E/D/I/T/O/R/I/A/L
主/编/寄/语

哈尔滨文化中心湿地公园——这座面积达200hm^{2}的城市湿地公园，利用城市雨洪和水厂尾水，通过最少的干预营建了一座服务于当地居民的城市公园，并采用放牧管理将景观管理成本降到最低，同时使景观发挥其生态服务功能。

The 200 hm^2 Harbin Cultural Center Wetland Park uses urban storm and tail-water to create an urban park that is accessible to local residents with minimum intervention. It also minimizes the management cost through grazing management and brings the ecological service function of landscape into play.

俞孔坚摄于2013年9月22日。
Taken by Kongjian Yu, September 22nd, 2013.

/ 向农民学习

主编 / **俞孔坚**

如何使城市里的公园和绿地无需花费高昂的投入去营建，无需耗费大量的水源去浇灌，无需消耗大量的能源和劳力去维护，而同时又使之不至于荒芜，仍然能为城市和居民提供服务？出路只有一条：向农民学习。

我这里所说的农民不是在北美大平原上驾驶着现代化机械进行作业的产业化农民，而是靠传统的农耕生产为生的自然经济下的小农。我曾经批判过“小农意识”，包括攀比意识、杂草意识和庆宴意识，但这并不妨碍我们向农民学习其土地的伦理、造田的技术与艺术。它们对于营造今天的城市景观，具有极其珍贵的启示意义。

在土地伦理和价值观层面上，以自给自足为基本特征的小农经济的优点（在其他意义上是局限）在于，农民从土地上所索取的只需满足自己和全家的生活所需即可，这决定了他们对自然的干预是有界限的，即最少的干预。让土地丰产并珍惜来之不易的收获，使“勤俭节约”成为评价其行为的核心标准之一。小农与土地的关系，天生就是以可持续为核心的，因为传宗接代为自然经济下的人伦第一要义：继承祖上所传的田亩，将遗产不减一分一毫或更多地传给后代，让后代拥有更好的生活，而这正是当代可持续理论的精髓。工具和技术的局限，决定了农民以宜人的空间尺度进行土地改造和管理。以个体和家庭为单位的生产组织过程以及春种秋收的节律适应，决定了邻里合作、亲友合作的重要性，因此社区便得以形成。而所有这些——最少干预、勤俭节约、可持续、宜人尺度、社区感——不正是当代城市景观所应有的特质和功能吗？

当然，若想将这些农民及其农耕生产过程中所体现的优秀特质转译为当代景观营造和管理的具体实践方式，尚需更加深入的、细致的分析。我把这些技术归结为以下几个方面。

填挖方技术。对于农民来说，填方和挖方是同时进行且不可分离的。但在今天的工程规范中，填和挖是分开的，挖一方土和填一方土的工程量需要分开计算。回顾现代的城市景观营造，我们看到多少为了挖湖而运出土方，或为了堆山而运入土方的浪费工程和造作地形。如果我们懂得像农民那样去填挖方、去造地形，我们的景观便能更具能效。

灌溉技术。当代的许多城市绿地已经离不开喷灌技术和排涝管道。向农民学习，就是要让我们的城市景观不再需要这样的“现代”灌溉系统。如果能够懂得如何利用自然的降雨来滋润土地和植被，便可以营造出高能效的景观。无论是在天津桥园还是哈尔滨群力湿地公园的实验性设计中，雨水都是天然的灌溉水源，因而，公园的管理成本仅为一般城市公园的三分之一。

施肥技术。城市里的绿地需要施肥吗？完整的营养链在当代城市生活中早已被切断，被农民当作宝贝的有机肥料，而今变成了一种城市灾害，对河流湖泊造成了污染。向农民学习，就是要缝合这个被切断的营养链，让施肥的过程也成为净化水体的过程。这样就可以节省化肥成本，污水净化的费用也可以减少。上海后滩公园将黄浦江的富营养 “污水”作为湿地植物和梯田作物的肥料来源，不仅净化了河水，也免去了人工施肥，一举而多得。消费型公园便可由此转变成生产型的高能效景观。

播种与收获。不为收获而播种的农民，一定会被看作是不务正业的农民。让土地丰产，天经地义。向农民学习，让城市绿地回归生产，则可以使我们的景观变得更加有意义且更加高能效。当然，景观的“收获”不再局限于食物生产的意义，还包括更综合的生态系统服务的含义。

所以，要实现城市中公园、绿地的高能效，我们有必要向农民学习，回归土地的伦理，回归造田、灌溉、施肥、播种和收获的基本技术。这既是回归，也是创新。

/ Learning from Peasants

Chief Editor / **Kongjian Yu**

How can we construct urban parks and green spaces without costly investment? To irrigate without consuming large quantities of water? To maintain without large inputs of energy and labor? To maintain their functions to cities and urban residents, rather than becoming wastelands? The only way is to learn from peasants.

I am not interested in industrial farmers operating modern combine harvesters and seeders on the great plains of North America, but peasants living within traditional farming methods and economies. I once criticized the “small-peasants consciousness”, including the ideas of comparison, wild weeds and feast, but I now believe we can learn from this land ethic, as well as the techniques and art of field making, which are precious references for constructing urban landscape today.

In terms of land ethics and sense of values, the merit of small-scale peasant characterized by self-sufficiency (which might be limits in other perspectives) is a reciprocal relationship with the land where demand does not exceed need, which means peasants’ intervention with nature is limited — the minimum intervention. They aim for a good harvest and cherish hard-earned yields. Nature is only altered where needed, and thus being “diligent and thrifty” is one of the core criteria to evaluate their activities. The relationship between peasants and their lands is intrinsically sustainable. The most important economy is the legacy of carrying forward the family name. At the core of modern sustainability is the idea that we will offer future generations better lives. The constraints of tools and technologies determine the suitable scale and arrangement of land transformation and management, while the production process and season rhythm adaptation (sowing in spring and harvesting in autumn) determine the cooperation among neighbors, family members and friends, enabling communities to be formed. All of these — minimum intervention, industriousness and thrift, sustainability, suitable scales, and a sense of community — are characteristics and functions that should be found in the modern urban landscape.

Of course, in-depth and careful analysis is needed to translate these good characteristics, reflected in traditional agricultural production process, into the specific practice of landscape creation and management. These techniques can be summarized as follows.

Cut and fill. For peasants, cut and fill are simultaneous and inseparable. However, in modern construction, cut and fill are evaluated as two separate concepts and calculated separately. A review of modern urban landscapes would show many examples of waste generated to create constructed terrains, such as the digging out of lakes and transportation of new earth to create hills. Following the peasant model of equal cut and fill, our landscapes would be more energy efficient and easily constructed.

Irrigation. Many vegetated areas in cities could not thrive without sprinkling irrigation and drainage pipelines. To learn from peasants is to construct urban landscapes without such “modern” irrigation systems. Energy-efficient landscapes can be constructed if we know how to use natural rainfalls to irrigate land. For example, in the designs of Qiaoyuan Park in Tianjin and Qunli Wetland Park in Harbin, rains are the primary irrigation source. Because of this strategy, their maintenance costs are less than one third that of other urban parks.

Fertilization. Do we really need to fertilize urban green spaces? The tropic chain in modern cities has long been severed, and organic fertilizers, once cherished by peasants, have become urban disasters, polluting our rivers and lakes. To learn from peasants is to re-stitch the trophic chain and turn fertilization into water purification. The cost put towards buying fertilizers would be saved and the cost of purifying wastewater reduced. In the Houtan Park in Shanghai, the eutrophicated “wastewater” from the Huangpu River is used as fertilizer for wetland plants and crops on terraced fields, purifying river water while removing the need of artificial fertilization. The consumptive park has become productive energy-efficient landscape.

Sowing and Harvesting. Peasants sowing not for harvest will be seen as worthless peasants. It is perfectly justified to have fertile lands. To learn from peasants is to restore the productive function of urban green areas and make our landscapes more energy-efficient and meaningful. Of course, the “harvest” of landscape is no longer limited to food production, but also comprehensive ecosystem services.

Therefore, to increase the energy-efficiency of parks and green space in cities, we must learn from peasants, look to a traditional land ethic and bring back such fundamental techniques of field making, irrigation, fertilization, sowing and harvesting. It is both return and innovation. (Translated by Jindong CAI)