

**UIMONEN**

**ANTTI UIMONEN**

**MOVEMENT IMPROVISATION  
AS A PRACTICE TO IMAGINE  
SUSTAINABLE FUTURES**



**HOME OF  
PERFORMANCE  
PRACTICES**



GRAPHY  
ORMANCE ART  
CES  
ODY  
ERFORMANCE  
OGRAPHY  
RT PERFORMANCE ART  
EATRE PRACTICES  
SCIPLINED BODY  
EOGRAPHY  
CE ART  
PRACTICES  
ODY  
NCE  
PHY  
ERFORMANCE ART

MOVEMENT  
IMPROVISATION AS A  
PRACTICE TO IMAGINE  
SUSTAINABLE FUTURES

ANTTI UIMONEN  
MA PERFORMANCE PRACTICES

A Thesis presented by Antti Uimonen to Master Performance Practices,  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of Master of Arts in  
Performance Practices, 2022.

HOME OF  
PERFORMANCE  
PRACTICES

---

2022

## SYNOPSIS

This dissertation project is multidisciplinary research that combines discourse and practice from the fields of Sustainable Development, Futures Studies, and Movement Improvisation. More specifically, the research aims to examine conditions and frames for Movement Improvisation practice to speculate on more-than-human sustainable futures.

The research derived from the observation that sustainability discourse often sets plans and pathways toward more sustainable futures based on nature's instrumental value to humans. In this way, humans put themselves above the planetary ecosystem. In addition, the sustainability discourse rarely touches on embodiment and embodiment knowledge as a source to speculate sustainable futures. That inspired me to take a posthuman standpoint and set this research to examine more-than-human futures and movement inspiration as a practice for speculations of futures.

Some essential findings of this research are connections, similarities, and overlaps between, within, and without this multidisciplinary research context. Based on the research conducted using Affective Methodologies, all fields approach complexity uniquely, and there are ways to combine them. More importantly, one of the critical aspects of framing Movement Improvisation is based on actualizing

affective potentialities in the space. For a practitioner, all the movements are in the space, and there is no need to create new movements but to actualize the potential of what is there. By changing perception from the need to create and control the happenings in the space, movement improvisation can turn from a self-centered perspective to a broader systemic perspective to acknowledge more-than-human relationships in the space.

Similarly, speculating more sustainable futures asks human perception to open up to the environment and see and actualize what becomes necessary. Nevertheless, it is crucial to highlight that we need plans and pathways toward more sustainable futures. However, as an additive, we need to understand bodies and embodied knowledge more broadly to create sustainable futures narratives.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Firstly, I want to thank Juha Klaavu for his unconditional support before and during my studies in the MA Performance Practices program. Without him, I would not have even considered applying.

I want to thank my supervisor, João da Silva for this dedication and guidance throughout the dissertation process. My research process took significant steps further after each of our meetings, theoretically and practically. Also, thank you for the Schizosomatics and Designing body of research modules.

I would like to express my gratitude to my external mentors Katie Duck and Pilvi Porkola. Katie for practically guiding me to the world of posthuman movement improvisation and allowing me to work my performance at her premises. Pilvi for allowing me to learn and discuss my process through her practice, knowledge of artistic research, and finding theoretical and practical contact points between sustainability, futures studies, and performance art.

Special thanks also to my friend Anushka Nair for insightful discussions and reflections throughout these two years and for being the proofreader for this thesis.

I want to thank the staff of HOPP and their commitment during the intensive periods and for the help and support during the assignments in the tutorials.

I want to thank my friend Tero Hytönen for endless phone calls and curiosity to discuss art and its place in society. It is always a pleasure and has helped me greatly during the process.

Last but not definitely least, I want to give my biggest hugs and sincere thanks to our cohort. Analu, Anne, Andrea, Can, Gustavo, Kadri, Katrina, Maya, Stelios, Zuzanna, and Zandile, it has been an absolute pleasure to meet you all and experience this journey with you.

## DECLARATION

I, Antti Uimonen, hereby certify that I have personally carried out the work depicted in the thesis entitled, MOVEMENT IMPROVISATION AS A PRACTICE TO SPECULATE SUSTAINABLE FUTURES.

No part of the thesis has been submitted for the award of any other degree or diploma prior to this date.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<i>Synopsis</i>	<i>i</i>
<i>Acknowledgments</i>	<i>ii</i>
<i>Declaration</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>Table of Contents</i>	<i>iv</i>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>LITERATURE REVIEW -</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>THE CONTEXT OF THE RESEARCH</b>	
Sustainability as a paradigm	7
Embodiment and sustainability	13
Experiential futures studies -	15
Embodying sustainable futures	
Movement improvisation as a	19
Non-human-centric practice	
<b>METHODOLOGY - AFFECTIVE METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>FINDINGS - THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY INTERSECTION</b>	<b>33</b>
Expanding, exploring, and finding connections	34
between theory and practice	
Performance -	40
Putting practice to practice	
<b>SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION -</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>IT IS NOT GOING TO BE PERFECT</b>	
<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>APPENDIX A</b>	<b>58</b>

## INTRODUCTION

This research examines movement improvisation as a practice of speculating and imagining alternative sustainable futures through embodied knowledge in performance making <sup>1</sup>. Studying alternative sustainable futures is often limited to plans, suggestions, and roadmaps based on analytical and rational thinking. For example, the global discourse on sustainability is driven by United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Paris Climate Agreement, which hold practical suggestions, goals, and solutions for individuals, collectives, and organizations on how to make more sustainable choices. However, they are criticized for not recognizing the otherness of nature, causing framing nature and futures solely by its instrumental value to humans (Groves, 2019). Furthermore, speculating more sustainable futures is more urgent than ever because societal, ecological, mental, and social unsustainability has become self-evident (Porkola & Salmenniemi, 2021). This research is thus conducted from the perspective that there is an urgent need for speculations and practices for more sustainable worlds (Lakkala 2020). The hypothesis is that because movement improvisation is an emergent process that operates with verbal and non-verbal knowledge (De Spain, 2014), it is possible to generate

---

<sup>1</sup> In futures studies, it is common practice to use plural term futures because the future is open and has many alternatives

additional knowledge to rational and analytical thinking in sustainability discourse. By studying the intersection of futures studies, sustainability, and movement improvisation, this research aims to set a starting point for creating a methodology that uses futures studies practices in performance making to enable speculation and imagination of sustainable futures from a more-than-human perspective. More specifically, this study aims to recognize and define frames and conditions for movement improvisation to speculate alternative sustainable futures such as spatial elements, objects, and mental images.

The methodological perspective is taken from the book *Affective Methodologies* by Knudsen & Stage (2015). Affects, in general, are defined as encounters between the affected body and, a second, the affecting body, independent of their subject (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987). In other words, affects operate beyond concepts of "self" and "I." In this research, the perspective allows the examination of relationships between human and non-human entities. It sets a lens to see humans as part of a more extensive systemic network of affects in constant interaction and change. Moreover, affective methodologies allow strategies for tracing affective forces to document and reflect on the emergent more-than-human research material.

In this research, the frames and conditions for speculation of sustainable futures are practically based on the logic

of both/and. Both/and logic aim to step away from either-or thinking, subject-object relationship, and have an additive perspective (van der Tuin and Verhoeff, 2022, 35-36). This perspective allows examining sustainability, sustainable futures, and movement improvisation together and individually as an addition to each other. For example, in movement improvisation and futures studies, not fully knowing what will happen next plays an important role. For instance, in Futures Studies, we can have projections, hopes, and preferences about the future, but it is not possible to know with certainty what the future will be like. Similarly, in movement improvisation, happenings unfold in the moment based on actions and openings in the space. Even though both disciplines deal with not fully knowing, this does not entail that they do not involve or engage in pre-established practices and structures. Furthermore, both/and logic is aimed to support openness and inclusion of differences and alternatives in the practices to speculate sustainable futures. Especially because sustainability discourse is currently based on an instrumental relationship between humans and nature (Groves, 2019), it could benefit from an additive perspective of both/and logic to explore alternative relationships with the surrounding environment.

In this research, I will suggest that to speculate sustainable futures with movement improvisation, both/and logic invites

the partakers to be open to the space and make choices based on openings in the space. The idea is not primarily to control, manage, or invent movements but to actualize potentialities in the space emerging in the relationships with other human and non-human bodies. Approaching sustainability from a similar perspective could help change the human centrist perception of the world and acknowledge both human and non-human entities as essential parts of the world.

The content of this thesis is divided such that in Chapter 2 I review the literature of the current sustainability discourse and a viewpoint to examine sustainability as a more-than-human entity by using Deleuzian concept of desire. In addition, I review the role of the body and embodied knowledge in that discourse and define the perspective of embodiment in this research. After that, I review the viewpoint on embodiment with Futures Studies. Lastly, I examine postmodern movement improvisation theory to complete the contextual frame of this research. In Chapter 3, I introduce the philosophy of affect and its relationship to the concept of desire. This viewpoint is followed by an introduction to affective methodology to define the methodological frame of this research. Chapter 4 is a review of the findings of this research. I discuss the process to define frames and conditions for speculating sustainable futures from a more-than-human perspective. I examine connections between theory and practice concerning the final performance presented in May 2022. In Chapter 5,

I concluded the research with a connective viewpoint to the multidisciplinary research practice and reflect on the limitations of this research. I discuss both/and logic, and how it connects the different disciplines.

In this thesis, I attempt not to fall into dualities or normative either-or assumptions or categorizations in my writing. Language has a tendency to fall into definitions, but my genuine intention is to use both/and logic throughout this paper to explore and open perspectives for speculating sustainable futures from a more-than-human perspective.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### THE CONTEXT OF THE RESEARCH

The broad subject area is an intersection of movement improvisation and Futures Studies theory. Sustainable development acts as a theoretical and practical context for applying movement improvisation and Futures Studies to research speculations of sustainable futures.

### SUSTAINABILITY AS A PARADIGM

This thesis considers sustainability as an issue of humans' relationship with the surrounding environment, formed by cultural, social, and ideological models of human behavior. I am inspired to consider sustainability from this perspective because, since the 1970s, it has been scientifically evident that humankind uses and exploits natural resources in an unsustainable manner. The link between human actions and their excessive and unsustainable behavior on the planet was scientifically exposed in the 1970s by The Club of Rome's Limits of Growth (1972) report. The computer-simulated models indicated worrying factors of overconsumption and finite supply of earth's resources with scientific evidence that the current consumption of natural resources is not sustainable. Therefore, it is rather self-evident that the sustainability crisis is not based on a lack of information on how our behavior affects the planet's living conditions. From this perspective, to

rethink humans' relationship with the surrounding environment is at the core of sustainability (Groves, 2019). The relationship with the surrounding environment is not a "natural" or biological construction that humans are born with; it changes over time and varies in different societies based on humans' beliefs. For example, excessive usage of natural resources and overwhelming CO2 emissions are based on embodied moral and ethical belief systems of what is considered acceptable and what is not. The way, especially in western societies, the relationship with nature is manifested creates enormous stress on the planetary ecosystem and is threatening the existence of human life on the planet.

To examine the topic further, I discuss the present discourse around sustainability and how the issues are addressed globally through the discourse of sustainable development. The term sustainable development was coined by the Brundtland Commission in 1987. They published a report, *Our Common Future*, which defined sustainable development as "development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (Brundtland, 1987, 43). United Nations has been the main driver of the sustainable development discourse. To address the issues of sustainable development, currently, the leading global pathway are the United Nations (UN) 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), divided into the categories of poverty, inequality, climate change, environmental degradation, peace, and justice (United Nations, 2018). In addition to SDGs as a driver for sustainable

development, 193 countries, in 2015, signed the Paris Climate Agreement on climate change to limit global warming to 1.5C (Scoones, 2016). The SDGs and The Paris Climate Agreement are two main events signaling a significant shift in international commitments to sustainable development and change to achieve a better and more sustainable future. However, there is much disagreement about the goals and agreements behind the international commitments, such as who should benefit and where responsibilities lie (Scoones, 2016). Also, the International Panel of Climate Change (IPCC) states in their newest report that the window for change is closing faster than previously thought (IPCC, 2022). The 26th UN Climate Change Conference also gave a similar message (COP26) held on 11/2021. The message effectively acknowledged that the climate change commitments were still inadequate, and national pledges currently have the world on track for about 2.4C of warming instead of 1.5C agreed in the Paris Climate Agreement (Volcovici et al., 2021). These factors indicate that the global commitments, agreements, and development are not working well enough to change the course of unsustainable development and behavior.

One possible way to get a more nuanced understanding of the underlying issue that the paragraph above states is to look at sustainability discourse from a perspective of paradigm. As proposed by Kuhn (1970). He states that, generally, a paradigm consists of the fundamental ideas, methods, language, and

theories that the members of a scientific community accept. A paradigm creates boundaries for establishing a field or defining relevant theories, which harmonize the choices of research questions, methods, and the direction of inquiry in their areas (Kuhn, 1970). Such development leads to scientists creating and making scientific development, but the boundaries, fundamental theories, or methods are not questioned. Kuhn's theory becomes relevant, especially because sustainable development aims for better futures in which environmental, societal, and economic considerations are balanced in the pursuit of an improved quality of life (UNESCO, 2015). To question and rethink the relationship between humanity and nature, requires challenging now-traditional modernist narratives of material human progress (Groves, 2019). It becomes meaningful to ask: where do the discourses for sustainability come from, and what are the underlying fundamental elements that are not questioned? What might be the underlying unquestioned issues of the paradigm, causing the mistracking of the global sustainability agreements and commitments? More importantly, it is relevant to remember that these are questions about human-made systems. As I stated earlier, sustainability discourse, generally, is based on human moral and ethical beliefs.

The current sustainability paradigm holds two distinctive systemic narratives. The two ways of orienting thought and action toward the future are the future-for-the-present and

the present-for-the-future (Adam and Groves, 2007). Groves (2019) explains that future-for-the-present in which the future is based on economic calculations on an assumed discount rate ensures that the value of future benefits and costs is progressively reduced. He states that such an approach seeks to make economic sense, realize the benefits of a decision as soon as possible, and push costs further into the future for others to bear. Furthermore, Groves (2019) indicates that the present-for-the-future is imagined, for example, through an apocalyptic lens meant to motivate reflection upon values, practices, and social structures which are currently held to be 'naturalized.' He argues that the present moment is therefore defined by the future and is aimed to open space for trying to conceive how these accepted elements might change. He is suggesting that the present-for-the-future narrative is about managing the environment and planning futures to incorporate economic relationships within a broader context of productive relationships that sustain natural systems, rather than enforcing the separation between inert non-human nature and a human economy geared to material progress measured in terms of financial value productivity. In other words, the current narratives acknowledge the change in the human relationship on an instrumental level in which nature is there for humans to manage and control it. Therefore, SDGs and the Paris Climate Agreement do not question the human relationship with the surrounding environment. Sustainability as a paradigm is not questioning the human relationship with

the surrounding environment, which is currently based on a human-centered belief that humans are above the natural ecosystems and nature is there for humans.

One of the critical aspects concerning change towards more sustainable futures would be finding ways to see humans as part of the ecosystem, not as the ones controlling it. For example, Groves (2019) suggests to approach sustainability based on attachment and care beyond the human sphere. He states that it would be possible to examine closely what we care about and understand about dependencies with the surrounding environment, and not only to articulate sustainability as the basis of a new, abstract global community or in a new, technologically mediated commitment to progress. It is necessary to recognize that present subjects are related to the future unevenly and differentially through attachments and commitments that anchor them in the political field here and now (Groves 2019). In creating alternative sustainability narratives, images, and speculations from a more-than-human perspective, one possibility could be to find shared practices to embody care for the surrounding nature and solidarity with future people. Scientific plans and roadmaps are essential to create conditions and constraints for human behavior. However, as Groves (2019) states, we need practices to embody relationships with the surrounding environment as a part of the ecosystem, not the ones controlling and managing it. This does not mean that changing perception

to more-than-human would dismantle humans and their responsibilities towards the environment. Our relationship with the surrounding environment still matters. However, it matters to us, not the environment, and we are not necessarily the most important part of the ecosystem.

### **EMBODIMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY**

Practicing embodiment concerning sustainability might seem to increase the complexity of the already humongous and complex issue. It may also cause some uneasiness because to rethink the relationship between humanity and nature challenges many now-traditional modernist narratives of material human progress (Groves, 2019). However, I argue that if we dare to trust more in the knowledge of and in our bodies, it might help us to find alternative, more-than-human, ways of being in relationship with the surrounding environment, behave differently and make better and more sustainable choices now and in the future.

Spatz (2017) introduces that embodiment is primary affordance in a trivial developmental sense, and it is necessary to learn to negotiate embodiment before interacting with objects and substances outside our bodies. In other words, he suggests that when humans interact with the surrounding environment, it happens through our bodies; we understand with our bodies. Therefore, practicing the embodiment of alternative ways toward sustainability and futures requires

awareness of embodied knowledge. Spatz (2015) indicates that knowledge can be, for example, felt experiences, ideas, words, mental images, sentences, and text. Bodily aspects such as mental, emotional, spiritual, vocal, somatic, interpersonal, and expressive, in this sense, are a zone of engagement, which necessarily cannot be fully described in words (Spatz, 2015). Embodiment and body as the first affordance may extend understanding of the foundations, beliefs, sensations, and feelings which eventually become concrete beliefs about what is sustainable and manifest as plans and roadmaps toward more sustainable futures.

Furthermore, considering embodiment and sustainability as a more-than-human concept invites us to examine human affects separately from sustainability. From a philosophical perspective, Deleuze and Guattari (1977) propose that the concept of desire constructs our everyday reality and is the force behind all our actions. For choreographer Diego Gil (2019), who expounds on Deleuze and Guattari's understanding of desire, desire is an immanent plane that exists before opposition between subject and object, representation, or production (Gil, 2019). In this research, the concept suggests that things we think are important and valuable are initiated before conscious awareness of them. Therefore, sustainability can also be seen as an entity, and how we relate to it depends on what happens or triggers us before our cognitive awareness. This perspective offers a

point of view to critically reflect on the reasoning, values, and priorities behind the discourses on practical solutions toward sustainability. It also provides a perspective to reflect on what is missing and what views are not considered in it.

In the following chapter, I will open a theoretical and practical view of how Futures Studies approach embodiment. This way, I hope to create a broader theoretical context for the role of movement improvisation in this research.

### **EXPERIENTIAL FUTURES STUDIES - EMBODYING SUSTAINABLE FUTURES**

In recent decades discourse in Futures Studies has shifted from predicting the future to mapping alternative futures to shaping desired futures, both at external collective and individual inner levels (Bell, 1996). Fred Polak coined the term futures images in his book *The Image of the Future* (1973). He states that envisioning alternative futures are foundational to the field of Futures Studies. For example, an organization, nation, or civilization will decline without a compelling vision and conviction that it can shape the future (Polak 1973). Another futures researcher, Anita Rubin, argues that thinking and envisioning futures images are crucial for coping with change (Rubin, 2013). Moreover, critical futures scholarship argues that 'the future' exists in a domain of ideation and imagination (Candy & Kornet, 2019). Consequently, futures "cannot be experienced directly, but only through

images, thoughts, feelings and the multiple ways these are subsequently expressed in the outer world" (Slaughter, 2018, 444). This is to say that creating future artifacts such as props, texts, laws, objects, or materials can evoke ideation and imagination of what the future might be (Candy & Kornet, 2019). In this way, the researcher of the future, performance maker, dancer, and artist in general, can evoke different narratives about futures possibilities and become a medium turning abstract futures into experiential scenarios to be seen, felt, and talked about. In this expanded role, artistic methods have a crucial role in bringing the future's possibilities into the present moment, as the following citation demonstrates:

*"[E]ngagement with the future is an encounter with a non-tangible and invisible world that nevertheless has real and material consequences" (Adam & Groves, 2007, p. xv).*

Hence, engaging with the future is materializing something that does not exist. Still, it can have real consequences because the encounters can change our relationships with the surrounding environment. Therefore, art plays a relevant role in between the futures and the materiality of the present moment. For example, edition 17 of the journal *Ruukku: Studies in Artistic Research* discusses the possibilities of studying everyday utopias with artistic research methods. The edition introduces various artistic outcomes in which different networks, communities, and practices imagine, speculate, build, and try alternative ways to experience other societal

and political living conditions (Cooper 2014). The different outcomes create various openings, possibilities, and spaces for one to be in a relationship with different kinds of utopian futures. Concerning the edition, my research operates in a similar area, giving contextual and practical references to my research. For example, in the edition, Annette Arlander's work *Calling for Zoe as a Utopian Gesture* takes part in the post-humanist discourse of dismantling human-centric mental models (Porkola & Salmenniemi 2021). In this work, Arlander calling for a dragon with a bell in different ways and locations is seen as utopian practice and process calls out to something imaginary and yet non-existent (Arlander, 2021). The work is an example of a process of actively speculating futures in the present time and space. Arlander's work also demonstrates practical strategies for creating spaces for speculation of alternative embodied relationships with the surrounding environment. Similarly, in the examples presented by Candy & Kornet (2019) above, the speculation of futures and the creation of bodily possibilities to experience the futures have rather relevant relationship with spatial aspects. For example, they introduce an example of different futures images presented in an immersive exhibition. In addition, *Foreland Studio Hydromax Open Show (2022)* operated similarly. In this, designers, artists, and architects engaged with the technology behind hydrogen and its societal implication for the energy transition, for example, by creating speculative energy sources for the future and having performative examples of

questioning the human relationship with nature. In such an example, space and the installations found in it trigger the imagination about different futures. Some installations are also to be experienced by entering the futures scenarios and, for example, feeling, touching, or smelling them. In addition, some artworks provoke and expose the issues and problems in the present moment, inviting the visitor to think and speculate about what it means in terms of the future.

Similarly, in my research, movement improvisation, and its conditions and frames aim to create openings for alternative relationships with the surrounding environment. In connection with improvisation Candy & Kornet (2019) introduce a project in which experts of specific fields are invited to describe how futures might be, and players are improvising scenes based on different possible futures based on guest experts' input. According to them, the host and actors ask some questions; then, the players improvise a series of scenes from futures inspired and informed by the opening for both audience and experts to react. What differs from the examples in the previous chapter is that in the context of improvisation, the persons doing the improv are making decisions in the moment and affecting the space and the speculation of futures. Therefore, there is no "ready" space to go to and experience, but the space is rather in the making. Thus, the openings to possible alternatives are created with everyone involved. This way of practicing movement improvisation

could also work as a practice to learn, facilitate, and hold spaces for alternative futures. In the next chapter, I examine posthuman movement improvisation practice and shed light on its theoretical background in this research.

### **MOVEMENT IMPROVISATION AS A NON-HUMAN-CENTRIC PRACTICE**

Before this research, my background in movement improvisation was mainly based on Breakdance. For this research, I wanted to examine if movement improvisation could operate as a practice to consider more-than-human entities. Based on this aim, even though breakdance is a dance based on movement improvisation, my experience is that it is rather self-centered. In breaking, dancers improvise based on the songs the DJ is playing, and the main idea is to improvise to the music played with complex and technical movement combinations. The focus is on listening to music and finding personal ways to improvise. The aims of breakdance are relatively simple; often, the one doing the most complex combination of movements and has the best form and responds to the music by staying on the beat is the most appreciated dancer. Therefore, my experience is that movement improvisation in breaking is mainly based on skills, form, and impressing others. Even though my experience in Breakdance helped me in the research, for example, by having practice experience in exchanging embodied knowledge, it does not necessarily offer space for exploration

of relationships from a non-human viewpoint. In Breakdance, the focus is primarily on the human subjects with a standpoint that other entities are there to serve humans to enable their maximum potential in the dance. Therefore, in this research, I investigate posthuman movement improvisation practice to examine movement improvisation from the more-than-human viewpoint.

Historically, postmodern movement improvisation started to develop in and as a performance in the early 1960s in Judson Church, where several dance practitioners engaged in and developed improvisational dance (da Silva, 2017). As with my experiences with breakdance, postmodern movement improvisation is also a subjective process; its theories are often based on personal experiences (Albright, 2019). For the same reason, movement improvisation as a practice does not have solidified methods, structures, or frames. However, in his book *Landscape of the now*, Kent De Spain (2014) explores how seminal movement improvisation practitioners' structure and negotiate with the complexities of improvised movement. The book does not introduce specific methods for movement improvisation but focuses on how a number of key figures of movement improvisation approach it. By doing this, De Spain (2014) has recognized issues and resources of how movement improvisation practitioners create structures in their practice. These structures, however, are not necessarily all there is to improvisation. Nevertheless, in the context of the

thesis, they offer a basis for framing movement improvisation practices in such a way as to enable one to speculate and imagine more-than-human sustainable futures.

In addition, I conducted the research alone by doing solo improvisation. However, in this thesis, I am approaching movement improvisation from a group perspective because I consider the audience as an active part of the performance. By their presence, the audience is changing the space's dynamics, and therefore, they influence what happens on the stage. To study frames and conditions for movement improvisation, to speculate on sustainable futures, I needed to understand how the process of movement improvisation operates individually and in the context of a performance.

In terms of embodied knowledge, a relevant aspect of framing and conditioning movement improvisation to speculate sustainable futures is different verbal and non-verbal ways of knowing in the context of movement improvisation. De Spain (2014) indicates that a significant part of our consciousness emerges from the habit of using language. For example, we often think in words without speaking them out loud. He also highlights our tendency to oversee other ways of knowing and thinking that does not come out through language because there are no words to communicate. As I introduced before, embodied knowledge is often related to non-verbal knowledge. For example, based on De Spain's (2014)

interviews, the practitioners sometimes cannot articulate their experience with sentences; therefore, their experience is not accessible to verbal consciousness and language. In my practice, in breaking, there is a culture and ideology of sharing and creating a conversation or an exchange through movements. The exchange is held in dance circles or battles where two or more dancers respond to others. It is to fight back, borrow, steal, represent, collaborate, and at times aggressively claim one's voice and right to speak (Watkins and Caines, 2014). Therefore, my practice has been based on exchanging non-verbal knowledge. Breakdance as a culture strongly posits that your movements and style are used for self-expression and to bring your personality into the front. There is, of course, a critique that when someone presents themselves as too different from the normative understanding of the cultural structures, it creates difficulties to present yourself as you are. Therefore, there are also limitations in that culture. For example, non-dynamic, not flowing, or non-musical moving are often overlooked as the wrong way of dancing. In addition, attitudes towards LGBTQ+ identities are not tolerated as openly as the culture promotes. Nevertheless, the element of non-verbal exchange of knowledge is strongly present in movement improvisation. In such cases, the knowledge is in the form of sensations and movements beyond words (De Spain, 2014). For example, I have experienced that I know some breakdancers and their personalities better after seeing them dancing and dancing with them for a day in a breaking event.

However, I also want to indicate that movement improvisation is not a magic tool to know everything. Da Silva (2017) states that, generally, we cannot know all in verbal or non-verbal knowledge; none of it is all to know. Nevertheless, not having words for something does not mean not-knowing at all, as De Spain (2014) also indicates. These interpretations might happen since non-verbal knowledge is often difficult to express with language, and, therefore, it can be understood as something unknown. For this matter Da Silva (2017) suggests unknowing as a modality of knowing

*by means of which one deals with the 'known' in differential manner: neither fully ignoring it, nor allowing it to fully determine the action in the moment (da Silva, 2017).*

Unknowing means that it is known unknown, and it is possible to choose how we relate to knowledge that is difficult to express with language. These examples indicate that movement improvisation allows examination of non-verbal knowledge and unknowing. Therefore, as De Spain (2014) states that movement improvisation can bring awareness to non-verbal ways of thinking and knowing. Our bodies can be part of dealing with unknowing, as there are limitations with capturing certain knowledge or unknowing with language. Movement improvisation can thus operate as a gateway for expanding the realm of knowledge to embodied knowledge in the speculation of sustainable futures. Therefore, we do not need to fall into the categorization that knowledge must

be expressed only with clear and verbal sentences. It is up to the movement improvisation practitioner to decide how to be in a relationship with them. In this way, I believe that movement improvisation can expand understanding and transmit alternative forms of knowledge in addition to the current sustainability discourse. Especially when sustainability is mainly concentrated on verbal knowledge, movement improvisation can open ways of knowing before and after language.

After understanding that movement improvisation can operate in the realm of verbal and non-verbal knowledge, I would like to discuss how a rather self-centered practice of movement improvisation could work as a practice to study more-than-human sustainable futures. As I stated earlier, my aim is to offer perspectives to decenter humans from the sustainability discourse. In movement improvisation, this raises a question about the concepts of "self" and "I" and their "place" in the practice. One possible way to approach this is through agendas leading the improviser toward or away from specific actions and choices (De Spain 2014, pp.35). The agendas are how decisions and actions of movement improvisation are directed toward the purposes of the movement. For example, if a goal is to improvise and get to know another dancer, it is unlikely that the dancers will spend time in the corners of space without interacting at all (De Spain 2014, 35). Similarly, the focus of the improvisation can

be directed to a non-human-centric perspective. Suppose the agenda is directed to the space and outside of the concepts of "self" and "I". In that case, the decisions and choices can be made from the perspective of what the space needs, makes possible, or proposes (da Silva, 2022). In addition, an essential factor of postmodern movement improvisation is not how "I" feel but how my choices affect the space and others in the space (Duck, 2022). For example, as a breakdancer, I would approach the space to create my movements based on my personal feelings, not how my movement affects the space or others. In addition, breakdance holds on to the idea that if I invent a move or certain combination, it belongs to me, and I own it.

Compared to post-modern movement improvisation practice, the movements focus more on a somatic sense of perception than visual shape (Albright 2019). In addition, Duck (2022) states that, theoretically, as a practitioner, my relationship with the space is based on awareness of the happenings in the space that create intuitive impulses. The happenings can be interpreted as openings which, I as practitioner, choose to actualize. Therefore, all the movements are already there; I am not creating new movements but actualizing the potential of what is there (Duck, 2022). From this viewpoint, movement improvisation can turn from a self-centered perspective to a broader systemic perspective to acknowledge more-than-human relationships in the space. The space is not for me

to conquer, own or impress others. It can be, but it is not necessarily the aim. There might be a time when others are supporting me and giving me a possibility to take the space, but it is happening because of others, not solely because of me. The matter is to open to perspective that me as a practitioner is changing space and the space is changing me, and there can be multiple narratives and aims in the space simultaneously in constant change. To be intentional in the moment, both externally and internally, and be grounded by being aware of subjective feelings and what is happening in the space can allow movement improvisation from more-than-human viewpoint. The following chapter discusses the methodological perspective of researching and developing practical frames and conditions to speculate sustainable futures with movement improvisation.

## METHODOLOGY

### AFFECTIVE METHODOLOGY

Theoretically, affects are encounters between the affected body and the affecting body, independent of their subject (Deleuze and Guattari 1987). In proposing that, affect philosophy allows reflection and analysis of what happens before the body becomes aware of sensations, feelings, and thoughts. Affect theorists such as Massumi, Thrift, Brennan, and Clough, consider affect as an outside stimulation, somehow hitting first the body and then reaching the cognitive apparatus (Knudsen & Stage 2015). Deleuze and Guattari (1987) suggest that affects operate between bodies (human and non-human) and desiring-machines actualize the potentialities between them. For Deleuze and Guattari (1977), the desiring-machine produces a flow of desire from itself. Desire being the productive force of reality, which is not based on lack, they argue that human and non-human bodies are formations of multiple desiring-machines. For example, I have desiring-machines in my physical and non-physical bodies. Therefore, for example, I do not create movement in movement improvisation because something is a lack of something. I produce it because an opening can be actualized based on the collision of desiring-machines and the networks of affects in the space. Based on this approach, it becomes relevant to explore ecologies of movements

in which movements are not pre-determined by a subject-object, knower-known structure of experience but are instead directed towards more than the individual body of the human subject. To be open to networks of affects of more than human entities beyond bodily-centered perceptions (for example, qualities of atmosphere or patterns of relations) may hold keys to investigating alternative non-human-centric futures. This approach may provide alternative modes of being with the surrounding environment.

As I stated earlier, movement improvisation has the potential to operate in verbal and non-verbal areas of knowledge. Methodologically, conditions and frames of movement improvisation are aimed to create space and openings to inquire and experiment and produce information to understand and further societal change toward sustainability. Speculations of better futures often occur in irregular intervals, are unpredictable, and are difficult to verbalize (Porkola & Salmenniemi 2021). In addition, language cannot fully capture affect or the unknown (da Silva, 2017). Affective methodologies by Knudsen & Stage (2015) created strategies for engaging with affective processes in academic research. For me, the biggest challenge is academically researching affective processes since they operate beyond language, body, and mind representations. To meet this challenge, affective methodologies have two distinctive perspectives. The difference in the perspectives is centralized in the

relationship with language. Firstly, from the perspective that affects are outside simulations, language can be considered capable of expressing affects, as there is no inherent contradiction between the categories of language and the categories taking part in the social shaping of bodies. Hence, they become emotionally sensitive to certain stimulations (Knudsen & Stage 2015). The second perspective considers that affects are beyond language categorization, and analytical strategies must concentrate on semantics and semiotics (Knudsen & Stage 2015). Based on the Deleuze & Guattari perspective above, and because movement improvisation is a rather subjective process, I believe there are differences in how each subject operates. Therefore, I do not find it necessary to make a separation on how one becomes aware of the affective processes. As I explained above when showing the limitation of sustainability discourse, in this research, the way movement improvisation operates in verbal and non-verbal realms of knowledge does not have a significant impact if the affects are predominantly worked with language, semantics, or semiotics. Either way, in this research, the body is seen as part of a more extensive systemic network of affects in constant interaction and change.

As a method to research emergent material through affects, I used Knudsen & Stage's (2015) five analytical strategies for tracing the presence of affective forces. I focused on the following perspectives:

- formal or stylistic characteristics of communication in affect (e.g. outburst, broken language, hyperbole, redundancy)
- building of assemblages (for example, texts, actions, images, bodies, and technologies)
- non-verbal language and gestures of affected bodies
- communicative content about experienced or attributed affect (for example, by informants, the researcher him-/herself, or in existing texts)
- the rhythmic intensification, entrainment, or destabilization of affective energy in relation to specific spaces and (online) sites. (Knudsen & Stage 2015)

In my studio practice, I moved with different scores, conditions, and frames based on the emergent ideas on the introduced strategies. Because of the nature and aim of my research, I entered the studio often without predetermined plans. I trusted that the research is “living” around, between, within, and without my active control and planning. Allowing topics, thoughts, and practices to appear in space without me deciding beforehand gave the research an open and evolving

perspective. That has allowed me as a researcher to engage with the affective strategies, document the emergent themes, and reflect on them concerning the research topic. Reflection of the material and documentation allowed me to find ways for different tryouts and findings. Cross-disciplinary literature review and the analysis of the affects allowed me to relate and connect the more subjective material with a larger research perspective. In addition to the studio practice writing, elective module assignments such as Schizzosomatics allowed me to develop my theoretical thinking and practical understanding of the research. For example, I am thinking with and through the movement and researching specific theoretical topics such as similarities with Futures Studies and movement improvisation. Moving with thoughts and questions enabled thinking about the issue through the movement. To think of such complex topics can become exhausting, confusing, and tiring to the mind. Letting go from actively trying to think or solve the problems and staying with the question and moving with them helped ideas and clarified thoughts appear—for example, a perspective to separate sustainability and human affections because of such practice.

## FINDINGS

### THE MULTIDISCIPLINARY INTERSECTION

In this chapter, I will discuss the research findings through the process of creating and performing the final performance, *It Is Not Going To Be Perfect*, in ArtEZ Theatrium on the 18th of May 2022<sup>2</sup>. The chapter will include theoretical and practical findings on movement improvisation and speculation of sustainable futures. I divided this section into two parts. Roughly speaking, from February 2022 to mid-April 2022, I practiced and found theoretical and practical connections with movement improvisation and speculation of sustainable futures. For this time, I was trying out, documenting, and reflecting on them. In other words, I was expanding my research. After mid-April, I had a switch in focus toward bringing thoughts, reflections, and findings together. I decided that the research was broad enough, and I began to look more carefully into the collected material. I also focused on the final performance in mid-May 2022. In a way, the material from the first period was squeezed into the final performance. In this chapter, I will first discuss the part of the expansion and then the narrowing down part.

<sup>2</sup> See Appendix A for the video documentation of the performance

## EXPANDING, EXPLORING, AND FINDING CONNECTIONS BETWEEN THEORY AND PRACTICE

As I discussed earlier in the literature review, my theoretical approach to sustainable futures and movement improvisation aims to offer viewpoints to decenter the human from the ecological systems. The approach aims to see humans influencing and being influenced by a more extensive systemic network of affective relationships. The relationships between human and non-human entities are formed through desire as a productive force and desiring-machines that actualize the affective potentialities. The actualized potentials create openings for sensations, emotions, thoughts, and actions on a human level. Based on this theoretical frame, concrete actions that become concrete in sustainability and movement improvisation are not based on our ideas, feelings, or sensations. They are more than human; they do not start from us; they are around us in endless different forms. Mirroring the theoretical perspective of the practice, the movement improvisation conditions and frames must support a similar shift in perception to be open to the space and internally aware of personal sensations, emotions, and impulses. Therefore, I am framing the movement improvisation practice from that foundational perspective.

As I introduced in the chapter about movement improvisation, theoretically, practicing movement improvisation beyond the concepts of "self" and "I" has to do with the perspectives

and relationships taken with it. The movement improvisation practice and theory came together in Katie Duck's multidisciplinary workshops on 27.3.2022 and 29.5.2022 in her attic studio in Amsterdam. Based on Duck's philosophical perspective, movement improvisation could happen based on openings coming from outside one's body and mind. Practically, movement improvisation is centered on constant choosing (Duck, 2022). Based on my experiences in Katie's workshop, this means continually and purposefully choosing in the moment, being present and decisive in every moment, and making actions meaningful in the space concerning the fellow human and nonhuman participants. Choosing and being open to space allows impulses and decisions of movement improvisation to happen outside of "self" and "I." I choose to exit and leave behind the decisions I was making before. I am not stopping; I am choosing to enter and exit based on the openings in the space and my intuition. It is not taking everything in like a sponge but being aware, considering, acting, and listening (Middelow, 2019). As a partaker, I am not moving only or primarily based on my personal feelings and impulses. I am aware of my subjective impulses, but I choose to act on them or not. In this way, I can have the possibility for decisions and choices to go with, against, in between, within, and without the emergent openings in the space.

From the bodily perspective learned from Katie's practice,

movement improvisation has two main aspects framing the practice. Katie's movement practice is inspired by how babies and infants learn to move. Based on Katie, no one teaches babies or infants how to move their arms, turn, or walk. They explore and learn from the body, and babies do not have to filter what is right or wrong. They are decisive and determined with a clear focus on what they are doing. Similarly, Katie encourages childlike curiosity as an approach to the space. To fully commit to exploring the space beyond cultural and social codes, names, and definitions. For example, a chair in the space is not just a chair; it is an entity that can be multiple things beyond its cultural and social definitions.

On top of that, to be mindful of the intensity, time, proximity, spatial orientations, and directions of the actions can direct the decision of the partakers and create a spatial awareness in addition to childlike curiosity. For example, being aware of my back makes me aware of my body more holistically. When moving forward, Katie proposes to have attention on the back and vice versa. In this way, bodily awareness and spatial orientation increase. In addition, I learned to explore different ways of looking with my gaze, directing my visual focus and attention. I can see the space through my peripheral vision or cone my sight to specific details or in space in general. Being active with my gaze allows me to change attention and be aware of what I am looking at and seeing. I have noticed that, without being active with my vision, I tend to focus only on

my introspective journey. If I keep my eyes closed, I actively try to look through my eyelashes to maintain the openness to the space.

From an emotional perspective, I feel that in practicing movement improvisation, a certain amount of embarrassment or hesitation must be dealt with personally. Trust that the space and the people can accept the childlike curiosity and be open to giving space, taking space, being in conflict, being confused, and not being in control. From my perspective, I have noticed hesitation and shyness because of being worried about ruining someone's moment, going too much against, or taking too much space from others. However, when improvising, there can be no regrets, no going over, retouching, or reshaping (Midgelow, 2019). To see and be with what emerges and commit to that. Not only committing to subjective impulses and feelings but being aware and seeing what the space offers and proposes and choosing to go with that with full intention. Losing the hesitation and embarrassment also offer possibilities to be changed and change the space with the actions.

*"When you affect something, you are opening yourself up to being affected in turn, and in a slightly different way than you might have been the moment before. You have stepped over a threshold. Affect is this passing of a threshold, seen from the point of view of the change in capacity (Massumi 2015, 103)."*

As the quote indicates, being influenced constantly changes the human and non-human bodies taking part in movement

improvisation. This same perspective also allows proposals to mutate and turn into something else that was not intentional. For example, if one chooses to actualize something in the space, someone else might have a different intention simultaneously. In that short moment, one must decide how to be influenced by the other proposal and possibly mutate. In such a situation, something else is created which was not intended. These situations are also at the core of speculation about sustainable futures. Sudden changes to the intended future, being aware of new alternatives, and being ready to mutate with alternative proposals are possible ways to let go of predetermined ideas and visions. This also resonates with the sustainability perspective I was proposing, as in not to be self-centered by pushing and dominating with own intentions but seeing what is necessary and what the environment is proposing and acting and being able to react and mutate based on that.

On the other hand, such practice asks for embracing and seeing the mistakes or not intended happenings as openings (Middelow, 2019). Things most likely are not going as planned, and therefore, the blurring of process and realization inevitably leads to the irreversibility of improvisation. Irreversibility leads to feelings of risk and questions of failure. In the normative sustainability discourse, something does not go as planned. I argue that failure depends on value systems. In improvisation, failure is not about mistakes but the inability

to commit to decisions despite the personal feeling of the failure or mistake, which might cause hesitations and direct attention to personal feelings only. Hesitation can be a performative mode but being hesitant to be open about what is happening is different. On the other hand, being hesitant and fearing failure is very humane, especially when exploring something that is unfamiliar. Therefore, I am not saying there is only one mode of doing and being in movement improvisation. I propose that a relationship with the space can open us to reflect and see tendencies and learn from being open to explore the space beyond its definitions.

Therefore, the choices one makes matter, and they will modify the space; ideally, participants will be responsible for them. Movement improvisation can create a playground for trying, seeing, and speculating different alternatives. Suppose the space is safe for childlike curiosity to see actualizations of different potentialities. In that case, there is a chance for speculating and imagining what the future might be based on the relationships we decide to take with the space and the other people. I believe it takes much practice to trust the space and others. Furthermore, it is interesting that space, people, and objects are never the same. These elements are constantly changing and are always different (da Silva, 2017). As also the process of desire, it cannot be captured, it is emergent and operates without predetermined goals or needs, and it does not have an object or fixed subject

(Buchanan 1997). Therefore, being open and not expecting something specific or what was there are also essential aspects to consider. When things are never the same, it requires attunement and openness from the practitioners to be curious about the moment and see and feel what there is. In this way, movement improvisation has potential for speculation because the conditions cannot be completely standardized and captured.

### **PERFORMANCE - PUTTING PRACTICE TO PRACTICE**

Based on the affective material I was documenting and reflecting on, I noticed that the emergent material was related to the emotions and sensations of what sustainability means and what it requires from humans. For example, the uncomfortable feelings and emotions about movement improvisation practice enabled me to dive deeper into different aspects of change. Based on my experiences, to use affective signs created a direction to analyze and verbalize topics such as ownership, control, and management of sustainability. Fear of letting go of ownership and control became an essential aspect of the research and allowed me to connect characteristics of movement improvisation practice and sustainable futures. On a human level, changing the perception to non-human-centric requires surrendering and accepting what emerges from the environment. It invites humans to be with the unknowing and open to deal with what becomes necessary, evident, and meaningful in our

relationship with the surrounding environment. Coping with such openness can be scary because one might be afraid of not knowing what will happen next on an emotional level. From this perspective, change became an essential factor in my performance. Theoretically, I propose that sustainability and human affects are separate things as discussed earlier. I noticed that change is a different process from sustainability and more sustainable futures. We can have pathways, facts, and dreams about more sustainable futures, but societally, we should also be able to acknowledge that changing is a complex process. In this way, my performance also started to speak back to my theoretical frames and allowed me to clarify the perspective for the performance. It is rather difficult to discuss how change is embodied and what kind of human emotions, sensations, and perspectives are related to it in a research paper that would be felt and shared on a non-verbal level. For example, figure 1 below is from one of my studio practices where I used an exercise from the Designing Body of Research module held by Joao da Silva in Sept-Oct 2021. I applied the exercise to move, document, and reflect on sustainability from different viewpoints as discussed earlier in this paragraph.

Sustainability is...

Sticky swamp that you cannot get out

It is not only fun

it is also a prison  
it is just another prison

Like a xalber

Hope

Cynical

Better is never fully free  
struggle

Difficult

it's like cooking, you put something in and you cannot take it at any more

Scary

bully like in school  
ways to deal with them  
can front

Dialogue but not -> can have different opinions

Different

and difference

Conditions

and constraints

ignorance

Stomach flu

salt legs

Sustainability is...

Sustainability is conditioned by...

Sustainability is willing to...

Sustainability is received by people as...

Sustainability demands...

Sustainability feels like...

|||||

|||||

sad funny part went already

Should not be that hard

Artistic practice is...

Body is conditioned...

Body is willing to...

Body is received by audience as...

Body demands...

Body feels like...

eats you alive

it's like a fairy wheel in dark and half of the lights are broken

Ghost train that is not scary but just pathetic

not my problem

How much do you eat and what

People in China or India

People with power should do something

DON'T TOUCH ON MY PENSION

We can suck the CO2 from air

OR MY SUMMER

Figure 1 notes from studio practice. Affection and affirmation in relation to sustainability.

I created the performance based on an overall concept - frame, texts, and bodies. My initial intention was to create a frame for the performance with a projection of videos, visuals, text, and sound. The frame allowed me to create an overall container and dramaturgy for the performance, in which different texts and bodies appear. The frame was built in two sections representing the present and the speculations of the sustainable futures. The texts and the bodies were the results of the documentation and reflection of the emergent content based on working with the affective methodology. The projection included scientific facts about climate change based on the IPCC 2022 report. The purpose of the material was to give larger context and perspectives to the otherwise rather personal content in texts and bodies. Based on the research findings, sustainability, affects and affirmations are separate things, and when dealing with the changes concerning sustainability, it is essential to understand the separation. Therefore, the projection was built around Deleuzian's quote, "There is no such thing as man or nature now." With the quote, I wanted to highlight the non-human perspective of sustainability and the forces of desire around us. The childlike and humiliating dragon costume "from the future" was a perspective to accept the emotions that change is causing in humans. Similar to the movement improvisation practice -to be open to and aware of subjective emotions and feelings but mindful of how to act based on the surrounding environment.

On the stage, the improvisation was framed with the characters. The characters were considered concepts about the research topic. Each character emerged from the affective material and described how they relate to change and their general opinions. The characters offered me space for improvisation and exploration in the rehearsals and on the stage. In the end, the frames for the movement improvisation were rather tight. According to de Spain (2014), learning and finding ways to frame the improvisation in the performance context is a learning process. I noticed that the tighter frames gave me more safety and confidence in my choices on the stage. De Spain (2014) also discusses tracking, meaning that experiential knowledge start to accumulate when spending longer time with certain improvisation frames. The last two weeks before the performance allowed me to run through the performance and accumulate experiences and material. If the process had continued longer, I believe I could have let go of some texts. I was leaning on the texts about body movements and bodies. When I rehearsed the performance, the underlying material became relatively stable foundations. I could have let go of the more cognitive parts and opened the performance more for the movement improvisation.

The feedback session with the cohort raised a perspective of my performance having many endings. I was reducing the ambiguity in the ending by shortening the empty moments when the audience could believe that this was

now the end of the performance. However, I was ending the different narratives of the performance in parts. Each of the perspectives held an image of alternative preferable futures. For example, the part withstanding in front of the audience and the approaching was one of the endings to having the courage to meet and connect with people compassionately. The video from the future by the dragon had an intention to remind us that the future is there and there are possibilities for futures with well-being. The ending with the megaphone brought the performance back to the present moment and proposed where to focus to cope with the changing climate.

Based on my discussions with Katie concerning my final performance, I had a dilemma of bringing myself and my personality to the front. In Futures Studies, the aim is to be as objective as possible. Therefore, I found it challenging at first to step in front and say what I think. In addition, I have experienced that humans are sometimes diminished or belittled in posthuman artworks, as the works are meant or tend to be non-representational. For example, how Yvonne Rainier's No Manifesto (1965) can be interpreted from the present moment as a manifesto for posthuman art, in which the representation is stripped down to a minimum. As the manifesto states:

No to spectacle.  
 No to virtuosity.  
 No to transformations and magic and make-believe.  
 No to the glamour and transcendency of the star image.  
 No to the heroic.  
 No to the anti-heroic.  
 No to trash imagery.  
 No to involvement of performer or spectator.  
 No to style.  
 No to camp.  
 No to seduction of spectator by the wiles of the performer.  
 No to eccentricity.  
 No to moving or being moved.

I believe the reasons were different for Rainer at that time, and the manifesto translates differently currently. To highlight the point of this research, I don't think being only non-representational is meaningful because it creates an either-or situation which I wanted to avoid in this research. I understand the attempt to avoid human-centrism and see non-representationalism as a starting point to create openings for something new outside our linguistic, cultural, or societal structures. However, I approached being representational in my performance because I wanted to expose and juxtapose the current discourse around sustainability. Humans should

not be the center of the system, but human is still part of it. Therefore, also humane things such as emotions and sensations are. This approach might have a pitfall of becoming too normative and supporting and reproducing the current unsustainable structures. However, I intended to share the representational material from the perspective of exposing societal phenomena about sustainability. In addition, my intention was not to take a lecturer position or lift myself above others as I know better. I argue that the paradigm shift towards being more sustainable would be more possible if we also consider the humane aspects of changing when creating more sustainable futures. That being said, how humans deal with change is one embodied aspect of sustainability that is, based on my current understanding, not widely discussed and/or addressed in the sustainability discourse. Therefore, I wanted my performance to have rather emotional content. However, ethically, it is a thin line if the emotions are poured or shared with the audience. Interestingly De Spain (2014) also discusses emotions in movement improvisation, and he states that emotions are fine but with some distance. My approach is that I must be personally fine with the things I am performing. The performance is not, and should not be, therapy for me. If I start to tear myself inside out in the performance context, I believe that is not responsible for me or the audience.

Continuing with the perspective of non-representationalism, it also creates a perspective on the relationship with the public. Being non-representational can create a blurry or unclear relationship between the public and the performer. Again, it can be intentional, and the public can create meanings and associations. For example, in the performance, *Weak Dance Strong Questions* (2001), Jonathan Burrows and Jan Ritsema perform an improvised dance performance in which they aim to avoid all negotiations with themselves and the audience. Interestingly, during the 50-minute performance, patterns appear even though the performers try to escape them. Therefore, the performance suggests that it is impossible to escape or remove cognition from the equation (Cvejic, 2017). An alternative approach could be that in performance, there is a certain agreement, commitment, or responsibility of the performer to decide or be aware of the relationship with the public. I am not saying that it always must be clear and self-evident. In terms of movement improvisation as part of a performance, this becomes a question of framing and being clear with the frames for the improvisation. I also wanted to be representational with the relationship with the public because of the urgency of sustainability in general. A non-representational way of performing can create multiple meanings and associations depending on the individual. However, I believe that sharing some of the humane aspects

of change can create sympathy and the feeling that we also have many similarities, and seeing familiarities at this humane level is also an essential aspect to discuss. In that way, to decenter humans from the ecosystem does not mean that humans are completely removed from the picture. Human is still part of the ecosystem, and so are humane things such as emotions.

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

### IT IS NOT GOING TO BE PERFECT

One connective perspective to all the disciplines in this research is both/and logic. Based on van der Tuin and Verhoeff (2022, 35-36), both/and logic includes three things. First, the aim is to remove the exclusionary binary logic of either/or. Both/and logic is additive, and it promotes inclusivity. Secondly, both/and logic step away from dividing subject-object and seeing subject and object through double dynamic affecting each other. Thirdly, both/and logic operate more to addition, not linear accumulation, of human and/or non-human entities reflect, refract, or diffract one another, transforming and becoming with each other. In the question of sustainability and movement improvisation, based on this research, I conclude that both/and logic is one of the foundations for speculating sustainable futures with movement improvisation. Both fields require awareness of the surrounding environment and attune to what the environment offers. In both cases, the future unfolds without one knowing precisely what will happen next. There can be predictions, images, ideas, and feelings, but everything realizes in the moment. There are many futures, and they are not either-or; they can be many simultaneously, in the present and future. Both fields ask for letting go of control and management, and I argue that approaching sustainability through both/and logic changes its perception to be a constantly changing

entity that cannot be captured. It is in flux, as are the futures and the happenings in movement improvisation. This does not mean we should let go of action plans and pathways. Like in movement improvisation, it is not either mind or body, inside or outside. It is both and all of them at the same time. However, both/and logic, as in movement improvisation, plans can change and mutate in the moment based on the changes in the environment. In this moment, it would be crucial to let go of predetermined plans and openly see and act based on the environment's needs. Not based on selfish needs, privileges, or assumptions. Sustainability is not only human or nature, it is both/and in multiple different ways. In such a way, there are connections, similarities, and overlaps between, within, and without these fields. They all approach complexity uniquely, and there are ways to combine them.

An issue in the research appeared, especially with limitations of language. Movement improvisation has structured terms and language use regarding movement and movement performances. Furthermore, Futures Studies and sustainability have their terminology and use of language. In this research, I was trying to find terms and concepts that refer to similar topics from the perspective of language. For example, word composition could translate into performance language for scenarios in Futures Studies. Both are constructions of happenings in their language. In addition, in dance, sustainability can refer to the sustainability of the movements

and bodies of the performance. Still, sustainability science can refer to social, environmental, or economic sustainability. When taking the aspect of verbal and non-verbal communication and knowledge, I noticed many times during the research that I am becoming lost in the language. For example, how to talk and communicate these issues to others in an understandable manner? I am sure there are still many areas to cover and create new language and understanding about the intersections of these fields. However, I believe that in this research, I was able to find a starting point in commonalities and overlaps in the intersection of these three disciplines.

Another limitation of this research is that I did not explore different spaces for the movement improvisation practice. Ideally, I would have wanted to try practices in various spaces, from studios to public spaces and in nature. Also, performing outside of the theatre space. In addition, and importantly, I believe that futures speculation is co-creation. The fact that I conducted research and the performance alone did not allow me to add additional perspectives to the futures speculations.

For the future of the research, I would like to gain experience and experiment with different affective and non-representational methods. Now my performance was rather a representation because of the dynamics of the methodology (how and why?) and going "deeper" into the nonverbal realm

of knowledge. Language and text were like safety ports to not get lost. Developing the material further, I noticed that I could let go of some texts and be more non-representational. Now I was balancing verbal and non-verbal knowledge, but I would like to expand and play with the balance between representational and non-representational. In addition, there is also a lot to explore within the field of movement improvisation. I was surprised by how difficult it is to theorize and discuss movement improvisation because the process is very subjective and abstract. I hope this research acts as a starting point for me and others interested in developing performance practices with a multidisciplinary perspective. In my future research, I would like to look at the topic from another direction and examine how futures studies and sustainability discourse can influence performance making.

However, for now, I conclude this research that sustainable futures will not be perfect. As in movement improvisation, we are always limited in one way or another. For example, we are fundamentally limited by our bodies and spaces. Similarly, in Futures Studies, there is no perfect future; there are always some limitations. However, it does not mean we should not dream and aim for better futures and complete freedom in movement improvisation. Not because we must develop ourselves into better persons, but because dreaming of something better gives us directions, helps us make decisions, and gives us reasons to fight for better futures. Posthuman

movement improvisation practice can expand embodied knowledge and understanding of sustainable futures from a more-than-human perspective, and what also Groves (2019) was calling for, operate as a practice to embody sustainability through care and justice towards human and non-human entities now and in the future.

## REFERENCES

- Adam, B. and Groves, C. (2007) *Future matters: Action, knowledge, ethics*. Brill Academic. DOI: 10.1163/ej.9789004161771.i-218.
- Albright, A. C. (2019) *How to land: Finding ground in an unstable world*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Arlander, A. (2021) "Calling for Zoe as a Utopian gesture," *RUUKKU - Studies in Artistic Research*, (17). doi: 10.22501/ruu.1112890.
- Bell, W. (1996) *Foundations of futures studies: History, purposes, knowledge: Human science for a New Era*. Somerset, NJ: Transaction.
- Brundtland, G. H. (1987) "Our common future—call for action," *Environmental conservation*, 14(4), pp. 291-294. DOI: 10.1017/s0376892900016805.
- Burrows, J. and Ritsema, J. (2001) *Weak Dance Strong Questions*. Available at: <https://vimeo.com/showcase/6691019/video/383037271>.
- Candy, S. and Kornet, K. (2019) "Turning Foresight Inside Out: An Introduction to Ethnographic Experiential Futures," *Journal of futures*, 23(3), pp. 3-22.
- Cooper, D. (2014) *Everyday utopias: The conceptual life of promising spaces*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- daSilva, J. (2022) *Elective Module: [Lecture]*. Schizosomatics. ArtEZ Hoogeschool, Jan-Feb 2022.
- daSilva, J. (2017) *Reflections on improvisation, choreography and risk-taking in advanced capitalism*. Helsinki: University of the Arts Helsinki, Theatre Academy.
- De Spain, K. (2014) *Landscape of the now: A topography of movement improvisation*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1977) *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Viking Books.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1987) *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. 2nd ed. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Buchanan, I. (1997). *The Problem of the Body in Deleuze and Guattari, Or, What Can a Body Do?* *IN: Body Society* 1997; 3; 73 DOI: 10.1177/1357034X97003003004
- Burrows, J. and Ritsema, J. (2001) *Weak Dance Strong Questions*. Vimeo. Available at: <https://vimeo.com/383037271> (Accessed: March 19, 2022).
- Duck, K. (2022) *Multidisciplinary workshop: [Lecture]*. Improvisation workshop for musicians, actors, dancers, singers and poets. Katie Duck's Attic studio, Amsterdam. March 27, May 29th.
- Gil, D. N. (2019) *A Study on the 'Intervals of Perception' and the 'Architectures of Experience': towards Schizosomatics*. Concordia University.
- Groves, C. (2019) "Sustainability and the future: reflections on the ethical and political significance of sustainability," *Sustainability science*, 14(4), pp. 915-924. DOI: 10.1007/s11625-019-00700-0.
- Hydromax Open Show (2022). [Exhibition]. Foreland Studios, Arnhem. 3 June 2022.
- IPCC, 2022: Summary for Policymakers [H.-O. Pörtner, D.C. Roberts, E.S. Poloczanska, K. Mintenbeck, M. Tignor, A. Alegría, M. Craig, S. Langsdorf, S. Löschke, V. Möller, A. Okem (eds.)]. In: *Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [H.-O. Pörtner, D.C. Roberts, M. Tignor, E.S. Poloczanska, K. Mintenbeck, A. Alegría, M. Craig, S. Langsdorf, S. Löschke, V. Möller, A. Okem, B. Rama (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press. In Press.
- Knudsen, B. T. and Stage, C. (2015) "Introduction: Affective Methodologies," in *Affective Methodologies*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, pp. 1-22.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1970) *The structure of scientific revolutions*. 2nd ed. Books on Demand.
- Lakkala, K. (2020) *Disruptive utopianism: Opening the present*. In Eskelinen, Teppo (ed.) *The Revival of Political Imagination: Utopia as Methodology*. London: Zed Books, 20-36.
- Massumi, B. (2015). *The power at the end of the economy*. Duke University Press.
- Meadows, D. H. et al. (1972) *The limits to growth: A report for the club of Rome's project on the predicament of mankind*. Universe Books.
- Midgelow, V. L. (2019) "Introduction: Improvising Dance: A Way of Going about Things," in Midgelow, V. L. (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Improvisation in Dance*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, pp. 1-22.
- Polak, F. L. (1973) *Image of the Future*. London, England: Elsevier Science.
- Porkola, P. and Salmenniemi, S. (2021) *Edition 17: EVERYDAY UTOPIAS - Everyday utopias and artistic research*, Ruukku: *Studies in Artistic Research*. Available at: <http://ruukku-journal.fi/fi/issues/17/editorial> (Accessed: June 10, 2022).
- Rainer, Y. (1965) *No manifesto*, 1000Manifestos.com. Available at: <https://1000manifestos.com/yvonne-rainer-no-manifesto/> (Accessed: June 1, 2022).
- Rubin, A. (2013) "Hidden, inconsistent, and influential: Images of the future in changing times," *Futures*, 45, pp. S38-S44. DOI: 10.1016/j.futures.2012.11.011.
- Scoones, I. (2016) "The politics of sustainability and development," *Annual review of environment and resources*, 41(1), pp. 293-319. DOI: 10.1146/annurev-environ-110615-090039.
- Slaughter, R. A. (2018) "Two fine additions to the futures literature," *foresight*, 20(4), pp. 443-446. DOI: 10.1108/fs-08-2018-098.
- Spatz, B. (2015) *What a Body Can Do*. London, England: Routledge.
- Spatz, B. (2017) "Embodiment as first affordance: Tinkering, tuning, tracking," *Performance philosophy*, 2(2), p. 257. DOI: 10.21476/pp.2017.2261.
- UNESCO, 2015. *Sustainable Development [WWW Document]*. UNESCO. URL <https://en.unesco.org/themes/education-sustainable-development/what-is-esd/sd> (accessed 11.6.21).
- United Nations (2018) *Take action for the sustainable development goals*, United Nations Sustainable Development. United Nations: Sustainable Development Goals. Available at: <https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/sustainable-development-goals/> (Accessed: April 21, 2022).
- Van der Tuin, I. and Verhoeff, N. (2022) *Critical concepts for the creative humanities*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Volcovici, V., Abnett, K. and James, W. (2021) "U.N. climate agreement clinched after late drama over coal," *Reuters*, 14 November. Available at: <https://www.reuters.com/business/cop/un-climate-negotiators-go-into-overtime-save-15-celsius-goal-2021-11-13/> (Accessed: January 21, 2022).
- Watkins, P. and Caines, R. (2014) "Cyphers: Hip-Hop and Improvisation," *Critical studies in improvisation*, 10(1). doi: 10.21083/csieci.v10i1.3518.

## APPENDIX A

Link to the performance: <https://youtu.be/v5kf4bRYaco>



CHOREO  
PERF  
THEATRE PRACT  
DEDISCIPLINED BO  
DIGITAL PERF  
CH  
PERFORMANCE A  
TH  
DEDIS  
CH  
PERFORMA  
THEATRE  
DEDISCIPLINED BO  
DIGITAL PERFORMANC  
CHOREOG

2022

PERFORMANCEPRACTICES.NL  
FB / INSTA: HOMEOPPERFORMANCEPRACTICES