

难以复制的中国

It's Not Easy to Copy China. Not Even for China Itself

[荷]奥雷·鲍曼 著 何润 译

Ole BOUMAN, HE Run

我曾获得建筑历史的学位，建筑历史这门学科不仅仅研究有关建筑的历史，其也研究建筑在人类历史发展的长河中作为重要的构成要素。大约 20 年前，我开始在荷兰从事建筑杂志编辑的工作，决定杂志所出版的内容是我的职责，那时我便深刻意识到关注中国建筑的重要性。不仅要关注于当时发生的极不平凡的城市化革命，这也是哈佛设计学院城市项目的议题之一，同时也要关注中国独立建筑师的作品，在国际的舞台上展示他们的设计成果。

工作 10 年后，我创办了新的期刊，以历史的创造作为建筑发展的驱动力。我逐渐意识到仅仅展示一个国家的作品是远远不够的。就中国来说，其建筑以及建构环境下的衍生产品已经建立了一个超越建筑本身的全球语境。“无处不在的中国”是一期特刊，讨论了中国的迅速崛起已经涉及到世界文化的多元维度。与此同时，中国出色的建筑师不但“展示”他们的设计作品，也在众多国际期刊上发表文章。要想深刻了解他们的设计思想，仅仅欣赏其设计作品是不够的，还要聆听他们的发声。在此期间，我发表了一篇关于这期杂志的文章。^①

如今，不可被忽视或否认的是，中国的“无处不在”已然成为事实。当中国的经济在不断地进步之时，中国的城市也在蓬勃发展。类似于“亚洲基础设施投资银行”（Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank，简称 AIIB）等正式官方机构的设立、“一带一路”的举措，都证明了这一点。中国建筑师正在迅速扩大他们在世界上的影响力——在世界顶尖的设计学校里担任院长、被享有盛名的新闻媒体推崇备至，并问鼎全球顶级奖项。王澍、张永和、马岩松、马清运、张轲、都市实践等建筑师和建筑设计事务所在国际语境中被人们所熟知。

中国在全球各类出版物上登上头条，同时世界各地的建筑媒体也进驻中国，设立中文版刊物或网站，例如 *Archdaily*、*Domus*、*Interni*：他们一直积极地介绍在中国新建成的优秀作品，这代表着中国建筑的品质可以跻身世界前列。我们可以看到新的材料、生产技术、业态分布、景观与文脉、社会参与、品牌推广等方面的试验。作为最昂贵的艺术形式之一，建筑实践在广义上有着另一层含义：越来越多的客户认为建筑与房地产不一样，并逐渐意识到可以通过委托设计项目来挖掘设计师的潜力。我曾有幸参与到一栋大楼的设计工作中，一栋建筑只有通过客户的认可才能够得以实现。这可能是跨越设计复杂性与盲目生产之间矛盾的一座有效的桥梁。

进入 2018 年，以建筑历史的视角来看，我们可以说，在不到 1/4 个世纪的时间里，建筑作为一门设计学科已完全获得了自主性。建筑学的视野更加成熟，人们对建筑学的认知更加完整。现在的问题在于，如何去应对这样一个挑战——中国建筑要在未来的 20 年中保持警醒、具备勇气、责任，以及研究的价值。面对这一问题，商业上的成功、媒体大量的曝光、公众的认可或者被学术的研究对中国建筑而言，是远远不够的。或许现在这个问题应该变为：世界能够从中国的身上学到些什么？也许我们已经到了这样一个阶段：我们不应该只按照国际标准来衡量中国建筑，因为在这个问题上，国际标准应该被中国的价值观重新衡量。如此一

来，中国不仅仅会给国际上的建筑实践带来新的见解，中国的建筑实践也承受了新的压力，驱使其不断超越自己，不断进步，从而拥有更深刻的社会意义。

为了进一步论述，我想先厘清两个问题。第一个问题是关于世界建筑能够从中国的身上学到些什么。这或许可以参考多年来引人注目的“空头市场”^②所引发的职业危机问题相关的讨论，即便目前的经济不断繁荣，但是这些问题却一直存在。其实这也关乎于建筑师所扮演的社会角色问题。有一些全球知名的建筑师，自嘲自己仅仅是服务于资本的工具，另一些人为渲染软件和计算机技术彻底颠覆了建筑微妙的美感而义愤填膺。自我批评与专业训练的无力已成为主流建筑话语的一部分。中国自身有着足够的实力不断超越其他国家，但是考虑到历史发展的轨迹，我们也有理由去换个角度思考。中国的建筑实践已经能够重塑质量、城市视野、社会向上流动和生态文明，甚至有点乌托邦的思想。西方建筑引以为傲的价值观在经过了一个多世纪的猛烈发展之后，几乎完全消失了。那么问题就在于中国是否可以完成学科的使命，实现中西方建筑的共同进步。

另外一个问题是，中国自身有很多任务需要完成。如果说前文所提的观点展示了一些迹象，那么中国建筑有责任将之最终发展成为实质性驱动力，去取得更大的进步，并将建筑生产的范围扩大。中国需要在全球建筑业中起到领导的作用，完成从超越规则到规则的制定者的转变。中国还需要考虑品质的意义以及对如何实现目标需要付出努力

如果说这是一个挑战，那么我们就应该谈论相互效仿的话题，甚至中国与其他国家都无法相互启发。这是关于世界各国共同重塑建筑的使命，在历史长河中，能够遇到这样的机会也可以算是一件幸事。

注释：

①参见奥雷·鲍曼，著．杨媛媛，译．张晓春，校．合作中国 共同创造[J]．时代建筑，2010年第（4）：10-12．

②译者注：空头市场（Bear Market）亦称熊市，指价格长期呈下跌趋势的证券市场。价格变化的总趋势是不断走低，特征是大跌小涨。

It's Not Easy to Copy China. Not Even for China Itself

Ole Bouman

One of my degrees is in architectural history. This is not only a discipline that studies the history of architecture, but also the study of architecture as a factor of history. About twenty years ago, when I was at the beginning of my career in the Netherlands working as an architecture magazine editor, I had to make decisions about what to publish. I was fully aware of the need to cover Chinese architecture. Not only a need to shed light on the phenomenal urban revolution that was taking place at the time, as exemplified by the famous Harvard Design School Project on the City on this topic, but also by paying attention to the work of individual Chinese architects, presenting their built work to our international audience.

Ten years later, having started a new magazine that took the making of history as the ultimate driver of architecture, I found it was no longer enough to just present work from one out of many countries. In the case of China, I considered its architecture and all other productions of built environment setting a new global condition beyond the very boundaries of architecture itself. Coined as “Ubiquitous China”, I issued a special edition to discuss the emergence of China as an omnipresent dimension of world culture. In parallel, reputed Chinese architects at the time, were not only “presented,” they also wrote essays in most of the issue. Showing their work was no longer enough. Better to listen to their voices as well. Around that time, I also published an article about this rise in this magazine [\[link\]](#).

Today, China's ubiquity has become a fact that can no longer be ignored or denied. While China's economy has grown, its cities have boomed, and its international investments have become official in institutions like the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) bank and initiatives like the One Belt One Road (OBOR), Chinese architects are rapidly expanding their portfolio's worldwide, obtaining deanships at prestigious design schools, receive accolades from the most prestigious news titles, and are honored with global top awards. Wang Shu, Chang Yunghe, Ma Yansong, Ma Qinyun, Zhang Ke, Urbanus, and others have become household names in the international discourse.

And it's no longer only China making headlines in the global press. The global architecture press is also coming to China to establish thriving Chinese versions. Archdaily, Domus, Interni: they incessantly publish new work in China itself, revealing a quality that we only can rank among the best in the world. We see experimentation in new materials, production techniques, program arrangements, landscaping and contextualism, social engagement, branding, and so forth. As the most expensive art, this quickly expanding practice of architecture in the broadest sense means one more thing: increasingly clients believe architecture is not the same as real estate, and start to recognize the huge talent available by commissioning them. I myself happen to work in a building that only could come into existence through such a client's

acknowledgement, albeit this time from Japanese origin. This might be the beginning of bridging the gap between the design sophistication and the often mindless production of square meters as soon as possible.

So in 2018, from the perspective of architectural history, in less than a quarter of a century, we can say architecture as a design discipline has fully emancipated. Vision matured. Recognition accomplished. The question now is: how to carve out the challenge that will keep Chinese architecture alert, bold, responsible and worth studying for the next 20 years. For this question, business success, media exposure, public acknowledgement and academic track records can never be enough. Maybe the question now should be: what can the world learn from China? Maybe we have reached the stage that Chinese architecture should not just be measured against international standards, but international standards can begin to be measured against Chinese ones. It may not only bring new insights to international practice, but at the same time put new pressure on the Chinese practice to continue to excel and gain a wider social relevance

To conclude this article, let me distinguish these two aspects more precisely. As for the question of what world architecture can learn from China, it may be good to refer to a discussion that has been lingering on for several years of professional crisis in a dramatic bear market, and which the current new economic boom hasn't put to rest. It's the question of the role and relevance of the architect. Some architects, even globally famous, deride themselves by claiming they are mere instruments of capital. Others fume about the total takeover of architectural subtlety by rendering software and other computed effects. Self-criticism and disciplinary fatigue has become part of mainstream architectural discourse. Of course China would give ample reason to do the same, but given the historical trajectory as described above, there might also be reason to test the opposite argument: that architectural practice in China has been able to reconnect to quality, urban vision, upward social mobility, ecological civilization and perhaps even a bit of utopian thinking, values for architectural pride that in the west have all but vanished, after being fueled by them for more than a century. The question is: can China help revive a disciplinary mission to enhance the common good.

As for the other question, there is a lot of work to do in China itself. Because if the above argument shows sparks of evidence, than it would mean an enormous responsibility on the end of Chinese architecture to make those sparks into substantial drivers for much more improvement and a much broader production. This is about taking up a leadership role within the construction industry. From producing the exceptions to the rule, to becoming the rule itself. The rule of quality and the awareness of what it takes to get there.

If this is the challenge, then we can no longer speak of copying each other, or even mere mutual inspiration. This is about a joint reinvention of the mission of architecture. It's an historical privilege to come across such an opportunity.