关于（荒野）殖民化
About Colonisations

著：（德）狄德瑞奇·布鲁斯 译：王应临 校：崔庆伟
Author: (DEU) Diedrich Bruns Translator: WANG Yinglin Proofreader: CUI Qingwei

著者简介：
（德）狄德瑞奇·布鲁斯 / 男 / 德国卡塞尔大学景观规划与土地利用荣誉教授 / 研究方向为规划历史、范式与方法，特别是公众参与和文化多样性
(DEU) Diedrich Bruns is a professor emeritus of landscape planning and land use at Kassel University, Germany. Research interests are in planning history, paradigms and methods, particularly with respect to participation and cultural diversity.

译者简介：
王应临 / 女 / 博士 / 北京林业大学园林学院、城乡生态环境北京实验室讲师 / 本刊特约编辑 / 研究方向为风景园林遗产保护与管理
WANG Yinglin, Ph.D., is a lecturer in the School of Landscape Architecture, Beijing Forestry University, a member of Beijing Laboratory of Urban and Rural Ecological Environment and a contributing editor of this journal. Her research focuses on protection and management of landscape architecture heritage.

校者简介：
崔庆伟 / 男 / 博士 / 北京林业大学园林学院、城乡生态环境北京实验室讲师 / 研究方向为风景园林规划设计理论、废弃矿山修复与再生
CUI Qingwei, Ph.D., is a lecturer in the School of Landscape Architecture, Beijing Forestry University, a member of Beijing Laboratory of Urban and Rural Ecological Environment. His research fouses on landscape architecture planning & design theory, restoration and reclamation of discarded mines.

摘要：由于人类体验自然的渴望日益增长，在政治和实践层面，在城市中提供接触自然的机会显得越来越必要。关于"城市荒野"的思想和规划旨在提供一种特殊的自然体验。鉴于不同荒野思想之间存在冲突，风景园林师必须设法了解已有的荒野认知及其含义。通过 3 个荒野类别——"未知荒野""特定荒野"和"过程荒野"，探讨发展千年的荒野理念，并提出"殖民化"（colonisations）概念作为理解荒野理念发展的一个关键。自然过程伴随着动植物对空间的殖民，而人类进入和占有空间的殖民过程则包含生理、心理和精神 3 个层面的内容。空间命名是一种特殊的、具有精神和象征意味的殖民化形式。例如，人类在城市中发现野生植被，称其为"野性自然"或"城市荒野"。然而，如今大多数（尤其官方）的荒野定义中均排除了人类干扰：一旦被殖民，真正的荒野就不复存在。科学研究对自然过程的殖民化已取得很多成果，但对于人类有关自然和荒野的认知和态度了解并不多。对于风景园林师来说，这有助于更好地理解如何"基于自然进行设计和建造"，对创造令人满意的景观也非常重要。探讨与"城市荒野"有关的论述、规划和设计观点及思想。
关键词：自然过程；自然发展；自然体验；城市景观；荒野概念

Abstract: As people's longing for nature-experience is growing, providing access to nature in the city is becoming increasingly relevant both politically and in practice. The idea of and planning for "Urban Wilderness" promises a special kind of nature-experience. Acknowledging how different perceptions create conflict, landscape architects must try to understand which wilderness perceptions exist and what they might imply. Employing three categories, "Unknown Wilderness", "Specific Wilderness" and "Process Wilderness", this essay discusses ideas of wilderness that have developed over millennia until today. For the purpose of this essay, the term "colonisation" serves as key to understanding how ideas of wilderness develop. Natural processes include colonisation of space by plants and animals. Processes of people entering and taking ownership of areas include colonising space physically, mentally and spiritually. Naming areas is a special form of mental and symbolic colonisation, for example, when people "discover" wild looking vegetation in the city and calling it "untamed nature", or "Urban Wilderness". However, most current and particularly official definitions of wilderness exclude human interference: Once colonised, "True Wilderness" ceases to exist. Scientific studies have contributed much knowledge about natural processes and colonisation but little about people's ideas of and attitudes towards nature and wilderness. For landscape architects it would be important to learn more about how "designing and constructing with (ideas of) nature" might contribute to providing desirable landscapes. This essay discusses some (of the many) attitudes and thoughts related to discourses, planning and design for and of "Urban Wilderness".
Keywords: natural process; nature development; nature experience; urban landscape; wilderness concept

在风景园林学科，从专业领域建立之初延续至今，设计结合自然和自然过程[1]一直是非常重要的基本理念。最初从业者在花园和公园设计中运用"自然演进"相关的概念、方法和技术，后来进一步将其运用于景观和生态规划领域。作为风景园林师，我们擅长实践，同时也必须深入思考所使用术语的含义。使用缺乏清晰定义的理念，即使其初衷是美好的，也有削弱作为专业基础的共同信念的危险。"荒野"，特别是"城市荒野"，在风景园林领域是一个缺乏认知的概念[2]。更加复杂的是，当前我们正在学习和借鉴的一些新的、富有雄心的概念往往和"城市荒野"密切相关，如"新生自然"（Novel Nature）、"工业森林"（Industrial Forest）、"城市森林"（Urban Woodlands）、"城市野地"（Urban Wildlands）和"城市荒野"（Urban Wilderness）。此外，新的公园和开放空间建设在某种程度上开始包括荒野的理念。这些概念和工程涉及多种荒野（和自然）的含义，运用这些含义可能导致专业领域认知的模糊，引发我们对于所做工作的困惑[3]。当然，在概念错综复杂模糊不清的时候，也恰恰存在更好的机会用以指导我们的行为或实践。因此，对这些含义进行探析显得非常重要。

笔者提出一个术语"殖民化"作为了解人类如何感知和进入荒野的关键。本研究的目的并非赋予荒野及其相关术语明确定义，而是更好地理解与"城市荒野"相关的多重含义。将"殖民化"运用于多个维度，包括征地、土地利用、社会占有和意识渗透等，同时也应用于自然过程，如动植物对某地区的入侵和定植定居。

1 荒野相关理念

人类其实是通过命名，创造了一个又一个荒野。这种命名的途径包括认定某个区域是荒野，或者赋予其荒野的意味。尽管人类对于荒野地并不了解，而一旦称其为荒野，说明他们将会占有这片区域，开始对这里进行殖民。人类对一处区域进行殖民的复杂性在于不仅包括身体活动（散步、划船、野营等），还包括社会实践（团体活动、竞技和社会媒体等）和意识（"荒野体验"）。占有土地及物质资源是殖民化的第一个和最重要的维度。思想的

渗透和占有则是一种不具体但强有力的殖民化维度，是文化和理念层面占有，如将一片区域划定为荒野"保护地"并进行管理。在所有这些活动和过程中，一些荒野品质遗失了。人类欣赏并游览那些被归入原始自然的区域。每次的到访都会减弱这些原始区域"无拘束"（untrammelled）的特性。游人被荒野地区的自然特征（自然声音、纯净水体、清洁空气等）吸引。同时，通过支持其保护和管理、控制可进入权和使用（游客低密度的物质殖民），人类也占领了这些"纯净"的荒野区域。实质上，从日常生活（主要在城市）中解脱出来的游客，在荒野保护地中，可能更喜欢有人类不经意地出现。城市景观尚且不具有这些特质，因此，一些人将具有自然面貌的城市区域称作荒野。当提到"城市荒野"，人们脑海中会浮现出哪种类型的区域呢？

在不同时期和文化背景存在不同的荒野理解[4-7]。通过提出 3 个荒野类型，试图理解与"城市荒野"理念相关的荒野区域[8]。它们包括：1）"未知荒野"（Unknown Wilderness），例如神秘森林；2）"特定荒野"（Specific Wilderness），例如人类认为是野生区域的场地；3）"过程荒野"（Process Wilderness）强调与生态活力有关的自然性。

2 殖民"未知荒野"

在史前时期，野性因素是指超越或者外在于人类日常生活范畴的事物[9]。人类将这种"外在性"看作"伟大的未知"，看作充满神奇力量的虚幻和神秘世界。然而，不论这个世界看上去多么未知、荒凉和危险，总有人会冒险进入它。无论是游牧生活还是不断迁移（荒野曾经是摩西及其子民进行探索的区域），他们都需要探索食物来源并殖民新的土地。他们还会外出寻求非凡的经历，或在面对恐惧、忍受和抵抗诱惑的时候证明自己。因此几千年以来，人类已经改变了一部分地球环境，不仅改变了他们家园范围之内的区域，还包括那些直接控制之外的领域。任何曾经到访原住民区域的人，都会了解到原住民如何富有创意地赋予远离家园的区域以精神层面的意义。例如处在村庄和打猎场地之间的古代精神场

所和路线。由于打猎和采集活动对生态系统有影响，如促进有用物种生长、使用火改善生活状况和加工食物等[10]，当现代政府开始把荒野地作为保护地进行保护的时候，他们习惯性地忽视人类在这些区域生活并且已经生活了很长时间的事实。例如，政府在宣布建立保护地的时候，没有一个国家公园是"没有人类存在的荒野地区"[11]。

在古代，很长时期里，荒野是定义模糊的领域，是一种有关未知甚至伟大的未知的理念。例如，生活在地中海区域的人们认为任何野生的事物往往处于天堂的对立面，或者说在天堂之外。封闭空间的古波斯语是"pairidaēza"，在很多语言中，这个词用以指代天堂①。作为最宜人的场所，在很多文化背景下，天堂的创建与再造是几千年来被重点关注的问题。"崎岖的荒野（steep wilderness）"围绕在约翰·米尔顿（John Milton）伊甸园"芬香的天堂（delicious Paradise）"周围，在花园围墙的远处充斥着黑暗。在中世纪的欧洲文化中，作为神秘土地的荒野处在家园、城堡、城镇和农业区域之外。在旷野、沼泽、野生森林、高山和远海等环境中有令人恐惧和敬畏的野兽。森林作为有魔力和危险的地方，是所有林地自然状态地区中典型的荒野 [今天许多人认为"丛林"（jungle）一词才是"真正的荒野"]。森林边界是人类通常不会冒险去跨越的一条线：农民很少远离村庄去旅行，他们不能确保在村庄的不远处没有住着一个食人魔、女巫或罪犯。而在古老的神话故事中，英雄（比如罗宾汉）确实进入了森林（去藏身）。森林充满魅力，诱惑人去冒险，帮人躲避追赶。魔力森林是超出常人经验的、变化莫测的地区。例如在德国民俗中，森林代表危险的场地和神奇的避难所。德鲁伊人、隐士或者勇敢的骑士会跨越国境，去寻找隐居之地、灵感、伟大的宝藏或者极端的冒险[12][11]。而根据科学研究，欧洲的森林从旧石器时代就已被显著的利用和改造[13]。

总之，在史前和早期历史时期，荒野是与精神层面有关的概念，包含危险的意味。通常来说，荒野是一个总体概念而不具体指代一个地方。很少有人能够寻找到某处具体的荒野地

（比如隐藏的山洞和神圣的土地）。现实中的土地利用形式并不是荒野概念的组成部分。

荒野及其相关概念如何继续演化，以及这些概念如何开始与具体场地发生关联，在起初并不明确。随着时代发展，有关荒野是伟大的未知，是安全和美好事物的对立面等认知逐渐减弱。例如在罗马历史学家塔西托斯（Tacitus）的《日耳曼》（Germania）中，提到了一个具体的、明确界定了边界的地区。然而，他用并不明确的术语描述了这个地区的多种特性。大约公元 98 年，在把《日耳曼》作为一个信息传递给当时的罗马读者时 [14]77，塔西托斯对这个地区的土著人有一套刻板印象，认为他们是"高贵但嗜血的野蛮人"，他们的土地是"野生森林"。他粗略描述的日耳曼森林是充斥着残忍野兽和野蛮人类的黑暗领域。

塔西托斯创造了一个思想库，使得后世的作家可以从中汲取灵感，并继续加以丰富。16—19 世纪，当欧洲人游览和殖民美洲、非洲、亚洲和大洋洲时，他们往往会遇到原住民。很多原住民并没有关于土地的正式地图，也没有关于他们自己的正式文字记录。这些欧洲访客开始绘制地图，记载他们是如何认知这些原住民的，尽管这种记载具有选择性 [15]。这些记载中充满了鼓舞人心的细节，启发艺术和文学思想。例如，19 世纪，浪漫主义从中提取元素来更新其陈旧的模式（包括绅士和残忍的红色恶魔）。旧的模式马上被抛弃 [16]。北美洲大地成为具体但仍然定义模糊的地区，即"野性西部"（Wild West）。亨利·大卫·梭罗（Henry David Thoreau）在文章《漫步》（Walking）中说道："我所谓的西部其实是荒野的代名词。"西部一词似乎不再指代黑暗，而是伊甸园，宣告着它的神圣，"我从没有听过或读到过任何有关天堂的描述赶得上它（此处指代西部）的一半" [17]。到 1991 年，植物学家斯坦温·谢特勒（Stanwyn Shetler）将其感知的荒野描述为"最初的伊甸园，一处原始的自然王国"，这里"原住民在景观中是透明的，作为生物圈中的自然要素一般生活。他们的世界……是一处几乎察觉不到人类干扰的净土" [18]。

综上，荒野"本质上由人类创造……它看上去如此自然，因而更为引人遐想" [19]。所谓"未知荒野"，是针对没有人类的世界（或者人类属于荒野的天然组成部分）的一种构想，是一种近乎天堂和自然的理念。城市荒野概念可能保留了一些人类与"未知"相联系的痕迹，例如很少的人类活动以及因为自然主宰而需要努力才能进入的地区。

3　殖民作为自然遗产的"特定荒野"

在探索和发现时期，荒野不再与"未知"的领域相关联。接下来的例子证明了荒野如何转变为一处"特定"的地方，即人类将其看作"自然遗产"加以赞美和保护。在 17、18 世纪的诸多探索中，在北美洲的"西部"变成"荒野"之前，来自西班牙的征服者们试图寻求冒险和财富，而神父们则努力寻找并转化"野蛮的"当地人。西班牙人到达了与他们毫无关联并且语言不通的地区。例如，有时候他们难以描述一条巨大且无法跨越的河流的规模和特征。他们只能记录河流的具体位置和水的颜色，并将这条河流命名为"科罗拉多"（Colorado）[20]。许多年后，在洪堡式（Humboldtian style）探险时代末期，大约 1857—1858 年，浪漫主义艺术家发表了他们通过地图和绘画记载其游览这条河流的场景 [21]。不像早期的神父，这些浪漫主义旅行者的行李中除了《圣经》，可能还有卢梭（Rousseau）、沙夫茨伯里（Shaftesbury）以及其他人的著作。卢梭解释了自然状态下人类如何享有充足的自由。安东尼·阿什利·库珀（Anthony Ashley Cooper，1621—1683，即沙夫茨伯里伯爵）阐明了荒野如何令人愉悦以及自然的经历如何引发"合理的喜悦"（reasonable extasy）[6]447, [12]111。如今浪漫主义者怀着极度的惊喜站在科罗拉多河流峡谷边，试图通过很多语汇去描述这些过去神父们不能欣赏的（特殊）场景。在世界很多地方，人类开始用新的视角观看过去的场景。回到欧洲，浪漫主义者重新发现了阿尔卑斯山脉。在人类的认知中，这些地方从原来的冷漠荒凉变为如今的舒适、受欢迎。在曾经危险的"荒野西部"，浪漫主义者看见了如画般的崇高场景 [22]。此时，科罗拉多峡谷成为所谓的"大峡谷"（Grand Canyon）[20]38。

在西方文化中，冒险和探索时代带来了一种变化，荒野从暗示着野蛮危险和模糊（外面的世界）转变为令人兴奋和敬畏的场所。航海者跨越边境，在荒野之地寻找并占有财富。世界旅行者在冒险之旅中记述那些鼓舞人心的见闻，这些旅行见闻的出版进一步激发了国内读者的热情。整个大陆都在等待发现和殖民。荒野将被征服，宝藏将被发掘 [14]77。

科罗拉多大峡谷是一处特殊的宝藏。1919 年，当政府取得这里的所有权并宣布对其进行保护的时候，这里被"正式殖民"。做出这一决定的过程是艰难的。很多利益相关组织对于保护"自然遗产"而不是开发这片土地及其"资源"的想法提出质疑。尽管这里如此荒野（基于当今 IUCN 的标准），政府宣布将大峡谷（以及西部几个其他壮观的地区）作为一处公园而不是荒野进行保护。荒野成为具有崇高性或美学上的愉悦性而受人欢迎的空间。在 1864 年，风景园林师奥姆斯特德作了题为《约塞米蒂和蝴蝶林》（Yosemite and the Mariposa Grove）的报告，报告中他以一处设计的公园、一系列具体场景和视图、一幅壮丽的艺术作品的方式来描述了山谷和丛林。

作为公园，国家公园和其他大型保护区一样，都有明确的边界和大门、建设的游览路线和停车场、指定的露营地、餐馆和旅馆等其他服务设施。政府通过划定保护地并建设基础设施的方式对国家公园进行殖民，忽视了当地原住民的利益和权利。荒野不再具有野性，而成为一种美丽的土地利用形式。所谓"特定荒野"是关于游客进入"野地"看一部分世界的构想，他们可以舒适地享受贴近大自然的感觉，并寻求他们与某处特定区域相关联的特殊体验。城市荒野理念可能包括人类与"特定场地"（specific）相关联的痕迹，比如遇见相似观念的人，发现特殊类型的自然，在这类自然中已经有人（公园管理者、设计师等）为游客提供可接近的便利条件。作为公园，城市荒野区域同样具有边界、可进入的基础设施和游客。

直到今天，政府通过划定某个区域为国家公园来保护重要的、在全球范围内具有影响力的遗产 [2, 20]。除了自然遗产，《保护世界遗

产公约》（UNESCO，1972 年）还保护文化遗产。地区的军事和工业遗产是其文化遗产的一个类别。自 20 世纪 70 年代以来，这两个概念都已成为一个美学范畴。下文将通过一个例子来展示文化遗产如何与荒野理念相融合。

4 殖民作为文化遗产的"特定荒野"

军事区、采矿厂、钢铁厂、铁路转运站等在运营或者停止运营一段时间后属于危险场地，不准许人们进入。如同伟大的未知荒野，它们也处在人们日常生活之外，是处于围墙中的禁忌场地。政府常常在官方地图上把这些未经授权的未知领域画成白色，而不标注细节。20 世纪 50 年代以及接下来的 20 年见证了一个重工业时代的结束。重工业区关闭的浪潮改变了世界范围内工业区的特征。采矿和钢铁制造业关闭，工人离开。只有围墙依然存在。例如，1985 年，在德国鲁尔区（Ruhrgebiet），杜伊斯堡—梅德瑞克（Duisburg-Meiderich）蒂森（Thyssen）工厂的冶炼工作停止了。因为只有钢铁工人才能进入，几乎没有人熟悉这块场地。在停止生产之后，这片场地仍然关闭以免公众受害。杂乱的植物开始在这里出现，并不受人为干扰地生长，无秩序的黑莓藤条和野生灌木丛逐渐覆盖了场地的大部分面积。可以想象，有一天人类在围栏上凿了一个洞来到这里，穿过灌木丛寻找道路，如同在丛林探险，他们将面临一个一无所知的世界：铸造厂、储气罐、冷却塔、汽轮机、矿坑和矿渣堆。特别是对于孩子来说，这一定是令人激动的。当"现代"浪漫主义者们来到这里，他们采用如同描述魔法森林的传说一般强有力的隐喻来描述这片场地。现在这里是杜伊斯堡北风景公园（Landscape Park Duisburg-Nord）。纽约时报在关于这个公园的一篇文章中，将 3 个高炉描述为"盘旋在场地之上的生锈的巨龙，它们的嘴巴不再喷火"。冶炼厂关闭时，文章继续写道："可怕的庞然大物仍然存在，它们的恢宏和壮丽几乎是神话一般，宿命般地被困在此处。在 21 世纪早期的典型公园中，它们可能会重生的想法如同看见翼龙从头顶飞过一般都有可能发生。"[23]

这篇文章的目的并不是如题目所说的"反

奥姆斯特德（Anti-Olmsted）"，或是对奥姆斯特德反浪漫主义的论述提出质疑。文章主要内容介绍杜伊斯堡北风景公园遗产。"反奥姆斯特德"是指在设计中不是完成一种看上去自然的、人类在其中"幻想在原始自然中得到庇护"进而满足的景观。相反，通过允许野生植物自由生长，实现对更大面积废弃土地的殖民；通过完整保留高炉、煤气罐和储料坑，工业时代的文化遗产本身成了公园设计的主题。杜伊斯堡北风景公园的规划并不是创造一处地球上的天堂，而是展现那段人口稠密和伤痕累累地貌的历史。在这里，如同伊甸园一样，碧草青青也非常遥远[23]。

景观及其创造物（花园和公园等）随时间不断演化。设计一处景观实际上设置了一个融入自然过程的序列。杜伊斯堡北风景公园的设计师彼得·拉茨（Peter Latz）持续关注公园内的变化。在观察这些变化 25 年之后，他发表了他的发现[24]。就像奥姆斯特德一样，拉茨在19世纪对这个公园进行了描述和讨论。尽管拥有清晰的结构，不夸张地说，场地的大部分区域都表现出荒野的属性。然而，所有在无序的系统中看上去自然和自发的要素其实是伟大规划的一部分。对于风景园林师来说，这里没有自然秩序和未经触碰的自然。公园成为一处受欢迎的目的地，满足人们自然、文化和运动相关的休闲活动需求。人们迅速占领这里，在建筑师尚未提出再利用策略之前就开始充分利用场地空间：一面古旧的混凝土墙成为一个攀爬公园；一个跳水俱乐部则占据了煤气罐，将里面灌入 20 000 m³ 的水，用来进行潜水练习；戏剧、歌剧和电影等节事活动在冶炼高炉举行；矿坑中有繁荣生长的花园。来自邻里社区的人们从墙的缺口（被设计的）处溜进来，带着他们的狗在这里散步。

在这片区域，受约束的和自然的生长彼此竞争，植物可以自发传播。例如，一场关于外来植物已经入侵这片土地的激烈讨论已持续多年。植物专家知道某些植物属于欧洲地区德国以外的原生物种。他们也知道这里的一些其他植物是从遥远的大陆迁移来的。随着铁矿石的运输，外来物种（Alien species）可能是最先到达杜伊斯堡的偷渡者。生态学

家通过公园调查，发现这里有百余种非原生物种。"保护专家希望彻底去除这些外来植物，而拉茨想要告诉园艺师如何培育这些植物，其中有一些是非常稀有的"[23]。与文化遗产公园有关的设计和理念变得流行。桦树、柳树和醉鱼草属植物与人工栽植的树木一起生长，同时装饰着巨大的矿渣堆。

5 "过程荒野"

第 3 个荒野类型是"过程荒野"，这个名字源于自然（所谓的"野生"）演替的过程性，进而与其他类别相区别。只要一个区域有适宜的条件，就会有野生动植物的入侵。森林大火和地质滑坡之后，休眠的种子会立刻萌发；风和鸟类在空中运送植物和小动物，使其在任何可能条件下茁壮生长，包括屋顶、泥浆池和军事训练场。在战争和旧工业设施清理之后，野生生物出现。20 世纪 20—30 年代，注意到自然入侵经常形成丰富的野生物种群体，生物学家和工程师开始研究能够将自然演替融入景观工程的技术[25]。自然的发展演变需要时间：自然草地的再生需要几十年，森林再生则需要几百年，这个时间对于委任的景观工程来说太长。20 世纪 30 年代早期，风景园林师开始尝试加速自然发展的进程。他们在建设新的，例如基础设施和房地产项目时，从草地和森林中收集当地的种子和植物，建立原生植物群落。这种对于自然植物的使用与18世纪设计具有自然面貌的风景公园不同。风景园林师不再提倡模仿自然栖息地，而是构建自然栖息地。例如，德国在景观建设中使用原生植物物种的目的并不是去仿造一处荒野，而是通过绿化展示场地的自然特征[26]。在考虑场地的自然特征时，设计师为了在没有原生植被的情况下确定参考点和证据，往往运用生态数据来绘制所谓的"潜在自然植被图"（PNV）。这些地图展示的不是最初的和原始的荒野，而是假设在自然入侵和演替之后，在不经过人类干扰的情况下，地区将会发展出来的植被类型[27]。从大约 20 世纪 60 年代开始，自然入侵和本地植物的利用成为土地复原、生态修复和栖息地重建实践中的技术手段[25]。

接下来的案例展示了 20 世纪 80 年代德国

政府在实行减轻和补偿环境影响措施时如何运用自然过程来配合设计修复工程。案例位于德国黑森（Hessen）州富尔达（Fulda）市郊区，是用于补偿大尺度铁路转换站工程的湿地修复项目。1983 年，黑森州管理局将这个湿地修复补偿工程纳入高速铁路线的审批工作中。在一些低于地下水位几米的地方，工程师去除了所有的植被和顶层土壤，因此这里成为一张白纸，植物可以自然入侵。修复工程实际上降低了过去对开放湿地栖息地的影响，新的场地需要尽可能地长年保持开放和阳光照射。规划的目标是为邻近的湿地"贡献"入侵物种，在林地植被的种子到达此处和萌发之前，让湿地植物首先覆盖所有开放土地。场地设计的目标是进一步释放植物的入侵定植过程，并允许自然过程在这里快速发展[28]。

建造工程与官方监测在 1986 年停止。作为该工程的设计师，笔者持续关注着场地发生的变化。最初，一切发展顺利。自然的入侵最初是一年生草本植物，第二年是多年生的湿地植物。两栖类动物和湿地鸟类也如预期般到来。如同最初的期望，树木仅在靠近现有林地的区域内萌发。在没有人类干扰的情况下，榛树和赤杨类植物需要花费约 20 年的时间才能出现在这个场地（大约在 12 000 年前的末次冰河时期之后，这些树种经历了 1 000 多年才在欧洲定植。）

在当地保护专家对这里的林地发生兴趣并在这片开放的湿地栖息地规划种植几百棵柳树之后，一切都发生了变化。一年之内，整个场地全部变为柳树林。1990 年，区域保护当局决定将 40 hm² 的柳树林划为自然区域。2008 年，也就是建造完成 22 年之后，这里成为欧洲栖息地保护网络计划——Natura 2000 中的一处保护地。当局宣称根据欧盟动物—植物—栖息地（Flora-Fauna-Habitat）法令，这片人造湿地是一处"自然的河岸生境"。对于管理当局来说，这里是一处"连续的荒野"。如同许多"城市荒野"案例，新的（完全人工的）湿地可能某种程度上展示了自然的特征。它可能唤起人们对于浪漫主义绘画及其描绘的梦幻荒野景象的回忆。如同城市荒野的主宰者，保护机构的工作人员可能基于美学基础

而不是生物学证据对这片场地加以决策。比如在上面的案例中，早期的德国保护专家瓦尔特·斯格尼切（Walther Schoenichen）在一本书中把场地中在河边枝条倒垂的柳树和桤木景象称作"初级荒野"（Urwaldwildnis），并把"Urwaldwildnis"一词作为这本书的书名（发表于 1943 年）。

6 作为生态系统的内部殖民化荒野

20 世纪 70 年代，恢复生态学家和规划师认识到自然入侵场地对于保存原生植被和野生生物具有重要意义，因此他们提出，并非所有再利用的土地都需要进行生态恢复，部分可以任其发展为荒野地区[29]，并提出了建立野性特征区域的规划。近年来，划定荒野景观区成为生物多样性保护工具和保护策略的重要组成部分。例如在欧洲，"再自然化"（re-naturalising）城市棕地和其他废弃地成为确定自然过程占主导的区域和"自然特征"景观区域规划的组成部分[30]。在德国这个几乎国土范围内每一片都为人工区域的国家，到 2020 年将有包括城市区域在内的 2% 土地成为"荒野"。荒野，过去是一种"在外面"的事物，正在成为"在里面"的事物。新的荒野通过"内部殖民化"而制造出来。

通常，殖民化是指来自外部的强有力的规则支配偏远的人类及其土地的控制系统。内部殖民化则相反，是创造一种来自内部的动力控制系统。历史学家在营建新社区或在已有国家的"处女地"进行重建工程时，往往会使用内部殖民化这一术语[31]。在 18 世纪和 19 世纪的欧洲，随着公国成为一个国家，内部领土成为政府关注的焦点，以解决其人口增长需要土地的问题[32]。在建成区内划定"荒野"区域也是一种内部殖民化的形式，城市区域内点缀着荒野——如同一种图底关系的翻转。

制造荒野（包括城市荒野）的内部殖民化途径包括：话语、重新命名场地、赋予新命名场地新的功能、将这些功能正式纳入区域和城市绿地体系等[33]。不同的观念带来矛盾。例如，生态系统服务理念的支持者认为城市生态系统与原始生态系统存在多个层面差异。一方面，对他们来说，被建筑和硬质

地表所支配的地区不具有"生物学上的多样性"，在这些地区，"自然"过程很难有能力维持"自我平衡"的状态。因此，这些区域不像高山、森林、丛林、沼泽等区域那样能提供（自然的）"服务"。另一方面，城市生态系统服务于城市的规划和发展。规划师可能对包括所有形式的城市荒野和所有形式的自然过程感兴趣，例如发生在旧工业、基础设施等废弃地区的自然过程。人们可能喜爱城市荒野，希望体验那些他们认为很大程度上受生态系统自身调节的区域，如能够展现本土和非本土物种的种群活力、受人类直接影响很小的区域[34]。

7 结论

近 20 年的研究已经证明"原始"自然的神话形象仅停留在神话中[35]。与古代地球上还保有未经触碰的荒野不同，如今人类对于世界所有区域都有深远的影响，包括存在数千年的雨林、苔原、沙漠和极地区域。"最后的荒野"所包含的特质也荡然无存。历史不再允许我们在现存的野生特征区域进行持续的砍伐、焚烧、采矿和农业种植活动。这些区域是不可替代的，每一处都是独特的。然而，这些地区并不能提供荒野发展演变的蓝图。对于一个如今不再有明显人类活动痕迹的生态系统的殖民政策来说，"再野境化"城市开放空间尤其不能成为一种生态补偿。

通过 3 个特殊的荒野类型来研究不断演化的荒野理念可知，新的（城市的）荒野理念和传统荒野理念似乎有共通之处。两者都是或者看上去是野生的，并在一定程度上处于人类直接的控制之外。在古代，人类通过去"外面"和"跨越边界"殖民荒野。而现代，人们正在通过"内在殖民化"，寻求占有或创造荒野。荒野是"未知"的一部分，人类通过给荒野地命名、将符号或其他意义赋予荒野、进入和访问荒野等途径，令荒野变得独特。所有的荒野地区似乎拥有与自然殖民和自然动力过程相关的特性。人类将荒野地作为特殊的、在不同语境下非凡的和独特的地段来认知（像杜伊斯堡这样的地方甚至带有"壮丽"的特质）。这些地方还可能是区域或地方认同

感的标志和来源。原始的和城市的荒野通过各自的方式提供了一系列情感体验。人类因为远离了日常生活的范畴而感到振奋和激动。尽管有其他人在场并共享场地，在自然中避难的幻想仍可能会产生。

所以，当我们提到和设计城市荒野时，我们的态度是什么？我们要考虑什么？可以确定的是，我们不是简单的提供生态系统服务，或是满足人口众多的城市对于开放绿色空间的需求。我们也不是简单的在语汇中增加一个新的流行词。通过提供处在我们直接控制之外的场地，我们是不是正在尝试回味敬畏与兴奋的感受？迷失在充满魔法和梦幻的神秘场所的感受？进入城市荒野将提供不断的惊喜与未知的神秘交织在一起的体验。我们甚至可能希望去看一眼天堂。我们可能会努力感受自己是自然甚至是更大宇宙的有机组成部分[36]。尽管"未知荒野""特定荒野""过程荒野"和"作为生态系统的荒野"之间的差别很大，但可能它们都是一个屏幕，人们可以在这个屏幕上投射荒野区域感染他们的那些感知，如同置身于一个反世界（counter-world）之中，每个荒野特征都有其相对应的感知图像。设计这样的反世界，风景园林师可能要给城市居民提供他们渴望的经历和感受。

我们已经证明自然殖民化对城市生物多样性做出了贡献。但是，我们对于可能正在植入我们思想中的自然和荒野理念仍然知之甚少，尽管我们已经做出了一系列的努力去描绘荒野感知[37]。我们对于人类如何与自然和荒野特征区域相联系的了解远远不够[38-39]。目前结论性的研究很有限，有关如何"基于自然进行建设"的问题可能对提供令人满意的景观更有意义[40]。没有什么能弥补人们在暴力冲突或灾难破坏的环境中所经历的损失，即使是春天野花遍布般的壮丽[41]。在经济萧条时期，居住在曾经繁荣过的城市内的人们可能希望维持美丽的邻里社区外观，包括精细打理的花园和有秩序的公园。对于"遗产城市"的居民来说，杂乱无章的植被区域并不是在展示自然，而是在展现象征衰退、缺乏管理的破败土地景象，甚至是危险的、具有犯罪风险的地方[42]。同时，未经使用的土地好比一些提供玩耍和冒险机会的公共场所，用于观察其呈现的自然过程。野生动植物则可以进一步增加位于社区附近的当地绿色区域的吸引力。

自然特性对于广大民众享受城市空间、体验幸福和快乐（尽管废弃工业场地存在土壤和水污染问题）非常重要[43]。现代作家借助晚期浪漫主义模式，确信今天如果我们要在拥挤不堪的世界里找到任何一个野生场所，那就必须把自己带到非常偏远的地方[44]。野外旅行运营商就是这样做的：将游客带到南极洲、喜马拉雅山、育空、大峡谷等地进行开拓。我们真的需要通过离开家、去参与极限旅行来走入荒野吗？并不是。如今在我们的城市社区就能发现并体验"野生景观"[45]②。我们开始更好地了解荒野本身和我们对荒野的态度[42, 46]。作为景观的设计师，风景园林师需要关注设计项目所发生的变化，花时间进行密切观察并撰写城市荒野的景观传记，这是非常值得的。

注释：
① 参考牛津通用词典（1955 年）。
② 详见 http://www.wildernessinthecity.org/。

参考文献 (References)：
[1] MCHARG I L. A Quest for Life[M]. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966.
[2] ABOTT M. Designing Wilderness as a Phenomenological Landscape: Design-Directed Research within the Contexts of New Zealand's Conservation Estate[D]. Lincoln: Lincoln University, 2008.
[3] DIEMER M, HELD M, HOFMEISTER S. Urban Wilderness in Central Europe, Rewilding at the Urban Fringe[J]. International Journal of Wilderness, 2003, 9(3): 7-11.
[4] OELSCHLAEGER M. The Idea of Wilderness: From Prehistory to the Age of Ecology[M]. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991.
[5] NASH R F. Wilderness and the American Mind[M]. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001.
[6] KIRCHHOFF T, VICENZOTTI V. A Historical and Systematic Survey of European Perceptions of Wilderness[J]. Environmental Values, 2014, 23(4): 443-464.
[7] TIN T, YANG R. Tracing the Contours of Wilderness in the Chinese Mind[J]. International Journal of Wilderness, 2016, 22(2): 35-40.
[8] KANGLER G. Der Diskurs um 'Wildnis'. Von mythischen Wäldern, Malerischen Orten und Dynamischer Natur[M]. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2018.
[9] DUERR H P. Dreamtime: Concerning the Boundary Between Wilderness and Civilization(Traumzeit: Über die Grenze Zwischen Wildnisund Zivilisation)[M]. GOODMAN F, translation. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1985.
[10] THOMAS W L. Man's Role in Changing the Face of the Earth[J]. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.
[11] KANTOR I. Ethnic Cleansing and America's Creation of National Parks[J]. Public Land & Resources Law Review. 2007, 28: 41-64.
[12] HASS A, HOHEISEL D, KANGLER G, et al. Sehnsucht nach Wildnis. Aktuelle Bedeutungen der Wildnistypen Berg, Dschungel,Wildfluss und Stadtbrache vor dem Hintergrund einer Ldeengeschichte von Wildnis[M]// KIRCHHOFF T, VICENZOTTI V, VOIGT A. Sehnsucht nach Natur. Über den Drang nach draußen in der heutigen Freizeitkultur. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2012:107-141.
[13] RITTER E. Forests in Landscapes: The Myth of Untouched Wilderness[M]// RITTER E, DAUKSTA D. New Perspectives on People and Forests (World Forests). Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer, 2011: 11-27.
[14] SCHAMA S. Landscape and Memory[M]. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1995.
[15] WINICHAKUL T. Siam Mapped: A History of the Geo-Body of a Nation[M]. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 1994.
[16] HOELSCHER S D. Picturing Indians: Photographic Encounters and Tourist Fantasies in H.H. Bennett's Wisconsin Dells[M]. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2008.
[17] THOREAU H D. Walking[M]. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1937.
[18] SHETLER S G. Three Faces of Eden[M]// VIOLA H J, MARGOLIS C. Seeds of Change: A Quincentennial Commemoration. Washington and London: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1991: 224-247, 267.
[19] CRONON W. The Trouble with Wilderness; or, Getting Back to the Wrong Nature[M]// Uncommon Ground: Rethinking the Human Place in Nature. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1995: 69-90.
[20] PYNE S J. How the Canyon Became Grand: A Short History[M]. New York: Viking Penguin, 1998.
[21] HUSEMAN B W. Wild River, Timeless Canyons: Balduin Möllhausens Watercolors of the Colorado[M]. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1995.
[22] RONCKEN P A. Shades of Sublime: A Design For Landscape Experiences as an Instrument in the Making of Meaning[D]. Wageningen: Wageningen University, 2017.
[23] LUBOW A. The Anti-Olmsted[N]. The New York Times, National edition, 2004-05-16.
[24] LATZ P. Rust Red: The Landscape Park Duisburg-Nord[M]. München: Hiemer, 2016.
[25] BUCKLEY G P. Biological Habitat Reconstruction[M]. London and New York: Belhaven Press, 1989.
[26] ROLLINS W H. Whose Landscape? Technology, Fascism, and Environmentalism on the National Socialist Autobahn[J]. Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 1995, 85(3): 494-520.
[27] ZERBE S. Potential Natural Vegetation: Validity and Applicability in Landscape Planning and Nature Conservation[J].

Applied Vegetation Science, 1998, 1(2): 165–172.

[28] BRUNS D, GILCHER G. Restoration and Management of Ecosystems for Nature Conservation in Germany[M]// CAIRNS J. Rehabilitating Damaged Ecosystems. Boca Raton: Lewis Publishers, 1995: 133-164.

[29] BRADSHAW A D. Derelict Land: Is the Tidying Up Going too Far?[J]. Planner, 1979, 3(65): 85-88.

[30] Wild Europe. A Working Definition of European Wilderness und Wild Areas[EB/OL]. 2013[2015-10-08]. http://www.wildeurope.org/index.php/wild-areas/definitions.

[31] VAN DE GRIFT L. Introduction: Theories and Practices of Internal Colonization. The Cultivation ofLands and People in the Age of Modern Territoriality[J]. International Journal for History, Culture and Modernity, 2015, 3(2): 139-158.

[32] BLACKBOURN D. The Conquest of Nature: Water, Landscape and the Making of Modern Germany[M]. New York: W. W. Norton, 2006.

[33] KOWARIK I, KÖRNER S. Wild Urban Woodlands. New Perspectives for Urban Forestry[M]. Berlin: Springer, 2005.

[34] KOWARIK I. Urban Wilderness: Supply, Demand, and Access[J]. Urban Forestry & Urban Greening, 2018, 29(1): 336-347.

[35] DENEVAN W M. The Pristine Myth: The Landscape of the Americas in 1492[J]. Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 1992, 82(3): 369-385.

[36] HINTON D. Mountain Home: The Wilderness Poetry of Ancient China[M]. New York: New Directions Publishing, 2005.

[37] KLISKEY A. A Comparative Analysis of Approaches to Wilderness Perception Mapping[J]. Journal of Environmental Management, 1994, 41(3): 199-236.

[38] BAUER N. Attitudes Towards Wilderness and Public Demands on Wilderness Areas[M]// KOWARIK I, KÖRNER S. Wild Urban Woodlands. New Perspectives for Urban Forestry. Berlin: Springer, 2005: 47-66.

[39] ZHENG B, ZHANG Y, CHEN J. Preference to Home Landscape: Wildness or Neatness?[J] Landscape and Urban Planning, 2011, 99(1): 1-8.

[40] BRUNS D. Does Reclamation by Natural Colonization Produce Desirable Environments: Proceedings of American Society for Surface Mining and Reclamation. Conference[C/OL]. 1986[2018-12-10]. http: //doi. org/10.21000/GAMSR860100045.

[41] TIDBALL K G, KRASNY, MARIANNE E. Greening in the Red Zone: Disaster, Resilience and Community Greening[M]. Berlin: Springer, 2014.

[42] NASSAUER J I, RASKIN J. Urban Vacancy and Land Use Legacy: A Frontier for Urban Ecological Research, Design and Planning[J]. Landscape and Urban Planning, 2014, 125: 245-253.

[43] FOLMER A, HAARTSEN T, HUIGEN P P. How Ordinary Wildlife Makes Local Green Places Special[J]. Landscape Research, 2018, 44(4): 393-403.

[44] MACFARLANE R. The Wild Places[M]. London: Granta Books, 2007.

[45] JORGENSEN A, KEENAN R. Urban Wildscapes[M]. New York: Routledge, 2012.

[46] HEGETSCHWEILER K T, VRIES S D, ARNBERGER A, et al. Linking Demand and Supply Factors in Identifying Cultural Ecosystem Services of Urban Green Infrastructures: A Review of European studies[J]. Urban Forestry & Urban Greening, 2017, 21(1): 48-59.

（编辑 / 刘玉霞）

Designing "with nature" and natural processes is and always has been important in landscape architecture, even from the start when the professional field established[1]. Professionals have employed concepts, methods and techniques of "nature development", initially in garden and in park design, but then in landscape and ecological planning. As landscape architects, we are intent on action. However, we must think through the meaning of the terms we use. Poorly defined ideas, even propelled by good will, can undercut what we believe is our common ground. "Wilderness" is a concept that, even in the field of landscape architecture, and particularly when speaking about "Urban Wilderness" is poorly understood[2]. To complicate matters, we are learning about and contesting over new and extremely ambiguous ideas that all relate to "Urban Wilderness", such as "Novel Nature" "Industrial Forest" "Urban Woodlands" "Urban Wildlands" and "Urban Wilderness". In addition, park and open space projects are developing that appear to include ideas of wilderness in one way or another. These concepts and projects all contain many more than one meaning of wilderness (and nature) and using them may lead to vagueness in the field and confusion over the things we do[3]. However, where there is faction tension on meaning, great opportunity exist in the many options for movement and action that may guide us. It may be important to try exploring them.

As a key to understanding how people perceive and access wilderness, this essay introduces the term "colonisation". For the purpose of this essay, the term colonisation applies in many dimensions, including land taking, land-use, social occupation and penetration of consciousness. The term colonisation also refers to natural processes, such as the colonisation of areas by plants and animals. The aim is not to arrive at a definition of wilderness and related terms, but to get a better understanding of some facets of the many meanings of "Urban Wilderness".

1 Wilderness Ideas

By calling an area wilderness, people are creating one. They are doing this by identifying the area as wilderness and by attaching wilderness meaning to the area. Knowing about wilderness areas might not be enough, however, and people will take ownership of areas they call wilderness, and they will start colonising them. The complicated thing about people colonising areas is that it encompasses not just physical activities (walking, boating, camping, etc.) but also social practice (group activities, competitions, social media, etc.) and consciousness ("wilderness experience"). The taking of land and material resources is the first and foremost dimension of colonisation. The penetration and occupation of minds is a not so concrete but very powerful dimension of colonisation, one that takes ownership of cultures and ideas, such as the designation and management of areas as wilderness "reserves". During all of these activities and processes, some wilderness qualities are lost. People appreciate areas that classify as pristine wilderness but they also visit them, leaving them less "untrammelled" every time they do so. Recreationists cherish wilderness areas for their natural character (natural sounds, pure water, clean air, etc.). However, people also take ownership of "pure" wilderness areas by supporting their protection and management, to allow for controlled access and use (low density of physical colonisation by visitors). Visitors of designated wilderness areas, seeking respite from everyday life (mainly in cities), prefer a presence of humans that is substantially unnoticeable. Urban landscapes offer none of these qualities and yet, some people call some naturally looking urban areas wilderness. What sort of areas do people have in mind when they speak of "Urban Wilderness"?

Different understandings of wilderness exist in any given period and cultural context[4-7]. In order to try to learn how understandings of wilderness might relate to ideas of "Urban Wilderness", this essay uses three wilderness categories[8]. They are 1) the "Unknown Wilderness" such as mythical forests, 2) the "Specific Wilderness" such as places

that people perceive as wild, and 3) the "Process Wilderness" emphasising naturalness pertaining to ecosystem dynamics.

2 Colonising the "Unknown Wilderness"

In prehistoric times, anything wild would be what lies beyond and outside of the boundaries of everyday lives[9]. This "outside" people might have perceived as the "great unknown", as vague and mythical worlds filled with superior powers. However, no matter how impenetrable, savage and dangerous these worlds might have appeared, some people would have ventured into it. Whether they had nomadic lives or went on migrations (The wilderness was where Moses had wandered with his people), they would explore food sources and colonise new land. They would also have been going out to have a divine experience or to prove themselves in the face of the frightening, enduring and fighting temptations. People, therefore, have changed parts of the Earth for millennia, altering areas not only inside of the boundaries of their homes and gardens, but also in realms that are outside of their immediate control. Anyone who has visited indigenous people will know how they are very capable of mentally mapping out places in areas far away from home, such as ancestral spirit places and routes between villages and good areas for gathering and hunting food. Hunting and gathering affect ecosystems, for example by furthering particularly useful species and by using fires to improve living and food conditions[10]. When modern governments started to "protect" wilderness as "reserves" they conveniently ignored that people lived in these areas and that they had been living there for very long times. For example, at the time of their declaration, no National Park had been an "unpeopled wilderness"[11].

During antiquity, wilderness continues to be a vaguely defined realm, continues as the great unknown, or at least as an idea being unknown. For example, people living in Mediterranean regions would consider anything wild that lies opposite or outside of paradise. The Old Persian word for enclosed space is "pairidaēza", a term that was adopted in many languages to refer to Paradise on Earth ① . The creation and recreation of paradise as a most desirable place has been a major concern in many cultures for thousands of years. A "steep wilderness" surrounds the "delicious Paradise" of John Milton's Eden and darkness prevails on the far side of the garden wall. During medieval times, in European cultures, wilderness was the mysterious land that expanded outside of their homes, castles, towns and cultivated fields. Moors, swamps, wild forests, high mountains and the open sea harboured horror and formidable beasts. The forest as a place of magic and danger is the quintessential wilderness in all regions where the natural state of wild land is forest (To this day, the "jungle" is what many people think of as "True Wilderness"). The forest edge is the line beyond which people normally would not venture: Peasants who seldom if ever travelled far from their villages could not conclusively say that it was impossible that an ogre, a witch or outlaws could live an hour away. According to old sagas and fairy tales, however, the hero (such as Robin Hood) does go into the forest (to hide). The forest contains enchantments, lures the adventurous and gives safety from pursuit. Being outside of normal human experience, the enchanted forests acts as a place of transformation. In German folklore, for example, forests can be places of danger and of magical refuge. Druids and hermits, or brave knights would surpass the frontier, to find solitude and inspiration, or great treasures and extreme adventure[12]111. According to scientific research, however, European forests have been used and altered considerably since Palaeolithic periods[13].

In summary, during prehistoric and early historic times the concept of wilderness pertained to the spiritual and included realms of danger. Usually, wilderness was a general idea and the wild not a specific place. Accordingly, only few people were able to find specific places in the wild (such as hiding holes and sacred grounds). Realities of land use were not part of wilderness concepts.

How ideas about the wild and wilderness continue to evolve, and how they started to refer to specific places, is not always evident at first glance. In the course of time, wilderness is gradually loosing attributes of the great unknown and of being the opposite of all that was safe and good. For example in his work "Germania" the Roman historian Tacitus refers to a concrete region and specifically defined its boundaries. Nevertheless, he describes the region's various qualities in not very concrete terms. In designing "Germania" as a message to his fellow Romans[14]77, Tacitus assigns, around 98 AD, a set of stereotypes to the native people of this region as "the noble yet bloodthirsty savage" and to their land as "wild forest". Germania's forest he depicts vaguely as a realm of darkness filled with ferocious beasts, human savages included.

Here, Tacitus created the reservoir of ideas from which generations of writers would draw and continue enriching it with detail. During the era from roughly 1500 to 1900, when Europeans explored and colonised the Americas, Africa, Asia and Oceania, they usually encountered native people. Many of them had no official maps of their land and no formally written records of their own. The visitors would draw maps and document, albeit selective, how they themselves perceived the "natives"[15]. These records are filled with inspirational details that would captivate the artistically and literary minded. For example, 19th century Romantics picked from these records what they needed to expand on old stereotype of natives as both "gentlemen" and "bloodthirsty red devils", "soon to be pushed aside"[16]. In the case of North America, the land was a specific but still vaguely defined region, the "Wild West". "The West of which I speak is but another name for the Wild", writes Henry David Thoreau in his essay "Walking", likening it not to darkness but to Eden itself, declaring it divine: "No description of Heaven that I have ever heard or read of seems half so fine"[17]. As late as 1991, Stanwyn Shetler, a botanist, describes his perception of wilderness as "The First Eden, a pristine natural kingdom," where the "native people were transparent in the landscape, living as natural elements of the ecosphere. Their world … was a world of barely perceptible human disturbance"[18].

Summing up the above, wilderness is "profoundly a human creation … all the more beguiling because it seems so natural"[19]. The category of the "Unknown Wilderness" in particular is a construct where parts of the world are without people (or people being "natural" parts of the "wild"), as being close to ideas of paradise and close to nature. Urban Wilderness ideas might include traces of what people associate with the "Unknown", such as few people and areas where nature rules and that require effort to penetrate.

3 Colonising the "Specific Wilderness" of Natural Heritage

During times of explorations and discovery, wilderness ceases to be associated with realms of the "unknown". The following example illustrates how wilderness is turning into a "specific" place, one that people admire and cherish as "Natural Heritage". During their many 17th and 18th century explorations, before the North-American "West" became "wild", Spanish Conquistadores were looking for adventure and riches, while Padres were engaged to find and convert "wild" natives. The Spanish encountered a land that exhibited nothing they could relate to and words failed them altogether. For example, on several occasions they were unable to describe the size and character of a particularly large river gorge that they tried to cross. They only recorded the specific location of the abyss and noted the specific colour of the water, naming the river the "Colorado"[20]18. Many years later, towards the end of the era of Humboldtian style expeditions, around 1857—1858, artists of the Romantic era published visual logs in the form of maps and paintings of their trip along the same river[21]. Unlike the padres of earlier times, these Romantics would have carried, in their cultural luggage, not only the Bible but also the works of Rousseau, Shaftesbury, and others. Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712—1778) explained how humans in the state of nature are blessed with enviable amounts of freedom. Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury (1621—1683), had stated

how „wilderness pleases" and how the experience of nature triggers "reasonable extasy"[6]447, [12]111. Standing at the rim of the Colorado River gorge, with utter amazement, Romantic's eyes now rested on and found many words for the (specific) scenes that the padres failed to appreciate. In many parts of the world, people are now beginning to see old scenes with new eyes. Back in Europe, Romantics rediscovered the Alps that, in people's perception, changed from inhospitable to welcoming. In the once dangerous "Wild West", the Romantics saw the picturesque and the sublime[22]. This is when and how the Colorado gorge became the "Grand Canyon"[20]38.

In Western culture, the period of adventure and discovery brought a shift in its connotation from the wild as something savage and dangerous but vague (somewhere "out there") to specific places of exhilaration and awe. Trying the frontiers, voyagers were finding riches in the wild, making them their own. Publishing their travelogues, world travellers where enflaming others to undertake explorative trips themselves the account of which were, in turn, inspiring a perceptive audiences at home. Entire continents awaited discovery and colonisation. Their wilderness were to be conquered and their treasures be taken[14]77.

The gorge of the Colorado River was a special treasure, "officially colonised" in 1919 when government took ownership of it and declared it protected. The process that lead to this decision was arduous. Many interest groups contested the idea of preserving a "natural heritage" instead of exploiting the land and the "resources" it held. However wild it was (by current IUCN standards), government declared the Grand Canyon (and several other spectacular areas in the West) not a wilderness but a "park". Wilderness became equal to areas being cherished for sublimity and aesthetically pleasing. In 1864, the landscape architect F. L. Olmsted presented a report titled "Yosemite and the Mariposa Grove" in which he describes the valley and groves in much the same way, as he would describe a designed park, as sets of specific scenes and views,

and as a "magnificent" piece of art.

As parks, National Parks and other large reserves have defined boundaries and gates, engineered access routes and parking, prescribed camping and various services such as restaurants and accommodation. Governments colonise areas in the form of reserve declaration and inserting infrastructure, all the while ignoring interests and rights of indigenous people. Wilderness ceased to be "wild" and became a form of beautiful land-use. The category of the "Specific Wilderness" is a construct where visitors enter "wild" looking parts of the world, comfortably enjoying closeness to nature and seeking specific qualities that they associate with specific areas. Urban Wilderness ideas might include traces of what people associate with the "Specific", such as meeting kindred minded people and finding a specific kind of nature that someone (park manager, designer, etc.) has made accessible to them. As "parks", Urban Wilderness areas also have boundaries, access infrastructure and visitors who use them.

To this day, governments designate areas as National Parks to preserve important and, as is the case all around the world, iconic heritage[2, 20]. In addition to natural heritage, the convention concerning the protection of World Heritage (UNESCO, 1972) also includes cultural heritage. The military and industrial heritage of a region is an aspect of its cultural heritage. Both have become an aesthetic category since about the 1970's. The following presents one example illustrating how cultural heritage can fuse with ideas of wilderness.

4 Colonising the "Specific Wilderness" of Cultural Heritage

Military grounds, mines, steel factories, rail switchyards, etc. are, during and sometimes after operation, too dangerous for unauthorised persons to enter. Like the great-unknown wilderness, they remain outside of the boundary of people's everyday lives, forbidden places with a wall around them. Like uncharted territory, terra incognita, governments used to put white space instead of details on official maps. The 1950's and following decades saw an

era ending that is based on heavy industry. A wave of shutdowns changed the character of industrial regions around the world. Mining and steel making ended and workers left. Only the fences stayed. For example, in 1985, in the German "Ruhrgebiet", the Thyssen plant of Duisburg-Meiderich smelting works closed. Very few people knew the place well because the steelworkers alone had always gone in. After closing, the site remained fenced in, keeping the public out of harm's way. Scruffy vegetation appeared and, undisturbed by people, the unruly vines of bramble and wild brush started to cover large portions of the area. Imagine people, one day, cutting a hole in the fence and visiting the place. Finding their way through thickets of brush, as if on a jungle expedition, they would have stood face-to-face with phenomena that exhibited nothing they knew: foundries, gasholders, cooling towers, turbines, ore bunkers, and overgrown slag heaps. It must have been very exciting, particularly for children. When "Modern" Romantics visited the site, they used powerful metaphors, like out of tales that describe enchanted forests. The Landscape Park Duisburg-Nord now occupies the area, and in an article about this park, the New York Times speaks of three blast furnaces as "looming" over the area "like rusting dragons, their flaming mouths silenced". The moment the smelting works closed, the article continues, the "nightmarish hulks that remained —almost mythic in their lurid grandeur—stood stranded, presumed doomed. The notion that they would come back to life in the quintessential park of the early 21st century seemed about as probable as sighting a pterosaur in flight overhead"[23].

The objective of the NYT article was not launching, as the title "The Anti-Olmsted" might suggest, a polemic anti-romantic discourse about Olmsted. The article is about the legacy of "Landscape Park Duisburg-Nord". "Anti-Olmsted" refers to a design that did not aim to achieve, as Olmsted had in his time, a landscape that appears natural and where people enjoy the "fantasy of taking refuge in pristine nature". On the contrary, by

allowing wild plants to continue on their successional path of colonising large tracts of abandoned land, and by leaving blast furnaces, gas tanks and storage bunkers intact, the cultural heritage of the industrial era itself became theme and subject of park design. The plan for Duisburg-Nord was not to create paradise on earth, rather it "deferred to the history of a densely populated and deeply scarred terrain, where virgin verdure seems as remote as Eden"[23].

Landscapes and landscape creations such as gardens and parks unfold over time. Designing a landscape sets a process in train and natural processes proceed. Peter Latz, the designer of Landscape Park Duisburg-Nord, keeps an eye on changes going on in the park. After observing these changes for a quarter of a century, he published his findings[24]. Like Olmsted did, in the 19th century, Latz describes and discusses the site as a park. Although unmistakably fabricated, to the unassuming eye, much of this area would have appeared quite wild. However, all that appears natural and spontaneous in its successional dishevelment is part of a greater plan. To the landscape architect there is no natural order and untouched nature here. The park developed into a popular destination for natural, cultural and sports-related leisure pursuits. People took ownership quickly, filling gaps where the architect did not prescribe a specific programme. A climbing park established on old concrete walls. A diving club adopted the gasometer, had it filled with 20,000 cubic metres of water and now use it for diving exercises. Theatre, opera and film events take place where the blast furnace once operated. Gardens flourish within the confines of ore bunkers. People from nearby neighbourhoods slip through (designed) wall openings and take their dog for a walk.

Contested are the areas where controlled and wild growth mix so that vegetation could spread spontaneously. For example, a heated debate over exotic plants that had colonized this land prevailed for years. Specialists know how some plants are native to European regions outside of Germany; they know how others have migrated here from faraway continents.

"Alien species" probably first arrived in Duisburg as stowaways on shipments of iron ore. Surveying the park, ecologists found hundreds of species that are not native to the area. "Conservationists favored extirpating these exotics, while Latz wanted to educate the gardeners in how to care for the plants, some of which are rare"[23]. The designer and the idea of a cultural heritage park prevailed. Birches, willows and buddleias are living side-by-side with planted trees together adorning huge slag heaps.

5 "Process Wilderness"

The third wilderness category is "Process Wilderness", and the category's title derives from the processes of natural (allegedly "wild") succession that distinguishes it from other categories. Wild plants and animals colonise an area the moment it becomes available. Dormant seeds germinate immediately after forest fires and landslides. Wind and birds transport plants and small animals through the air, for them to thrive anywhere possible, including rooftops, slurry ponds and military exercise fields. Wild life appears in the wake of warfare and after clearance of old industrial installations. Noticing, during the 1920s and 1930s, how natural colonisation often establishes rich assembles of wild species, biologists and engineers began to develop techniques that incorporate natural succession into landscape projects[25]. Nature development takes time, several decades for natural grasslands to re-establish, hundreds of years for forests to re-generate; too long for commissioned landscape projects. As early as the 1930s, landscape designers where experimenting in hastening processes of nature development. They were harvesting seeds and plants locally from grasslands and woodlands to establish native vegetation in the course of building new infrastructure, housing estates, etc. This interest in using "natural" vegetation differed from designing naturalistic landscape parks in the 18th century. Landscape architects were now advocating not to imitate but to construct natural habitats. In Germany, for example, the aim of using native vegetation in landscape construction was not to imitate wilderness but for greened areas to exhibit natural character[26]. To

establish reference points and evidence for defining what designers considered natural character, in the absence of primary vegetation, ecological data served to produce maps of the so-called "potential natural vegetation", PNV. These maps present no primary and pristine wilderness, but vegetation types that would hypothetically develop through natural colonisation and succession and in the absence of human intervention[27]. Since about the 1960s, natural colonisation and the use of native plants are established techniques in the practice of land rehabilitation, ecosystem restoration and habitat reconstruction[25].

The following example illustrates how, during the 1980s, when German government made mitigation and compensation for environmental impacts mandatory, employing natural processes became particularly fitting with designing restoration projects. The example is about a wetland restoration that served as compensation for a rail switch project of enormous dimensions, located in the outskirts of the City of Fulda in the State of Hessen. In 1983, the Hessen administration included this compensatory wetland restoration project into the approval for a high-speed rail line. Engineers scraped away all vegetation and top soil, several meters below the water table at some places, thus providing a kind of tabula rasa where plants could naturally colonise. As the restoration project was meant to compensate mainly for impact on open wetland habitat, the newly formed area needed to remain open and sunlit for as many years as possible. The plan was for adjacent wetlands to "donate" colonisers and for wetland vegetation to cover all open soil before woodland seeds would arrive and germinate. Designing the site aimed to ease colonisation and to allow natural processes to proceed quickly[28].

Construction and official monitoring ended in 1986. As the designer of the project, I continued keeping an eye on changes occurring on the site. Initially, all went well. Natural colonisation included annuals at first, followed by perennial wetland plants in the second year. Amphibians and wetland birds developed as expected. As hoped, trees germinated only along a small strip of land adjacent to existing woodland. Without people interfering, it

would take decades for Hazel and Alder to spread into the site (it took those tree species more than a thousand years to colonise Europe after the last Ice Age 12,000 years ago).

Everything changed when local conservationist, interested in woodland and contesting plans for an open wetland habitat, planted hundreds of willows. All of the area turned into willow thickets within a year. In 1990, the regional conservation authority decided to designate 40 hectares of this thicket as nature area. In 2008, 22 years after construction ended, the site became part of the European habitat network Natura 2000. Authorities declared the entirely manufactured wetland a "natural riparian habitat" according to the EU Flora-Fauna-Habitat Directive. To the authorities, a "Successional Wilderness" presented itself. Like many examples of "Urban Wilderness", the new (entirely artificial) wetland might have exhibited, at least to the unassuming eye, a somewhat natural character. It might have reminded people of romantic paintings and their dreamy versions of wilderness. Like protagonists of "Urban Wilderness", the people who worked in conservation authorities might have made their decisions not based on biological evidence but on aesthetic grounds, in this case referring to images of willows and alders drooping over riverbanks that the early German conservationist Walther Schoenichen had called "Urwaldwildnis" ("Primary Wilderness") in a book of the same title (published 1943).

6 Wilderness as Ecosystem, Internal Colonisation

Observing how naturally colonised sites have become important refuges for native vegetation and wildlife, restoration ecologists and planners have, during the 1970s, suggested that not all land earmarked for reclamation should be restored but much of it left to become wilderness areas[29]. They put plans for creating areas of wild character forward. More recently, designating wild landscapes has become instrumental for and part of biodiversity strategies. In Europe, for example, "re-naturalising" urban brownfields and other abandoned grounds has become part of

plans for designating areas where natural processes dominate and landscapes of "natural character" develop[30]. In Germany, where nearly every piece of the country is artificial, 2% of the land is destined to become "Wilderness" until 2020, urban areas included. Wilderness, once thought of as something "out there", is now establishing "inside". The new making of wilderness happens through "internal colonisation".

Colonisation usually refers to systems of domination whereby external powers rule over people and their land from afar. Internal colonialism, by contrast, refers to processes of creating systems of domination whereby forces exercise power internally. Historians also use the term internal colonization when referring to the building of new communities and to reclamation projects on "virgin lands" inside of an existing country[31]. In the advent of principalities becoming a nation, for example during 18th and 19th century Europe, internal territories became the focus of attention for governments in need of land for their expanding population[32]. Designating "Wilderness" inside of built up areas is also a form of internal colonisation, the city perforates to include wilderness —as in a figure-ground reversal.

Internal colonisation for making wilderness (including Urban Wilderness) is happening by words, by renaming places, by inscribing new functions to the renamed, and by formally including these functions into regional and urban green systems[33]. Different ideas lead to conflict. For example, protagonists and providers of "Ecosystem Services" understand urban ecosystems as differing in several ways from primary ones. For them, areas dominated by buildings and hard surfaces are not "biologically diverse" and their "natural" processes are not seen as capable of ever reaching states of "equilibrium". They, hence, will not be providing the same (natural) "services" as places such as high mountains, forests, moors, marshes, etc. would. On the other hand, urban ecosystems are subject to urban planning and development. Planners might be interested in including all forms of Urban Wilderness and all forms of natural processes such as the ones occurring on abandoned areas of old

industry, infrastructure, etc. People might cherish Urban Wilderness, hoping to experience what they perceive as high levels of ecosystem self-regulation, including, for example, phenomena that represent population dynamics of native and non-native species, while direct human impact remains small[34].

7 Conclusions

Researchers in recent decades have shown that the mythical image of "pristine" nature is just that—a myth (in a seminal paper)[35]. No ancient, untouched wilderness remains on Earth, and humans have had a major impact on all areas of the World, including rainforest, tundra, desert and Polar Regions for thousands of years. Yet, the "last of the wild" includes qualities that do not exist anywhere else. History offers no permit for continued logging, burning, mining and agricultural cultivation of any existing wild character area. These areas are irreplaceable and each of them is unique. They provide no blueprint for wilderness development. "Rewilding" urban open space, in particular, can be no eco-compensation for a policy aiming at colonising ecosystems that are free from obvious signs of human activity today.

Studying different ideas of wilderness, as they have evolved over time, and by applying three distinct wilderness categories, it seems as if new (urban) and some old ideas of wilderness do have things in common. Since both either are or seem wild, they somehow border or appear to be outside of people's immediate control. In ancient times, people would colonise wilderness by going "out there" and "beyond the frontier". In modern times, people are seeking to locate or create wilderness through "internal colonisation". All wilderness is part of the "Unknown", yet they specific in the way that people give wilderness areas names, associate symbolic or other meaning with them, access and visit them. All wilderness areas either are or seem to be possessing properties that pertain to processes of natural colonisation and natural dynamics. People perceive wilderness areas as special places, remarkable and exceptional in their respective

context (places such as Duisburg-Nord even qualify as "grand"). Both are or can be iconic and sources of regional or local identity. In their own ways primary and urban wilderness offer a range of emotional experiences. People would feel inspired and excited, being away from and outside of the boundaries of everyday life. Phantasies of taking refuge in nature might arise even in the presence of other humans sharing the same place and interest.

So, what are our attitudes towards and what are we thinking of when we speak of and design for Urban Wilderness? Surely, we are not simply providing "Ecosystem Services" or trying to satisfy needs for open green space in overpopulated cities. We are not simply adding a new buzzword to our repertoire, are we? By providing areas apparently lying outside of our immediate control, are we attempting to bring back feelings of spiritual awe and excitement, feelings of getting lost in mysterious places filled with magic and enchantment? Entering urban wilderness would offer experience where constant surprises interweave with the mysteries of the undiscovered. We might even be hoping for a glimpse of paradise. We might be striving to feel as being organic parts of nature and of a greater cosmology[36]. As different as "Unknown Wilderness" "Specific Wilderness" "Process Wilderness" and "Wilderness as ecosystem"are, they all might be serving as a screen onto which people project perceptions that get hold of them while inside of wild looking areas, like being in a kind of counter-world where every feature has its counter image. Designing for such counter-worlds landscape architects might be offering experiences and feelings that urban dwellers are longing for.

We have evidence about natural colonisations contributing to biodiversity of cities. However, despite serious professional efforts to map wilderness perception[37], we have sparse knowledge about ideas of nature and wilderness that might be colonising our minds. We know little about how people relate to areas of natural and wild character[38-39]. Conclusive studies are limited and the question stands how "constructing with nature" might contribute to the providing of desirable

landscapes[40]. Nothing, not even the splendour of a spring wildflower explosion, can compensate for losses people experience in environments disrupted by violent conflict or disaster[41]. During economic depressions, people who live in once prosperous towns may hope to maintain the façade of nice neighbourhoods with well-managed gardens and orderly parks. To residents of "legacy cities", scruffy vegetation exhibits not nature but lack of care and derelict land symbolises decline, even danger and risk of crime[42][249]. At the same time, unused areas are like commons that offer opportunities for play and adventure, for observing natural processes unfold. Wildlife and wild flora can add significantly to the perceived attractiveness of local green areas near home. Natural character can be very important for broad segments of the population to enjoy urban space[43] and for people to experience well-being and happiness (despite soil and water contaminants of abandoned industry).

Modern writers, drawing on late-Romantic models, are convinced that if we were to find any wild places in our overcrowded world today we must take ourselves to the remotest of lands[44]. Wilderness travel operators do exactly that: colonising Antarctica, the Himalaya, the Yukon, the Grand Canyon, etc. with tourists. Do we really need to leave home and go on extreme trips for wilderness encounters? We do not. We are finding and experiencing "wildscapes" in our urban neighbourhoods[45] ② . We are only beginning to understand them and our attitudes towards them better[42, 46]. As designers of landscapes, landscape architects need to keep an eye on changes occurring with our projects. Taking a closer look takes time. It is time worth spending and writing the biographies of our urban wilderness landscapes.

Notes:
① The Oxford Universal Dictionary, 1955.
② See http://www.wildernessinthecity.org/.

(Editor / LIU Yuxia)