。因为激情与热忱是我们研究的动力，是我们创新的源泉。我们也经常去激励和鼓舞周围的人，我认为如果你失去了对工作的这份热情，或许你真的不应该再继续从事下去了。

**提问4：在那些常常遭受沙尘影响，或是过度干旱的地方，您觉得应该怎样运用景观都市主义来解决这些环境问题呢？**

**莫森：**世界上很多干旱的地方都不太适宜植物生长，但这不是说这些地方就不能拥有很好的景观效果。我不赞同把景观建造等同于“绿色植物多多益善”，我觉得我们应该更广义地看待景观。在处理沙漠或过度干旱的地方时，我们应当选择适应性更强的植物，或是该考虑考虑是不是需要改变它的地表材质。其实我们有很多方法可以解决这个问题。

我觉得这个问题跟景观都市主义的关系

不大，这更倾向于你在处理观景时对细节部分的考量，这包括景观的色彩、色调、昼夜的光线变化等等。我认为有些时候我们对景观“转瞬即逝”的一面的关注有限——有时候展现在我们眼前的景观面貌并不是持久不变的，就像早晨的光线与午后的光线，两种光线虽然差别不大，但照射在景观外立面上的效果却相差很远。这是艺术家的工作方式，他们很关注质感。我对可以产生这种新感知的相关方面非常感兴趣。

**提问5：正如您提到的，哈佛设计研究生院参与到了世界各地的研究项目当中，那您认为在实践生态都市主义的过程中最大的挑战是什么？**

**莫森：**GSD的确拥有很多的工作室，也都各具特色。生态都市主义还算是一个比较新的概念，虽然我们也参与到了很多有关城市、生态和系统性建设的课题。在以往的研究工作里，我认为最困难的就是如何运用更细微的感官处理手法，如何参与到一些新型的设计实践活动当中，如何进行艺术美学上的创作，这意味着这些工作室在处理生态与城市化的结合时需要一些有别于常规、区别于传统的运作方式。

因为传统的运作方式只是涉及到系统性问题，或是如何减少能量消耗等问题，而我认为这些问题需要用一种新的角度来思考，需要运用“城市舞台”的理念。城市就像是一个大舞台，在此导演一出戏剧时，就需要演员、剧本、音效设备，以及道具服装，当然，还有表演，需要所有这一切汇集在一起。从某种角度上讲，在城市中，我们需要面对这种情形，并考量“城市舞台场景”。

当我们在学校的时候，只关注物质环境的工作方式是相对简单的。而我们往往忽视了在城市舞台中的“演员”——那些置身于其中的人们——他们与环境的关系。当我们在做生态都市主义的研究时，我们不应该仅仅是去关注那些新的设计形式，而应为那些身处城市中的人们去思考，去思考如何使他们更好地参与其中。所以我们不仅要精于规划设计，还要懂得如何使一座城市更加良好地运作，要懂得如何使人民参与到城市建设中来。■

译者注

①“签名实践”是一种迎合新闻媒体口味、具有表现张力的设计形式，其注重大量修饰，并以视风格和外观为第一设计要素为特征，是带有商业色彩的建筑艺术作品（凯伊·简·霍特兹，1990年1月，《建筑（20世纪80年代的“签名建筑”发展）》）。

## Interlocution with Mohsen Mostafavi

Time: 16:00, March 14th, 2010  
Location: Room 505, Innovation Center, Peking University Science Park  
Presider: Professor Kongjian YU  
Participants: Professors and students of GSLA, media



### □ Prologue

**Mohsen Mostafavi (Mohsen for short as follows):** It has been a great pleasure to be here today, to see how you are working and doing research in this office and also in the university. Based on the many exciting things I have seen, it's clear that a new kind of investigation is going on.

At the Graduate School of Design at Harvard, we are also trying to have a mode of education that is really speculative, that is very experimental; at the same time, it's thinking about a new way of engaging with society as well as being innovative in the kind of work that one does. Planning for the future is critical, and this is part of the reason why we are interested in collaborating with universities in China, with people who are doing research, because obviously this is a nation where there is a great deal of work that's being done very fast, producing a lot of exciting possibilities.

At the GSD we have a number of different areas, with people working on architecture, landscape architecture, and urban planning and design. Today, when you look at these disciplines, each has its own history; and part of the challenge that we've faced is how we can advance these disciplines. At the same time, we find that there are many promising works, many innovations, that interface with these disciplines. So on one hand, you have to move forward with these disciplines, and on the other hand, you have to think about the reciprocities or the connections between them. It creates an interesting situation, because you can't make everything a kind of fusion—not everything can be based on cooperation. When you look at architectural projects related to landscape, there's also something about their quality as architecture. It is a challenge to promote disciplinary advancement while also devising new forms of collaborative engagement.

I'm interested in the resulting idea of transdisciplinary practices where, as a result of this proximity and

cooperation, you actually discover innovation. Because it's across different fields, it's not one thing or another, but it produces new forms of innovation as a result of the interchange or interactivity that reveals new conditions. So we are trying to set up that kind of situation within the context of the school, which means that for the past few years, the way we deal with teaching is changing. And part of the challenge for all of us who are involved is the question of how to organize the structure of the school to produce new forms of knowledge, new forms of innovation.

At Harvard, our students are becoming more and more interested in the question of social engagement, in the way in which what they are doing in the school also relates to something outside of the school. How can you be in the school but, with the same work, have some impact on societal conditions? It also works in the opposite way: how can societal engagement actually impact the nature of research and pedagogy?

Many years ago, there was a lot of emphasis on, let's say, signature practices. People were very interested in the work of individual architects. I think it is still true to some degree for individual landscape architects, but today many people are thinking more broadly, not just about this question of signature practices<sup>①</sup>, but also about the way in which people are engaging with the societal situation and how that forms new possibilities for individual practice.

Within the history of urban planning—after the Second World War in Europe, for example—there has been a lot of emphasis on the notion of the social good, but we are now thinking of a different conception of the idea of social. We are therefore trying to add to the GSD technically to address the topics that we feel are going to be very important. We will discuss one of them this afternoon: ecological urbanism. Basically, we need to think in a new way about the future of our cities; we need to come up with new forms of



practice, new ideas in design, that are a result of, again, a kind of transdisciplinary practice. This is the relationship between ecology and urbanism, which I hope we are going to discuss a little bit later.

## □ Interlocution

Q1: If you could go back to the days at the Architectural Association when you were a student, what kind of training do you think is the most important for you and how would you choose your research range?

Mohsen: I was a student during the 1970s, and so most of you were not yet born. It was a very interesting time in Europe, because it was a period when there was almost no building, and much of the work of the good schools was focused on what was called “paper architecture.” That meant, before the days of computers, we were all drawing and working with paper, and these works were not going to be built.

In knowing from the beginning that you were doing work that was not going to be built, you were also in some ways relieved, if you like, of responsibility for the construction of the building. This was seen as an experiment, as a way to be innovative, because you were not simply thinking about the practicality of things, and you could really do something that was inspired, a little bit more utopian. During that period, I saw a lot of work that was more focused on this kind of experimentation. That’s harder to do now.

What was also exciting for me at the time was that we worked with some of the first versions of computers, with people who were interested in this area called cybernetics. I don’t know if you’ve heard about it, but this is also the relationship between computation and design thinking.

And then also in the 1970s, there was a lot of emphasis on the city. I become more interested in the study of the relationship between landscape or garden design and urban design.

Today there are a lot of opportunities for building, and one of the ways in which it is possible to create innovation is by knowing about the potential realities of construction and almost using those as a form of innovation—developing some experiments, prototypes, investigations. So I think that in different times, you can do different things. They can be just as exciting and create opportunities.

Q2: From your perspective, what is the relationship between academic research and practical work in landscape urbanism and ecological urbanism?

Mohsen: In some ways, you could say that the evolution of the discussion of landscape urbanism is

related to a critique of planning. When you dealing with landscape, there is a sensitivity to environment, to time, and to the relationship between time and space. I think that when we were dealing with the city, with planning, it hasn’t always been as sensitive as landscape study has been.

So landscape urbanism tried to bring some of the sensibilities and methodologies of landscape architecture into urban design or urban planning practice. This is evident, for example, in a country like France, where many of the urban planning projects are been done by landscape architects, who are doing the master planning by looking at large-scale territory.

There is also a very long historical connection between garden design and urban design, going back to the sixteenth century. I was personally researching the period called the Counter-Reformation at the end of the sixteenth century. At that time, you have a number of leaders of the Catholic Church, for example, who are developing gardens, private villas with gardens, and these gardens become the sites of experimentation. I did research about one particular cardinal who became Pope Sixtus V (1585 to 1590). When he became pope, he transformed the city of Rome in ways influenced by what he had done in his own garden. So at this moment, during the Counter-Reformation, you see a period where ideas of garden design have a direct impact on urban design and urban development.

So landscape urbanism is actually a kind of revision of the tradition that goes back to the sixteenth century—it’s not new. When I established the graduate program in London, I tried to do something a little bit different, which is to say that this is an urbanism program, not a landscape program. An urbanism program shows the impact of landscape on urbanism. Therefore it is not just about the position of landscape and urbanism, not about making the city full of parks or green spaces, but about what we can develop as a methodology for urbanism. These ideas developed within the academy are influenced by something that has happened before. But then the academy transforms those things and it goes back to practice, in the sense that contemporary practice is now rediscovering a new way of thinking about the urban. Although the tradition has been there, it’s been rediscovered in a new way.

Q3: Why did you choose Professor Kongjian Yu as a visiting professor at Harvard, and could you please introduce the education system of the GSD? Is there any difference from any other university, such as Cornell or the AA?

Mohsen: I think the work that professor Yu is doing is very unusual. [professor Yu laughs] He is one of the few people who has a sense of contemporary practice as a holistic formal practice—it’s looking at

things together, simultaneously. When I did research about landscape urbanism and we published a book, I wrote that one of the things that is, for me, very interesting—and I’m going to mention it tonight—is the concept of the maintenance of landscapes. In the United States and Europe, there is the tradition of many small parks, which are looked after by the city governments, who do maintenance of trees and this kind of thing. But we have never placed enough emphasis on the possibilities of thinking that the landscape and its relationship to the urban, at that scale, is not like a park that is maintained and controlled by the city government.

To me, this notion of maintenance-free landscape is very interesting. In terms of contemporary landscape architects, I think Yu is using this idea of the maintenance of landscape in the most concise and clear way, and he has really created something, with his own specific way of producing landscape. He combines this with research about urbanization and urban development, and not thinking of landscape only as a garden or a traditional landscape, but thinking about landscape as territory and with regard to infrastructure, big systems of water management, highways—these kinds of things. It’s an unusual talent to have that; most of the focus of landscape architecture in America is actually on smaller territory. Some people do very beautiful things, but it’s at a different scale that deals with different, more subtle problems.

He has also created a team, and this teamwork makes a different kind of knowledge available. This goes back to the question about teaching and practical things; in a different approach for us, we are arranging studios with not just one professor teaching, but more and more it’s a team of people with different kinds of experience. Not everyone has to do the same thing—one person is good at this, another person is at good at something else, and then it’s how this group comes together to create a new structure for pedagogy. We call this integrated design practice. We try to do that not only with landscape and urban issues, but also when we are dealing with architecture—having teams of people with different kinds of experience who think in more holistic ways about how we address issues of design today.

AA and Cornell both have undergraduate schools, although recently they have placed emphasis on their graduate education. At Harvard we are a graduate school, and therefore the dynamic is very different. We are part of the leading university in terms of research, which makes a huge difference. In London, you only deal with architecture; this can be good in some ways, but on the other hand, you don’t have the connection with landscape, with urban planning and design, with engineering; you don’t have the connection with biomedical research, with law, with governance.

When you doing this kind of graduate work, this kind of investigation is really impossible to do world-ranking research if you do not have the possibility of connecting to multiple platforms of knowledge that are available in those other fields. If you believe, as I do, that design must now be systematically connected to research, then you need to have the connection with other aspects of a research university that allow you to have genuine laboratories for innovative investigations into different fields, along with a library, exhibitions, publications, and things like this.

The other thing that makes Harvard unique is that the students are extraordinary, and we also have amazing faculty coming from all over the world, who are doing important research.

I’ve enjoyed all of these schools at different moments, for different things; you try to work with the limitations you have and create new kinds of possibilities. You always want what you doing now to be the most exciting part of what your life is about, rather than thinking that in the past it was better. [Professor Yu: So the most important thing for you is passion?] Yes. If you don’t have that sense of excitement, you shouldn’t do this kind of job. Because it’s very important that you have the enthusiasm to continue this kind of work, to find new situations, new possibilities. A lot of the work we do is about inspiring other people, and if you feel you don’t have the energy, the intellectual condition, to inspire other people, you shouldn’t be doing it.

Q4: If some cities or areas suffer from sandstorms or are too dry for many plants to grow, can landscape urbanism still be used to deal with their environmental problems?

Mohsen: There are many parts of the world that are very dry and have little vegetation, but they still have beautiful landscapes. I don’t think we should define landscape always with the emphasis on green—we could think about landscape in terms of the beauty of the territory more broadly, and not always connected to “green.” People in the desert see a great deal of beauty in particular plants that can grow only in the desert, or they appreciate the other materials of the surface. There are many different ways that you can transform those things. I think it’s not so much a question of landscape urbanism; it’s more a question of how you become sensitive to the little things that matter in landscape: coloration, tonality, differences between day and night, the way that places can be lit.

Something that we don’t pay enough attention to is the ephemeral aspect of landscape—things are not there consistently, not there permanently. So if in the morning the light reveals the surface in a certain way, and in the afternoon it hits it in another particular way, the differentiation between morning light and afternoon light could itself be the way you frame the



variation. It’s how artists work. Artists pay a lot of attention to these qualities. I’m interested in a related notion of the production of new kinds of sensibilities.

Q5: As you mentioned yesterday, the GSD has engaged in many studios all over the world, so what is the most challenging thing when you try to practice your idea of ecological urbanism?

Mohsen: Well, we do a lot of studios, as you’ve said, and they have varied inspirations. Ecological urbanism is relatively new, although we have many studios that deal with the city, with questions of ecology, and with questions of sustainability. So they have existed in the past and they have worked. I think the hardest thing is the question of the articulation of what I was just saying—this new sensibility, this new model of design practice, of artistic practice, which means that the studios have to work with where the combination of ecology and urbanism produces something slightly different from the conventional operations.

The conventional operations just to do sustainability, or energy reduction, and all of those things matter. But a new approach has to do with the concept of urban choreography, in which you see a city as being in some ways like a theater, where the directors try to produce a play with actors, a story, music; they have to make sure the stage, the bodies of the actors, the clothes, the performance, all of these situations come together. In the city, in some ways, we also have to face this kind of situation, where we are thinking about the choreography of the urban scene.

In terms of the way that we working in schools, it’s easier for us to pay attention to the physical

environment. But what we have not focused on so much is the relationship between the actors—the people who are participating in the scene, and the space. So a lot of what we want to do with ecological urbanism is not just simply the idea of new design, but also new forms of participation, different models of people being active, contributing to the life of the city. And that needs to come as part of the studios, which is a hard thing to do, because the time you have for studios is normally focused on the production of the design. We get very good at design, but we need to get very good at governance, at understanding how cities run; we need to think about the way that people participate and live the life of the city. ■

### NOTE

① Signature Practice was a mediagenic, mesomorphic form of design. It was a product in which cosmetics mattered most and design’s first order was style and surface. It was architecture for The Art of the Deal. [Kay, Jane Holtz, January, 1990, Architecture (development of signature architecture in the 1980s) ]