Public Space in Chinese Urban Design Theory after 1978

a compressed transculturation

Sun, Wenwen

Public space in Chinese urban design theory after 1978: a compressed transculturation

Wenwen Sun

Public space in Chinese urban design theory after 1978: a compressed transculturation

The 1978 economic reform not only propelled a rapid urban development in China but also unlocked vast possibilities for global exchanges of knowledge and techniques in the fields of architecture and urban design. To establish a theoretical and empirical understanding of the notion of public space, Chinese scholars and design practitioners have related to design theories and exemplary cases through direct and indirect contact with the Western context in the four decades since 1978. This paper analyses how the Western notion of public space encountered Chinese urban design and was rapidly negotiated on the level of concept through theoretical developments. The process began with a loose transmission of design knowledge and technique while uprooting the embedded cultural background; it then developed into a situated and structured framework of knowledge in the specific context of modern China. This paper argues that the notion of public space in Chinese urban design culture has articulated the substance of compressed transculturation, not only through its compact four-decade-long development trajectory, but also as a result of both acculturation and deculturation.

Wenwen Sun

*Faculty of Architecture and the Built Environment, Delft University of Technology
The Netherlands
w.sun-1@tudelft.nl
swwkt1990@gmail.com
ORCID 0000-0003-1250-2780*

Introduction

This paper originates in the observation that public space is a notion produced within particular cultures and historical circumstance. When discussing public space in the fields of architecture and urbanism, we explicitly refer to the contemporary concept evolved in a twentieth-century debate of the public sphere in philosophy and sociology in Western Europe and the USA, such as the thinking of Hannah Arendt, Jürgen Habermas, and Richard Sennett, among others.[1] Owing to its strong cultural dependence, the notion of the public sphere is adopted in the fields of architecture and urbanism globally, while being highly contested. Various debates about its meanings and ways of existence were generated in academia and practice after the Second World War all over the world.

One of the exemplary cases is the introduction of the notion in Chinese urban design. The economic reform in 1978 propelled a rapid urbanisation process in

China vis-à-vis the growing effects of globalisation in terms of cultural exchange. Remarkably, the Post-Reform era briefly coincided with deep interests in public space in both scholarly research and design practice in the fields of architecture and urbanism. However, studies attempting to clarify the emergence of the concept of public space via the transmission of Western urban design knowledge barely existed in China. This paper thus sketches the trajectory of the acceptance of public space — mainly as a theoretical concept — and its intensive local development in Chinese urban design debate in the four decades since the reform; more importantly, it constructs an analytical framework that guides the reader to approach the subject of public space in China from a local perspective.

This paper discusses the migration of the notion of public space from one cultural territory to another, introducing the concept of *transculturation,* a term that describes the process of merging cultures, especially the complex transmutations of culture.[2] It was coined by the Cuban anthropologist Fernando Ortiz to substitute the previously used term 'acculturation', which, according to Ortiz, implies a sense of supremacy of one dominant culture upon another. Transculturation implies a more equal and interactive reality of cultural relations: it encompasses not only the process of acculturation, meaning the acquisition of another culture, but also deculturation, the uprooting or loss of the previous culture.[3] It is a process of 'an exchange between two cultures, both of them active, both contributing their share and both co-operating to bring about a new reality'.[4] Besides eliminating the cultural hierarchy, transculturation emphasises the dynamics of the evolving process of a new cultural phenomenon; it is best used to express 'the different phases of the process of transition from one culture to another'.[5] As such, this neologism provides a theoretical lens through which to scrutinise the global circulation of architectural and urban knowledge as a multi-directional, dynamic, and never-ending interactive process; adopted in post-colonial architectural studies, it counters the assumption of a simple import-export framework that is static or unidirectional.[6] Employing transculturation as a theoretical framework, this paper identifies the critical steps of the theoretical development of the notion of public space in late 1978 China: from a loose transmission of design theories, knowledge, and techniques to a more situated, structured, and independent network of knowledge.

This paper's research is based on a large corpus of local publications by Chinese scholars, such as books, theses, and journal papers, as well as translated Western urban design theories. Knowing that the amount of information could be endless, the material for discussion is selected deliberately: it represents the first appearance of ideas and insights from different eras, as it informs the paradigmatic shifts of a theoretical focus of public space and urban design in China. The selection is also limited to Chinese-written material and omits similar studies conducted and presented in other languages. Therefore, instead of a worldwide review of theories and critiques regarding the topic of public space in China, this paper examines particularly the understanding of public space within the urban design debates among Chinese scholars.

In conclusion, this paper argues that due to a loose transmission of knowledge and concepts, the notion of public space in Chinese urban design theory is a compressed transculturation, manifesting an extremely short and compact development trajectory of a Western architectural concept in the Chinese context. In China and amongst Chinese scholars, transculturation took place in three stages: an embryonic stage, an intermediate stage, and finally, a situated stage, resulting in three notions as open space, human space, and the space of society.

Embryonic transculturation: urban design theories and open space

The understanding and definition of public space in the Post-Reform era in China emerged in conjunction with the acculturation of various theoretical concepts of the discipline of urban design in the West. In the early 1980s, Chinese cities needed development towards international standards and models,[7] prompting the fields of architecture and urban design in China to theoretically engage with Western knowledge and techniques. By establishing transnational academic exchanges with the USA and Western Europe, as well as translating Western urban design theories — often the most dominant ones — Chinese architectural scholars in the 1980s had the chance to embrace Western urban design knowledge, and pave the way for the development of urban design in China.

In the Post-Reform era, Chinese architect Kang Qi was amongst the first to make summaries of several urban design studies that dominated discourse in the West. In an article published in 1988 entitled *The Interaction between Urban Design and Architectural Design*, Qi categorised the works of Camillo Sitte, Frederick Gibberd, Gordon Cullen, and Roy Worskett as visual image-based urban design studies, and Kevin Lynch, Jane Jacobs, and Christopher Alexander as being based on human experience of the urban environment.[8] This paper briefly addresses public space, suggesting that urban spaces are designed as 'places and stages which meet different physical and psychological needs of people'.[9] In contrast to Chi's previous manifesto in his 1982 manuscript *The Urban Forms*, in which he wrote that 'planners can conscientiously grasp and follow the rules of changing urban form and propose a rational planning project',[10] this paper reveals a slightly different perspective of urban planning in the 1980s: that social interaction in urban spaces matters as well as the top-down manipulation of urban form.

Meanwhile, being in European countries for academic exchange enabled Chinese architects and scholars to directly encounter Western urban conditions in the 1980s. Chinese architect Chunyuan Sha researched the main pedestrian street in the historical centre of Munich during his visit to the Technical University of Munich as a guest researcher from 1979 to 1981.[11] His research made a critical contribution to the early formation of urban design discourse in China by recalling this exemplary case as a reference. In his report, Sha analysed this case not only from the large-scale perspective of an urban planner but simultaneously from a human perspective, analysing different types of public space with respect to how they represented the image of the city and how they

brought the quality of *gute stube* (good living room) to the city centre.[12] Sha's study established a critical point of reference that architects could rely on in their practice vis-à-vis the theoretical development of urban design.

Translation, which improved the accessibility of Western literature on a large scale, was always a crucial tool to create a mediated encounter with knowledge of Western urban design in the 1980s. The year of 1983 saw the import of *Town Design* written by British architect and planner Frederick Gibberd in the 1950s.[13] This significant work of city making from the UK, which covered architecture, landscape, and road design, became one of the earliest informative brochures for Chinese architects to get to know Western urban planning and design theories. In 1987, twenty years after American urban planner and architect Edmund Bacon published *Design of Cities*, the Chinese edition of the book was released officially in China, delivering the first message of modern urban design from the USA. *The Art of Building Cities* by the noted Austrian architect Camillo Sitte, which was composed much earlier than Bacon's, was translated into Chinese and published in 1990. Additionally, this first impulse of translation in Chinese academia covered the books of Rob Krier and Ian McHarg in 1991 and 1992, respectively.[14] From multiple continents and different schools of thought, this seemingly random selection of urban design books has served as a fruitful source of references for the establishment of the discipline of urban design in China, and furthermore, the transculturation of public space.

According to an investigation of the existing literature produced after 1978, the starting point of the transculturation of the Western notion of public space is marked by the emergence of the concept of open space in Chinese urban design discourse in the 1990s. Open space was first defined as an important urban design element in 1991 by Chinese architect and urban designer Jianguo Wang in his pivotal manuscript *Modern Urban Design Theory and Method.* This publication made a name for Wang as one of the first architectural scholars to introduce Western urban design theories to China after 1978. Wang's work traced some leading urban design theories between the 1960s and the 1990s from North America and Europe with a focus on their methods for analysing cities; it presents a general introduction of ideas such as the sense of place from Christian Norberg-Schulz, the cognitive image from Lynch, social liveability addressed by Jane Jacobs, and methods of bricolage from Colin Rowe and Fred Koetter, as well as Cullen's visual coherence and organisation, to mention a few.[15] In the fourth chapter of the book, which discusses 'urban design elements', he acknowledged the definition of open space as 'public outdoor space of a city', a phrase adopted and translated from *The Urban Design Process* written by British-Iranian architect Hamid Shirvani in 1985.[16] The section Open Space reffered to Shirvani's analysis of the characteristics of open space in the city as a multi-functional system. By analysing a few pedestrian streets in European cities and China, he also emphasised the interdependence of space and activity, emphasising that urban space is designed to facilitate urban public life. Furthermore, he extended the definition of open space, incorporating courtyard spaces of a public building, which connect indoor and outdoor spaces and are collectively used and publicly known by citizens.[17]

The embryonic stage of transculturation is a stage in which the knowledge of public space is acculturated from a seemingly random selection of Western urban design theories; in this mode of acculturation, the notion of public space partly lost its initial meaning and was understood as open space. Using open space to refer to public space reveals an explicit focus of 'space' rather than 'public', which has resulted in operative guidelines for the physical design of urban spaces. Open space was considered an urban or architectural form, a spatial component of the city much more than a social space from a human perspective. As such, the concept of public space was quite constrained on a technical and spatial level: the social and political meanings of public space were marginalised in the body of urban design theory as they were considered less relevant to the task of urban transformation which was considered the highest priotiy in the Post-Reform era, when rapid urbanisation was to be achieved as efficiently as possible.

Intermediate transculturation: human space

In the late 1990s, the concept of social accessibility was woven into the definition of open space, unfolding a new stage of transculturation: intermediate. Chinese urban designer Guangjun Jin followed Wang's step and composed another key work of Chinese urban design theory in 1999 entitled *Illustrating Urban Design*, which informed a nuanced enrichment of the definition of open space. Jin used the term public space (*gonggong kongjian*) with the English translation of 'open space' (*kaifang kongjian*), which seems to echo Wang's definition from eight years earlier, but the definition of open space is modified as 'the space that is open to and used by all citizens'.[18] In the same section, Jin exclusively discussed Jan Gehl's study of the dependence of social activity on the urban physical environment in *Life Between Buildings,* an idea that was not included in Wang's book.[19] Regardless of treating urban public space as open space, the open space here, in essence, tends to move away from a sheer material definition of public space and indicate a different sense of the word 'open': no longer the openness of actual space or architectural form but the right to access and to appropriate.

The local promotion and practice of urban design theories opened the door for a broader acceptance of Western urban design ideas in China. The start of the twenty-first century welcomed another significant step in the introduction of urban design theories. In 2001, the Chinese edition of Lynch's two famous books *The Image of the City* and *A Theory of Good Urban Form* were finally launched in the local bookstores in 2001 and 2003, respectively; after Lynch, three books by the Danish urban designer Jan Gehl were translated. Additionally, we should mention the more recent studies concerning radical urbanisation and the loss of public space in modern cities, such as *Collage City* in 2003 and the milestone work of Jane Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities,* in 2005.[20] From the selection of books in this second period of translation, we can clearly sense a change of interest towards a human perspective on the social practice of urban space. Moreover, since some of the main ideas of these works

already appeared as a critical point of reference in some Chinese urban design theories in the 1990s, one could conclude that it was the application of those theories by Chinese scholars in their urban design studies that indirectly prompted the official introduction of those books.

The inclusion of human activities in urban design indicates an essential care of the social dimension of public space, which means that the social and cultural substance of public space is not entirely exhausted by the acculturation of the technical and methodological dimensions of Western design theories. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, public space was often interpreted as human space (*renxing kongjian*) — closely associated with the public life of citizens — in the debates about social and political issues in spatial design among Chinese scholars and designers. Landscape architect and scholar Kongjian Yu is a progressive thinker and one of the mainstays of the idea of human space. In one of his papers published in 2004, a manifesto entitled 'Back to the Meaning as People's Place', he addressed his understanding of the city square in the Western city as 'a political landscape',[21] a place for human identity and public participation, which embodies humanity and a sense of citizenship. Yu criticised squares of an inhuman scale, which have become political tools for autocracy and have lost any human quality and proposed a broadened social concept of public space. Thus, it was a remarkable extension of the understanding of public space towards its cultural grounding. In Yu's opinion, city squares should function as places for public assembling and collective social activities, symbolising collectivity and equality.[22] The German-educated Chinese architect and researcher Yongjie Cai, who conducted comprehensive research on a large number of European city squares in the 1990s, is another recognised supporter of human space. In his significant publication *City Square* of 2006, Cai analysed how city squares act as the centre of the social and political life of a European city and which spatial forms accommodate this feature. He is also aware of the fact that, in China, the intentional design and creation of urban public space appeared since the arrival of Western design culture; however, the design intent became a superficial copy of the physical forms without conforming to the social conditions of those Western cities.[23]

The idea of human space became a central topic not only in the theoretical debates of urban design but also in urban practice. In urban development from the late 1990s to the early 2000s, urban design was radically used for marketing purposes, as it helped create an international brochure that manipulated images of new urban development. The focus of urban design seemed to have devolved into pure functionality or aesthetics, and the quality of design was no longer a parameter in the process of urban development. In 2006, an article entitled *The Loss of Public Space* was published in the major Chinese planning journal *Urban Planning Forum*, in which urban planner Baojun Yang harshly criticised the massive new constructions being carried out in Chinese cities at the expense of the urban environment and quality of life:

> The loss of public space in our city does not refer to a decreasing number of public spaces, but to the loss of spatial quality, the disappearance of character, the fading of the human dimension, the deviation from proper aesthetic taste. […] The orien-

tation of design is getting lost. It is bidding farewell to the public life of citizens, departing far from public activities, opposing the needs of users. Some of the public spaces have endured ruthless damage or a hostile reception, and others retreated into being mere showrooms detached from their original meaning.[24]

The public debate in practice and academia also focused on how modern urban development in the twenty-first century China largely erased the human dimension of urban public space by the sheer growth of vehicle traffic in major cities. As an example, another paper published in the same journal in 2006, entitled *The Humanised Urban Public Space* by the renowned Chinese scholar Deci Zou, echoed Yang's critique from a different angle, but situated in the same context of the modern Chinese city:

> In the modern city, […] the social attributes of public space such as the place for walking, interacting, resting and entertainment are ignored or discarded. […] It became indifferent to human needs and experience, and only the spectacularity of the modernist style remained. These public spaces become meaningless without the people who use them.[25]

The presence of these two articles with such strong emphasis on the importance of people notably enriched the agenda of this major planning journal, whose main focus had been modern urban planning theories and practices from a more distant and top-down perspective. Since this issue of 2006, the journal has begun publishing urban design research and practice, announcing a shift of focus more towards the architectural qualities of urban spaces.

Shortly after the publication of the above-mentioned two articles, in 2007, US-based Chinese architectural scholar Pu Miao questioned and challenged the development, design, and management of urban public space in the rapid expansion and renewal of Chinese cities. In his paper *Whose City? A Pictorial Essay on the Three Problems of the New Public Space*, Miao addressed three problems in the urban public spaces of modern Chinese cities: (i) the privatisation of public space; (ii) window-dressing; and (iii) social segregation, regardless of scale or history. Miao argued:

> Some governmental officials attempt to copy the form of the Western city in urban development in China. For them, developing a modern society equals constructing Western-style buildings. Those people do not understand the inherent characteristics of many Asian cities developed throughout history as high density, large scale, paucity of public space, and high frequency of usage, as well as a lack of networks of public space that European cities have developed since the 19th century.[26]

This paper demonstrated a critical view of public space and urban development in the specific urban conditions in China. Being an Asian city expert, Miao mainly accused developers and politicians of preferring a so-called 'hard import' of Western modernisation. At the same time, he remained modest about the impact of design on the potential to change the general condition of the urban environment. 'In the absence of any agreement that citizens are the actual owners of public spaces', he noted reluctantly, 'urban public space would continue towards its destiny of being a tribute to political authority and the money-making machine'.[27]

Highlighted by the notion of human space, the transculturation of public space entered an intermediate phase from the late 1990s; this phase could be seen as a transitional period towards the social essence of public space. A discourse formed around the notion of human space resulting from a harsh negotiation between the large-scale manipulation of urban development and people-centred design. In this period, the results of acculturation on a technical level was faced with resistance from the local realities of urban China. Therefore, transculturation started to occur at a social level.

Situated transculturation: the space of society

By the end of the 1990s, the trajectory of the transculturation of public space in China tended to deviate from actual physical design solutions towards its philosophical and sociological connotation. The various post-war discourses around the public sphere, such as those of Hannah Arendt and Jürgen Habermas, circulated in China and facilitated an in-depth understanding of public space not only as a spatial issue in urban design but also as a social and political topic.[28] In this way, the study of public space in China seemed to regain the cultural layers of the notion and developed into a comprehensive network of knowledge in its own right.

In the architectural and urban discourses of the 2000s, public space was regarded as a social issue and was therefore attached to the social conditions of Chinese cities. In a thesis published in 2005, *Research on the Publicity of Space,* Chinese architect Lei Yu acknowledged that 'the design of public space is no longer a mere technical subject. It engages with society and the people'. Referring to Arendt and Habermas in particular, Yu's study showed an intensified awareness of the political and social meanings of public space, addressing the fact that the introduction of the concept of modern publicity in China has pervasively challenged traditional social relations and people's perceptions of the public, of the private, and of communities. It also challenged the role of the architect, confronted with a nation's political and social environment and the task of facilitating public space through architectural means; as Yu mentioned in this book, 'public space has become a device for architects to engage with the political and the social environment'.[29]

Accordingly, the transculturation of public space seems to have achieved a comprehensive status quo: re-adapting Western concepts by Chinese scholars and designers to analyse local issues of Chinese cities and society, and greatly expanding the network of knowledge. Based on epistemological studies, in their 2009 essay *What is Authentic Urban Public Space?,* Hong Kong-based scholars Zhu Chen and Min Ye concluded that public space in the post-war Western context is the platform for the coexistence of multiple social activities from urban and social perspectives, and for public performances in political and philosophical terms. The study of public space headed towards merging several disciplines: the study of form and environmental-psychology, sociology, and philosophy. In their opinion, what the Western concept of public space could provide was 'a value basis to re-examine the urban environment in

China and new perspectives for the social and cultural construct of a city'.[30] Following this line of thought, parameters such as accessibility, inclusiveness, and social diversity have been utilised to evaluate the quality of urban space in Chinese cities.[31]

The space of society, as we might call it, has marked a specifically situated stage of the transculturation, a stage in which public space is reborn as a culturally specific notion. It opens up possibilities for new conceptual interpretations of public space in the specific context of modern Chinese society. These specific interpretations have proven that the transculturation of public space is no longer a literal projection of concepts and design ideas, but a situated and independent network of knowledge, as Ortiz put it, 'no longer an incomplete version, but an alternative one'.[32]

Conclusion: from loose transmission to structured transculturation

By discussing the cross-cultural transmission of the notion of public space from the West to post-1978 China amongst Chinese scholars, this paper has substantiated that the notion of public space in Chinese urban design theory is a new cultural phenomenon in its own right, rather than 'a passive adoption to a clear and determined standard of culture', the existing Western model.[33] The term 'transculturation' is therefore instrumental in describing the Chinese notion of public space and how it has become what it is today. Furthermore, the concept of 'compressed transculturation' addresses the unique fashion in which the notion has been adopted and integrated within the Chinese urban context; in a short space of time, the process has developed from loose adaptions of design theories and methods excluding culture, to a structured understanding of the social and cultural meanings of public space. The three concepts this paper has qualified as open space, human space, and the space of society, respectively represent the results of the three stages of transculturation. Hence, the transculturation of public space is not only compressed in time — in as little as four decades — but also compressed in meaning.

Additionally, my argument affiliates the transculturation of public space in Chinese urban design theory with a loose transmission of knowledge and ideas across cultures. Loose transmission refers to the loose and open way in which concepts travel from one cultural context to another with a change of the initial meanings. It partially maintains the primary meaning while simultaneously receiving new meanings, manifesting the binary of acculturation and deculturation in the three stages of transculturation. First, the understanding of open space points, for example, to the fact that Western architectural and urban design knowledge is extracted from its socio-cultural basis and interpreted merely as design references, instruments, and approaches. Such simplification of new theories and ideas has resulted in utilitarian adoptions of urban design for marketing and image production. Second, scholars, design professionals, and everyday practices of citizens have resisted the loosely transmitted concepts and design ideas in the new context. The confrontation of this situation finally prompted the notion to regain its cultural layers in order

to reconceive a comprehensive network of knowledge in China. The wrought concept of public space in Chinese urban design theory can only be seen as an alternative to the notion used in the West, which is no longer a restoration of a Western concept but a new independent idea in the Chinese context: a transculturation. Furthermore, this paper considers these *transculturated* concepts of public space more crucial in the development of urban design theories in China than their Western origins, for they are not only more accessible for the Chinese-speaking general public but are also thoroughly modified according to the local conditions in China.

The scope of this paper is constrained within theoretical debates, but public space in the Chinese context is an extensive topic that requires further research through other methods. Due to its selection of materials, this paper has already approached the topic in a transcultural way, especially given the translation of texts from Chinese to English and the cross-cultural adoption of the term 'transculturation'. Moreover, the study of transculturation in this paper is limited to public space in Chinese urban design theory, yet the framework of transculturation might usefully continue to pose questions of cross-cultural research in the fields of architecture and urbanism.

Funding

Notes and References

1. Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958). Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991). Richard Sennett, *The Fall of Public Man* (New York: Knopf, 1977).
2. Fernando Ortiz, *Cuban Counterpoint: Tobacco and Sugar* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995), pp. 97–98.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., p. lix.
5. Ibid., p. 102.
6. Felipe Hernández, 'The Transcultural Phenomenon, and the Transculturation of Architecture', *Journal of Romance Studies*, 2.3 (2002), pp. 1–15. Tom Avermaete, 'Coda: The Reflexivity of Cold War Architectural Modernism', *Journal of Architecture*, 17.3 (2012), 475–77.
7. Piper Gaubatz, 'New Public space in Urban China', *China Perspectives*, 4 (2008), 72–83.
8. Kang Qi and Dekun Zhong, '城市设计与建筑设计之互动', *Architectural Journal*, 9 (1988). Original text: 城市设计就是要根据人的行为心理特征, 为人们提供舒适的城市环境, 提供适应不同要求的场所和舞台。因而城市设计常常对人在城市公共空间中的行为方式, 心理特征进行调查分析, 从而使得空间的设计能够适应人的各种活动和心理要求 (author's translation).
9. Ibid., p. 18.

10. Kang Chi, '城市的形态（研究提纲初稿）' *Journal of Nanjing Institute of Technology*, 3 (1982).

11. '一、专家 (List of Experts)', 江苏省地方志 (Local Journal of Jiangsu Province). http://jssdfz. jiangsu.gov.cn/szbook/slsz/cxjsz/HTM/290300.htm

12. Chunyuan Sha, '城市的起居室: 西德慕尼黑步行商业街评述', *Urban Planning Research*, 3 (1985), 3–12 (p. 12).

13. 吉伯德, 市镇设计 [*Town Design*] trans. by Lirao Cheng. (Beijing: China Architecture & Building Press, 1983).

14. 埃德蒙·N·培根, 城市设计 [*Design of Cities*] (Beijing: China Architecture & Building Press, 1987). 西特（Camillo Sitte). 城市建设艺术—遵循艺术原则进行城市建设. [*The Art of Building Cities*], trans. by Charles Stewart, Dekun Zhong, and Kang Qi. (Nanjing: Southeast University Press, 1990). 伊恩·麦克哈格 (Ian McHarg). 设计结合自然. [*Design with Nature*], trans. by Jingwei Rui (Beijing: China Architecture & Building Press, 1992). 罗伯·克里尔 (Rob Krier), 城市空间. [*Urban space = Stadtraum*], trans. by Shan Zhong, Jialian Qin, and Yuan Yao (Shanghai: Tongji University Press, 1991).

15. Jianguo Wang, 现代城市设计理论和方法. [*Modern Urban Design Theory and Method*], 3rd edn (Beijing: China Architecture & Building Press, 2001), pp. 87–127. In chapter 6 of the book, Wang reviewed several major urban design books from the USA and Europe in English, such as: Christian Norberg-Schulz, *Existence, Space & Architecture* (New York: Praeger, 1971); Christian Norberg-Schulz, *Meaning in Western Architecture* (New York: Praeger, 1974); Kevin Lynch, *The Image of the City* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1960); Jane Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (New York: Random House,1961); Colin Rowe and Fred Koetter, *Collage City* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1978); Gordon Cullen, *The Concise Townscape* (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1971).

16. 开放空间 (open space) 意指城市的公共外部空间(不包括那些隶属于建筑物的院落), 包括自然风景, 硬质景观(如道路等)公园, 娱乐空间等. (Wang, *Modern Urban Design Theory and Method*, p. 73) This definition is adopted and translated from Shirvani's 1985 book *The Urban Design Process*: 'Open space can be defined as all landscape, hardscape, parks, and recreational space in urban areas.' Hamid Shirvani, *The Urban Design Process* (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1985), p. 27.

17. Ibid., p. 76.

18. Guangjun Jin, 图解城市设计 [*Illustrating Urban Design*] (Harbin: Heilongjiang Science and Technology Press, 1999), p. 57. '城市公共空间也称开放空间或开敞空间。其是指城市中向全体市民开放使用的空间.' Urban public space is also known as open space. It is the space that is open to and used by all citizens (translation by the author).

19. Ibid., p. 58: Jan Gehl, 戶外空間的場所行為: 公共空間之使用 [*Life Between Buildings: using public space*], trans. by Qiuling Chen and Chaoxing Chen. (Taipei, 田園城市, 1996).

20. 凯文·林奇 (Kevin Lynch), 城市意象 [*The Image of the City*], trans. by Yiping Fang and Xiaojun He (Beijing: Huaxia Press, 2001); 凯文·林奇 (Kevin Lynch), 城市形态 [*A Theory of Good City Form*] trans. by Qingyi Lin (Beijing: Huaxia Press, 2003). 扬·盖尔 (Jan Gehl), 交往与空间 [*Life Between Buildings*], trans. by Renke He (Beijing: China Architecture & Building Press, 2002); 扬·盖尔 (Jan Gehl), and 拉尔斯·吉姆松 (Lars Gemzøe), 新城市空间 [*New City Spaces*], trans. by Renke He, Wei Zhang, and Canhong Qiu (Beijing: China Architecture & Building Press, 2003); 扬·盖尔 (Jan Gehl) and 吉姆松 (Lars Gemzøe) 公共空间, 公共生活 [*Public Space, Public Life*], trans. by Yu Tang (Beijing: China Architecture & Building Press, 2003); 柯林·罗(Colin Rowe), and 弗瑞德·柯特 (Fred Koetter) 拼贴城市 [*Collage City*] (Beijing: China Architecture & Building Press, 2003); 简·雅各斯 (Jane Jacobs), 美国大城市的死与生 [*The Death and Life of Great American Cities*], trans. by Hengshan Jin (Nanjing: Yilin Press, 2005).

21. Kongjian Yu, Jun Wan, and Ying Shi, '寻回广场的公民性: 成都都江堰广场案例' ['Back to the Meaning as People's Place: the case of Dujiang Yan Square'] *New Architecture*, 4 (2004), 25–28 (p. 25). Original text: 广场本质上是一种政治景观 (author's translation).

22. Ibid., p. 26. Original text: 中间这个广场代表了公家, 是集体的体现, 在这个场所里人人是平等的 (author's translation).

23. Yongjie Cai, '从两种不同的空间形态看欧洲传统城市广场的社会学含义' *Time + Architecture*, 4 (2002), pp. 38–41. Xiangling Qu, '蔡永洁·人文关怀城市空间 ['Yongjie Cai: Urban Space with Human Care']', *Chinese & Overseas Architecture*, 12 (2008), 30–35 (p. 32).

24. Baojun Yang, '城市公共空间的失落与新生' ['The Loss and Revival of Urban Space'] *Urban Planning Forum*, 6 (2006), 9–11 (p. 10). Original text: 言及我国城市公共空间的失落, 并非指城市公共空间消失或者减少, 而是指它的环境品质下降了, 个性魅力褪色了, 人文观海淡漠了, 审美情趣偏离了, 设计手法庸俗了, 营造方向迷失了 (author's translation).

25. Deci Zou, '人性化的城市公共空间' ['The Humanised Urban Public Space'] *Urban Planning Forum*, 5 (2006), (9–12), (p. 11). Original text: 现代城市中, 汽车和快速路的出现缩短了时空距离, 同时也将城市空间分割零碎的片断, 道路的通行能力被摆在第一位, 而公共空间应有的步行、购物、休闲、交谈、景观等社会特质被忽略甚至摒弃了 (author's translation).

26. Pu Miao, '谁的城市？图说新城市空间三病', *Time + Architecture*, 1 (2007), 4–13. Original text: 政府主管的官员企图在我国城市建设中照搬西方城市的模式, 把建设现代化社会等同于建造西方化建筑。这些官员不理解亚洲许多大城市在历史中形成的一下基本特点: 人口密度高, 城市规模大, 公共空间总量少, 公共空间使用率高, 缺乏像欧洲城市从19世纪开始逐渐形成的公共空间系统 (author's translation).

27. Ibid., p. 13. Original text: 我国的不少城市空间有可能继续演变为官员的邀功请赏的贡品, 资本家造钱的机器 (author's translation).

28. 尤尔根·哈贝马斯 (Jürgen Habermas), 公共领域的结构转型 [*The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*], trans. by Weidong Cao, Xiaoyu Wang, Beicheng Liu, and Weijie Song (Shanghai: Xuelin Press, 1999); 汉娜·阿伦特 (Hannah Arendt), 人的境况 [*The Human Condition*], trans. by Yanli Wang (Shanghai: Shanghai Century Press, 2009); 理查德·桑内特 (Richard Sennett), 公共人的衰落 [*The Fall of Public Man*], trans. by Jihong Li. (Shanghai: Shanghai Yiwen Press, 2008).

29. Lei Yu, 城市公共性研究 [*Research on the Publicity of Space*], (Nanjing: Southeast University Press, 2005).

30. Zhu Chen and Min Ye, '什么是真正的公共空间?—西方城市公共空间理论与空间公共性的判定' ['What is Authentic Urban Public Space? A Review of Western Public Space Theories and an Evaluation of the "Publicness" of Public Space'], *Urban Planning International*, 24 (2009), 44–49 (p. 45). Original text: 西方学术语境下的城市公共空间概念及其价值判定为我们重新审视中国公共空间建设的价值观基础, 探讨城市建设在社会人文方面的意义提供了一个有价值的视角 (author's translation).

31. Kai Xu and Klaus Semsroth, '公共性的没落到复兴——与欧洲城市公共空间对照下的中国城市公共空间' ['Fall and Revitalization of "Publicness": Chinese Urban Space in Comparison with European Ones'], *Urban Planning Forum*, 3 (2013), 61–69. Leiqing Xu and Yu Yan. '公共空间的公共性评估模型评述' ['A Review of the Evaluating Model of the Publicness of Public Space'], *New Architecture*, 1 (2016), 4–9.

32. Ortiz, *Cuban Counterpoint*, p. xix.

33. Ibid., p. lviii.