# 人类学与社会学视角下的城市设计与乡村建设

# URBAN DESIGN AND RURAL CONSTRUCTION FROM THE PERSPECTIVES OF ANTHROPOLOGY AND SOCIOLOGY

于长江
北京大学社会学系副教授，
北京大学深圳研究生院人文
学院副院长

**Changjiang YU**
Associate Professor,
Department of Sociology,
Peking University; Vice
Dean, School of Humanities,
Peking University Shenzhen
Graduate School

**摘要**

在本文中，受访者首先就人类学、社会学和文化人类学的学科定义、关注重点、研究范围之间的区别和联系予以了阐述，随后论证了人类学与社会学知识或观点对于景观设计实践及教育的意义。并从人类学与社会学视角出发，探讨了古村落保护、乡村地方性、社区认同感等议题，为景观设计师提供了审视问题的新思路、新方法。其强调空间具有社会人文属性，呼吁设计师时刻将这一属性纳入考量，并提出人类学与社会学及景观设计相结合的跨学科发展方向在未来应予以关注。

**关键词**

人类学；社会学；人文；认同感；乡村建设

**ABSTRACT**

The interviewee first clarifies distinctions and links between anthropology, sociology, and cultural anthropology through discipline definitions, areas of focus, and scope of study. Next, he demonstrates the significance of anthropological and sociological knowledge or points of view in landscape architectural practice and education. From the perspectives of anthropology and sociology, he discusses issues that include traditional village protection, rural local identity and community identity, and provides landscape architects with new ideas and methods to examine such challenges. He emphasizes social and cultural attributes of space, encouraging designers to always take these attributes into consideration and put forward interdisciplinary development for anthropology and sociology to be combined with landscape architecture.

**KEY WORDS**

Anthropology; Sociology; Humanities; Identity; Rural Construction

**能否请您解析一下人类学、社会学及文化人类学之间的联系与差异？**

**于长江（以下简称于）：**简单地说，人类学和社会学都以"人"、"社会"、"文化"以及它们之间的关系为研究对象。人类学始于跨文化研究，探究的是人类的深层共性和生存方式的多种可能性，其多从历史、文化和人性等角度看"人"，并试图跨越时代、族群、文明背景的差异来理解"人"；社会学始于对现代化的反思，侧重于研究个体和群体的现代性、后现代性和社会性，以及未来趋势等，其更多地从人的"个体–社会"双重属性中理解"人"，以及现代社会中的种种现象。通过个体、群体、角色、行为、互动、组织、社会关系、社会结构、社会思想观念等方面来理解和解释人与社会。

社会学和人类学关系密切，理论和方法互相交叉，视角上也存在置换关系，因此常常不做严格划分。在社会研究与实践中，每个学科从不同的视角来探究和解决问题，丰富我们的认知和解读。

文化人类学属于人类学的一个分支，主要从"文化"角度对"人"进行研究，这一名称来源于美国的说法，英国的"社会人类学（Social Anthropology）"及欧洲的"民族学（Ethnology）"与其语义大体相当。

**能否请您谈谈人类学与社会学的理论、概念对规划设计有哪些启示？**

**于：**最初，人类学与社会学主要是从社会文化的角度理解空间：一是将其视为"空"的，只作为人类活动的方位参照系，与"时间"共同构成人们感观的客观维度；二是将其视为依据人类活动的延展度和自由度而界定的人在某种活动中可以利用的空间范围和边界；三是将其视为以建筑、公共设施等物质实体来呈现具体的生存空间。在这一阶段，空间被理解为某种客观的存在。

但随着人类学与社会学对空间认知的逐步深化，人们意识到空间与人的主观性更相关，其人文和社会属性才是其存在的根本，即先有"人"才有"空间"。纯粹物理意义的"空间"逐渐被弱化，甚至不再被单独讨论，"空间"概念已经与"人"完全结合在一起。因此，景观设计师在设计空间时，不应忽视空间的人文和社会属性。

而人类学与社会学中的一些基本理念，则可以成为设计实践的参考和依据。例如，"人类具有共性"和"人类生存方式具有多种可能性"是两个人类学的基本理念。"共性"意味着不论种族、民族、国籍、文化、阶层、职业等，所有人都可能存在同理心或共识点，比如人基本的自由、安全、尊严等

需求，而这些应作为我们设计工作的底线。"多种可能性"意味着同一社会功能可能由不同的方式实现，应保有人们选择的自由。规划设计要力争留下宽泛的功能潜力，让使用者对空间自主选择和发掘。

方法论方面，人类学的"主位"和"客位"的概念对于城市规划和景观设计具有特别重要的意义。"主位"是指研究者能够站在"当地人"或"当事者"的主观角度来理解相关的社会文化现象；"客位"则是从"外人"或"观察者"的角度理解之。现实中，很多空间规划师与决策者经常一不小心就站到"客位"的立场上，习惯于对着设计图纸或沙盘模型，从"总体"、"鸟瞰"的视角描绘蓝图，而规划中的主体——市民公众——却几乎不会也不必以这种"俯视"角度来感受这些设计结果。事实上，以使用者和公众的视角营造的感受，才是所有建筑、景观规划设计在设计空间时应当优先考虑的。

人类学与社会学中的社会结构、社会关系、社会群体、社会组织等概念，亦可以丰富景观设计的思路。比如房屋设计的关键在于空间格局如何适应人的社会关系，而当下千房一面的状况基本忽视了人们特定的社会关系和组织形式，使用者被迫不断拆改，最终造成空间资源的浪费。再比如如果深入

研究广场上人的活动，我们会发现不同角色的人在广场上有着不同的诉求，在个人、家庭、朋友间形成了显性或隐性的互动关系。因此，广场的设计，不应仅仅满足人们"休闲娱乐"或"广场舞"的需要。

**多年来，您参与了北京大学深圳研究生院景观设计专业开设的"景观社会学"课程，能否结合您的教学经历，谈一谈人类学与社会学在景观设计专业教育中的意义？**

于：首先，这门课名称中的"社会学"，与其说是一个专业称谓，不如说是一种学术表态。人类学与社会学学科的研究对象就是"人"本身，学科基础就是对现实中"人"的深度观察、交流和体验，其宗旨是努力实现人与人之间的"共感"和"共识"。这一定位基于我们所意识到的景观设计专业人员培养在此方面的欠缺。景观设计虽然一直被归入工科，但它实质上也是一门"人学"，其目的是为"人"而设计。而长期以来"重工轻文"的教育背景导致了设计人员在实际工作中常常存在"见物不见人"的倾向，亟需在思想意识、认知方法和具体调研技能方面进行拓展。未来的设计者应具有深厚的人文关怀和社科素质，自然而然地把对"人"的考量贯穿于景观设计的始终，依靠设计者个人的内在素养，来保证景观设计真正蕴含人文精神的营养。开设景观社会学课程以及对教学方法的安排，正是一种

旨在增加景观设计教育中人文社科成分的探索。

同时，人类学与社会学为我们提供了实地调研的正确态度和基础方法。实地调研（或称田野工作）强调把研究者与被研究者放在一种平等的、平行的、设身处地的、互为主体的关系中，感知自己之外的另一个主体的视角和态度。其重点在于交流、互动和理解，在于培养学生对于现实中"人"的熟识和感知，从而深切理解我们的工作是会影响和改变多少活生生的人的命运，也可能为其带来多大的痛苦和灾难。"参与观察"即是一种重要的调研方法，它要求研究者深度参与到当地人的工作和生活中，成为当地人一份子，通过观察和体验，完全以"主位"的角度理解和领悟当地社会的人和事，将他们非专业的表达用专业的方式体现出来。这门课的目标就是培养学生"参与观察"的能力和思维方法。

此外，对人类学与社会学方向的教育也促使学生们在进行设计时将社会问题纳入考量。比如景观设计和规划一旦进入实施阶段，"社会治理"因素造成的难题往往远超专业技术问题。由于社会阻力，很多与社会现状相矛盾的意见并不能得到有效处理，"征求市民意见""公众咨询"或"公众参与"变得形同虚设。虽然作为设计人员，可能无法彻底扭转这种现状，但至少可以在具体操作中做出"将枪口抬高一寸"的努力，在力所能及的范围内避免负面效果。而当涉

及古村落、城中村、老城区保护等问题时，人类学与社会学则提醒我们思考这些区域的文化意义——其生存方式和社会形态是"人性"赖以存在的重要基础，是人们统合自身生活、经历、祖先和情感的纽带。维持传统，并不是面向过去，而是关乎当下，更是决定未来。

**当下"乡村建设"在全国广泛地展开，您如何看待这样的当代建设对乡村的"入侵"（"殖民"）？乡村如何在这种全球化的冲击之下保持"地方特色"？**

于："乡村"本身是无限多样的，各地有各地的历史脉络和禀赋条件，根本不可能形成在某一时点上"齐步走"的建设需求。而应该是由各地乡民和相关者因地制宜地制定建设需求、时间节点和方式方法，而不是在全国范围内"广泛地展开"。

乡村是人类在曾经的几千年间最主流的生存状态，由此发展出了丰富深厚的文化和文明。乡村汇集了人类在各个时代解决生存困境的各种措施，也积累了人类向往美好生活的梦想。当下社会的很多文化要素直接来自于乡村传统，比如人们最基本的亲情联络、家族关系、社区认同、共同体意识等，都是在乡村时代形成的。而如今，伴随着"现代化"、"发展"这些全民梦想被"城镇化"偷换，"乡村"实际上沦落了为"发展"的对立面——不仅彻底丧失了其独立价值，甚至逐渐丧失了存在的正当性。如果"现代化"意味着"城镇化"，那么乡村的存在本身就是个错误！甚至很多人的头脑中都隐含着这样一个假设：现代化就意味着消灭乡村！

在各种强力而有组织的连续冲击之下，乡村只剩下两种状态：一种是所谓的偏远地区，那里的青壮年都被吸引到大城市中，留下老弱人口留守，导致社会空心化，村落衰败凋敝；而临近"发达"的地带早已被资本和权力强行纳入至高无上的"城镇化"浪潮，没有自主选择的可能性，唯一可做的就是在这种重大变故到来之时，用对抗、拖延、私人关系、投机钻营等方式为自己多捞一点补偿，而乡村生活原有的人文社会元素，只能弃之如敝屐。毕竟在这种"被城镇化"过程中，所有人必须使出浑身解数投身于权利较量和利益博弈中，谁还顾得上那些情怀、情感、习惯？原有乡村生活被视作一次次折腾和变故的祸源，人们迫不及待地想要忘记那一切，在新的语境下重整自己错乱的生活。在城市化话语和制度强势的霸凌中，今天的乡村已经成为一种半解体的社会形态。

所以我认为，当下的乡村，根本就没有力量"保持"什么，因为"乡村"已不再是自主的主体。当我们谈及"乡村"的时候，我们究竟是在指什么？指那块地方？还是那里的人？那里是否还有具有主体意义的"人"？农民，或者农村人，是否还能作为一个主体与他人对话或互动？今天的"乡村建设"已不是城市人到乡村去"建设乡村"，而是城市的各种力量把自己的活动范围扩展到了那个曾经被称为"乡村"的地理和人口中去。这里的基层组织处于半解体状态，家庭处于天南地北离散状态，文化传统处于分崩离析的飘摇状态，这里的人口没有自己独立的目标和方向，只是在维持生存和等待，但又不知道具体在等什么——或许"发展"的浪潮能波及这里，好则分一杯羹，坏则被赶到别处自谋生路。所以让乡村维持它的"地方特色"不太现实。乡村既没有动机，也没有能力承担这个使命。

人类学通常认为，人类的各种生存状态——包括以农业为主的乡村、以牧业为主的游牧群落和以工业为主的城市生活——都是人类文明在不同维度上的演进，其文化价值并无高低之分。在现代化意义上，也没有明显的优劣之分。事实上，欧美等发达国家的历史表明，农业、牧业也可以采用最新技术实现现代化，并不一定要通过城镇化手段。在日本等人多地少的国家，也发展出了高人口密度的农牧业生产方式，打破了农牧业如传统上一般"地广人稀"的印象。这些都是乡村转型的良好参照。

我反对在现代化、城镇化等问题上采取一刀切的二元立场——包括把城市和乡村对立起来，把市区与城中村对立起来，把现代文化与乡土文化对立起来，把工业与农牧业对立起来，把都市生活与乡土习俗对立起来等。现实社会中，"传统"与"现代"是相

辅相成而非对立零和的。现代化不必以消灭传统为前提，而可以从传统中汲取某些要素，用于支持现代化发展或缓解现代化的冲击。

我们要确立兼容并蓄的发展观，不要以单一的"进步""先进""美化"标准去衡量丰富多样的城乡生活，不要以"单线进化论"的观念去指导社会发展，不要以特定群体、特定阶层的偏好去强行改造城市和乡村的面貌。我们没有资格和权利去强行改变别人的生活，也无法证明自己绝对正确——"正确"只存在于"共识"中，假如一时没有共识，那就要保留多样性。

**您能否从社会学家的视角谈一谈当代城市社区的认同感可以从哪些方面来营造？**

于：　"社区"的英文"community"是形容词"common"的名词化表达，其本意不是对一种具体事物的称呼，而是对一种状态的描述。"社区"这一概念的建构，源自于对传统社会村落和小镇生活的分析，其中包含的"归属感"和"依恋感"，是在当时通讯和交通不发达、社会分工不明确、工作生活不分离的情况下，人们与比邻而居的人朝夕相处而自然形成的潜在心理，当遇到社区之外的人，人们会形成"自我"与"他者"的对比时，这种潜在心理会被激发出来，表现为对本社区的"认同感"。

问题是这种"认同"能不能、有没有必要移植到现代城市生活中来？现代都市人实则是以"个体"为基本单位，且现代社会的组织方式和个人归属早已经超越了居住空间，而更多地取决于个人的社会联系和喜好。现在的城市社区以功能性为主，而非以情感和心理为基础。在城市社区中，"认同"不是一种目标，而应是一种客观结果，或者说副产品。社区营建的目的就是使社区中的人生活得更安全、舒适，至于认同不认同，则关乎个人偏好，不必刻意去"营造"一个"认同"。

"认同感"本身是个中性词，并不必然地包含"好"或"坏"之意，但它可能衍生出多种可能性。比如群体或地域的认同感很可能导致某种"排他性"。中国长期以来的社区建设一直在推动打造小区内人口"共同体"意识和"认同感"，事实上就是在不断强化小区居民自认为与"外人"不同的特殊化心理，公开确认实行"内外有别"的原则，城市空间也因此被分割成一个个私人的或本单位的领地，"封闭式管理"社区可谓随处可见。

所以当我们谈到"认同感"的时候，需要保持一种敏感和反思，为何要营造这种"认同"？有何益处？对谁有意义？能解决什么问题？最后我们发现，"认同感"更多是组织化和管理的需要，而非个体层面的需要。但组织化其实也完全可以基于理性化、功利化合作来实现。从长远持久和稳定有序的角度来看，或许功利化、契约化合作的组织更能稳定地自动运行，同时节约维系情感的精力成本。**LAF**



1.　2012年，于长江教授在新疆进行关于城市建设的访谈

1.　An interview about urban construction in Xinjiang, 2012.

**Can you please explain the similarities and differences between Anthropology, Sociology, and Cultural Anthropology?**

**Changjiang YU (Hereinafter referred to as YU):** In short, both anthropology and sociology are disciplines that study people, society, and culture and the relationships between them. Through cross-cultural research, Anthropology explores the underlying universality of humans and the different ways they inhabit the world. It observes people from the perspectives of history, culture, and humanity, and strives to understand people across different eras, ethnic groups and cultural backgrounds. Sociology initiates from the introspection of modernity, with emphasis on modernity, postmodernity, and societal relationships between individuals and groups, including projecting forward into their future trends. It understands people and various phenomena in a modern society more from the "individual-social" dual-nature of human beings. It understands and interprets people and society through many different aspects such as personality, group, role, behavior, interaction, organization, social relation, social structure, and social idea.

Sociology and Anthropology are closely related, and their theories and methods overlap each other. Their perspectives are often interchanged, and therefore often not strictly divided. In our social research and practice, each subject explores and solves a problem from a different perspective, enriching our understanding and interpretation.

Cultural Anthropology is a branch of Anthropology, mainly studying the cultural aspects of people. This name originates from the United States, while in Great Britain, it is often called "Social Anthropology," and in continental Europe "Ethnology," with roughly the same semantics.

**How could theories and concepts of Anthropology and Sociology guide the planning and design?**

**YU:** Initially, Anthropology and Sociology mainly understand space from the perspective of social culture: first, it is regarded as "empty," as a reference for direction of human activities, which, together with "time," constitutes the objective dimension of human existence. Second, it is regarded as a spatial scope and boundary that contains certain human activities based on the degree of expansion and freedom for human activities. Third, it is regarded as specific living space presented by physical substances such as buildings and public facilities. At this stage, space is understood as an objective existence.

However, with a gradual deepening of spatial cognition in Anthropology and Sociology, people have realized that space is more relevant to human subjectivity. Human and social attributes are a fundamental of the existence of space, that is, human beings make space. Pure physical space is weakened and no longer discussed separately. The concept of "space" is now fully integrated with people. Therefore, when designing certain spaces, landscape architects cannot ignore their human and social attributes.

In this scenario, some basic concepts in Anthropology and Sociology can be used as reference and a basis for design. For instance, "human beings have commonality" and "human beings live in various ways" are two basic concepts of Anthropology. "Commonality" means that regardless of race, ethnicity, nationality, culture, class, or occupation, we all may share empathy or consensus. Some examples of this include basic freedom, security, dignity, etc., which should be the bottom line of our design work. "Various ways" means that the same social function may be achieved in different ways. In design and planning, we need to try to leave broad functional potentials for public users' to choose and explore.

From a methodological point of view, the concepts of "subject" and "object" in anthropology have particular significance in urban planning and landscape architecture. "Subject" refers to a researcher that can be subjective from the perspective of a "local" or an "agent" to understand the relevant social and cultural phenomenon, while "object" refers to an "outsider" or "observer." In reality, a lot of space planners and decision makers often unconsciously stand on the "object" position. They are accustomed to using design drawings or sand table models, describing their vision from an overall, bird's eye view perspective. However, the subject of our planning — the public — do not (and do not need to) perceive the design results from such an overall perspective. In fact, feelings of the users or citizens should be preferentially considered in all space-making through architecture and landscape planning.

Other concepts in Anthropology and Sociology, such as social structure, social relations, social groups, and social organizations, can also enrich ideas in landscape architecture. Taking house designing as an example, the key of it lies in how spatial patterns could adapt to people's social relations, rather than merely an exercise in sizing and scale. The current situation of "a thousand houses with the same appearance" is a result of neglecting people's social relations and organizational form. The users are forced to repeatedly demolish and rebuild, ultimately leading to a waste of space and resources. If we look at people's activities on the plaza, we would find that people with different roles and goals enjoy themselves in different ways, and that there is an explicit or implicit interaction between individuals, families, and friends. Thus, the design of plazas should not merely meet people's entertainment or dancing needs.

**Over the years, you have participated in the "Landscape Sociology" course offered by the Landscape Architecture major at Peking University Shenzhen Graduate School. Could you talk about the significance of Anthropology and Sociology in landscape architecture education from your teaching experience?**

YU: First of all, the course uses the term "sociology," which is rather an academic attitude than an academic term name. The subject of anthropology and sociology is the human. Based on deep observations, communications, and experiences of the reality of humans, its purpose is to try to realize the common sense and consensus between people. This is based on our awareness of the deficiency in cultivating professionals in landscape architecture. Although landscape architecture has been classified as an engineering course, it is also a human science, with its purpose being designing for people. The prolonged educational background of emphasizing engineering over arts has led to a tendency in designers to emphasize physical things over people. Thus, they need to be extended in terms of ideology, cognitive methods, and specific research skills. Future designers should possess care in both a profound humanism and quality of social science, allowing them to naturally take people into consideration throughout the landscape architecture design process. Relying on their personal taste and preferences, designers should ensure that a landscape design actually contains the nutrition of humanistic spirit. It is an exploration to set up a landscape sociology course and arrange special teaching methods, which aimed to increase the composition of humanities and social sciences in landscape architectural education.

At the same time, Anthropology and Sociology provides us with the correct attitude and base methods for field research. Field research, or fieldwork, emphasizes the fact that researchers and subjects are placed in an equal, parallel, considerate, and inter-subjected relationship, in order to understand

the perspective and attitude of another subject. The focus is on communication, understanding, and interaction, to cultivate a student's familiarity and perception for the reality of people, and thus deeply understand that our work will affect and change a number of people's fate, and may also cause them pain and disasters. Participant observation is an important research method, which requires researchers to participate deeply in locals' lives until they become part of the local people. Observation and experience allows them to understand and comprehend the local community and things from a subjective viewpoint, and to interpret their non-professional expression. The goal of this course is to develop students' ability and way of thinking for "participant observation."

In addition, education in the direction of Anthropology and Sociology also encourages students to take social considerations into account for their design. For example, once a landscape architecture design and planning project enters into the implementation phase, difficulties arising from factors of social governance are often far more serious than professional and technical problems. Due to social resistance, many substantive opinions cannot be effectively dealt with. Seeking public opinions, public consultation, and public

participation only exist by name. Even though as designers we may not be able to change the overall situation, we can at least try to avoid negative effects within the limits of our ability. When it comes to situations such as ancient villages, urban villages, and old city protection, anthropology and sociology reminds us of the cultural implications of these areas. These ways of life and social forms are important bases for the existence of human nature, through which people integrate their own lives, experiences, ancestors, inheritance, and emotions. To maintain the tradition is not only about the past, but also about the present and future.

**Rural construction is currently being extensively carried out throughout China. How do you see the "invasion" ("colonization") of such contemporary construction in the countryside? How could the countryside maintain its local characteristics under the impacts of such globalization?**

**YU:** The countryside is infinitely diverse. Given the diversified historical context and natural conditions, it is impossible to achieve extensive development nationwide in all countryside areas. Instead, local villagers and related stakeholders should jointly lead the development according to local

needs, schedules, and specific ways and means.

From an anthropological and sociological point of view, the countryside lifestyle is the most mainstream state of survival that has existed over the last few thousand years of human history, and has developed a rich and profound culture and civilization. The countryside has precipitated various measures to solve the plight of survival throughout all ages, and has accumulated human beings' dream of longing for a better life. Many of the elements of today's society come directly from the traditions of the countryside, such as people's most basic awareness of kinship, family relations, community identity, human community, etc., which were all formed in the rural era. And now, with the universal dreams of modernization and development replaced by the urbanized, the countryside has actually became the opposite of development — it lost not only its independent value, but also the legitimacy of its existence — if "modernization" means "urbanization," then the existence of the countryside itself is a mistake! Many people even have such a hypothesis in their mind: modernization means the eradication of countryside!

Under a variety of strong, organized, and continuous impacts, there are only

two conditions in countryside. One are the remote areas, where young adults have been sucked away, leaving the old and weak populations behind, creating a hollow and destitute society. While the other are close to developed areas and have long been forced into a wave of supreme urbanization by capital and power, with no possibility of independent choice. The only thing to do is to fish for a little more compensation through confrontation, delay, private relations, speculation, etc. when the major turnaround comes. In this situation, the original human and social elements of rural life can only be abandoned as valueless. After all, in this process of being urbanized, all must resort to any means to join in the game of right and interests. Who would have attention to spare on those feelings, emotions, or habits? The original rural life is seen as the source of repeated frustration and misfortune, for which people would like to forget and reorganize their own lives in a new context. Under the strong bullying of urbanization in both discourse and institution, the countryside today has become a semi-unintegrated social form.

Therefore, I think that the current countryside has no power to maintain anything, because the countryside is not an autonomous subject any longer. What do we mean when we talk about the countryside? Do we refer to that place? Or the people there? Are there any more people with subjective meaning? Can a farmer, or a villager, talk to or interact with others as a subject anymore? Today's rural construction is no longer by city people who come to the countryside to build the village. Instead, it refers to a city, with its various forces, that expands its range of activities to the geographical location and population once called "countryside." Here, grass-root organizations are in a semi-unintegrated state; families are far apart, and cultural traditions are in the swaying state of disintegration. People here do not have their own independent goals or directions except for surviving and waiting, but not specifically knowing what to wait for. Perhaps the wave of development will reach here one day, so as to take a share in a better scenario, or worse, be driven away to some other place to make a living. Therefore, it is unrealistic to let the countryside maintain its local characteristics, for it has neither the motive nor the ability to take on this mission.

Anthropology generally believes that various forms of human existence — including agriculturally-based countryside, animal husbandry-based nomadic communities, and industrial-oriented urban life — are the evolution of human civilization across different dimensions. Their cultural values are incomparable, and in a modern sense, there are no obvious merits or demerits in them. In fact, the history of developed countries in Europe and the North America shows that by using the latest technology, agriculture and animal husbandry can also realize modernization without necessarily adopting urbanization practices. In other countries with high population density, such as Japan, farming and animal husbandry production methods have also been developed, breaking the tradition that agriculture and animal husbandry must be in sparsely populated areas. These are all good references for rural transformation.

I oppose the use of a dichotomous stand on the issue of modernization and urbanization, including the confrontation between city and countryside, urban areas and urban villages, modern culture and local culture, industry and agriculture and animal husbandry, the city life and local customs, and so on. In real societies, tradition and modernism are complementary rather than a zero-game. Modernization is not necessarily based on destroying the tradition, instead, it can absorb traditional elements, and use them to support modern development or ease the negative impacts of modernization.

We should establish an inclusive and harmonious concept of development: not to measure rich and varied urban-rural lives under single standards of progress, advancement, and aesthetics; not to guide social development according to a concept of "linear evolution;" and not to force the transformation of cities and the countryside according to the preferences of specific groups or classes. We are not qualified and have no right to force others to change their lives, nor can we prove that we are absolutely correct — since the "right" only exists in the "consensus." When there is no consensus achieved, it is necessary to retain diversity.

**From the perspective of a sociologist, what aspects can be used to create a sense of identity within contemporary urban communities?**

**YU:** The English word "community," a noun derived from the adjective "common," was not originally intended to name a specific thing, but rather to describe a status. The establishment of the concept of "community" is derived from the analysis of life in a traditional social village and town. It contains a sense of belonging and attachment during a time when communication and transportation were underdeveloped, the social division of labor was not clear, and working and living life were not separated. This mentality naturally derived from people living together with their neighbors day after day, and experienced encounters that contrast "self" and "others" when people met each other outside of their community. This potential mentality therefore gets stimulated, and shows itself in the form of community identity.

The question is, can we or should we transplant this "identity" to modern city life? The basic units of modern urban people are literally the individuals, and the mode of modern social organization and personal belonging have long been perceived beyond living space, depending more on an individual's social connections and personal preferences. Today's urban community is functional rather than emotionally and mentally based.

Identity is not a goal in urban communities; it should be an objective outcome, or a by-product. The purpose of community building is to make people in the community more secure and comfortable. As far as identity, which concerns personal preferences, we do not have to deliberately create an identity.

Identity itself is a neutral word and does not necessarily contain a good or bad meaning, but may derive a variety of possibilities. For example, group or regional identity is likely to lead to "exclusivity." China's long-standing building of community has been kept through promoting community awareness and a sense of identity. This constantly strengthens residents' mentality of being different from outsiders, publically endorsing a differentiation between those that are inside and outside of the community. Urban space is divided into private territories, where a closed management community can be seen everywhere in China.

So when we talk about the sense of identity, we need to keep being susceptive and reflective. Why do we create this identity? What are the benefits of it? Whom is it meaningful to? What problem can it resolve? Eventually, we find that a sense of identity is more of a need for organization and management, rather than the needs of individuals. However, an organization can also be realized through rational and utilitarian cooperation. To make it long-term lasting and stable, perhaps utilitarian and contractual types of organization can better support automatic operation, while having energy cost-savings on emotional maintenance. **LAF**