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Introduction

This chapter considers the question of sustainability and aesthetics from the perspective of an artist’s critical reflection on contemporary environmental art practice. It adopts a specifically concretionary approach, examining the way concepts from different disciplines might be able to generate creative and speculative aesthetic possibilities. It considers scientific ecology alongside allusions to Guattari’s (2000) ‘three ecologies’. It argues that art and aesthetics has a role in ‘unsolidifying’ sustainability. Through reference to a practice-based example, it concludes with a call for an aesthetics of action in the face of the inevitable uncertainties inherent in an ecological worldview.

The dynamic field

The domain of sustainability has as many different adherents as it has variations in its applications. The very fact that it has interdisciplinarity at its core – in its combination of the three pillars of economic, social and environmental well-being – generates a diversity of responses. It is both a strength and a weakness and to be able to reconcile these competing interests is obviously one of sustainability’s greatest practical challenges. The concept of sustainability (and its frequent conflation with sustainable development), its discourse and societal application have been subject to a range of critique. Although originating from concern from the sciences about environmental issues, the vocabulary of sustainability is replete with economic terms (such as natural capital or triple bottom line). The original definition, "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987, p. 37, also known as the Brundtland Report) makes explicit the centrality of an anthropocentric, progressive development mentality. Confusion arises as to whether we are developing sustainment or sustaining development (Phillips, 2007b); the word sustainability can imply maintaining stable conditions' and this can be interpreted as a conservative strategy and in the worst case, foster inaction rather than action (Holden, 2010).

Like many overarching concepts there is a danger that sustainability can become an empty rhetorical vessel: products (or actions) can be labelled ‘sustainable’ without discerning the matter of degree or quality. The more sustainability is made mainstream in government and business the more it is susceptible to minor tweaking of products or systems rather than wholesale change. At the level of the individual, product greenwashing has its parallel in our rationalisation of small changes to our lives where we may be deluding ourselves about the impact we are having. Sadly there is ample evidence that environmental indicators are deteriorating (National Sustainability Council, 2013) and that we are not addressing adequately the nature and scale of the issues that are facing us. The realisation that we are living in the Anthropocene places further demands upon us to reconsider our human-centred position. The death of environmentalism has already been proclaimed (Shellenberger & Nordhaus, 2004, 2006). Mentz (2012) goes as far as to contend that we are already in a post-sustainable world.

Hector, Christensen and Petrie (2014) and others (e.g. Redclift, 2007; Weinstein & Turner, 2012; Ziegler & Ott, 2011) argue that critical reflection is required on the political and philosophical under-
pinnings of sustainability and sustainable development. Values and beliefs held about sustainability differ. It seems difficult to reconcile the prudentially-conservationist and environmental-preservationist positions identified by Hector, Christensen and Petrie. There are contrasting opinions as to whether unsustainability can be solved primarily by technological and economic changes or whether individual value changes are the most important element. Paradoxically, rather than relying upon the clarification of definitions and positions, John Robinson argues that “the power of the concept of sustainability… lies precisely in the degree to which it brings to the surface these contradictions and provides a kind of discursive playing field in which they can be debated” (2004, p. 382). Whilst remaining critical of sustainability, he goes on to argue that new configurations of sustainability can still be useful – ones that are action-oriented, go beyond technical fixes, are integrative and that incorporate “a recognition of the social construction of sustainable development, and engages local communities in new ways” (p. 369). How can a post-sustainability thus be made more dynamic and flexible?

Turning now to aesthetics, what are its limitations in addressing sustainability? I shall make clear at this point that I am an artist rather than a philosopher so my focus is on the practical application of aesthetics. In this chapter I am looking at aesthetics as firstly, a set of principles that underlie the work of an artist or movement and secondly, in the sense of a combination of qualities that pleases the visual, moral or intellectual faculties. There is a strong historicocultural tradition of beauty being associated with harmony and balance. First I will explore how notions of aesthetics are relevant to sustainability via an examination of the concepts of complexity and resilience.

A complexity/resilience aesthetic

“The systems sensibility will be like that of the musical ear which perceives the competitions, symbioses, interferences, overlaps of themes in one same symphonic stream, where the brutal mind will only recognize one single theme surrounded by noise” (Kagan, 2010b p.1098 quoting Edgar Morin).

A complex adaptive system (CAS) is a collection of elements that are interrelated by a dense network of connections. Because they are complex, cause and effect relationships are difficult to predict, but because they have self-organising elements, learning and adaptation is possible. The theoretical background for CAS comes from complexity studies, chaos and systems theory and theoretical ecology. CAS theory has been applied to ecosystems and environmental management and been used to explain various human systems. Espinosa and Walker have critically assessed the failures of sustainability and applied CAS to sustainable governance (2011) and Darnton, Elster-Jones, Lucas, & Brooks have considered the application of CAS in promoting positive environmental behaviour (2006).

Simus (2008) has investigated how a more complex ecology might affect environmental aesthetics. He argues that aesthetics should be based on appreciation of natural processes and responses should be cognizant of the effects of different spatial and temporal scales. Simus calls for an aesthetic that comes from constant, generative, dynamic and fluctuating conditions of change: ‘our gaze must be adaptive, fluid and flexible according to appropriate spatiotemporal scale’ (2008, p. 70). If aesthetics is to be influenced by the ecological science, it becomes critical to understand how society views, values (both positively and negatively) and responds to change. Uncertainty/complexity means that there is always a uniqueness to specific places: a fruitful area for environmental art is investigations of how we discover, value and work with local places.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Balance of nature</th>
<th>Nature in flux</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural systems are closed.</td>
<td>Natural systems are not closed, discrete objects. They are more open with movements across boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural systems are self-regulating.</td>
<td>Natural systems are not balanced, and fluctuate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equilibrium comes to a point.</td>
<td>Natural processes have no single goal: they have no telos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecological succession is fixed and its path is predictable.</td>
<td>Succession is not fixed but irregular.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbances to natural systems are exceptional.</td>
<td>Disturbances are not exceptional but common and necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humans are separate and excluded from the definition of nature.</td>
<td>Humans make up a fundamental component of ecological systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity, harmony, order, balance.</td>
<td>Disunity, disharmony, disorder, imbalance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1 Balance of nature and Nature in flux.** From Pickett and Ostfeld (1995), with further additions by the author.

A concept derived from CAS, is the idea of resilience in environmental systems. In the last 50 years a lot of environmental art has been concerned with seeking a balance with nature. But contrary to what the general public might like to believe, the environment is full of crises and catastrophes. It is not that disturbance doesn’t happen in ‘natural’ ecosystems, but a question of whether systems can cope with the magnitude and speed of change. The concept of an adaptive cycle is therefore key to understanding our futures (Figure 1).

![Figure 1. The Adaptive Cycle.](image)
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Imagine a coral atoll that emerges from the sea (r). Over time as coral and coral sands are accumulated the island is colonised by low shrubby beach plants, then larger trees such as mangroves or coconuts. Eventually a low forest is formed (K). Then a cyclone comes along and causes a catastrophic breakdown (Ω). The coral island may slowly build up over time to form a mature community again (α). But perhaps it may not if sea levels have risen and there are no longer conditions for coral to accumulate and form a coral cay and the system exits to another state. Resilience is a measure of whether ecosystems are equipped to absorb disturbance and reorganize whilst undergoing change, so as to still retain essentially the same function, structure, identity, and feedbacks (Walker, Holling, Carpenter, & Kinzig, 2004).

The problem western socio-ecological systems have as a whole is that they have a preference for stability and optimised conditions. A typical agricultural system hold conditions stable (K) as long as possible, favouring monocultures, which are easy to manage – to keep in the one state by pumping fossil fuels and fertilisers in to support them. Such systems ‘avoid’ pain, but lose out on taking advantage of adverse circumstances. With change (moving from Ω to α), the future is up for grabs. Invention, experimentation and re-sorting are the norm. Pioneer species appear seemingly from nowhere. Novelty thrives and small chance events can powerfully reshape the future (Walker & Salt, 2006). Stepping back for a moment and considering this scenario more analogically, seeing ecosystems as being-in-flux allows us to consider, do we remain (as a culture, as socio-ecological systems) stable in the same state or do we cultivate the ability to respond to change?

Part of the critical framing of an aesthetics of sustainability has already been explored by artists and thinkers such as pioneers Helen Mayer Harrison and Newton Harrison (1985) and Maja and Reuben Fowkes (Fowkes & Fowkes, 2006, 2012) and sociologist Sacha Kagan (2011). Sustainability’s broad nature both mirrors the complexity of environmentalism and allows for many different aesthetic approaches. Some common characteristics I have observed in a range of contemporary environmental art include:

- a sensibility to, and mindfulness of, environments.
- responsiveness to and responsibility towards environments (Fowkes & Fowkes, 2006).
- embracing interrelatedness: to find and make connections: being ‘sensitive to patterns that connect’ (Gregory Bateson via Kagan, 2010b, p. 1098).
- valuing iterative and experimental processes.
- incorporating adaptability, ephemerality and ambiguity.

Looking more broadly I have identified eight key ecoaesthetic sensibilities of in the work of a wider range of artists.

No one artwork includes all of these sensibilities, but it is in these deeper qualities that new potentials in sustainability can be identified. It is possible to create complex adaptive systems and think and act across boundaries. A post-sustainable aesthetic asks creators/viewers/participants to decrease their consumption and also to take a transdisciplinary perspective. Transdisciplinarity goes further than interdisciplinary in that it is “the recognition of the existence of different levels of reality governed by different types of logic” (from the Charter of Transdisciplinarity quoted in Kagan, 2010b, p. 1097).
Sensibility | Example
--- | ---
To think at different scales of time and space. | *Longplayer*, Jem Finer (1999-2999).
Transdisciplinarity. | Cape Farewell Project, (founded by artist David Buckland, 2001-)

Table 2 Eight Ecoaesthetic Sensibilities

**Ecosystemic thinking**

I have discussed elsewhere (2012) what it means to adopt a resilient style of walking as a metaphor and *tactical* position - continually adjusting your balance whilst coping with delays and picking yourself up after failure – the art of walking on uneven ground. From the range of artworks I have observed, searching for a consistent visual aesthetic of sustainability is probably missing the point. As a set of aesthetic principles underlying and guiding the work of a particular artist, they are more likely to be conceptual or intellectual in nature. The aesthetics of contemporary environmental art has moved a long way from classical or neo-Kantian notions of beauty as unity, stability and balance.

What might it mean to extend the ‘boundaries’ of how we think? I’m arguing for an aesthetics of *thinking through* complex environmental problems – of ecosystemic thinking – of being more flexible and responsive to change and treasuring diversity (see Patchett & Phillips, 2013). Through artworks, this may be one way of *unsolidifying* the rational-economic basis of sustainability.

**Zombie environmentalism**

In previous work (Phillips, 2013a, 2013b) I have discussed the shift in some recent environmental art from ‘nature as balance’ to a darker tone. Work by artists such as Edward Burtynsky documents environmental problems and brings strong visual images of pollution and consumption to the public consciousness. But it has always troubled me as to how effective these images were in penetrating the values, opinions and actions of viewers. Connected to this is a trend in early 21st century relations with the natural world that I’ve defined as Zombie Environmentalism. It is;

- the behaviour of individuals or groups in society which is willingly or unconsciously *uncaring* of the natural world and the *consequences* of individual or collective behaviours.
- the apparent *attraction* to the dark side — polluted conditions make for sexy art.
- a certain tendency in some environmentalists that since disaster has come, it’s time to build your survival shelter and retreat.

Sometimes the latter comes across almost as revelling in the apocalyptic. All of these are certainly coping strategies, but ultimately they are a turning away, a deadening of the senses, a deadening of materiality, a deadening of responses, a closing of perception of nonhuman worlds. Provocatively, if
the world is un-beautiful, does this decouple us from ethical action? If we are already in the world of disaster then we are already post-sustainable. The question then is how to keep upright on our feet and not let the present conditions stop us from functioning.

**Living Beauty**

The previously discussed strategy of augmenting aesthetics by borrowing from complexity and ecology is a form of scientific cognitivism that suggests environmental aesthetics can benefit from this particular method of understanding the environment. But is it a question too, of re-evaluating what might be considered beautiful with other methods of understanding and then applying this back to sustainability? Consider that overtly sustainable art asks of audiences to do something and frequently to do it differently, if not radically so. But these types of works can appear earnest and emit a strong sense of ‘duty’ that at times becomes onerous and creates ‘bad art’ (Anonymous Artist (who has made both good and bad environmental art), 2005). Even in the more challenging and more oblique environmental artworks, there is a tension between using art in an instrumentalist way and any notion of the autonomy of art or the independence of aesthetics. It is not the first time that art has been used to promote an ideological point of view (see Petras, 1999), but is it possible to retain a contemporary criticality with the ethical imperative implicit in any eco-aesthetics? A similar situation arises in literary ecocriticism. To explore this, instead of gleaning possibilities from the sciences as I did previously, I will pick up some threads from certain vitalist tendencies.

![Figure 2. Living/Alive.](image-url)
Consider the range of values associated with ‘living’ and ‘alive’ in figure 2. Here it can be seen that living is connected with the nonhuman other at the same time as it describes human lifestyle and place of habitation. At the same time as it is active and energetic, it is a reminder of things that are remembered and kept with us. It is vivid and imaginative but also homely and welcoming. What happens if beauty itself is seen as living, communicating and alive? Vitalism is of course something specifically rejected by today’s science, but around the end of the 19th century when the limits of biological life were being explored, it was harnessed as a specific rejection of a mechanistic and atomistic biology. For these vitalists, underlying life was an invisible force that distinguished living from non-living matter (Normandin & Wolfe, 2013). More recent forms of vitalism have worked at ways of combining both process (becoming) and material:

“...objects, subjects, concepts are composed of nothing more or less than relations, reciprocal unfoldings gathered together in temporary and contingent unities... since a relation cannot exist in isolation, all entities can be understood in relation to one another” (Fraser, Kember, & Lury, 2005, p. 3)

In this more modern usage the vital qualities of living things have been extended to the inorganic. The ‘essence’ of the vitalism is not ether-like but is in the nature of the ‘becoming’. Contradictorily, at the same time as a relational framework makes ‘things’ appear materially insubstantial it also makes all things capable of ‘movement’ in the world. This of course creates an ethical imperative³:

“Rather than approach this world as a warehouse of inert things we wish to pile up for later use, we must hold ourselves accountable to a materiality that is never merely an external, blank, or inert space but the active, emergent substance of ourselves and others” (Alaimo, 2012, pp. 563-564).

Thinking about how this might be applied to aesthetics I was intrigued to discover that 167 years ago John Ruskin had written about ‘vital beauty’ – a definition of beauty as being capable of nourishment and therefore of change – as opposed to his more classical ‘typical beauty’ (Frost, 2012). The former allows us to focus upon the dynamic, creative and cooperative in nature (and art). In Venus in Exile (2001) Wendy Steiner notes “I think we must stop treating beauty as a thing or quality, and see it instead as a kind of communication... Beauty is an unstable property because it is not a property at all. It is the name of a particular interaction between two beings, a ‘self’ and an ‘Other.’” In an interview with Arjen Mulder she describes the important role of interactivity in an artwork where in the best of cases one gives oneself up as a viewer in a living way so that the Other (in the artwork) may live. The idea that emerges from this milieu is to grow generosity into the relationships between the artist, model, artwork and audience (Steiner, 2012). Here the relationships between ‘things’ are treated as a living, active space.

Hope and practicalities?

“What hope is there for sustainability when conspicuous consumption holds all the cards for pleasure: self-realization, aesthetic transport, spiritual transcendence?” (Steiner, 2009, p. 5)

Can austerity be fun? Art and artists in post-sustainable times need to grapple with how we live a life that is pleasurable (and beautiful) with less consumption. Others have noted the fundamental contradiction of producing material artworks⁴ (e.g. Bamford, 2011), but at this point I want to examine how consumption might otherwise be rerouted. This is different from
creating pictures of environmental degradation. Concentrating on the top-heavy consumption by wealthy nations, which have a significant impact on global sustainability (Worldwatch Institute, 2013), it can be seen that conspicuous consumption and affluenza (see Hamilton & Denniss, 2005) are examples of zombie environmentalism. Lauren Berlant highlights the condition of cruel optimism – when something that is desired is actually an obstacle to flourishing. She deems it a double bind: “even with an image of a better good life available to sustain your optimism, it is awkward and it is threatening to detach from what is already not working” (Berlant, 2011 p. 263). She also highlights the fact that this consumer life is itself a grind.

Formulating the idea of alternative hedonism, Kate Soper points out that affluent consumption “is both compromised by its negative effects (including congestion, pollution, overwork and stress) and pre-emptive of other possible pleasures and satisfactions” (Soper, 2007, p. 205). Soper’s position is less ambivalent than Berlant, ascribing more agency to those who slip sideways away from the bind of consumption. She points to the dependence of globalized capitalism on consumers not connecting the consequences of consumption on environments and societies at the same time as being permanently seduced by endlessly seeking the incomplete pleasure of consuming.

By mobilizing self-interest, alternative hedonism provides alternative possibilities for artists to critique consumption other than picturing the prodigious mountains of environmental waste as despair. Soper sees a role for artists in the creation and evolution of an anti-consumerist aesthetic. Aesthetic suspension and reordering is needed “whereby the commodities once perceived as enticingly glamorous come gradually instead to be seen as cumbersome and ugly in virtue of their association with unsustainable resource use, noise, toxicity or their legacy of unrecyclable waste” (Soper, 2008, p. 580). We must “detach the values of self-expressivity, excitement, and ecstasy from waste, and attach them instead to sustain-ability [sic]” (Steiner, 2009, p. 3). Such moves can highlight things that are “residual and disappearing”, but it is also about “the interstitial and emerging” (Soper, 2008, p. 578).

As part of moving pleasure elsewhere, there is work to be done in making unconsumption attractive by attaching pleasure to things that cannot be consumed (e.g. surprise and wonder and Soper’s diversity, change, novelty, self development). Artists are already creating experiences that highlight pleasure of gifts, giving and exchange (Purves, 2005) and highlighting sensory pleasures that consumerism denies (e.g. Slow Art Day), with the ultimate goal of permanently turning down consumption.

A second strategy for reconceptualising austerity is to rethink the quantity of happiness in life. Recognising that consumption may have given us unrealistic expectations about how much happiness the individual will encounter every day is part of this. Wanting what one has, rather than what one doesn’t is related to mindfulness (Brown, Kasser, Ryan, Alex Linley, & Orzech, 2009). But the issue is also raised when tackling the negative apocalyptic and thinking through how there can be a move on from the guilt in environmentalism. Here I take from philosopher Tim Morton’s investigations into guilt, shame, melancholia and sadness.

“...normative environmentalism wants me to feel guilty or ashamed, and in doing so it scratches at the itch of human being, an itch that is already rubbed raw by the very modernity that created the current ecological emergency” (Morton, 2012, p. 17).

It is a complicated argument, but for him there is a progression in intensity from guilt to shame to melancholia to sadness.

“Guilt is to shame as the sugar coating is to a chocolate. But sadness is to shame as the liquid center is to the chocolate. If we want to progress ecologically, for instance if we want to have more people accepting the reality of global warming, then we need to walk them through an experience that is phenomenologically equivalent to accepting global warming, rather than bludgeoning them
with facts or trying to ‘guilt them out’ or shame them, which will only breed denial. The best way to do this is to make contact with the liquid center of sadness, often frozen into melancholy, at the core of sentient being. This liquid core is the trace of coexistence, shorn of coexistents, unconditional, strange, palpable yet withdrawn, uncanny, sad. That way, no bludgeoning is required: we will have poured people into the right psychic space to accept the very large-scale, long-term issues that beset this planet” (Morton, 2012, p. 18).

Paradoxically, if the answer to any addiction to searching for happiness or fulfilment is to co-exist with sadness, this will actually bring further hope into our lives. Morton’s liquid core is an acknowledgement that in the core of being, there is a sadness, a raw tenderness of absence and of resonances of coexistence with concepts like climate change or deep time that are bigger than what we can comprehend: that the emptiness at the centre of human existence is contradictorily full of connections, that although invisible, can’t be denied.

Figure 3 The .-./.-./.- (penguin anticipatory archive)

**An example: the anticipatory archive.**

“After sustainability, we need dynamic narratives about our relation to the biosphere” (Mentz, 2012, p. 587).

In a recent project about Little Penguins (*Eudyptula minor*) in Sydney Harbour (following a mini-residency at The Cross Art Project) one of the artworks produced was the .-./.-./.- (penguin anticipatory archive or P A A)³. This was a collection of images and drawings that described the breadth of issues surrounding the threatened colony at Manly. Here I attempted to draw the
threads that I have discussed in this chapter together into a practical example. The Little Penguins are a cryptic and little-known inhabitant of the harbour, despite living in the middle of a global urbanised centre. I was able to see only one wild penguin at Manly Wharf, which was heavily shielded from human contact by volunteer wardens. But by collecting images, writings and thoughts about penguins my intention was to use a range of ‘pasts’ to craft ‘futures’ that we might want: “We tell stories to explore the alternative choices that might lead to feared or hoped-for futures” (Cronon, 1992, p. 1368). I was utilising anticipatory readiness: a cultivated, patient, sensory attentiveness (Bennett, 2010). It was my attempt at a project that ‘stays with the trouble’ (Haraway, 2013). The archive melded science, art and popular culture, with the recurrent motif of shifting the point of view (POV) of the viewer to underneath the penguin, looking up – challenging the human’s position as subject.

The image shown in Figure 4 is a graphic summary of the ideas the project generated. At the same time as the content is factual, the relationship amongst elements is often wild and unruly. I wanted to turn a ‘dead’ document into vital possibilities by using the conceptual ‘interference’ between the different information sources. This kind of project is successful when invisible things come to the surface and it becomes possible to take notice of invisible matters and flows. Clearly, even this modest project looks at models of change. As the audience turned the pages of the archive in the gallery, my wider intention was to open up dialogue and debate surrounding human inaction, intervention, responses and responsibilities to the world at large.

![Image](image-url)

**Figure 4.** Relating different elements (detail of page from the .-.-.-.-.-.-(penguin anticipatory archive)).

**An ecoaesthetic of action**

Some artists make direct intervention in environmental issues, but even in the case of works such as the P A A the intention was an aesthetics of action. The ecoaesthetic I propose builds resilience, entangles with materiality and proposes that nonhumans, matter. It cultivates a prospective mind (Homer-Dixon, 2006) and coexists with sadness (Morton, 2012). It takes on the pleasure of the local
and the satisfaction of the necessary, combining it with the imaginative and unruly. Engaging with uncertainty and imperfection, risk and opportunity, it allows participants to act in a contingent world: both inside the ‘problem’ and inside the solution. Of course no one artwork can do all of these things and that is why there are a great variety of aesthetic ‘styles’ in environmental art.

Why would such an ecoaesthetic be useful to sustainability? I have demonstrated that a conventional beauty, concerned with harmony and balance may not be helpful to any sustainable project. However by working with what an ecoaesthetic might consist of, we as creators/viewers/participants are in a better position to deal with the changes needed in our human/nonhuman ‘societies’ in the future. The post-sustainable world(s) will sound, feel and look differently, and in many cases it will not have a clear, coherent or stable aesthetics. But the fixed relations between nature-culture and the techno-economic focus of sustainability need to be unsettled. What happens if aesthetics and sustainability are made more animated?

At the heart of what I am talking about is responding to the zombie consumer, the user of materials and energy to no great purpose, to the turning away and confronting the sense of inaction in zombie environmentalism. Art is not able to create the nation-wide or global change ultimately required, but it can stop us from halting or going backwards on our personal journey. Art is best when it is not purely instrumental – its greatest power can be at the level of working with ‘resonances’ rather than operating instructions. Is it possible to question sustainability at the same time as create a desire to act? Is it possible to undermine the conventions of top-down models at the same time as ‘good’ behaviour is encouraged? Is it possible to have ‘goodness’ in austerity at the same time as we have questioning and transformation? That is something for us to work on in the future.

\[ Dr \ Perdita \ Phillips \ is \ an \ environmental \ artist/independent \ scholar \ based \ in \ Western \ Australia. \ She \ has \ worked \ with \ termites, \ bowerbirds, \ thrombolites, \ swamps, \ albatrosses, \ penguins \ and \ rubbish. \ Current \ research \ interests \ include \ walking, \ wildness \ and \ anticipatory \ futures. \ www.perditaphillips.com. \]
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i Remaining stable over time, or sustainability as the ‘capacity to endure’.

ii E.g. integrated into ISO standards and environmental reporting.

iii Even complexity theory can be linked loosely to vitalism via autopoiesis (defined as a system capable of reproducing and maintaining itself), which Kagan (2010a) uses to generate his sensibility of the ‘autoecopoietic’.

iv I will not be discussing the practicalities reducing the impact of studio practice here but see Phillips (2007a).

v Here I am specifically addressing consumption but note the much wider possibilities for artists listed in Table 2.

vi see [www.perditaphillips.com/portfolio/16-1-1-penguin-anticipatory-archive](http://www.perditaphillips.com/portfolio/16-1-1-penguin-anticipatory-archive)

---

*Figure 5 Penguin POV (pages from the P A A: one is on translucent paper; the view of the reader is from below.)*