

situations

Published Interview

Paul O'Neill interviews Jeanne van Heeswijk

Part of Locating the Producers
Case Study One – *The Blue House*

Locating the Producers

Locating the Producers is a major three-year curatorial research and public events programme. Through case study research of six exemplary long-term commissioning projects, it combines an investigative study of contemporary curatorial methods and processes with a series of internationally-focused discursive events and publications.

The Blue House

In 2004, Van Heeswijk arranged to take a large villa off the housing market in a newly developed district called IJburg, in the city of Amsterdam. The artist invites artists, urbanisms, architects, writers, scholars, scientists, politicians, sociologists and other thinkers to become members of 'The Blue House Housing Association of the Mind' for the duration of the four-year project. Associate members dedicate their time to engage with, to live and to work in *The Blue House* for certain periods, times and levels of intensity upon which they can decide.

Members of 'The Blue House Housing Association of the Mind' are encouraged to engage with one another and to with fellow IJburg residents, to consider the particularities of the location of the house and their participant role within the 'Housing Association'.

For further information on The Blue House please visit www.blauwehuis.org

For further information on Jeanne van Heeswijk please visit www.jeanneworks.net

Paul O'Neill: So how did Blue House originate? How and when was it initiated, how did it emerge?

Jeanne van Heeswijk: It came into being quite by a detour. Initially, the architect who built this block, Teun Koolhaas, wanted to bring an extra element into the block. He asked Dorine de Vos, who is somebody closely related to him and a very well known designer of some of the most amazing restaurants and hotels in the Netherlands, to come up with some elements that would create a sense of cosiness and put a focus on the entrance. He was a little afraid that people would perhaps not be able to find the entrance. I think he was probably right to be afraid, because people still can't find the entrance. She worked on a proposal which included working with me, as we had worked together well on the Hotel New York project in New York. Her first idea was to have a mural on that wall painted by her husband, who is a well-known painter of sea views, and to add some special lighting. They had also been talking to AFK (Amsterdam Fund for the Arts) about a possible matching contribution, to equal that made by the architect's office. They said they wanted to involve me in the project and the AFK was quite happy with this. Then Dorine withdrew from the process for personal reasons and left the project with me to develop. I was more interested in the general idea of the routing on the island, and the way in which it would be used in the future. The AFK formulated a small commission to look into this and the way in which the identity of the island would shape.

PO'N: So you could say that you were commissioned to do a painting, which became a project about the identity of the Island, which then became *The Blue House*.

JvH: Yes, but they never asked me to make the painting, but, rather, to think about elements that could draw people into the block, which could be a painting or the lighting. But when they asked this, the island was still all sand, and there were only paper drawings of the future housing blocks and a large model. I started studying this, and from that, I formulated questions, sometimes very small questions, about the routing in general on this island, the community that would come and live there and the way the inhabitation could work. And when you start looking, you start to notice that every bit of the island is planned in detail, that there is no 'open' space left. Then my eyes fell on the drawing of this blue house in the middle of a block and I imagined it could function as a blue screen. Could this perhaps be a place that could still reflect the things that might

come to be desired, things that were not anticipated in the planning of the island? And that's how I came up with the proposal to make this blue house, actually a blue screen for the unplanned, for that which is still to come, yet to become a desire. And I also made references to houses in history, like the Casa Azul of Frida Kahlo, Diego Riviera and Trotsky, as to how art (in public space) and habitation could influence the course of history. I also referred to Van Gogh's Yellow House and his letters in which he expresses his desire to live and work collaboratively with another artist, like Gauguin, as well as about doing something for people in the village. So I referred to houses in history that actually became catalysts of history.

PO'N: And that was also your philosophical thinking behind its potentiality?

JvH: Yes, that through actually becoming part of the island, through inhabitation, you could be part of its history in the making and to do that not by observing, but by participating. This is why *The Blue House* was not given a pre-inscribed function like that of a meeting point for the neighbourhood, or an art centre, but to just be a kind of open shell, allowing for different people to inhabit it and become co-writers of the island's histories. This is how I proposed the idea for a project to the commission at the time. I still remember their reaction: they said they loved its utopian character and they offered money to make a small booklet on the idea, because they thought it was totally unachievable. I was quite surprised by this, because I thought if they knew my work or my practice, then they knew I'm not that kind of conceptual artist. I don't write stories or a concept for the sake of the story or the concept. I write outlines for what I call fields of interaction or fields of (inter)action, which only come alive when they are executed, when they happen in a place. They don't exist as concepts, they are working models. I thanked them for their offer and went to look for somebody who could buy the house.

PO'N: And how would you describe or define your role within *The Blue House*?

JvH: As a complex one, because in one way, I'm the initiator, but in another, I am just a member of the association, like all the other members. Sure, I am a member with a strong voice, but I am, in general, a person with a strong voice. In principle, I would love to see all the participants of *The Blue House* take their membership seriously and co-direct, co-steer the house. Some members do, others less so. Some members take it as a place to do things for themselves, others are bringing new members as well. So,

people bring people, or tell about the house, or hook all their other projects to *The Blue House*, which I also like. I look at how things evolve and sometimes guide the choices, because we also get a lot of people just asking, "Can I show my work here?" Then I look to see if it can somehow belong within the framework of the house, but I don't make curatorial decisions. There are members of the house whose work is not to my direct personal choice/taste, but who have affinity with another member of the house. I am, also, of course helping to fundraise for the house. Sometimes I am the spokesperson, or merely the person who makes the water run.

PO'N: And how would you distinguish between the associate members of the Housing Association of the Mind and the residential artist who is coming to spend some time here working, researching, investigating, engaging?

JvH: They are all members.

PO'N: They become the house...

JvH: Otherwise, you're not welcome. You're an exception [LAUGHS].

PO'N: Uh huh.

JvH: But you understand that you have to become an associate at some point.

PO'N: Right, okay, I'll become a member then.

JvH: I mean, in principle, all the people who stay here are members.

PO'N: So, that's primary?

JvH: Yes.

PO'N: That comes before artists or architects or residents are invited in?

JvH: Yes, the residents of IJburg are also invited in. When someone does a project at *The Blue House*, they also become a member.

PO'N: Automatically?

JvH: Yes.

PO’N: So, it is an accumulative organisation, self-organisation in a sense?

JvH: Yes.

PO’N: That needs to be clarified. As you understand it, what are your reasons for the durational approach underlying the project which have led to kind of a curatorial or an artistic or an accumulative process developing over time?

JvH: Because I have been doing more large-scale projects, I know a little bit about projects and the impact of duration. I know what it means if something is taking place for a year, for two years, for four years or for ten years and what the intensity of the span is. With *The Blue House*, I initially opted for a four-year period, as I thought it to be an interesting lifespan for the project. This was also the projected timeframe for the completion of the first phase of IJburg, which will be next year, around this time.

PO’N: And...

JvH: If you look around now, you see that the building is going quickly, this part of the island is nearly finished.

PO’N: And it’s also very important to you that the project has a beginning, middle and an end is there a certain rhythm across the project?

JvH: The beginning yes, the end also, the middle I don’t know. That has to shape itself throughout the project.

PO’N: You have your own plan, that’s the space?

JvH: Yes, that’s the space of emptiness. I do think it’s important to think of the house as an art project and not, for instance, as an art institute or an art office that organises. In that sense, for it to be independent/autonomous. I think that if you want to be a place for the unplanned, it would be strange for it to become an institution. But given how art funding functions nowadays, it’s very hard to do anything without becoming an institution. It is one of the biggest side challenges of *The Blue House*: to stay alive in a funding system that’s basically designed for exhibitions or events, and not for durational projects, unless there is a governmental institution, like SKOR in Leidsche Rijn, behind it. Long-term durational projects without a governmental body behind you are not done in

the Netherlands. But in order for the project to be heard, I thought its (relative) autonomy to be of importance. This is also a reason why we don't take money from the city or the development agency project Bureau IJburg.

PO'N: And that was a choice?

JvH: That's a very conscious choice. So we are neither a local art institute nor a Kunsthalle nor an art agency.

PO'N: It was quite interesting when I interviewed Igor Rovers from Bureau IJburg and he said that one of his regrets in relation to *The Blue House* was that they didn't support the project from the outset in-terms of funding and he was unable to articulate what the criteria for that was. Do you think that in some ways that would not have been a very productive thing for *The Blue House*, if they had funded it from the outset? They'd have a hold on you, wouldn't they?

JvH: Yeah, although I'm regretting it sometimes too, because we could really use the money [LAUGHS]. But I know it is really important that we do not get money from them, that we are not paid by regeneration/development money. So the house remains able to be what it wants to be, self regulated, non-planned and non-institutional.

PO'N: I think that is an important aspect. How does *The Blue House*, in your view, demonstrate, or show publicly, an interest in sustaining a long-term engagement with this specific context and the place of IJburg within which it is placed?

JvH: That is always an interesting question because we do and we don't, as the mandate of *The Blue House* has always been larger than just IJburg. I think it is very important that we didn't set up a place dealing only with IJburg, but a place to research into how communities develop, a place that is not just location specific, but more context specific. And here the context is not just the physical locale, it is this larger frame of new towns in Europe and the way we still try to construct communities. *The Blue House*, in general, is interested in these larger issues, of which IJburg, I think, is a very good example. So yes, we are interested in sustainability here, but also in distributing our knowledge in a wider field. At this moment, we are thinking a lot about what to do with the legacy of *The Blue House* or what we can do with what we have generated and how we can accumulate the project's knowledge and make it transportable. What would be

the blueprint of this whole endeavour? We are talking now with our members about how to make this accumulated knowledge travel, this we call Blue Points. Could the house, for instance, fragmentise and take points out and then sustain those points or those fragments which might be of interest? Where would these fragments be placed? Certainly, some will be placed on IJburg. We are working very hard now to make sure that the Child's Library gets a permanent place on IJburg, because it keeps growing and is becoming too big for this house. But more importantly, to sustain it, as we did with the Adult Library which is now part of the community restaurant. Or the way we worked very hard to give all those youngsters who were here during the Chill Room project a permanent place. We try to sustain the small initiatives here on IJburg, but are also working very hard to sustain other ideas and projects, for instance, the Chat Theatre for which we've now managed to set up a fixed point at the university in Porto Allegro, Brazil. So that is what we call Blue Points.

PO'N: So, it is not particular to the place? It is not particular to IJburg? They are about location specific and context and situation specific elements, but there are also larger questions, more generic in relation to the general kind of issues and problematics that arise when a place, a community or fabric of the structure you're using.

JvH: Yes, addressing these larger questions is also very important. In the beginning it was very important to keep stressing this to some people here on IJburg who would say, "Well what are you doing for this community?" I would always answer, "My mandate is not necessarily to serve this community only."

PO'N: What was really fascinating for me, was this tension between an understanding of it as a kind of community centre, that has now somehow removed itself from that community, which is one of the tensions that seem to have emerged when talking to individual residents, and they're also quite happy with that. They understand that there are reasons for that. So, for example, at the beginning, they were coming in and having coffee all the time and now that doesn't happen so much, but also...

JvH: Yes, but how many cups of coffee can you have? If you have nothing to talk about at the same time.

PO'N: And I think it is also representative of the transformation that IJburg itself has gone through. As more people moved here, a community has been ultimately formed by

a relatively small group of people, but the more it expands and the more new people add to that, it becomes less possible.

JvH: It is interesting that you should say that. In the beginning, most of the people who were directly involved in the block came here a lot. Now they just come here when they feel the necessity, when they want to meet somebody, or when somebody wants to meet them. There is this understanding of each other's presence. In the beginning, sometimes it was even hard, because there was this, almost over desire/enthusiasm to participate. Like, "This house is going to be solving all my questions and all the problems." So, in the beginning we quite often had to say, "No we're not doing that," but, "Yes, we can collaborate." We are also dealing with being here, like you, we co-inhabit with you. At the moment, they see us as just one of the houses in the street, though a very particular house, which they sometimes visit and sometimes not. Irene told me something interesting in the car yesterday. Because these last three months, we were quite low profile, unlike last summer, we were frantically busy and also had all the noise of the structures going up, a lot of people on the street say to her, "But we like to see a lot of things happening in *The Blue House*."

PO'N: That was the impression I got from speaking to people here. That it's definitely more of an art project. That it is something that has had more of a distance than they hoped, but they weren't uncomfortable with that.

JvH: No.

PO'N: Astrid Bonder (IJburg resident), particularly, seemed to have quite a real view on things.

JvH: Yes, but that is also why I wanted you to talk to her because I know her.

PO'N: She's very pragmatic.

JvH: Yeah, very pragmatic, but we put a lot of effort into making them understand that this was an art project although there were no paintings, that we weren't a community service. I think it was very important for that to not have money from the city.

PO'N: In order to be able to do that?

JvH: It is important to be, what I call, relatively independent, because that allows us to manoeuvre freely. Otherwise you get into all these dialogues about being an art engineer or being instrumental. And the discourse will only be about art and public space versus community art, which then has to evoke change or solve problems or be educational or be empowering. Sure, it can be, but it doesn't have to be, and I think that, for *The Blue House*, it is essential that it is not.

PO'N: What, in your view, are the challenges?

JvH: But, Astrid is here quite a lot. That's also quite funny.

PO'N: You see her quite a lot?

JvH: [LAUGHS] Yeah. She comes a lot for coffee. She needs a lot of coffee.

PO'N: Maybe she needs something else?

JvH: Yeah.

PO'N: In your view, what are the challenges to sustaining a long-term approach, the long-term in this context being four years? What do you think are the challenges? If one were to learn from *The Blue House* as a curatorial, a commissioning and an art project that could be carried into other ways of working, what are the challenges?

JvH: I think I would say to our main funders, don't do it!

PO'N: Right, that's not the answer I'm looking for. [LAUGHS]

JvH: [LAUGHS] And I mean it. There are some challenges I feel we should all address, that go back a bit, to our earlier conversation that we, I think, as practitioners ended up in a very interesting dichotomy between art with a possible function in society and art that is functionless and the way we make policies around that, funding strategies around it and a market around it, which doesn't allow for something that would try to cut across. The challenge of this house is how to fit itself into very narrow pre-inscribed policies, this is a very big challenge. For instance, we are non-programmatic. In the Netherlands it's very hard to get money for a project which is project-based or event-based, without being programmatic. That means that you have to show your programme before you get your money. Not to talk about a project that doesn't specify its direct outcome, not

because it doesn't want to have an outcome, because it's lazy, but because not having a pre-inscribed outcome is its fundamental purpose.

PO'N: Raison d'être?

JvH: Yes. I think these things are something to learn from. Sometimes it also makes me sad that we are actually almost mimicking the segregation going on in society. Art and art funding and art policy becomes very much...

PO'N: Compartmentalised.

JvH: Yes, compartmentalised. I think this is something I learned very much from, and it was very hard.

PO'N: Can you identify a set of core conditions or basic prerequisites that are necessary for a long-term project to succeed or for *The Blue House* to be a success?

JvH: I think *The Blue House* is a success if it influences in an interesting way the thinking and writing of IJburg, by actually being a living question mark at all times, and if it perhaps moves one millimetre to the left, or to the right, some of the pre-inscribed ideas there are about how these kind of communities or these kind of places should come into being. Like when Astrid said, "It's not what I wanted it to be, but it is rather okay that it's there, even if I'm not able to label it." I think it would be very interesting for *The Blue House* if it could achieve this on many levels and for some of the research we did, or some of the temporary interventions we did, to show certain cracks, possibilities to manoeuvre or defaults in the planning process, so that they become known. Known in a sense that something could stay, physically stay, but also known as maybe a bypass to some regulation, now used by everybody. You know, the joke we played with the flower stall is quite influential; it is copied and not only on IJburg. These are the kinds of things that we do together with *The Blue House*: in trying to move, to manoeuvre in the policy grey zone that sort of picks up everywhere. That you could prove that there could still be room created for the un-planned, that we don't have to fix everything or freeze everything or compartmentalise everything. If *The Blue House* could cut across that sort of ideas in general and on IJburg in particular, with the next phase of IJburg, they might just think a bit more about the public space. That would be nice.

PO’N: And as a model of working, as an approach to collaboration, or an approach to engaging with others and as a particular approach that you use, how would you define that as distinct from, say other commissioning contexts such as Beyond in Leidsche Rijn?

JvH: We don’t commission.

PO’N: But things get made...

JvH: Yes.

PO’N: ... or start to get done, engagement happens, discussions.

JvH: I think this is because we asked people to become an inhabitant, not an artist in residence, or a guest, but an inhabitant of IJburg by becoming a member of the Housing Association of the Mind for the duration of the project. In that way people connect themselves for four years to IJburg without our necessarily commissioning them. So, there are people staying here for two and a half years now, who just use the house for research and who never came up with any idea for a project or intervention on IJburg, and that is not necessary. But they affect the house and the thinking around the house very much, although this may be non-functional. I don’t believe that everything has to be free, but we don’t ask people to do something specific, we just invite them to engage, because we think they have something interesting to tell. So, we don’t say to them, “Okay go now and make something,” but we do always write in the letter we send to people, “If you want to do a project or intervention here on IJburg, we can assist you and we can help you fundraise, if necessary.” But it doesn’t have to be so, you can really be part of this exchange simply by staying. The only thing we ask people to do is to share their knowledge with the house.

PO’N: And how would that ultimately be disseminated? That could be through conversation, through dialogue, through talking, through emails, through various different ways, through work even.

JvH: Even, yes. I don’t need a project description from every person. I don’t need an evaluation, I don’t need anything.

PO’N: And in a sense, it is an un-commissioned context or un-curated space, which you've said, but at the same time certain commissions do emerge out of that, or certain productions, whether it's a production of discourse or production of an artwork, etc.

JvH: Yes, and that's what we always said, that we would facilitate projects. But, at this moment, even the members are facilitating other participants' projects, like Igor Dobrocic who came up with program money. He facilitates eight, nine other activities, and in this sense he almost became an indoor commissioner because he brought a certain agenda and some money to execute projects and to research his ideas, which I think is very interesting. He bought a lot of extra time for a lot of extra guests to spend at *The Blue House*.

PO’N: And what projects that emerged out of the time spent here by inhabitants who are invited were you happy with?

JvH: And which I like?

PO’N: You're not going to answer that?

JvH: No, I'm not going to answer that. I cannot.

PO’N: That's fair enough.

JvH: Because I think that that would then again say that there would be an ideal project for *The Blue House*.

PO’N: Well, let me ask the question in a different way. What, in your view, did not work? What went wrong? What could have been done differently, what could have been done better at particular moments in the project so far?

JvH: Almost everything. No, that's no gimmick that I really mean. Because I sometimes wish we had, for instance, a little bit more money, so we have a little bit more leeway to be more out there, to be, perhaps, more open, say open to the public on more days. So that we could more often employ the forms of communication that would open the house in a different way. We try a lot, we infiltrate on the website. We do everything we can within the given limits, but I think if you do something like this, then, I would not say there's never enough communication, but you could always improve the ways in which

you relate to both your neighbours, and the physical space. And sometimes I think we could have been tougher on the members by saying, "Okay, I do want you to engage more," without setting a standard. I tried very hard to not say, "Okay there is a specific, right *Blue House* project," but then again there are definitely projects that you don't feel are good enough. Or these kinds of questions should have been more structured, or less. These are things that are in constant evaluation in the house, which we do actually quite intensely with the group. For instance, yesterday I had this conversation with Irene. She said how people, because she is now sharing work with Daniela, now see her as the person to always talk to (because she's been here from the beginning), and that they tell her that, although Daniela is here quite a lot, she is not Irene. Which doesn't say anything about Daniela's qualities, but her Dutch is not as Dutch as Irene's. So then Irene said, "Is that good or bad, that people have this idea that they lost part of the interface?"

PO'N: Okay.

JvH: And I don't know the answer. Could we say, "Okay, Irene is now the public face," so there has to always be one public face for the house, or can it be different public faces all the time.

PO'N: Or is that too confusing?

JvH: Is that too confusing for the right reasons, or is it just too confusing?

PO'N: Is the durational approach demonstrated by *The Blue House* different from short-term, or itinerant, or nomadic curatorial models or ways of working in place and if so how do you see it as being different?

JvH: It depends on how you look at *The Blue House*, because I think that duration makes a difference. It absolutely makes a difference whether you are somewhere for a month, or a year, or four years, or ten years and I don't necessarily put a quality criterion on this. I don't think four years is better than one year, I just think it makes a difference in a sense that you have another relationship to the place, because you get a more extended history with the place and the place with you. So, in this case you could say that this absolutely affects *The Blue House*, the fact that people now think, "Okay, we know what it is and we have a close relationship, a kind of relationship that cannot be

built in a year, but one you build over time.” Then again, you could also say *The Blue House* is a series of short-term ‘affairs’, for a month or six months, or a series of two week, weekend visits.

PO’N: But in a sense, it is also perhaps what Tom van Gestel was doing with *Beyond* in Leidsche Rijn, he's been there for ten years.

JvH: Yes.

PO’N: You will be here for four years, although some of the inhabitants you invited in may be here for two or three days, or they never stick it, or may be here for six months, or like Maria, develop the project over four years, or like Daniela, develop a documentary film.

JvH: And become part of the organisation.

PO’N: Yeah.

JvH: There are constant shifts in the formed relationships. Then again, I think what makes *The Blue House* different is that it is a concentration of shifting relationships in a place. So it's not programmatic like *Beyond*, which you can see more as a programme of location-specific activities, ranging in duration and both event-based and more permanent. I think we are not that. In that sense, you could say that all our events long-term or short-term are part of one...

PO’N: Organism.

JvH: Organism. In that sense, you could say we are more of an intense organism in a place with quite a long duration span.

PO’N: And...

JvH: Without being something like *Tenantspin* in Liverpool, which has also been in one place for quite long, but is just one project. So you could say the interwovenness and the complexity of the different projects create quite an interesting unity. So it's not linear.

PO’N: And do you think *The Blue House* intended to form part of a critique of short-term, nomadic, or itinerant approaches that also engage with a place, locality or local

residents, such as many biennials and kind of regenerative projects where a commissioner or artist or curator is brought in for a short period of time?

JvH: I would say yes to that, but then again not for the reason that this is a better approach than the other. I think it is generating a different kind of work. Of course, there are always bad examples of biennials that have an artist drop in, look around one day and then make a pretentious proposition for a place, which often leads to bad projects. But there are also people who arrive with a fresh eye, really capture the heart of a conflict and shed new light. I think that can be the strength of shorter-term nomadic projects. Then again, long-term can also lead into nothing more than social activity, which is also not good. In that sense it's not a dialectical critique, but an attempt to show that long time inhabitation of a place generates different outcomes, which in itself cannot be mimicked by being [SNAPS FINGERS] instantaneous, just like that! I think if you are researching a certain place for so long, then it is logical that you would generate a much more complex, a more dense body of information. Which can still result in a bad painting at the end [LAUGHS].

PO'N: It is interesting that you picked up on critique as the dialectical idea for the long-term of that and what is nomadic and itinerant and mobile, if you like, of the other. What I am proposing and maybe you are agreeing on, is the possibility of thinking of *The Blue House* as a critique in a sense that the short-term and nomadic way of working is the dominant model...

JvH: Yeah.

PO'N: ... whilst perhaps *The Blue House*, like perhaps *Beyond* in Leidsche Rijn, is an emergent model. It is proposing an alternative to that which is dominant. So, in a sense it could be read as a critique.

JvH: That's why I said...

PO'N: Rather than a dialectical opposition?

JvH: Yes, I agree to this but I would not say, "I do this because of the other," but because I do believe (and that's why most of the projects I'm doing are long-term) that in our complex society there is, besides immediate (direct) reaction, also an absolute need

for longer, more dynamic, complex, interweaving of information and narration and that in my opinion you can only do by being in a place, like we do here.

PO’N: What evidence is there of *The Blue House* having already had an impact or a transformative effect on IJburg?

JvH: Well, I think it changed some of the discourse on IJburg. Igor Rovers probably told you that we sometimes have a very humoristic way of thinking about what is happening. We probably have already proven something on IJburg: that by addressing certain issues immediately, we accelerated some processes which people here thought could not be accelerated, like addressing the problem of the youngsters. The only thing authorities would say was that this was scheduled to be dealt with in 2012. So everything could only be addressed within the schedule of the development of the island based on a sort of grid on how this island and this community should be planned and everybody would always say it’s not possible to accelerate. You could say what *The Blue House* has already proven, is that you can accelerate from within the system, not necessarily by moving beyond, but by forcing them to actually create density instead within the given timeframe of the physical building process.

PO’N: The same pace tracked out for the build.

JvH: Yes, so we made it possible to have a youth house opening right here and now, instead of the one planned for 2012. I think we proved the possibility of urgency.

PO’N: And what do you think will be its legacy then, and what is one of the issues that a number of the associates like Igor or Dennis or Irene were talking about, what we leave behind or hope to leave behind in a sense or what we hope to carry forwards elsewhere?

JvH: I would say the possibility to change your mind, to be flexible.

PO’N: That would be the legacy?

JvH: Yes, but in a very dense form, like I said, to show that acceleration in this kind of system does exist, to show that you can create complex information without pre-programmed parameters, that you can have a series of activities happening without having a commission scheme, that you can have involvement over time without

necessarily becoming an institution or have governmental support. So, if it leaves a legacy, it is perhaps the fact that alternative models are still possible, from the very small to quite large ones, or let's say, necessary, or to keep trying new models.

NOTE: Three weeks in February, 2009, Project Bureau IJburg (Igor Rovers) presented the new plans for IJburg's phase 2 which very clearly state that they want to create a layer of openness, of flexibility in the planning process in order to be able to anticipate the unplanned (unknown) developments within the community. (With thanks to *The Blue House*)

© Jeanne van Heeswijk and Situations. Published by Situations at the University of the West of England, Bristol, 2009. The person using Situations Papers online may view, reproduce or store copies of this paper providing the information is only for their individual use, and is not used for commercial purposes. Any copies of this paper, in whole or in part, must include the copyright notice above and the customary bibliographic citation, including author, attribution, date, article title, Situations Papers Online, and the URL <http://www.situations.org.uk> The views expressed in this paper are not necessarily those of the Publisher or Editor.