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INTRODUCTION

Since November 2011 I have been doing a masters in Landscape Architecture. For me this graduation started in may 2014, while doing an internship, when I decided that I wanted to graduate in making a Landscape design in the studio Design as Politics. Until then no Landscape architecture students had done this, probably because the chair is only about 5 years old. However, as well architecture as urbanism studio’s have always been able to join after admission. After boldly applying and being admitted myself, I promised myself to do my very best to make this combination happen.

Now, before you, you will find a documentation of the graduation I have been working on for the last year. This is a project executed in those two studio’s; “Landscape Architecture” and “Design as Politics”. These studios’ themes for this year were respectively: “Flowscapes” and “New utopia’s on the Ruins of the Welfare State”. This combination, where both studio’s and all the courses have been fully attended is the final result of a long consideration between student, chair and professors. I would like to especially thank Marta Relats and Inge Bobbink for helping me to attend both studio’s and being able to follow my own path through this faculty.

The work I did can be considered as either a research, a design or even a plea, as my mentor has called the work many times; Maybe it can be described with all of the words above. I think that I can say that this years quest has been as well about finding the right emphasis on my project; As about finding my personal position as an independent landscape architect. Am I a researcher, a convincer or a designer pur sang? I will get back to you on both these questions in my reflection.

Let me first give you an idea of the topics that fascinated me to work on this project in the first place. After that, I will set a methodological framework for you that will explain theoretically what I have been doing. Then on the main pages you will hear me trying to convince you of my ideas, you will see my research and I will try to take you on a tour with me through the scenario that I created for the Netherlands.

I would like to thank you in advance for reading this and invite you to sent me any further questions or comments regarding my research/ideas or design.

Doris
A. CAUSE OR FASCINATION
Above: Hermes steals from Apollo, Arcadian painting by Claude Lorrain, c. 1645
A. CAUSE OR FASCINATION

I have recently learned that all good things come in three (Alle Guten sind Drei). So here we go, let me tell you about my three totally different topics of inspiration.

A.1. Arcadia

Arcadia, as Virgil describes it in his work Bucolics, is an ideal a pastoral country inhabited by shepherds, animals and gods. Everyone is peacefully living together in his or her way, sharing and shaping the fruits of the landscape. This is arcadic because of its edenic ideal, but as we look at it now anno 2015, it could also be determined as Utopian. As we’re looking at art and design in the last few decades, we see a strong longing for this wilderness, untamed and pastoral living. It is seen as a forgotten way of living that doesn’t exist anymore. Therefore it has a special attraction.

Nevertheless there have always been people keeping these Arcadian images alive. There have been nomadic groups, all over the world, forever already. However for a long time now, their pastoral way of living has been not accepted and facilitated. On the contrary; nomadic tribes are forced into made-up systems and assigned pieces of land, often the worst. They are seized in the static system of owning land that is identified as, for instance, a democracy and a welfare state. This results in many conflicts and/or an extinction of multiple cultures and traditions, but most of all, it doesn’t allow people with a different mindset to live anywhere at all.

We can ask ourselves, if while we are in a constant search of arcadia and utopia, we shouldn’t accept nomadism as a way of living, on the same level as we accommodate static living. After all, it will always be there. Why fight it, and not accommodate it like in the shepherds society?

themes can be translated into themes with a spatial relevance in landscape architecture, then why can’t we do this with politics. After all, why design within the system and it’s limitations, when we can also try to change or influence that same system?

A.3. Drug-waste in Brabant

2014 has been the year of chemical XTC waste. Everywhere. My parents, who live in the woodlands in the south of Holland, near Breda are familiar with a pair of mayors that until recently had to deal with this big problem. While sitting on the dining table I got fascinated by the causes and consequences of this problem.

Brabant is a home for big drug organizations and smuggling. At this moment the creation of XTC is one of it’s main forms of income and that doesn’t leave other people unharmed. The chemical and toxic waste that is the residue of the process is one of their biggest problems. How easy it is for the networks to get rid of their illegal drugs, so hard is it for them to get rid of the illegal waste. Therefore it is being dumped in fields, forests, basically everywhere. But as I said this is toxic and when it ends up in slurry pits that are spread over the crops that we eat; dutch government establishes a real problem. Acres of forest have been ruined for years.

Still, municipalities and forestripes are held financially responsible for this loophole caused by Dutch Laissez-Faire politics and their attitude towards drugs.
B. METHODS
**SCENARIO**

- **NUMBER:** MULTIPLE
- **TIME HORIZON:** MID- OR LONG TERM
- **CORE QUALITY:** PLAUSIBLE
- **AIM:** RESEARCH
- **FINISH:** SUFFICIENTLY IMAGINABLE
- **BASE:** INQUISITIVENESS, ASSESSMENTS
- **OCURRENCE:** POSSIBLE

**UTOPIA**

- **NUMBER:** SINGLE
- **TIME HORIZON:** NONE/PRESENT
- **CORE QUALITY:** ALTERNATE TO PRESENT
- **AIM:** CRITICIZE
- **FINISH:** SUFFICIENTLY REFLECTED
- **BASE:** ANALYSIS OF PRESENT
- **OCURRENCE:** NOT RELEVANT
B. METHODOLOGY

Foreseeing the spatial future of the Netherlands has been a fascination for many urban designers, spatial planners and (landscape-) architects throughout history. In the book: Dutch New Worlds (Salewski, 2012) several methods to do so are described; A vision, a forecast, scenario or a utopia. All these methods have their own properties, like base, aim and desirability. Now a scenario has the aim of being a research while a Utopian strategy wants to criticize.

What I have done is right in between the last two. I have made a very strange Utopian scenario. Hence the confusion that has been present during the process.

I chose this method that combines both in order to start a debate on my problem statement and to investigate design options in landscape architecture that can only be researched in a futuristic view.

B.1. Project

In this graduation, I am designing a Utopian Netherlands, where a certain percentage (say 20%) is living nomadic. A Netherlands that consists out of two segments: One super welfare state where planning is optimized and the organized part of society is taking place (education, healthcare, institutions). Here are the “Binnendijkers” living. The other is where Netherlands deals with the landscape in this new dynamic way, and where the nomads live; the “Buitendijkers”.

Imagine a Utopian situation where we are not going back in time, but ahead. As well in the welfare state as in the nomadic area people will need and demand hot water, gas, electricity, sewage systems and off course wireless network everywhere.

Design questions for this, are addressing a design for a Utopian political system as well as a spatial design for it.

A.1. How is the Netherlands Politically divided?
A.2. How do the two political situations work individually? How do the two political situations differ and go together?
A.3. How will and can politics influence the dynamic part of the Netherlands?
B.1. How is the Netherlands spatially divided?
B.2. What program is needed in the new nomadic situation? How is that applied?
B.3. How do the typical Dutch landscapes work now, and how will they transform?
B.4. How will the element that then not only spatially, but also politically divides the Netherlands; the dijk; work?
C.1. How can this utopia be extrapolated over the borders of a country?
C.2. How can this be seen as a test-case in an actual context and society? Like in Oost Groningen or Zeeuws Vlaanderen?

Here I will explain the methodology that I will be using during my graduation process for multiple reasons. It needs to connect to the aim of the project: Translating politics into a spatial theme and make it an equal part of the design. Also the method is supposed to enable answering these questions I stated before. Thirdly, I am searching for these methods in order to finally create an academically reliable research and design. Because the project is situated in between scales and disciplines, the method will be a tailor-suited combination of experimental methods in landscape design.

The main goal of my method is to make politics part of the design process. I will use Utopian thinking to do so. step by step, this means that I first have to translate politics into a spatial theme, in order to then experiment with it, using different media. As shown in the image above, you see that my method exists out of 1 main method divided
into sub-methods that can solve the questions. The main method will be Orgware, Software, Hardware, which already experiments with bringing politics into account. I will firstly discuss several methods I found useful.

B.2. Existing methods

B.2.1. Utopian thinking

Even though I already named the method Utopian thinking in the introduction briefly, I will explain the concept of this method a little more detailed. I’ll do this according the example of the garden city by Ebenezer Howard.

After reading multiple Utopian books, Howard designed a model for happiness, wealth and power, by combining the advantages of town and country. A planning model. He used Utopian thinking to design a completely new plan, groundless in that age, though being a great inspiration for later developments and designs. He aimed for people to see his Utopian Garden City as a practical, realistic alternative to the present (Schuyler, 2002). This implies, that he consciously created a fictional plan, but wanted it to be influential on reality.

Therefore he chose to ignore contemporary political possibilities, and created a new political setting in which his design would be placed: in other words: He disengaged the relationship between the political and spatial situation. Then he created a new situation of both kinds, but his goal was to let his spatial design get as realistic as possible in order to commence changes in the contemporary political situation that could lead the utopia situation.

B.2.2. Orgware, Software, Hardware

The second method I will discuss is one that takes politics into account during the design phase. I therefore will try to figure out how this method can be of assistance during my graduation track.

Orgware-Hardware-Software is originally not a (landscape-)architectonic approach, but for the first time spatially described by Crimson in their plan for a Vinex location in Leidse Rijn:

“Orgware (Organization-ware) is a term derived from economics that refers to factors of an administrative, political or policy-related nature which precede the implementation of certain ideas and knowledge (software) and the construction and deployment of physical elements (hardware). Urban design is getting more and more an orgware affair.” (Dijkstra, R., Provoost, M., & Vanstiphout, W., 1995)
Crimson describes the way to deal with a design problem in the following order:

1. Understand Orgware: First of all you have to gain an understanding of the topography of opportunities and constraints a certain site holds. The implications (like noise pollution legislation, the position of a municipal boundary or the idiosyncrasies of local politicians) that come from this orgware are at least as significant as the implications that come from the physical topography. "Orgware can present itself as an orderly landscape of predictable patterns; it can also manifest itself as a rugged country of rules and regulations, or as a soil pollution of secret ideals."

2. Make Software intelligible: With the knowledge of the orgware you can start implementing certain spatial design-concepts.

3. Make Hardware real: These concepts can actually be executed in a design for a new built environment because of the understanding of the political topography it will be placed in.

B.2.3. Design - Research - by Design

The next method I analyze is one that can help me in switching between different design scales and enables one to reflect in an academic way on a specific theme, like politics.

Design research and research by design are two methods in landscape architecture that can not be seen apart from each other. "Design research is an indispensable step in research by design." (Steenbergen, Meeks, & Nijhuis, 2008) In the book "Composing Landscapes", Steenbergen et al. separate the method in the following three steps. In order to start the process, one or more existing precedent examples are necessary.

1. Selection of location: After analyzing the internal rules of an existing composition, you can derive certain composition elements or a composition scheme. By applying these onto a new/different site or location, you can investigate new design-opportunities and how they are related to known examples.

2. The next step is to choose a theme, such as contextuality, collectivity, urbanism, route forming or the representation of nature, to deepen the design problem. After confronting this theme with the existing example, the design will become more sharp and relevant.

3. Finally you should make a connection between the analysis and experimentation. Here the chosen examples function as models to deal with the chosen theme. They are not only the point of departure for the analysis but also for the experimentation. This method provides the possibility to explore changes and possible opportunities for design. Therefore, it facilitates examining the landscape planning research I am doing perfectly.

Because analysis of existing designs or precedents are the basis for the design experiment, it is essential what example I choose to analyze and experiment with. In my case I have chosen a quite radical regional design solution (from that time: Plan Ooievaar by H+N+S). This is a quite old plan (1986) that already had been used as a design-solution for many landscape plans. However see the possibility to not use this example to extrapolate to a smaller setting (like former plans) but on a larger scale. I will proceed in using this precedent according to the method as described by Steenbergen et al.: in the 3 steps:

1. Analyzing and projecting internal rules:
So first I will have to distinguish the main design principles that have led to Plan Ooievaar, to project them on the larger scale.

2. Strain and confront theme.
The theme(s) I will work with have to do with my topic: Nomadism; therefore I will choose themes like: Housing, Route-forming; Natural processes and of course borders.

3. Connect analysis and experiment.
B.3. Combining Methods

B.3.1. Making Politics part of the process

So firstly I will use the “Utopian thinking” method. I will disengage design from its contemporary social paradigm by creating a utopia. By doing this you can separately but coherently design a new political setting as well as a spatial plan. After doing this, a feedback can be provided, by placing the new design back in the contemporary situation.

a. (Contemporary_Social_Paradigm) defines (Spatial_situation-A) and (Political_situation-A).
b. Disengage relationship between paradigm and both situations by creating a new paradigm: (Utopia).
c. Design a (Political_situation-B) & (Spatial_situation-B) in this (Utopia).
d. Place (Spatial_situation-B) & (Political_situation-B) back into (Contemporary_Social_Paradigm)

Then I am using the Orgware-Hardware-Software hierarchy to design: In order to let politics be an equal part of the design, I will use the hierarchy as pointed out by Crimson:

B.3.2. Understanding the Orgware

In this case the Orgware is the way both different parts are politically functioning. This part focuses on the first few design questions I put up. Understanding the Orgware in my project means experiment with extrapolating the welfare state for the Binnendijkers and experiment with creating a new political setting for the Buitendijkers. Then experimenting with the combination of both. This will be done by writing of scenarios; adding a new chapter in a book about the Dutch political History and by writing imaginative interviews/conversations with people living in both these societies.

I will receive inspiration and guidelines for how to do this by studying other written examples of Utopian/Dystopian world like Thomas Moore’s book “Utopia” and Rem Koolhaas’ project “Exodüs; or the voluntary prisoners of Architecture”.

B.3.3. Making the Software intelligible

In order to apply the Orgware (political topography) spatially, I’ll have to translate it.

I will do this by comparing the different political situations with the rules of two equally different games, as Deleuze and Guattari (2010) are doing. The spatial situations can then be compared with the boards of the games.

The sedentary state relates to “Chess”, as the nomadic machine relates to “Go”.

To make the software intelligible, I will use the design-research, research-by design method. With this method I can experiment in using different design-rules and concepts that have the spatial political theme integrated in them. I will analyze two spatial projects: “Het Frieze Kwelderlandschap” by Buro Harro and “Plan Ooievaar”. I will do this by drawing out the layers and interviewing the designers about their strategies and goals. Then I will take these examples and experiment with them in 2 ways:

- On a larger scale.
- Or use their design-principles in a different typology of Dutch landscape.

B.3.4. Making the Hardware real

And last but not least, to make the hardware real, and implement all the above, I will immediately start with working with models and sections to emphasize the impact of the different design-experiments. In the beginning of the design-phase I will also start making conceptual 3D visuals; By making these intuitively, I will, together with my tutors, find more design questions. While making the images we will continually evolve and reflect on the appearing program, political situation and landscape.
Making Politics Part of the Design Process

1. Utopian Thinking

2. Scenario Writing

3. Design Research by Design

4. Models/Sections/Visuals

Understanding Orgware

Translating Politics into a Spatial Theme

Experiment with THAT Spatial Political Theme

Tools for Research and Experimenting

Making Software Intelligible

Making Hardware Real
Before starting my graduation, I applied for a studio which uses Utopian thinking as a method. While writing this essay, I initially didn’t realize that this was a method that should have been taken into account. As I was writing I noticed that this whole Utopian thinking is one of the basis methods of a politically influenced design. This meant that it had to be implemented in my overall methodological model.

In landscape architecture, we are used to work with layers. Natural, Cultural and urban layers are a way to organize and analyze the landscape in a spatial way. The orgware, software, hardware-method is however, a totally different approach which is also about analyzing and organizing the landscape. But instead of being merely about spatial issues, this method divides the landscape in themes and steps. But it is not enough to simply add the political theme into the process.

The biggest challenge however, will be the translation of politics into a spatial theme. I found this somehow coincidentally in the theory of Deleuze and Guattari. It stroke me that what they did with their game-reference was basically this: As they referred to both games having different sets of rules, but both a planned board; they implicated that whatever politics there are, even if there is the fewest rules possible, there will always be a job for the designer to layout the field.

This might seem like a planning job. But the encounter between an existing field and a new one will always result in design problems and opportunities that have to be solved by a landscape architect. When a former identity meets a new one, what becomes the new identity of the landscape? Those questions then can be researched with the design research, research by design method, using models and cross-section drawings to experiment in this encounters.

I learned that there have to be possibilities to take this factor into account into the process. I’m hoping this can serve during the rest of the work I’ll be doing as a landscape architect. To be able to bridge the gap between these seemingly different disciplines, that are unmistakably connected to one and another.
C. PROBLEM STATEMENT
Above: The Benelux is turned 90 degrees to let gravity speak. Without political borders, you can get an impression about the immense amount of water surrounding and flowing through the Netherlands.
C. PROBLEM STATEMENT

C.1. A Dynamic Delta

My project is set in the Netherlands, a delta area with an extreme amount of water coming in from all sides: from the sea; the rivers, that are coming from the Alps; precipitation of course; but also seepage is entering it's landscape surface from below. But not only the water is moving. Also parts of the Netherlands are sinking by the reaction of the peat that has reached the open air in the polders. A reaction that slowly burns the peat, which decreases the volume of the soil and maybe even as importantly, resolves into an increased amount of CO2 in the air.

Which brings us to another process: climate change. Because with an increased amount of CO2 in the air, the Netherlands are saddled with even more water entering its political borders. The water in the rivers and the sea is knocking on our door. However, the Dutch are greatly skilled in dealing with all this water and the country’s regularly being consulted by others to help them out with their water problems. Now, as Dutch research and technology continues, and climate change is becoming a more and more relevant topic for design, we see dikes and dams making place for more natural/dynamic structures to deal with the water. Examples are Plan Ooievaar, which gives “space for the rivers”; Buro Harro’s Kwelderlandscape in Friesland, and ideas like the Sandmotor along the West-coast of the country.

These dynamic ideas are operating from the idea not to fight the water and the processes that are happening, but to use them in a positive way instead. They are often either small in size, or only partly executed.
EXPECTATIONS OF SEA LEVEL RISING AT THE DUTCH COAST
PERCENTAGE OF INTERNET USERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laptop</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smartphone</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tablet</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LOCATION OF INTERNETUSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At home</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At work</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At someone else's</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At school</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhere else</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL GROWTH IN FREELANCERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Freelancers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>792,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,063,405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GROWTH FREELANCERS IN INDUSTRIES

- Architecture
- Management Consulting
- Advocacy
- Scientific Research
- Advertising

Water No Get Enemy; Contemporary Nomadism as an alternative for the Dutch Poldermodel
Why aren’t these plans of the future embraced by the Netherlands? This is where politics come in. Because after all, that is the ultimate decision-maker about how to deal with issues like climate change and landscape.

These plans made by the Dutch government, the state apparatus that plans through compromising and working together. An idea that stems from the time after world war II, when almost all countries governments and inhabitants decided to work and build on a new future together through a welfare system for everyone. The politics that this system brings consists mostly on compromising. These compromises cost a lot of time and take many people and opinions into account. Interestingly enough, this way of practicing politics owed its name from the landscape: The poldermodel. Countries like Germany let their system evolve into new ones, where bigger decisions can be made. Take their plan on green energy for instance. However in Holland, anno 2015, we still use this system, and it is holding back a lot of initiatives and developments like described above. Not only is it holding back these bigger developments in landscape and energy. Also more and more inhabitants tend to speak up against it. According to the numbers of people free-lancing and the use of wifi etc. People are still becoming more and more individualistic and short-term in this society.

In my essay; “Embracing Nomadism”, I explain how nomadism might seem something from the past, but is actually a vivid part of todays society. Indeed, Dutch society had a growing amount of nomadic people, living in tents or boats. Also more and more people are claiming back their names from the Dutch state by becoming sovereign (van Dinter, 2013). However right now, there is no space in the Netherlands where both these people can live according to their ideals and standards.
ALL LAND IS (RE)CLAIMED IN HOLLAND!
ONLY A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF PLACES FOR NOMADS LIKE ME!

0.4% = 50,000

HELP! MY HOUSE IS GETTING TOO EXPENSIVE!

I AM A PART OF THE EARTH
NOT OF THE KINGDOM
O OF THE NETHERLANDS!
I WANT TO BE INDEPENDENT: SOVEREIGN!

\[ v = 100 \text{ PEOPLE} \]
C.3. Problem Statement
Right now, this Poldermodel can be described an outdated, compelling system that only thinks in short term solutions for people and the landscape. Is there an alternative option imaginable? Where we think in long term solutions and where the system is choice instead of a fact? Can we develop a scenario for a future where we practice politics in a different model? What would this model look like, how would it work? And what would it resolve in spatially? Will we be able to keep our Dutch landscape or shall we have to give it up?
D. UTOPIAN HYPOTHESIS
Above: Whereas the dijk used to be a technical and spatial element in the landscape, it now also becomes a political border between binnen- (right) and buitendijks (left).
**D. UTOPIAN HYPOTHESIS**

**D.1. An alternative model**

The system that I propose is one of separation; of choice for the inhabitants of the Netherlands. A choice between black and white, left and right, between all compromises or no compromises, between inside and outside of the dijken. Two sides of the Netherlands with different systems and different responsibilities and expectations of the system both working together on a strong and progressive future. Inhabitants can choose whether they want to live Binnendijks, under safety of the state. They choose to be a part of it and to fully collaborate with the decisions that are being taken by the democratic system. People that are not satisfied with the system can decide to move out and live buitendijks in cooperative groups. I will get back to you on the nature of these groups.

The Netherlands will have a state and an organization of self-organized groups, all held together by representatives of them both and EU. This main network has a task to remain the synergy between both parts and the rest of Europe. There is a clear division in responsibilities of the two parts. The welfare state for instance is responsible for high end education, worldwide network and healthcare. While the nomadic land will have a protective function over the binnendijkprovinces. They are the guarding natural borders.

**D.2. Binnendijks; Welfare state**

Binnendijks people would live in the Dutch democracy as we know it. Though participative startups are being recognized and facilitated more then now, a top-down implication is still the main base of the system. Spatially everything will be planned, either with buildings, recreation squares or energy-fields of solar-plains. Inhabitants pay a lot of taxes, but in return a lot of basics needs are arranged by state; like cheap healthy food and the topics named earlier.

The poldersystem will be optimized and more then ever we will see the landscape structure that has formed this part of the Netherlands. In about 50 years, most peatpolders will have reached clay-level and become lakebed-polders. Bigger differences in height will become visible and nature will be only seen in zoo’s or botanical gardens. For good recreation the binnendijkers go outside or at least towards the dijk.
Above: Binnendijks: People are moving towards and from the great schluss gates. Some are moving permanently to the other side, for others crossing is part of their daily routine.
D.3. Buitendijks; Nomadic state

Buitendijks, people will live in autonomic groups, organized in different ways. They are lead by a board of representatives of the groups. There is a meeting for each landscape typology, organized around the seasons. People are living according to:

- Handvest van de Aarde
- Handvest voor Compassie
- De verklaring van de rechten van de Mens en van de Burger

Buitendijks is responsible for the watersafety of the Binnendijkers, while those people are responsible for care and education.
Above: Designing 3D: Here an image on life Buitendijks. These series was made to develop the spatial questions that rise when designing in this utopia.
E. DESIGN RESEARCH
Impressie van nieuw kwelderlandschap. Een pier die opslibbing stimuleert verbindt binnen- en buitendijksgebied. Een verblijfsplek aan het eind van de pier, zoals hier een holle terp als streek-eigen vogelkijkhut, op de plek waar de Waddendynamiek het best beleefbaar is.

Above: Image on the kwelderlandscape Fryslan aan Zee by Buro Harro (Atelier Fryslan, year unknown)
E. DESIGN RESEARCH

To create my design for this Utopian dynamic nomadic Netherlands I divided my design research in three main parts. I worked on them simultaneously throughout the first two thirds of the year. First of all I did research by doing case studies on two different water-scapes: The sweet river-landscape and the salt-tide kwelder landscape. Analysis of the plans and interviews with the (co-) designers were my main tools for this.

I also analyzed different water-scapes per location: The Netherlands and in particular the north-eastern part of Groningen.

Thirdly I dove into my guiding theme: Nomads. Here I went through tons of literature regarding old and new forms of nomadic lifestyles and searched for the spatial component of this theme.

E.1. Case studies: Waterscapes

In order to design a dynamic Netherlands I decided to do a small study on previous projects that had been done in this field. Especially plans that were about a bigger idea, and that had/will only be partly executed. I chose two different water landscapes and plans for them. I studied the plans and arranged meetings with both offices or designers to learn from their knowledge and expertise and to try to use them as sparring partners.

E.1.1. Plan Ooievaar (H+N+S)

For the sweet river landscape I studied Plan Ooievaar and on 12/03/15 I met with Dirk Sijmons to talk about this topic and my ideas. Conclusions of this discussion were two-sided. Firstly, he informed me about the serious matter that climate-change, but also about the enormous amount of CO2 emission by the "peat-fire" we have in the Netherlands. Because of this, Dirk advised me to stick with proven methods, like stopping pumping out the water in the polders in order to let the peat grow back on. He also commented on the financial problems that overflowing the northern parts of the Netherlands would bring. Especially because of the very rich and perfect agricultural soil in that region.

After reflecting on our conversation I realized that I should have emphasized on my ideas being a research more than being a plan for the Netherlands. I also went deeper into the method of regrowing peat, because it had simply not come up into my mind before then.

E.1.2. Fryslan aan Zee (Buro Harro)

On 10/03/15, I payed a visit to Arnhem, where I met with Harro de Jong, the designer of Fryslan aan Zee. This is a plan that focuses on a new way of water protection along the northern Dutch coast by not taking water-defense, but offense, as strategy. He uses the old system of kwelder-grids in the Waddensea and created a plan for the re-connection of the province of Frysland with the North sea. We discussed the technique of the kwelder-grids, and experimented a bit with using this on a bigger scale.

He concluded with a statement about designing with water on the bigger scale as being exactly the same as on the very small scale: When you put your feet in the sand of the sea and you see the water pulling back around your feet, taking sand, bringing sand; this is a small example of how these processes go in the larger scale.
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E.2. Location Analysis

E.2.1. The Netherlands
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E.2.2. North East Groningen

In order to design different cultural layer of the landscape, I firstly separated the current landscape into those layers. I then made a concluding map where I identify different types of landscapes, to be able to transform them later.

Top Right: Cultural layer analysis: Polders and water;

Bottom Right: Cultural layer analysis: Landscapes;

Bottom: Natural layer analysis: Water and soil.
Water No Get Enemy; Contemporary Nomadism as an alternative for the Dutch Poldermodel
Water No Get Enemy; Contemporary Nomadism as an alternative for the Dutch Poldermodel
From the analysis I identified 9 landscape typologies in different categories in the region: 1 Waterlandscape, 3 Aandi-jking-landscapes, 3 Inpoldering-landscapes, 1 Peatsoil landscape and 1 Sandsoil-landscape.

Down, you can find the map with the location of the typologies, on the next pages I will elaborate on the history and the built up of the individual layers again.

Subsequently you will find an analysis on spatial elements in Groningen that were stated by the Province as unique qualities.

Top Right: Urban layer analysis: Infrastructure and Urbanization;

Bottom Right: All layer analysis: Combining the layers;

Bottom: All layer analysis: Conclusion map.
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A.3. Hoge grootschalige zeekleipolders door aandijkingen zonder terpen

I.3. Verstedelijkte kleinschalige zeekleipolders

INPOLDERING

A.2. Vrij hoge grootschalige jonge-re zeekleipolders zonder terpen

I.2. Vrij hoge grootschalige oude zeekleipolders met terpen

I.1. Kleinschalige oude zeekleipolders met terpen

AANDIJKING

A.1. Vrij hoge oude kleinschalige zeekleipolders door aandijkingen met terpen
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duinafzettingen door stroming
kwelderlandschap door zoet + zout + getijde

duinafzettingen door stroming
kwelderlandschap door zoet + zout + getijde

keileem neerleggen
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bergen op
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hoogte door stijgende zeespiegel
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terpen bouwen om op te wonen
inpolderen van het land
aandijken van het land
ophogen van de dijken

INPOLDERING
A.3. Hoge grootschalige zeekleipolders door aandijkingen zonder terpen

A.1. Vrij hoge oude kleinschalige zeekleipolders door aandijkingen met terpen

A.2. Vrij hoge grootschalige jongere zeekleipolders zonder terpen

INPOLDERING

A.1. Vrij hoge oude kleinschalige zeekleipolders door aandijkingen met terpen

I.2. Vrij hoge grootschalige oude zeekleipolders met terpen

I.1. Kleinschalige oude zeekleipolders met terpen

I.3. Verstedelijkte kleinschalige zeekleipolders
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A.1. Vrij hoge oude kleinschalige zeekleipolders door aandijkingen met terpen

A.2. Vrij hoge grote zeekleipolders

I.1. Kleinschalige oude zeekleipolders met terpen

I.2. Vrij hoge grootschalige oude zeekleipolders met terpen

I.3. Verstedelijkte kleinschalige zeekleipolders

L.1. Hele lage laagveenontginningen met wegdorpen

Z.1. Hoge verstedelijkte zandgrond

W.1. Beschermde Waddenzee
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Wierden & Essen

Beslotenheid en kleinschalige openheid

Verkavelings-patroon
E.3. Guiding theme: Nomads

E.3.1. Social Analysis

First of all I started a research on the concept of nomads and it’s historical and contemporary setting. What are already existing forms of nomadism? Who are those people, and what moves them? Aborigines, Toaregs and Indians seem obvious indigenous nomadic tribes. But if they are, aren’t students, pilots, refugees and fair-people contemporary forms of nomadism?

Jeremie Gilbert (2014) has several ways to describe nomadism: “Nomadism denotes a mobile way of life organized around cyclical or seasonal patterns. Nomadism refers to groups of people who practise spatial mobility to enhance their well-being and survival.” This describes the necessity of moving around the landscape in order to reserve basic life necessities like shelter and food of a group of humans.

He also states: “Nomadism is both a management strategy for sustainable land use and conservation, and a distinctive source of cultural identity.” This describes the necessity of nomadism for survival of natural and/or cultural values.

If we combine these statements, we could say that nomadism denotes a required mobile way of living, necessary in order to maintain mankind, nature and culture. Looking back at the past, basic life necessities as food and shelter were to be found directly off the landscape. Nomads like Toaregs would travel over it in order to find new sources of these while leaving the landscape to be restored for the next group. Aborigines in Australia new how to do this really well. Using and shaping the landscape in order to create the best possible living space fort their whole society, they burned pieces of land specifically to leave the land as they found it. This was stated by “The Law”, Australia’s ecological philosophy enforced by religious sanction around 1788 (Gammage, 2011). Also in Chinese old culture, regulations were made for treating the landscape. The daoist 180 precepts (Yibai bashi jie) specifically protect forests and waterways and even smaller features like flowers (Kemmerer, 2012).

At this right moment we see people starting to live like new nomads again. Tiny Houses Movement and Logomachy are pledging for a young digital nomadism, where wireless Internet is seen as the catalyst (Logomachy, 2014). Again the source of the wish for living mobile comes from the instinct to survive and maintenance of basic necessities. Only now, the landscape is not the direct fruit to use. In order to obtain these necessities, people need money, and they can only get more of that by saving on the costs they already make on these necessities. Living cheaper is one of them.

In the Netherlands for instance, costs of housing raised in 2014, according to the CBS, to up to more than 35% of the general income. Experience experts are saying that losing the house, and living in a tent for instance, would reduce these costs from about 1100 euro’s to about 200 euro’s a month. By doing this, money is saved to buy food and to keep a roof above the head.

The way to get to being a nomad might have changed, but the goal hasn’t. Nomadism is still a necessity for some people to stay alive. With prices of ground, houses and electricity still rising, more and more people will likely want to start moving in the future.

So out of the survival point of view, students for instance, are not identified as nomadic. Pilots and refugees however, are. Here, Deleuze & Guattari (2010) come up with a differentiation between nomads and migrants that contradicts the idea of refugees being nomadic: “The migrant goes principally from one point to another, even if the second point is uncertain, unforeseen, or not well localized.

But the nomad goes from point to point only as a consequence and as a factual necessity; in principle, points for him are relays along a trajectory.” They also elaborate on the fact that migrants are moving to settle down again, whereas nomads are not looking for any kind of sedentary existence. On the contrary, according to them, nomads try to territorialize smooth space and de-territorialize striated space, like that of the state. A refugee can be seen as a migrant in their theory, looking
Above: Arcadian style image on Buitendijkers overlooking the polder of the Binnendijk area, here with Apollo.
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for sedentary way of living and moving from one point to another. In that way, migrants, whether they are moving for survival or not, are not to be seen as nomadic.

In Engeland, many Travelers moved into buildings that make part of the static society. In a report that shows the analysis of written letters against a city plan in 2011 in the city of London, many Travelers explain feeling trapped and imprisoned when living in a house (London Gypsy and Traveler Unit, 2011). They explain they feel forced into a way of living that doesn't suit them, because the other option is living in intolerable conditions.

In the Netherlands, indigenous nomadic tribes are not forced into buildings, but onto specific sites, that are often located on the border of cities near trash belts or other unpleasant forms of landscape. Because of the high crime-rate, their territory is being split up into multiple smaller patches the last couple of years. In these buildings or on these patches, people make part of the society they're living in. Dutch "woonwagenkampers" are just as much part of the democracy or welfare-state as any other inhabitant of the Netherlands.

This is done differently in the United States, where a tribe of Indian culture lives also in reserves. Here however, they were allowed to have a different system of law. Gambling for instance, is a legal activity within their “territory” under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act. That is an example of indigenous people receiving the opportunity to have some sort of own system.

In the Netherlands however, a whole new movement is taking faith in own hands by emancipating themselves from the state. This “claiming of your name” makes you an independent and sovereign inhabitant of the Netherlands, that still has to live according to: Charter of the earth, Charter of compassion and the declaration of the rights of man. Besides that they have become free of duties and rights that come along with the Dutch state citizenship. A next step for them is to organize themselves spatially. Project Wonderland in the Netherlands is an area where these people are ought to live in a permaculture-based society with an own constitution. The land for this project was tried to be claimed in the province Gelderland in spring 2014, but however their right on a place to live, municipality did not “understand” their claim. (van Dinter, 2013) There is no space in Holland for people that are not part of the Dutch state. Land is privately owned or municipalities are not cooperating with their rights.

CHANGING THE LANDSCAPE TO EMBRACE NOMADISM.

After establishing what are nomads, that they are still there, and what problems are rising between nomadic and sedentary cultures, we should take a look at the landscape. The nomadic routes that Deleuze and Guattari are describing, “The elements of his dwelling are concertized in terms of the trajectory that is forever mobilizing them. Whereas the migrant leaves behind a place, the nomad is one who does not depart, who clings to the smooth space left by the receding forest.” (Deleuze & Guattari, 2010) Are clearly about the landscape. However in this landscape there is not much possibility for the nomad to move freely. With or without a designated piece of space, people are moving and always will be moving separately from existing state apparatus, whether that is spatially or politically.

How can we embrace and use this nomadism in the landscape in order for it to be a valuable part of society? How would that be working? What would the Netherlands look like if there was a clear differentiation between structured and nomadic landscape? How could that improve the general landscape? How would that effect the landscape?
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E.3.2. Creating research groups

In order to design for future nomadic groups, I needed groups and characteristics. Therefore I started analyzing codes (Murdock & Wilson, 1972) with information about the way of living of more than 200 nomadic tribes. I distinguished relevant topics like way of organization and movement along certain patterns and finally made 3 hypothetic Dutch groups. That is: one calendrical moving (along patterns of seasons etc): the BOAT people; One individual moving (along patterns of birth, death, marriage etc): The NUP people; And one religious (along religious events like Christmas etc): the RELIGIOUS people. All of the groups live in a mainly peripatetic way. Pastoral and hunter gatherer styles are more likely to be a style from history instead of the future. But all three are based on a different reason to get together, and have different organizational forms.

### Table 1. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Society</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Koreans</td>
<td>Sm</td>
<td>Dc</td>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>Uf</td>
<td>Uf</td>
<td>(O) Wp</td>
<td>Sm</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Ih</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Sh</td>
<td>Dc</td>
<td>Us</td>
<td>(O) O</td>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>Mh</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ci</td>
<td>Kh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ainu</td>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>Uc</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>If</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gitoa</td>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>If</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Ft</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukaghir</td>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>If</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Ft</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chukchee</td>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Pd</td>
<td>Us</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Oi</td>
<td>Ah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inupiat</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>Dv</td>
<td>Us</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleut</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Dv</td>
<td>Uf</td>
<td>Uv</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Eskimo</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>Dv</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Us</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montagnais</td>
<td>Se*</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>Dv</td>
<td>Us</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micmac</td>
<td>Us</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Us</td>
<td>Sv</td>
<td>Di</td>
<td>Us</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saulteaux</td>
<td>Us</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Us</td>
<td>Sv</td>
<td>Di</td>
<td>Us</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slave</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>Ur</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>If</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaska</td>
<td>Us</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>If</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyak</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>Dv</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>Uv</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haida</td>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>Nn</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>Dl</td>
<td>Uv</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellacoola</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>Dl</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tswana</td>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>Dl</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yurok</td>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>If</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pomo</td>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Sv</td>
<td>Sv</td>
<td>Iy</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yokuts</td>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Sv</td>
<td>Sv</td>
<td>Iy</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paiute</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Ue</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klamath</td>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Ne</td>
<td>Dl</td>
<td>Uv</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kutenai</td>
<td>Us</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ne</td>
<td>Sv</td>
<td>Sv</td>
<td>At</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gros Ventre</td>
<td>Us</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Ne</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Dl</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidatsa</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Dc</td>
<td>Ne</td>
<td>Uf</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawnee</td>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Uf</td>
<td>Uv</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Ne</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huron</td>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>Uc</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creek</td>
<td>(N)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Us</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socle</td>
<td>Mb</td>
<td>Us</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comanche</td>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Ne</td>
<td>Uf*</td>
<td>Dl</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiricahua</td>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>Uc</td>
<td>Uf</td>
<td>Uf</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zuni</td>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>Dc</td>
<td>Fs</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Uf</td>
<td>Uv</td>
<td>Wv</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havasupai</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Dc</td>
<td>Ne</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papago</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Fb</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Uf</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huichol</td>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Fb</td>
<td>Uv</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aztec</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Fb</td>
<td>Us</td>
<td>Sv</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popoluca</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Dc</td>
<td>Fs</td>
<td>Uv</td>
<td>Uv</td>
<td>Us</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiche</td>
<td>Um</td>
<td>Dc</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Uv</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miskito</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ir</td>
<td>Uf</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briberi</td>
<td>(M/1)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Up</td>
<td>Sv</td>
<td>Uv</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuna</td>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>Uc</td>
<td>Dc</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Uv</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guajiro</td>
<td>(Ub)</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Uv</td>
<td>Sw</td>
<td>At</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitians</td>
<td>Um</td>
<td>Dc</td>
<td>Fb</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calliago</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ir</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warraw</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ir</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yanomamo</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Dc</td>
<td>Uf</td>
<td>Uf</td>
<td>Uv</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carib</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ss</td>
<td>Sa</td>
<td>Sv</td>
<td>Uv</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saramacca</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ir</td>
<td>Us</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Sv</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mundurucu</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ir</td>
<td>Ns</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cebu</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ir</td>
<td>Us</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cayapa</td>
<td>Ub</td>
<td>Uc</td>
<td>(U)</td>
<td>Sv</td>
<td>Sv</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jivar</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Ir</td>
<td>Fs</td>
<td>St</td>
<td>Ht</td>
<td>Bm</td>
<td>Oo</td>
<td>Jh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Top: Characteristics of nomadic groups combined form a tribe. This tribe consists out of bands that specifically live together and share a responsibility in for instance provision of food. These bands are divided into families again.

Left: Image of the nomadic code (Murdock & Wilson, 1972) I used for studying nomadic peoples’ behavior and patterns, socially & spatially.
- Organized around social economic status
- Peripatetic Lifestyle
- Collectively governed
- Live around individual patterns

NUPPEN
Water No Get Enemy; Contemporary Nomadism as an alternative for the Dutch Poldermodel

**WOONBOTERS**
- Organized around KIN-TIES
- Peripatetic Lifestyle
- No government
- Live around calendrical patterns

**RELIGIEUZEN**
- Organized around religion
- Peripatetic Lifestyle
- Lead by one leader and elders
- Live around religious patterns
Using also spatial characteristics as describes in the codes, I chose 2 study-groups (prece-dents). One that is also living in a previously reclaimed delta: the Creek people in the Missis-sippi area. Before Creek came in, Mississippi-people had already started building small mounts. This is a similar situation for the Dutch new nomads that find historically built terps and other small mounts in their landscape. The other group I studied is one closer to home: The Lapps. I created a spatial matrix and placed in my study-groups to create a basis for designing with them.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DENSITY</th>
<th>TYPE OF DWELLING</th>
<th>CENTRAL BUILDING</th>
<th>FOOD SUPPLY</th>
<th>TRANSPORT ON LAND</th>
<th>TRANSPORT ON WATER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2499 PER SQUARE KM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2499 PER SQUARE KM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2499 PER SQUARE KM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2499 PER SQUARE KM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2499 PER SQUARE KM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2499 PER SQUARE KM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2499 PER SQUARE KM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2499 PER SQUARE KM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Compact settlements; nucleated and concentrated camps. 200 - 399 persons. ~7 persons per square km.
- Rectangular dwellings built on or close to the ground of wood, bamboo, wattle, mats of other vegetal material.
- The most impressive structure is an assembly hall/men's house or public building.
- The subsistence economy is primarily pastoral, with animal husbandry contributing more than half.
- Land transport is done to a considerable extent by means of animal-drawn wheeled vehicles, e.g. carts or wagons.

- Nomadic bands, occupying temporary camps for brief periods.
- Round tents with a slightly pointed peak from which the roof slopes to the circular wall: yurts.
- The subsistence economy is primarily based on fishing with also trade as an important side-income.
- Water craft consists at least in part of vessels propelled by motors or sails.

- Dispersed settlements: neighbourhoods of isolated family homesteads. <50 persons.
- There are no structures in the community that are appreciably larger or more impressive than usual dwellings.
- The subsistence economy is equally spread pastoral and based on agriculture.
- Land transport is mainly done by foot or hitch-hiking.
- Water craft consists of dugout canoes or row-boats.

- Semi-sedentary settlements, occupied throughout the year by a part, from which a proportion departs seasonally.
- Conical tents with a pointed peak from which the roof slopes straight to the ground in all directions; tipis.
- The subsistence economy is primarily agricultural, with trade and fishing as important side-incomes.
- Land transport is done to a considerable extent by means of motorized vehicles, e.g. railroads, trucks.
- Water craft consists of dugout canoes or row-boats.

- Central building
- Food supply
- Transport on water
Above: Conceptual study on nomadic takeover of the city. Here: Rotterdam
F. RESEARCH BY DESIGN
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F. RESEARCH BY DESIGN

Henceforth I will show you the 4 strategies I made. The first one is on a national scale and shows the spatial proposal I make for a separation of the Netherlands in two parts. Subsequently you will find 3 test scenarios on the regional scale in the nomadic state. I chose not to work on the welfare state because I think the interesting new possibilities are laying behind the borders of the new dijk. Binnendijks, please imagine the Netherlands how it works now, but then maximized in planning and consensus.

Out of the three local scale scenarios I selected one to continue to work on. That scenario is also worked out on a regional scale.

F.1. Scenario; National scale

F.1.1. Processes in 200 years: Landscapes

On the national scale I propose a spatial division of the Netherlands in a static and dynamic part. I created 3 main provinces;

1. Lower Randstad, which is enclosed by a more secured Dijkring 14; This area will be subject to major changes as it mainly consists of peat and continue to evolve into a more lakebed-polder like landscape when the clay-soil will be reached in about 50 years.

2. Sandy high Brabantstad, which is mainly consisting of the former province of Noord-Brabant. Mayor cities like Eindhoven will shape this Binnendijkse into a technological headquarters of the country. Den Bosch will become an important harbor for freelancing nomads to connect to this technological capital. Spatially there won't be many dramatic changes to the landscape, though most nature will make place for a more intensive built environment.

3. High plateau Ooststad. Enclosed by the Ijssel and the German states, this higher province of the Netherlands will have some mayor capitals like Groningen and Zwolle and many housing projects will fill up the landscape. Again, this will remain quite static and besides from some former peat areas that turned into lakebed-polder landscapes, there won't be many changes.

Then there will be the nomadic state which gulps down parts of former big cities like Rotterdam South and parts of Utrecht.

This area houses many historic living mounts in the northern part, around the river-area, but also on different places. High areas like the Veluwe and Limburg are components of this landscape in order for the nomads to have as well risky as non-risk areas. Still landscapes that are more high are likely to change. The peat in the Veluwe will grow back again and in the south, the river Maas will keep on shaping its land.

The processes that are receiving space in the Buitendijk area are for example the Peat-polder and kwelder scenario. The images on the next page show how processes are now, and how they will continue either when we continue like this, or adapt to the nomadic model.

Binnendijks the Droogmakerij landscape will become more and more common as the peat will all burn in about 50 years and the clay-level will be reached.
KWELDER-SITUATION NOW

MAKING THE DIJK HIGHER

USING WADDENSEA TO (RE)CLAIM LAND

PEAT-POLDER

PEAT-POLDER IN 50 YEARS

RE-CREATING PEAT BY KEEPING RAINWATER IN

KWELDER

KWELDER-SITUATION NOW

MAKING THE DIJK HIGHER

USING WADDENSEA TO (RE)CLAIM LAND
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F.1.2. Processes in 1 year: Nomads

NOMADIC ROUTING SCENARIO

Nomadic tribes:
- Religious
- NUPpies
- Boat people

Water No Get Enemy; Contemporary Nomadism as an alternative for the Dutch Poldermodel
Sub-scenario 1
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F.2. Sub-scenario’s; Local scale

F.2.1. Sweet river landscape: Ochten

First test-scenario is done in the river-landscape; next to Ochten there is a small relatively new business-area, located in the middle of the peaceful river-landscape. You can see several dikes, the river and some individual housing. Often plots are surrounded by square shaped rows of trees. Big grasslands and views towards the river are mainly visible.

Top Left: Situation now, overlooking the Business area from the dijk;

Bottom Left: Overlooking the parking lot and the river from the dijk;

Bottom: Current situation east of Ochten.
Top: View on business area in the landscape: simple square boxes built up with steal construction and prefab elements;

Right: Experiment in designing for a nomadic state: Here you see two tribes in the area in summer, the free river and new harbor piers that come and go with the tribes. Some buildings are demolished or used for agriculture, others are used as communal buildings. Former backyards become public spaces for the nomadic groups. The elements I made are a transformation of Inge Bobbinks landscape analysis for the Netherlands (2009).
expansion of the "uiterwaarden"

farmland surrounded with square shaped rings of trees

pickingfields on the higher oeverwallen

summcamps of cattle on the riverbanks

Water No Get Enemy; Contemporary Nomadism as an alternative for the Dutch Poldermodel
Bottom: Another experiment in designing for a nomadic state: Here you see two tribes in the area in winter 2115: smaller tribes of NUPPEN form small groups on the backsides of the existing buildings.
Sub-scenario 2
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F.2.2. Sweet tide landscape: Ijsselmonde

Second test-scenario is done in the Sweet tide landscape; Ijsselmonde is a relatively old town on a higher area in the old creek-system, with newer extensions. The extensions in the southern polders are quite old while the docklands have only been redeveloped lately.

Top Left: Situation now, the new housing on the big dock in the river Maas.

Bottom Left: Backyards of the old town are facing the old dijk. Messy space is the consequence.

Bottom: Current situation in Ijsselmonde.
Top: The new-town consists of much social housing, and small open spaces with messy green, for instance with playgrounds like above;

Right: Experiment in designing for a nomadic state: Here you see two tribes in the area in summer, big dock has been reduced in scale in order to house more small boats. In fact the whole dock has been transformed into a boat-friendly area. The hinterland which once used to be creeks as well has overflown again, basically the whole new-town has disappeared. Old lines of metro, sewage etc have given the landscape a new radial pattern (Weisman, 2007).
scale reduction of harbor docks

residential areas are taken over by the water

front and backsides of buildings both become public

restored creek system in the back land
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- River becomes multiple direction crossing - zone
- Softened quays: species that arrive by ship
- Ribbon shaped buildings and nomadic settlements
- Lines of former infrastructures become gullies in the swamp
Top and next page: Studies on changes in ecology in Ijsselmonde: 4 zones are appearing with different ecology and plants.
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Sub-scenario 3
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F.2.3. Brackish tide landscape: Uitwierde

Last test-scenario is done in the kwelder-landscape; Here we see a historical residential form; the terp, or so-called Wierde in Groningen, located in the middle of the peaceful agricultural landscape.

Top Left: Situation now, public route through Uitwierde; view on front-yards;

Bottom Left: Backyards of the old houses are facing the wide open landscape;

Bottom: Current situation in Uitwierde.
Top: Old town square with church and cemetery on the highest point of the wierde;

Right: Experiment in designing for a nomadic state: Here you see two tribes in the area in fall. Small groups of NUPPEN are divided over the terp in small groups. There are currently no BOAT people on this Wierde. The main square stays empty during the stay of these small groups and life is centered around small groups of buildings.
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brackish plants

extremely enclosed main public route over the wierde

more nomadic fauna enters the area as well

polderpattern visible in the landscape: reed

Map showing more nomadic fauna entering the area, brackish plants, extremely enclosed main public route over the wierde, and polderpattern visible in the landscape: reed.
Bottom: Another experiment in designing for a nomadic state: Here you see two tribes in the area in spring 2115: One big religious tribe has joined several wierden to expand towards the amount of space they need. Also BOAT people have docked. They occupy the back of the wierde, which is more of a woodland.
Elaboration
F.3. Elaboration Sub-scenario 3

F.3.1. Strategy for North-East Groningen
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LEGENDA

Binnen- & Buitendiëks
- Waterkerende dijk
- Voormalig waterkerende dijk
- Dijken hierbinnen blijven functioneren
- Doorbroken dijk

Water
- Meer/plas
- Wad
- Kwelder
- Buitendiëks doorkruisend kanaal
- Binnendiëks boezem
- Voormalig boezem

Bebouwing
- Binnendiëks bebouwing
- Gedeeltelijk blijvende buitenlandelijke bebouwing
- Voormalige bebouwing
- Terp/wierde

Landschappen
- Poldermodel: geen getijdeinvloed
- Terpen/pastoral: lage getijde invloed
- Groeiend veen: geen getijde invloed
- Terpen/kwelder: hoge getijde invloed

Dijk doorsteken zodat de waddenzee naar binnen kan
A.1. Vrij hoog gebied zonder getijd invloed met terpen

A.2. Kwelder landschap met nieuwe terpen onder lichte invloed van getijde

A.3. Hogere oeverwallen/eilanden: nieuwe waddeneilanden zonder terpen

I.1. Kwelder landschap met nieuwe terpen onder vrij grote invloed van getijde

I.2. Vrij hoog gebied zonder getijd invloed met terpen

I.3. Haven en terpen eiland gebied onder invloed van getijde

L.1. Hele lage laagveenontginningen met weg dorpen

L.2. Vrij hoog gebied met zout water/morerassig

Z.1. Hoge versdichting van bebouwing
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extreme focus on wierden and terps

infinite pole-grids

recovery of former original and new creek patterns

more nomadic fauna enters the area as well
F.3.2. New Nomadic Landscapes

Gatherers during sunrise near Noordpolderzijl.
Summer near Wadwerd: The rapeseed is being harvested by the current tribe
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Stitswerd, Breeding season, 2147
New years eve in Groningen. Several tribes are lighting fireworkd to celebrate the new year.
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Fall at Onderwierum; The cattle is being taken up before the rain is coming.
Cycling Binnendijk people are enjoying the wild nature in spring 2122
Water No Get Enemy; Contemporary Nomadism as an alternative for the Dutch Poldermodel
Winter 2038; Arriving and leaving nomads at the state-gates of Groningen.
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G. CONSIDERATIONS
G. CONSIDERATIONS

G.1. General Scenario

In this scenario for the Netherlands, I separated the dynamic and static parts from each other, as well spatially as politically. The choices I made in designing this separation are according to spatial values. In this order we cannot see the spatial values in the Netherlands differently then the ones in for example Germany. In other words; Design is not limited by a political border. In that sense, this strategy has to cover more then just the Netherlands; and can it be a strategy for the northern Europe. A more specific design for separation can only be made when looking more specifically to the sub-landscape or cultures that we have. For instance the north sea coast in the north, that has a similar landscape. The design is not absolute and has to be placed in the setting of Europe; however in a Utopian possible different political scene.

G.2. Sub-scenario 1

The first sub-scenario shows the transformation of a part of the sweet river landscape. Transformation into a nomadic landscape means a re-installment of the old residential forms, like living on the higher elements. A lot of the spatial qualities as indicated by Inge Bobbink (2007) will get lost.

For nomads however, this area can be suitable because of the long lines of the dikes and the oeverwallen that flow through the landscape. Also the sweet water will fresh up the soil very often which is suitable for cattle or agriculture.

Also this model offers more space for water collection to use Binnendijks for sweetening the polder water which can get brackish because of the kwel.
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G.3. Subscenario 2
Frits Palmboom wrote a book called about the urbanization of Rotterdam in which he describes the process of the transformation of the sweet tide landscape into an urban harbor one. With the nomadisation of the landscape, this process is made undone, but also the main characteristics of the landscape are erased.

For nomads, this area is very suitable because of the location near the dike and the easy connection to plug in there. However there is not as much space as in the river landscape upstream.

Again, sweet water storage possibilities are present in this landscape.

G.4. Subscenario 3
Spatially the landscape is going back to a more historical form. However the main characteristics as indicated by the Province of Groningen (year unknown) are merely staying unchanged. Sometimes they are even strengthened. Only the polder-pattern, which is not a typically part of the identity of Groningen, will disappear partly.

When looking at the analysis of the landscape I did in my research you can see the influences different elements have had on the landscape, like ice, water, wind and people. You can also see that we are now on a point where a change is needed.

This area is very suitable for nomads because of the huge amount of space.

Then there is the problem of population shrinkage in this area at the moment. This means there are chances to upgrade the area and make it more attractive for a different kind of people. This model can, next to being a climate change solution, have a social value in this area.

Also other problems in the area, small earthquakes because of fracking; can be tackled with this new strategy.

Left: Urbanization of the polders of Rotterdam according to Frits Palmboom. (Palmboom, 1987)
Duisternis & Stilte
Grootschalige openheid
Bebouwing & Erven
Nederzettingen
Waterlopen, verkaveling & relief
Oude dijken
Wierden & Essen

Beslotenheid en kleinschalige openheid

Verkavelings-patroon

Left: Own analysis of the main characteristics of the landscape of Groningen according to their information. (Provincie Groningen, year unknown)
H.

REFLECTION
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOW</th>
<th>UTOPIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>poldermodel</td>
<td>poldermodel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nomadic model</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I stated that the Poldermodel can be described an outdated, compelling system that only thinks in short term solutions for people and the landscape. And wondered whether there is there an alternative model imaginable, where we think in long term solutions and where the system is choice instead of a fact? What would this model look like, how would it work? And what would it resolve in spatially? Will we be able to keep our Dutch landscape or shall we have to give it up?

I answered my research question by finding a new model that is maybe more radical then I expected it to be. This new Utopian system doesn’t replace or ban the poldermodel, and therefore nowadays system, but is embraces it and gives this contemporary model a new role in the future. Also this model does allow bigger processes, which could be a different concept in fighting climate change.

I found out that my scenario’s implication does different things to the landscape. Sometimes it brings back older forms, which doesn’t has to be a progression. When a landscape and it’s forms of settlement are old, there is a more interesting and positive implication then when a landscape only has been formed lately, as in Ijsselmonde.

H.1. Problem Statement

I started my year with a special interest in Arcadia, politics and an example of the unmistakably connection between politics and the landscape in Brabant. This specific example, where I wondered whether we could design with politics to solve problems in the landscape can be considered as solved in my design. Even though I let go of the topic during the process, this division of welfare state and nomadic state resolves in a solution for complicated laws. The Netherlands can make a decision between legal and illegal now, instead of constantly compromising. Therefore people can act around others and their surroundings in a clear and unambiguous way.

H.2. Inquisitiveness
H.3. Design Uncertainty

By doing this project I realized the following: During my education here at this faculty of architecture I was trained to imagine a static final picture. In landscape architecture, I also learned to design the road towards this static final picture: the process. Designing a scenario however doesn’t have anything to do with a final static picture and is solely focused on unending processes. This year, I have been struggling a lot with releasing this idea of designing where an end product is asked. I tried to find my way through this process by working with all kinds of different approaches. I received great help but also a lot of freedom in this by my professors.

Most useful were the meetings we had together discussing the direction of my project. Which was until now almost always unclear.

H.4. Reversed Process

The final product I show you is not a design but a strategy and a process. The process I followed towards a design started from a theory. Where a project in the landscape department usually starts with a location and a problem. I started through researching possibilities. From thereon I tested this on different locations, only to find the right location in the end. I learned about the social and spatial problems in the location and found that my idea and design could form a solution perfect for this area. The result is a location specific scenario and solution for multiple problems which haven’t formed the basis of the design. That came out of possibilities to improve in an even bigger scale.

Also this property of the process brought much uncertainty to the project. Therefore the result is not so much a project that has been worked out into detail. However the result is a strategy on the possibilities of dealing with the landscape in as well the design-process as the spatial-processes.
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