

Students’ reflections from the Conference

In conjunction of the Landmark Conference a Training School, supported by the COST Action IS1007 was organized. Altogether 24 PhD students from 12 countries presented a paper in a parallel research paper sessions, some of them also acted as co-organisers and co-chairs of the sessions.

Furthermore, there were 11 Master students from the University of Jyväskylä assisting in the conference at the info desk and in the parallel sessions. These students were attending to the second international transdisciplinary course “Cultural Sustainability”, arranged and coordinated by the Master’s Degree Programme in Cultural Policy, University of Jyväskylä.

All of the students were asked to write a short report about their observations from the conference focusing on the key messages of the session they attended and reflect how the topic of the conference was discussed by the presentations.

Their reports have been compiled in this publication with the consent of the authors.



Students’ reflections from the Conference

Throughout the three-day conference, participants were immersed in a rich and broad debate that dealt with complex and often contested concepts such as culture, sustainability, imagination, heritage, landscape, art, design, values, aesthetics, community, the collective, landscape, transition, justice, context, change and so on. In many cases, these concepts were linked, overlapping, used interchangeably or interpreted differently. However, what’s even more so, is that all these concepts – that produced a very far-reaching debate - were eventually brought back to the core question of the conference: What is the role of culture in sustainability? While no one would waive the role culture has to play in our sustainable futures, what still remained partly unanswered is how we are going to achieve a greater awareness and more consistent adoption of culture in sustainable development in all fields and at all scales. One thing the majority of the key note speakers and presenters during the sessions implicitly or explicitly did agree upon, is the crucial aspect of involving people in achieving true sustainable futures. The approaches of e.g. multi-actor governance, civic engagement and public participation all send us the underlying message that the core of the work will be to teach ourselves and others to look at sustainable development through another lens, i.e. to take into account that sustainability is a process and not an end point, that sustainability means different things to different people, that

sustainability will remain a contested concept and that its power and outcome will reside in the richness and braveness of our imagination. We will have to get out of our comfort zone and dare to go on in a different direction.

The session of local movements precisely dealt with explaining how, why and in what circumstances people in a local context organize themselves and take action by experimenting and breaking boundaries. The cases discussed in the session were diverse. From local urban agriculture movements, no food waste cooking and gardening movements to local power movements, local water management movements and movements that steer away from the traditional approach towards public space conservation. While very different in content and composition, all these movements have in common that – based on a growing awareness and consensus - change in the local environment is pursued. At the same time, these local movements have no manual or script for how to achieve that change. It is about doing something that has not been done before. The presentations showed that local movements in sustainability take on the role of the pioneer, through trial and error, through confrontation and contestation. The thread or key message of the different presentations was that local action and empowerment is key in spurring and achieving real change. In other words, policy alone is not enough to achieve sustainable development. Governments have to take into account and recognize the role and potential of local sustainability movements.

However, many barriers and complexities were highlighted when it comes to realizing the potential of local movements in sustainable development. Different visions, governance inertia, lack of policies or power relations are

few examples that pointed out this complexity. Interestingly, it was stressed in the sessions that local movements play a strong awareness-raising role among civil society, in politicizing environmental issues that otherwise remain ineffable and underexposed. However, the question remains how, overall these movements that are advocating for a specific cause, could learn from each other and enforce each other. What, if we could combine their efforts, could be the overall societal impact of people organizing themselves into local movement on a more global sustainable development?

Charlotte Prové

Institute for Agriculture and Fisheries Research,
Belgium

I had a paper in the session *The transformative potential of cultural and artistic endeavours for sustainable rural futures*. There were six presentations on Wednesday in the session no 16.¹ The themes of these presentations were quite diverse: from using arts-based environmental education to female entrepreneurship on farms and from the phenomenon of precariat related to art workers in Ireland to handmade socks in Turkey and from art projects related to social enterprise to promoting communal lands communities in rural Spain. Participants also represented different fields of science: geography, economics, ethnology, design and arts.

The common characteristic with these six presentations was the micro level or local perspective to the issue of cultural sustainability. Many of the presentations also

included the theme of the challenges rural areas are facing today in general. I personally liked the presentation of Jan van Boeckel even though the name of the presentation made me wonder what would be the interpretations van Boeckel was about to discuss. However, the presentation dealt with environmental education in a very inspiring way and van Boeckel also put his dissertation (which was made in the Aalto University) to go round among the participants.

Question of the balance between the perspectives of micro and macro level in research related to cultural sustainability was raised in the concluding session by Nathalie Blanc. She urged for more research in the macro level and claimed that there was very little talk about the level of Europe in general in the conference. She also used her home country France as an example and mentioned that as far as micro level is handled, there is a positive attitude towards the aims of cultural sustainability but when one starts to handle the same issues e.g. on a national level, the attitude is not that positive anymore. If I understood correctly it seems that cultural sustainability on the micro level is considered as harmless promotion of well-being of local communities and their residents meanwhile broader levels bring forth more political aspects. However, as Blanc noted, sustainability is a process and therefore it is also inevitably a political issue. It cannot be reduced only to some minor micro level issues.

This in turn makes me think of another speaker in the concluding session, namely Oleg Koefoed. He made a very interesting and profound illustration of the contents of the conference by using artistic methods. I dare say Koefoed's performance included observations that many

of the conference participants could identify with. It presented very well how much energy goes to the (seemingly endless) challenge of confining the concept of cultural sustainability and we should proceed forward. According to Koefoed we should start to challenge ourselves (and the society), go beyond the safe settings and stop being polite. He also asked what about the long time perspective: the futures aspect and that related to both micro and macro level. However, it remained open what cultural sustainability is and therefore it remains also open how (and why) we should actually challenge ourselves.

I discussed with one session participant on Thursday and he asked where the aspect of futures is in the conference sessions and key notes. According to him there should have been at least one session with an anticipatory view to the theme of the conference. I agreed there was a point in his opinion. We talked that as the plural form of futures was mentioned in the very title of the conference it would have been appropriate to have a session where different scenarios of futures would have been discussed related to cultural sustainability. This kind of session need not necessarily be organized as a session with presentation of papers but it could be in the form of a participatory workshop with open discussion around some scenarios.

I was a newcomer in the field of cultural sustainability as I participated this conference. I knew some of the key note speakers from name and was familiar with some Finnish participants from other connections but that was all. It was, though, easy to be in the conference and discuss with other participants. The overall impression I got from all I experienced is that the cultural sustainability is not an easy concept to use. The conference started effectively with

Soini's and Dessein's presentation which included COST Action's suggestion of three possible ways to interpret the cultural sustainability notion. Almost three days with interesting presentations from very wide range of disciplines, research themes, and artistic perspectives, however, put the discussion almost in to the square one: what an earth cultural sustainability is all about. Is there anything that does not include into its realm from some perspective? It does not mean that the conference would not have been successful, on the contrary, but it reminds me that inter- and transdisciplinary endeavours are very challenging. The situation is similar at the practical and applied level like Nancy Duxbury's presentation in the session no 6 revealed very expressively how slow process it is to get cultural sustainability issues added into different official and policy text in national level.

On the grounds of the conference I would say that more important than to achieve an unambiguous understanding of the definition of the concept, is to see different disciplines go forward in researching the theme from various perspectives and having the willingness to come together to share the research findings despite of possible differences in the determination of the concept.

Katariina Heikkilä

University of Turku, Finland
Finland Futures Research Centre, Turku School
of Economics

Coming from an architectural background, I was particularly drawn to four different sessions that were more or less based on the theme of culture and its impact on the

landscape in both rural and urban contexts of which I found all relevant in their different approaches in addressing the theme of the conference. The fact that there was a rich Multidisciplinary composition in the topics discussed by the different sessions and also within the sessions itself created an ambience of rich discussions from different approaches and systematic thinking all unified by the common goal of finding transition systems on the role of culture as a key element that cannot be avoided in the discourse of Sustainable Futures.

In the session *Landscape as heritage: A central idea for the role of Culture in Sustainability* one of the key elements in this session was the idea of Autotopography which is the process of imprinting oneself on the landscape which is what different cultural groups do with layers of history on the landscape as a canvas. In this way the cultural landscape is a reflection of the stratification of different cultures on the landscape and the fact that humans are part and parcel of the landscape. The session presented 2 papers that approached the idea of landscape and public space as containers for cultural production of different social backgrounds. The session explored the idea of hybridity on the landscape with a specific case study in Rio de Janeiro where the role of guided and informed participatory approaches are a relevant key in addressing urban issues at a territorial scale. At a neighbourhood scale the way in which public space should be able to be adjustable and flexible so as to be able to host different needs of the cultural groups and also have adequate conscience of their role in catalyzing social intergration.

The second paper presented a project that brought to light the way in which potential labour in retired groups in Scotland is sustaining the local heritage using the 'Adopt a Monument scheme'. Although from completely different contexts, the two presenters both expressed the key role of people and culture in addressing different problems that different cities face in contemporary times.

Landscape as Heritage: A central idea for the role of culture in Sustainability was an interesting session that further elaborated what was discussed in the earlier sessions on the critical role of culture on the landscape, three papers were presented giving the case of the disappearing traditions of using water canals in the Veneto agricultural fields in Italy, the case of a misunderstanding of the landscape in South Africa that isolates the people from the landscape creating a divide between the natural and the artificial which eventually isolates the human aspect from their cultural perspective and rapport with nature. The third paper presented an ongoing research in Finland that explores the idea of identity in public spaces for different populations within the area which brought an interesting understanding of the role culture plays in perception of the basic ideas of space like functionality and aesthetics.

The role of participative perceptive maps in building and preserving sustainable cultures session was a very interesting one because it highlighted pragmatic methodologies of locating and mapping the quantitative and in some cases the qualitative aspects of the perception and experience of the cultural aspects of the diverse populations living within an area. The use of digital GIS and its limitations were discussed and brought to light. The mapping session was particularly relevant to

the theme of the conference as it clearly expressed pragmatic methods of research and the implementation of cultural knowledge in different contexts as four different studies from completely different contexts were presented, from Latin America, Kenya, Finland and a particularly interesting case study group of children who need a different approach.

Linking Cultural and Natural Issues: Cultural Ecosystem Services, Biocultural Diversity, Capabilities session turned out to be a very informative session, where the first presenter gave a very systematic presentation on how knowledge systems and their synergies can be used to link nature and culture using a Multi-Evidence Approach. This was followed by another interesting presentation that had a critical approach to the different discourses on landscape from the different knowledge fields like the ecologists, the sociologists, anthropologists and the phenomenology fields all with apparently different theoretical perceptions on how to approach the idea of landscape. This was a good beginning for a session that concluded with two case studies that were based on ethnographic aspects of the cultural landscapes of the Xhosa people in South Africa and another group in Afghanistan. The discussion was concluded with a recognition of the importance of different knowledge fields in the discourse of cultural systems making it an interdisciplinary issue that crosses across ecosystem services, ecological issues, social, economic and political systems.

Aber Kay Obwona
University of Florence, Italy

Session framing Culture(s) in Sustainable Development: Breaking the Boundaries, focused on the different theories of cultural sustainability as well as how it has been framed in the past and should be framed in the future. The presenters had various views on the topic, which emphasized that the definition of cultural sustainability is not universal. Through their use of theories and examples, it can be understood that the field is still evolving and the debate will continue regarding where culture belongs in sustainable development.

During the Wednesday sessions, one presenter, Tobias Luchte explained this model, a different model than those previously proposed, which shows where culture belongs in sustainable development. His model was a house, which showed culture as the foundation and therefore the most significant element. This model elicited several comments from the audience, suggesting again that there is no universally accepted model. His concept and the discussion that followed highlighted the different perspectives that exist in the field and one of the boundaries that needs to be broken, that of where culture belongs in sustainable development. Other presenters focused on the discourse of sustainable development and its relationship to religion, nationalism, and its connection. To preserve the cultural practices of place-based cultures, such as in Finland and the Alpine region. One theme that emerged from these presentations is the need for solutions to be created locally, instead of globally. One presenter even went as far as to point out that free trade agreements such as TTIP, CETA and TISA would be a threat to local solutions, as the "buy local" mantra would be seen as discriminatory. This comment points out how economic "solutions" can be challenges for culture. This notion, that of the

impact of economic decisions on culture, was the most interesting to me, as it shows the interconnectivity between the “pillars”. Even for those who focus on the cultural aspects of sustainable, ignoring the other pillars is impossible.

The explanations from the different presenters showed this, from the culture of small villages being threaten like in Finland And the Swiss Alps, To the presentation that touched on the concept of commons and how heritage is a resource for communities and needs to be managed. For many of them finding, solutions to the cultural issues, included solving many economic issues as well. There were a few presentations, such as the one on sustainable sciences and cultural sciences where I didn't understand the connection to the thematic stream or the conference in general. However, This suggests to me that there is much to be learned on the topic and while some concepts' connections are not immediately clear, their importance is no less relevant. The concept of sustainability reaches across all disciplines and there are bound to be topics, which are valuable, but more challenging to understand for those who lack knowledge of these disciplines. Furthermore, as the field is still relatively young, 25 years as one presenter pointed out, there is still much to be research and learned as the field continues to evolve.

Sandra Hipke
University of Jyväskylä, Finland

movie), popular culture phenomenon (social media) and immaterial (relation to place) and material culture (items like works of art) and the cases were from different countries thus different cultural contexts and views. Themes discussed culture from ethical point of view - values, thus I found the whole session very much of sustainable culture debate. Papers reflected contemporary culture thus the view was towards future; not looking or analyzing that much of history of human behavior and culture in our planet.

Next I write about the most interesting papers by presenting few interesting concepts from those presentations I found the most interesting. Environmental ethics and post humanist ethics (for example Johannesdottir & Thorgeirsdottir 2015): environmental ethics is a familiar concept or area to me but the post humanist ethics is still the area that I have not read. Thus for example this concept (paper) gave me a lot new views towards how I could myself in future problematize and analyze culture - to approach sustainability in culture. Post humanist ethics as a view to criticize and contemplate our (this time humans) relation to earth is certainly area I became interested in. In addition to Johannesdottir's & Thorgeirsdottir's paper the theme was introduced through arts and multisensory experiences. Embodied experiences - multisensory experiences (e.g. Järviluoma-Mäkelä et al. and Horlings). Values in place and a value-oriented approach toward sustainable places and continuing to identity building or effects (Bozетка 2015) was also one of the fruitful themes which was reflected in many papers. Territorial bonding (Battaglini 2015) for example was a very interesting and new concept to look human relationship towards one's own surroundings and to compare this concept (theory) in relation to

Culture was approach rich and versatile in the session 'Values in place: the interior dimension of sustainability': papers had backgrounds in various arts (fine arts, dance,

theories of place bonding or relationship to place (Horlings 2015; my own paper).

Artistic education (for example Johannesdottir & Thorgeirsdottir 2015; Breteau 2015) and arts as part of culture and their importance and role to passing culture (thus values) to human beings now and in future were very much contents of this session. What human beings do in our planet is culture or it becomes culture - manmade separated from natural world. Culture is producing artefacts which are material or immaterial and these artefacts carry strongly values thus the idea how important the debate of sustainability is in this area strengthened in my mind. Relation to environment was analyzed through various arts like movie, dance, fine art, popular culture, media (e.g. Nenonen, Oldin). Arts are also using one's imagination thus I found the most fruitful also the approaches were imagination was reflected. To view future humans need a lot imagination. Also to understand past, this time and future together uses one's capability of imaging, imaginative faculties. Nenonen's paper about ancient or archaic magic stories - some of them are still living in our cultures - brought history and historical under laying values nicely to the debate.

Somehow most of the papers could be reflected to dealt with the theme of human wellbeing in this planet - thus environmental wellbeing here. Wellner though looked this theme deeper by contemplating it through one certain case (river and its value to humans living nearby and what this rivers' restoration meant). One of the plenaries dealt with just and sustainable cultures (prof. Julian Agyeman) which goes near human wellbeing.

Päivi Takala

University of Jyväskylä, Finland

Linking Cultural and Natural: Cultural Ecosystem Services, Biocultural Diversity, Capabilities session aimed at exploring conceptual approaches and methods of policymaking in order to combine issues of cultural and natural preservation. It instigated for the contribution of papers that addressed questions of conceptual transformations in socio-ecological assessments as a consequence of different cultural perspectives attributed to them.

In relation to my paper, I believe that this session was particularly helpful because it brought interesting questions of paradigm shifts into discussion. The discussions that were raised considered changes in paradigms not only regarding the necessity of new approaches in the processes of policymaking, but also in reference to the role of the scholars and intellectuals that stand behind the decisions that are made in relation to the measures that are adopted for the protection of cultural or biodiversity. The recognition of the importance of constant reconsideration of the role, or the "power" of the professionals who address, or conceptualize the issues that are embraced in policy making is a vital step to avoid extreme systematization, or automatic reproduction of policies, where there is no space for the singularities of specific cases. In this sense, in my paper, I tried to explore the role of the aesthetic experience and the necessary reconsideration of the aesthetic approach to the discussions of environmental ethics and diversity preservation.

In a more general sense, I believe that the session engaged in important debates that were at the core issues of the conference. As already mentioned, it instigated the reconsideration and discussion about different methodological practices adopted in the processes of

policymaking, as well as the conceptual approaches to these methods. These rich discussions reflect a very important aspect of this conference, which is the importance of opening the theoretical and pragmatic grounds for exploratory and experimental practices in these times of uncertainty. It reflects the necessity of reassessing old models of conceptualization and policymaking with fresh and open-minded spirits, in order to perceive what can be comprehended as an effective practice and what needs to be changed, re-conceptualized, or even abandoned and subverted.

Although I think this was a very rich and important session, in some moments I decided to participate in some of the other sessions, to explore the different ranges of discussions, as well as similar approaches of some papers to my interests of research. One of the most striking aspects of the conference, in my opinion, was the incredible convergence of the papers with the artistic contributions to the conference and the forms in which the curatorial and artistic practices were respectfully considered as an indispensable part of these processes of knowledge assessment and construction. I strongly believe that it necessary to find innovative ways to assess and create information, political conceptualizations, and personal values regarding sustainability and that art is an indispensable element for this.

My general impression on the last day, during the concluding session, was that there is a general sense of an “inconclusive conclusion” that was reached in this conference, which is in no sense negative. I see this somehow discomfoting situation, as quite comfoting, though. It warms my heart with the feeling that I am not alone in this unstable terrain of a

constant search. Perhaps, in the sense of finding the answers for the problems of the culture(s) in sustainable futures, we are getting closer to finding better ways to formulate the questions about them. That is, in my opinion, one of the greatest contributions of the cultural, and the aesthetic, perspectives on the possibility of creating sustainable futures for our species in a peaceful co-existence with other species in our beautiful planet.

Andressa Schröder

Justus-Liebig University Giessen, Germany

I was part of the session *Framing culture in sustainable development: Breaking the boundaries*. I was presenting my master thesis project: Making craft and creativity visible as sources of social-ecological resilience. There was an interesting variety of presentations in this session that reflected specific cultural events, phenomena and perspectives such as the role of food, performance and festivals in shaping and influencing our behaviour towards sustainability. I thought it was useful to see how actual events that take place can be viewed through a sustainability lens. This is because it highlighted the important point that humans are already engaged in many cultural activities that can be reflected upon in different ways. Furthermore, with engagement and education around how existing activities can be understood in terms of sustainability, the leap towards behaviour and attitudes that promote a more sustainable way of life is increasingly possible.

The range of topics was wide. I enjoyed listening to the definition of “sustainability” in Japanese which seems to encapsulate all the contradictions and complexity of this term and

the fact that the term is subjective and means different things to different people. To me this highlights one of the essential difficulties that culture faces when it encounters the natural sciences. Culture embraces the blurred lines whilst natural sciences aim for clarity and precision of sorts. A term like sustainability can be manipulated to justify actions that are not necessarily anything to do with practices that are carefully researched and investigated and found to promote better use of resources. One example that comes to mind is in the fashion industry where lines of “sustainable” clothes are produced, in addition to the other fashion lines, thus using even more natural resources and encouraging even more consumption. Better to have fewer seasons and encourage buying less and keeping clothes longer or altering items of better and higher quality.

Viveca Mellegård

Stockholm Resilience Centre, Sweden

After very informative plenary sessions and presentation of results and conclusions from the COST Action Investigation Cultural Sustainability (three roles of culture in sustainable development: culture as a fourth pillar; culture mediating between the three pillars and culture as the foundation for sustainable development, which I consider very important), I attended several research paper sessions, related to my topic and research interests.

The first day I followed the session *Framing culture(s) in sustainable development: Breaking the boundaries*. I think it was very informative and useful because the presenters defined key concepts and relations between culture and

sustainable development. All the presentations were interesting, starting from students presenting the new online course on Cultural Sustainability, to researchers developing innovative conceptual models of cultural sustainability.

After these introductory reflections on the key concepts, I attended the session *Governing cultural heritage – governing the future? The role of cultural heritage in sustainable development*. Since my presentation was related to the role of cultural heritage in sustainable development, I found all three presentations of the first part of our session very useful as a conceptual framework for my presentation, which was a specific case study related to potential opportunities of sustainable use of the most valuable local cultural resources.

The first presentation, *The EU heritage politics and the governance of a European cultural heritage*, gave an very informative overview of current EU policies related to cultural heritage. The next paper *The landscape-based approach: a future for sustainable urban heritage management?* was also very useful, because I used the concept of historic urban landscape in my analysis of the role of cultural heritage in sustainable development of the city of Pula, Croatia. According to UNESCO Recommendation, the historic urban landscape is the urban area understood as the result of a historic layering of cultural and natural values and attributes, extending beyond the notion of “historic centre” or “ensemble” to include the broader urban context and its geographical setting. Specific historic urban matrix of Pula, Croatia (which was my case study) perfectly fits into the HUL approach, which sees and interprets the city as a continuum in time and

space and which is aimed at preserving the quality of the human environment, enhancing the productive and sustainable use of urban spaces, while recognizing their dynamic character, and promoting social and functional diversity. It was very interesting to me also to learn about Finnish experiences about *Integrating cultural heritage into sustainable planning: The concept of cultural environment and cultural environment programs in Finland*. The presentation was followed by an interesting discussion about the responsibilities of individual ministries for specific aspects of cultural environment in Finland and in other European countries.

The second part of our session, on Thursday, 7th May, was dedicated to specific case studies: from the sustainability of the Buddhist heritage in Kathmandu to unused potentials of underwater cultural heritage as a means for sustainable development. My presentation was the last in this session, and I discussed possibilities of sustainable local development based on the unique and the most valuable local cultural resources, including urban heritage (consisting of ancient Roman monuments and modern military fortified architecture), creativity and participative democracy. I compared European best practice models (Suomenlinna Fortress, Seaplane Harbor Museum in Tallinn) and local experiences, since I consider Baltic models very useful for our local situation, characterized by a huge potential of unused and inadequately valued cultural heritage in the historic urban core and in the former military zones in the city port. The discussion which followed my presentation was very useful for me, because the colleagues from Finland and other European countries indicated some important and common problems in valorisation of urban heritage in cultural

tourism, especially in the former military areas (like Suomenlinna).

Since I was interested also for assessment tools (I collaborate in the project *Cultural Heritage Counts for Europe*, where we are trying to define indicators for measuring the impact of cultural heritage in sustainable development), the last day I followed the session *Developing assessment tools for measuring culture in sustainable development: Theoretical and practical approaches*. Besides the introductory topic *Sustainability assessment of heritage sites*, I found very interesting the presentation of my colleague from Dubrovnik *Sustainable tourism indicators for managing cultural heritage, City of Dubrovnik*. The presentation *The cultural value of event-led city regeneration. What makes a European Capital of Culture sustainable* was also very instructive, since I made a research about Croatian candidates for this prestigious title in 2020 and the sustainability of the project.

The last session I attended was *Dissonant societies, memory and cultural sustainability*. All presentations were very interesting, from the introductory reflection on the nature of collective memory to the case study of Skopje and the presentation *From conflicted heritage narratives toward sustainable communities of the Western Balkans*, where prof. Dragicevic Sestic analyzed the cases from Croatia and finally the concluding remarks on the dissonant heritage and the heritage of 'others'.

Nataša Urošević

Juraj Dobrila University of Pula, Croatia

I attended many sessions during the conference. I personally find that the most interesting topic discussed were those concerning the use of the cultural material heritage as a means for the sustainable development, which was a recurrent theme in all the presentation about, for example, urban regeneration and landscape management. In fact, it often happens that heritage is considered as an assessment or a resource to foster the development of territories by, for example increasing the touristic flows. What it came out from many presentations, was the risk of this approach and the importance to balance the equilibrium between accessibility and preservation of the cultural heritage, exactly as it should happens with the environmental heritage.

This led to the second point that, in my opinion, was really interesting in most of the presentations, which is the always more urgent need for multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary approaches. As it was mentioned in many presentations, the sustainable development discourse include many aspects: economical, environmental, social and cultural. Therefore, policies aimed at the achievement of the sustainable development should consider the different aspects not as separated, but on the same level, with the collaboration of experts from different fields working together to find solutions to common problems. This may seem something obvious, but, as it came out from some presentations it is not. Multidisciplinary approaches resulted to be particularly efficient in some of the presented projects related to urban renewal, when it is fundamental to think both to the preservation of the cultural and environmental heritage in a joint perspective, without imposing limitation to the public possibilities to experience the heritage itself.

Briefly, one of the takeouts, in my opinion, was that in the sustainability discourse, we probably should abandon the distinction between cultural and environmental heritage, and simply talk about heritage, as a resource and as something to be preserved.

Finally, another interesting theme was the necessity to involve local communities and the general public in all kind of projects related to development of territories, preservation policies and urban regeneration. In fact, it has been proved many times that too top down approaches in any project involving communities of people generate only resistance and obstacles to the realization of the project themselves. On the contrary, the involvement of local communities, of a city's neighborhood, of a small village, or of any another place, can be the secret for the real long term success of projects of territorial development or of urban regeneration in a sustainable way. The problem, or the challenge, is to find the right way to involve people making them part of any project as active subjects instead of passive objects.

To conclude, the conference represented an interesting opportunity to hear different experiences from different realities of people working to projects or researches aimed at understanding how to better include the cultural element, with all the different possible meanings that the adjective "cultural" can have, in the sustainable development discourse. Therefore, many questions posed by the conference would still remain open, due to their complexity, but surely, the experience of the conference was extremely positive to share ideas and practices that could be now be applied in different contexts.

Caterina De Vivo

Institute for Advanced Studies, Italy

Sustainability means, first of all, the capability of imagine, rather than the comprehension of reality, since the current environmental crisis is mostly due to the crisis of imagine capability. Sustainability could therefore represent the current challenge to repossess the capability to imagine and to recover the philosophical conception of aesthetic as experience, involving all our senses together. This mental and physical attitude could therefore respond to current feelings of frustration by means of 'ontological innovations', which do not mean the abandonment of the objectivity, but the overcoming of the previous schizophrenic dualism between nature and culture, now rebuilding their connections. This leads to the creation of new narratives, in which humanities and social sciences could have a crucial role in proposing new ways, strategies and connections towards the production of new paradigms to respond to these new epistemological needs.

The awareness of a 'third knowledge' requirement between expert knowledge and people perception, attitudes, and public values is another key concept to think sustainability as a social matter, which has to be built in a social way. In this regard the concept of landscape is a very fertile land for the social expression and, in accordance with the European Landscape Convention, people play a central role in shaping the future of their landscapes, by means of new meanings and values, thus responding to social needs, representations, and to the need of reconnection. The Convention precisely stresses this interaction between natural and human factors in shaping landscapes, highlighting the perceptive aspects firstly, and thus representing a new way in landscape approach. Although the Convention

is not a series of fixed norms, but rather a series of guidelines, it supplies the opportunity to use its principles in orienting politic and plans at national scales, with a European perspective.

'Landscape as heritage' means the recognition that landscape is not a physical space merely, but it primarily is a social context, and a set of both material elements and symbolic meanings, which are in strong relationship, even if they are not always related, as they should be. The consciousness on this distance is the first step to propose to 'sew' them again, in a more holistic view, in which culture is the 'glue'.

Urban and rural landscapes have been both presented, reasoning over their maintenance in order to respond to current issues of urban and industrial growth, economic development, and social crisis by means of the awareness of their intrinsic and complex values, and their capability to respond to current problems. In this regards, both material and immaterial qualities in landscapes have been quoted and stressed, as important to face and overcome very practical needs, such as the prevention from climate and environmental risks, needs for good planning, and so on, but also to respond to perceptive and social matters.

Particular emphasis has been given to the importance of landscapes representations, and the uses of all our senses in knowing and experiencing our landscapes, overcoming the previous visual knowledge of landscape, towards an understanding of its global complexity. Such awareness also means the understanding that 'heritage' does not means the musealization of landscapes, but rather the acknowledgment of living heritage, that is the recognition of landscapes as common goods, which should be preserved in a living and active way.

Crucially, the engagement of people and local communities was unanimously considered as a fundamental basis in thinking and shaping new 'heritagescapes' as 'livingscapes', creating a third way of knowledge to link top-down and bottom-up actions, in accordance with principles of the European Landscape Convention.

Angelica Dal Pozzo
University of Padova, Italy

I was assigned Panel 2 in the Parallel sessions: Biosphere stewardship for sustainability-Explaining how culture frames transformation. In trying to reflect on the overall theme of the conference it was useful to see the concluding session on the Friday afternoon. In particular Prof. John Robinson, the invited speaker from the University of British Columbia, provoked my thinking. The observations and reflections of Dr. Oleg Koefoed seemed to sum up the general theme of the emergent field with his Boat Trip analogy, showing that we are concentrating on the boat and concentrating on the waters around the boat ie the micro, yet the macro still feels a little intangible, the where we are going in the boat. The session was organised by the Stockholm Resilience Centre with four presenters, Jamila Haider, Vanessa Masterson, Johan Enqvist and Maria Tengo. The main concept was "stewardship" throughout the presentations themes of sense of place, local ecological knowledge, response diversity, cultural ecosystem services and bio cultural systems. The sessions provided some good questions from the floor, relating well to culture and biosphere stewardship for sustainability. One of the first things that you could not fail to notice is that the panel was made up of exclusively white westerners talking about their

research in India, rural South Africa, rural Tajikistan and Afghanistan. This may have been expected, considering the conference was held within the frame of a European research network. However, if there was an elephant in the room it was quickly addressed by an initial question from the floor to the panel. The question to the panel was about how they, the panelists, as white western researchers, placed themselves, with particular reference to power and politics and the local and indigenous cultures. Some of the answers addressed the decisions local communities make when faced with case studies or research in that they tend to be context specific as opposed to standard technical solutions proposed by agents of change. While Vanessa Masterson presented on a sense of place and stewardship in South Africa I thought of how the research faced the appropriation of the altruistic and the modernist paradigms, within which it would have to defend and mediate. How did the case study tackle leverage I wondered?

"The case study represents a social –ecological system in transition, where urban and western aspirations influence traditional agricultural and resource harvesting practices. We examine how connection to the land may be *leveraged* towards sustainable transformation, through fostering pride in agricultural identities intimately linked to culture and practices of sustainable agriculture and forest management." (Masterson, Tengo and Spierenburg)

The concluding session touched on some interesting ideas. From what I gathered there was a feeling of not quite knowing how to marry all the research and projects going on to the bigger picture. John Robinson mentioned transdisciplinary hermeneutics and the need to

stop looking for answers and to start asking questions instead.

There was a suggestion at the end of the conference that a Journal could be created. Cultural sustainability it seems has entered the ring and is trying to find a niche for itself. This niche and position from which to justify itself, operationalise itself and ultimately become policy, jostles with the need for bigger picture understanding. And it is this feeling of excitement yet a little angst that I am left with at the end of the conference. I left feeling that I had wished I could have seen all the presentations to try and tie my ideas and make links to the micro and the macro, to feel a little more secure in what I thought. Yet perhaps this is ultimately more rewarding, that it leaves me with questions and not answers.

Basarab Nicolescu calls the fracturing and growth of academic subjects the 'disciplinary big bang'. Academics going deeper and into more detail on one side of the coin, yet we have seen the proliferation world problems on the other. How can we bridge a deeper understanding of more complex issues with long term positive change? What I find encouraging about cultural sustainability is that it can be the cohesive force tying a myriad of disciplines together. This interconnectedness and continued dialogue across disciplines and sub disciplines seems on the face of it to be just common sense. Yet as we have seen by the fracturing of disciplines we can get caught up in the ownership of Cartesian projects, and as we shoe gaze, put more distance between ourselves and the big picture.

Jeff Pilgram

University of Jyväskylä, Finland

I participated in the session *The role of participative and perceptive maps in building and preserving sustainable culture(s)*. Recently, participatory mapping has become popular especially in participatory natural resource management approaches (Sletto 2009a). This links it closely to sustainable futures. Participatory mapping is a practical tool that is able to incorporate the spatial dimension of human and cultural aspects in sustainability research.

Participatory mapping can be seen as 'counter mapping' (Peluso 1995), which challenges the role and borderlines of formal maps produced by state or corporate actors as official representations of places (Sletto 2009b) that typically serve the interests of power and colonial and capitalist perspectives of the map makers (Scott 1998, Wood 2010). Above all, participatory mapping can be used to give a voice to the local communities and indigenous and other marginalized groups and capture the spatial aspects of their cultures and situated knowledges. Moreover, participatory maps are not just mediums to communicate knowledge of the materiality and spatial relations of the landscape, but they also hold information on social relations, temporalities and imaginaries that give it a deeper meaning (Sletto 2009a). For example, Julian Agyeman referred to this aspect in his keynote speech on Thursday morning in the conference, when he said that GIS (Geographic Information System) is a powerful tool for revealing spatial injustices. This is important in environmental management as, according to Agyeman, human equality and environmental quality should be equal goals. Agyeman did not mention *participatory mapping*, but I believe that was what he was referring to as in his speech, he also highlighted

the need to give voice to local people when we discuss about environmental issues because too often we take social equality for granted, even though we are typically far away from that goal.

The session, which I attended, consisted of four presentations of studies, which all utilized participatory mapping methods – some stressing it as a tool for qualitative research and some combining it with a more quantitative approach. The aspect of social equality and giving the voice to the marginalized groups was also present in most studies. First, the chairs of the session, Bonati, Codato and Tononi, gave an overview on the role of mapping in the construction of sustainable cultures. They also gave three examples of their own case studies from different parts of the world that employed participatory methods. For example, the case study of Madeira showed how participatory methods can be utilized in studying people’s vulnerabilities to environmental hazards. In the second presentation, I presented an empirical case study from the Taita Hills, South-East Kenya, which explored local people’s spatial and temporal knowledge on water resources and related ecosystems and the means of collecting and communicating this knowledge to higher level water resource management authorities. In our study (together with Minoia), we brought the memory aspect as part of the participatory mapping exercise by combining it to the historical timelines, also made by the local people, in order to trace the sociopolitical drivers of changes in the landscape. In the third presentation, Kuoppa and Laatikainen (one of the speakers was different from the name in the program, but I was not able to catch it) told about their study, which employed Public Participatory GIS (PPGIS) in exploring the uses and cultural and social meanings of urban water areas in Helsinki region. Their study combined

quantitative GIS data with qualitative narrative reporting, which enhanced the depth of their survey. In the fourth presentation, Puolamäki discussed about her study, in which she had looked at children’s way to assess the cultural landscape values and compared them with official values in Satakunta region, Finland. She employed a platform of digital map, which was easier for the children to use than for example PPGIS would have been. The study is important as children’s voices are rarely heard when preservation of certain cultural objects and areas is evaluated.

Despite the wealth and good quality of all presentations in the session, the general discussion after the presentations focused mainly on the methodological aspects and their critics. For example, some people in the audience were interested how different technologies like cameras would change children’s valuation of the landscape. The discussion time was also limited by some technical difficulties in the beginning, which reduced the overall session duration.

Johanna Hohenthal

University of Helsinki, Finland

References:

- Peluso, N.L. 1995. Whose woods are these? Counter-mapping forest territories in Kalimantan, Indonesia. *Antipode* 27(4): 383-406.
- Scott, J.C. 1998. *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*.
New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Sletto, B.I. 2009a. “We drew what we imagined”. Participatory mapping, performance, and the arts of landscape making. *Current Anthropology* 50(4), 443-476.
- Sletto, B. 2009b. ‘Indigenous people don’t have boundaries’: reborderings, fire management, and

productions of authenticities in indigenous landscapes. *Cultural Geographies*, 16, 253–77

Wood, D. 2010. *Rethinking the power of maps*. The Guilford Press, New York.

In the session *The Role of Mapping in the construction of sustainable futures, methods and experiences* different ways of mapping were discussed and presented with the aim to involve different stakeholders in developing sustainability in the whole meaning. In particular this session dealt with the role of mapping in participatory processes, interpreting it as an instrument to produce, share and analyze the spatial knowledge of communities. With the development of participatory mapping methods in the late 80's, there has been a considerable growth of approaches and methodologies on participative analysis as well as (but not only) sketch maps, 3D maps and community based maps, that thanks to the support of technology have produced new methods, like as PGIS (Participatory GIS), PPGIS (Public Participatory GIS) and VGI (Volunteered Geographic Information; see Rambaldi et al., 1996 and Sieber, 2006). Participatory mapping strategies are used to empower local community, make action, contribute in decision-making process, and involve people in the production, interpretation, use and communication of spatial information. These approaches evolve in parallel and interact with questions about the legitimacy and problems associated with the use of maps, that enter in the critical cartography sphere, but that can be associated with all the forms of spatial representation. Therefore, the session aimed to focus on the role of spatial representation, maps and cartography in building sustainable scenarios, through the promotion and preservation of local culture(s) and practices,

especially asking for research findings from participative spatial representation tools, like as (but not limited to) spatial infographics, 3D maps, sketch maps, PPGIS, PGIS and VGI studies. In particular, methods, discussion, applications and outcomes of using maps in participative approaches were presented in order to preserve cultural ecosystem values, promote sustainable practices and urban policies, reduce vulnerability to climate change, and integrate cultural knowledge in scientific analysis. Contributions were from both qualitative and quantitative traditions, with an integrated and multidisciplinary approach. The case studies presented different areas of the World, dealing with different cultures and contexts, such as Helsinki region and Satakunta region in Finland, Madeira in Portugal, Brescia in Italy, Kenya in Africa Kenya and Alto Mayo watershed in San Martin Region, Peru.

Geography has always aimed to discuss interactions between culture and nature in order to represent the world and the role of man in environmental transformations. Indeed, culture seems to represent one of the new ways to reach sustainability. Therefore, the adoption of strategies finalized to shape sustainable cultural practices is required. Representing the society-nature interaction through maps is one of the approaches favorite by geographers, which can be used in qualitative and quantitative analysis. In order to reach a more sustainable management of the places, today scientists call for the integration between local and scientific knowledge, with the aim to promote a co-management between experts, decision-makers and local stakeholders. Into this scenario, the role of geography and geographers should be to involve community in producing knowledge and participating in decision-making process, as well as to educate

people to interpret the world. This coproduction of knowledge could be reached in several ways. In some cases community interacts voluntarily with experts in order to return a shared knowledge, in other community participates with institutions in the process of decision-making. All these aspects emerged during the session, both during the presentations and final discussion. The different geographical origins of the case studies allowed the comparison between different approaches, tools, methodologies and consequently created a good background for the discussion about fieldwork and data analysis challenges. These were possible thanks to the presentations of different and very interesting tools and mixed quali-quantitative approaches, such as: the use of a GIS application, the Social Values of Ecosystem Services (SolVES) to map ecosystem services, internet based maps to map different social environmental attributes, the creation of a timeline to consider also the temporal scale, sketch maps with students to map risk perception, the value ranking of the attributes mapped, the comparison between experts and children knowledge, the use of ecological indexes applied with social data. The different maps presented highlight the capacity of the actors to create spatial representation of their reality, able to merging socio-economic and environmental attributes from their cultural background and knowledge and consequently their role in decision making processes and to build their sustainable futures, without forgetting the limits and challenges of these instruments.

Marco Tonini and Daniel Codato

University of Padova

Sara Bonati

University of Brescia, Italy

I participated in the session operationalizing culture in the sustainable development of cities. When concluding all the presentations together it became obvious that in different cultures and regions different sort of approaches work – there is no clear answer that how culture should be operationalized. It was also interesting to see that presenters with different scholar and working backgrounds had different solutions and they highlighted different factors. Some of them were practical and others more theoretical. Nevertheless there were some themes that were repeated such as city planners are needed to be embedded into the process furthermore the land use policies should be further changed and be open for interpretation. It is not enough just to re-design a district or area to increase the culture sustainability of the whole area if the cultural sustainability is interpreted as supporting pillar for economic, environmental and social aspects. There is a challenge of reaching the low-income, unemployed and immigrants through cultural implementation such as renovating a street, in addition how to create shared value within district area with citizens of different age, background and culture. Cultural planning in the cities should be made in way that it creates well-being of the whole city, reaches the people, and city planners should make land use policies more open.

Public policies in the municipality or governmental level is not enough but the support from the NGOs, universities and citizens is vital as well. For example Tanssiali Lutakko in Jyväskylä was a good example of how to maintain some cultural heritage in the area with the support of citizens and NGOs, when it is surrounded by new commercial and residential areas. It should be researched has

these sort of projects created well-being in the area even if it cannot satisfy everyone (elderly people might not be so interested in hearing live gigs and some might find the old building ugly).

In some areas there is problem that people living in the area are just not interested in the cultural value of the area. There was example from Pori (Häyrynen) where they tried some theoretical approach to create more cultural activity in the area. The project failed from its aim since majority of the people living in the area did not feel like promoting diversity – especially the elderly. There is also a challenge of reaching the community. It is also important to remember that community interests are not always sustainable, and culture may not be a way to improve some area economically. But on the other hand in some residential area similar kind of project could have worked and improved the area economically if the demographics were different and values more shared.

The *Panel 3: Blazing the trail to culture(s) of sustainability – Turning the wheel with change agents, research approaches and transition features* started with presentation (Krainer) about the dilemmas around the sayings “new is good”, “growth is good” and “times is money” which basically implied that green consumerism, political climate and general mindsets of people are not sustainable. To achieve sustainable consumption the general mindsets need to be changed by the public, businesses and citizens. One efficient way to reach sustainable development is through local actions such as eco-villages and it also preserves the culture in the area. The problem is that how to make eco-villages bigger, furthermore all the

people do not share to values that they would like to live in one.

They also introduced a wheel which opened up discussion related to sustainable consumption but the topics were discussed among small groups and no general conclusions were made. While I was listening through all the discussions in the small groups it also became clear that people had different opinions about sustainability depending on their background, especially how culture should be embedded as part of sustainable development. People had hard time agreeing on things, rather than one thing which is that implementing culture as a part of sustainable development is a confusing task.

Ville Happonen

University of Jyväskylä, Finland

The topics that were more interesting to my research were:

- Development is only sustainable if the cultural environment is nurtured and the diversity respected. Culture is not only one of the sustainability dimensions, it's more a transversal dimension that influences the other sustainability dimensions (social equity, economic growth and environment). It's through the cultural dimension that communities can integrate new paradigms, changes in institutional culture and a mobilization to embrace the sustainability challenges.
- However the incorporation of culture into sustainability debates seems to remain in a theoretical level and relations between culture, sustainability and policies remain vague.
- Monica Amari and Giovanni Carlo Bruno

position culture as a central dimension and a basic tool for the developing of policies through the concept of cultural rights: the right to education, the right to freely participate in the cultural life of the community, the right to enjoy arts or the right to benefit of science advancements. The development of policies needs to address these rights, not only as an intention but by introducing actions that allow citizens to participate in cultural life. A development model for the 21th century can only be sustainable if culture is given a central role in the setting of public policies.

- Ritva Mitchell and Olli Jakonen contextualize the thematic in the EU funds as a subject that is in discussion in EU institutions since 1995. In a context of urgency, the Sami community has been, since then, using EU funding to foster their culture, cultural identity and self-government. The sense of urgency seems to be an important factor for introducing culture in planning.
- The use of sustainable development as a concept in conferences around the world was analysed by Gerlach-Hansen. He realized that the concept is used, to legitimate "status quo", being re-contextualized into diverse discourses and varied interests. Culture is a driver for integrated sustainable development but it remains a challenge to build change in a context of so many conflicting interests. Cities remain hesitant to introduce systemic modes of cultural and social diversity and participation into sustainable planning.
- Mercer and Stevenson talk about the importance of regain the concept of responsibility instead of sustainability and

the linkages between local cultural resources, the need for participatory cultural planning and how these linkages shape cultural democracy.

- Finally, the relevance of public participation was approached in the discussion from the point of view of the researchers participation in public life, has a driver to actively participate in sustainable challenges and push the integration of culture in sustainable development.

Isabella Ferreira

University of Coimbra, Portugal

From my point of view the exploration of how cultural practices contribute to urban development in the context of sustainability, was the main topic of discussion in the session where I took part. The topic of sustainability comprises also other concepts such as sustainable development policies, sustainable creative cities and cultural urban resilience dynamics.

Although, this topic can be understood in a wide and general sense, the session was organised to enable the possibility of having a better understanding through case studies introduced in every paper. These different case studies were crucial in order to gain a deeper point of view regarding interesting long-term processes that currently cities are experimenting.

Therefore, it was interesting to notice that few concepts were common in almost every presentation or case study, such as, participation, transformation, collective identity, diversity and participation, experience based learning, etc.

However, within all these concepts the most referred one was the following: Community-owned governance / Resilient communities.

Several case studies highlighted the existence of self-managed spaces, which are organised mainly by people from neighbourhoods, whose aim is to work under the *common good* dynamics in order to meet the necessities of the residents. These activities are mainly related to nature, art, participation, self-managed libraries, workshops, exchange of knowledge, sports, gardening, open spaces and spaces for public debate.

These organised groups usually emerge from the conflicts appeared between local governments interests and neighbor's necessities. Interestingly, culture and artistic dynamics not only work for the development of the area or the particular project but for the integration of certain communities that tend to be marginalized.

A common aspect within these communities is that they are willing to overcome difficult circumstances and they manage to find motivation in order to create an oasis within the rapid urbanisation that cities have experimented recently. This motivation comes from the experience based learning, it is shared by local knowledge and shared values and beliefs.

The role of culture and cultural policies is crucial because these emerging and interesting forms of governance (mentioned above) are based on collective cultural identities that emerge from shared values and beliefs, that learn from collaborative actions and different ways of thinking for new future perspectives, driven by organized groups of people such as artist

communities, activists groups, neighborhoods associations, etc.

In summary, it was interesting to learn that these resilient owned organised communities could be seen as a necessary approach to meet the challenge of sustainable development. It changes the nature of decision-making to recognize the benefits of self-sufficiency and new forms of governance.

Adriana Partal
RMIT Europe, Spain

I assisted in the research paper session focused on the role of cultural policy in sustainable development. Undoubtedly, the approach towards this particular session reflects the overall theme of this whole conference, which was aimed at discussing the concept of culture as an aspect of sustainable development.

This conference was targeted at discussions on conceptual overviews, theories and practices, as well as policies and governance, which help to understand the place of culture in the process of sustainable development. As a result, new ideas towards understanding of the concept of culture within sustainable development were offered to ensure the future of this trend and build a bridge for the integration of sustainability into cultural practices in different countries and regions all over the world.

To my mind, this certain session was a core topic for the conference discussions due to the fact, that cultural policies play a key role in developing cultural sphere as well as ensuring the position of culture as the fourth pillar of sustainability.

There was a great variety of interesting presentations reflected the main topic of the session, but shown the role of cultural policy in sustainable development from different perspectives. All of them were relevant to the main idea of the session; they described the situation in the cultural sustainability field from different countries, or at the international level in general.

In other words, the speakers presented the overviews on the place of the cultural policy within the sustainable development in Poland, Taiwan, Finland, Canada, Romania, Baltic Sea region and Scotland. In addition, there was a presentation about the implementation of the UNESCO Convention on Cultural Diversity (2005) as an example of international cultural cooperation, which was a key element of sustainability.

The presentation about nationalist discourse within sustainable development in Scotland was very interesting for me due to the reason that I had studied the problem of Scottish identity during my study exchange in the UK, where as a study trip we had gone to Edinburg to see the real situation with the identity there. That is why it was extremely important for me now to listen to the professional overview on this issue, which completely corresponded with my observations.

To be more precise, for my particular interest the presentation on ‘the implementation of cultural rights as a basic tool for developing coherent policies of cultural sustainability in Europe’ made by the researchers from National Research Council of Italy was very useful due to the reason that I’m writing the Master’s Thesis studying the issues of the concept of cultural

rights. They explained that cultural sustainability should be considered as a set of actions to assert cultural rights, and moreover, the concept of cultural sustainability together with the idea of cultural rights formed the concept of human well-being.

It is possible to conclude that presentations shown during this session revealed the problem of evaluating the importance of cultural policies for the process of sustainable development.

Irina Poshtatskaya

University of Jyväskylä, Finland

I was involved in planning a panel discussion on stewardship for sustainability and I reflect on this here in the context of the conference’ themes and outcomes.

Thematic Stream 3 of the conference asked, among other questions: What would our futures look like if sustainability was embedded in the multiple dimensions of culture, including different worldviews and values, ways of life, and other forms of cultural expression? The panel explored this question through a focus on stewardship. This was examined from a social-ecological systems perspective (Berkes & Folke 1998; Berkes et al. 2003) and through these discussions, culture is viewed as a filter rather than a pillar of sustainable development.

Stewardship has emerged as notion that encompasses the ethics and practices of sustainable co-evolution of human civilizations with the biosphere. The term has been used and coopted in many contexts to refer to practices, management actions and care of local environments/landscapes. As an evolving concept, stewardship has also been used to

refer to an ability of the institutions that manage and care for landscapes, to deal with complexity and change, and overcome times of turbulence (Chapin et al. 2011). How do cultural values shape human nature interactions and how that in turn contributes to the emergence of stewardship? This was explored through four different approaches, anchored in four case studies: sense of place in the Eastern Cape, South Africa (Vanessa Masterson); cultural ecosystem services in urban green areas e.g. Stockholm (Maria Tengö and Erik Andersson); social-ecological response diversity in agriculture in the Pamir Mountains, Afghanistan and Tajikistan (Jamila Haider); and social-ecological connections in Bangalore, India (Johan Enqvist).

Particularly interesting, was how each case (implicitly or explicitly) showed a connection to place, to ecosystems or landscapes. A strong connection to nature in place, and traditional ecological knowledge developed through the practice and experimentation over many generations could produce important agricultural biodiversity, as was shown by Jamila Haider for the Pamir Mountains in Tajikistan and Afghanistan. This echoed the themes of the session chaired by Dr. Lumina Horlings: “Values in place: The interior dimension of sustainability” which also explored how values and a sense of place may enhance people’s willingness to take responsibility towards their environments.

Through the panel discussion understanding of connections to nature and sense of place were further nuanced by considering the tension in stewardship between conservative approaches (to protect “assets”) and the need for change (activism). Attachment to place may motivate people to protect a place from a perceived threat (e.g. NIMBYism) or motivate people to

act to change a situation (e.g. Devine-wright 2009; Devine-Wright & Howes 2010). This was discussed in the context of Masterson and colleague’s presentation of a resource conflict in the former Transkei in South Africa, where conflicting narratives about a nature reserve reflected multiple place meanings. Those who felt the forest represented sacred values and traditional uses acted against the reserve proposal; while those who felt that the forest represented threatened biodiversity, or an ecotourism development opportunity, acted to instate the nature reserve declaration. This discussion highlighted the need to move beyond understanding place attachment and length of residence and to understand the meanings of place that people hold dear (Stedman 2002). Therefore there is a need for understanding the range of meanings and values that can enable the balance between a conservation approach, valuing, preserving, and protecting what we have, and to act to change to preserve what we value and need.

This discussion also prompted reflection on the potential leverage points for change in different contexts in the global South and the global North. In the global North and in urban areas there is a concern that people have disconnected from the natural resources and landscape that sustain us and that there is a need for approaches that foster stewardship practices for reconnecting to the biosphere (Folke et al. 2011). In this panel Johan Enqvist described how the urban water provision network in Bangalore relies on external water sources but has begun to reconnect with neglected local lakes as water sources. Additionally, Maria Tengö and Erik Andersson presented cultural ecosystem services, such as aesthetic experiences, sense of place, and recreation, as experiences that can lead to engagement in stewardship activities and

transformative processes to improve protection, restoration, and overarching governance of urban green spaces. However, discourses in the global South, particularly in rural areas are more focused on economic realities and finding efficient and sustainable poverty alleviation solutions. For example projects and policies focus on reducing poverty through importing seeds and agricultural practices in the Pamir case, and through ecotourism in the Transkei case. In the urgency of these poverty reduction policies and projects, the non-tangible benefits of nature, that are culturally mediated, and the subjectivity of relationships with the environment, are often forgotten. There is still a great need to consider issues of access, sacredness, beauty, and identity related to nature alongside and a part of equitable and sustainable transformations.

This also reflects the issues of equity in sustainability that Julian Agyeman presented in his key note speech. There is a need for more explicit treatment of power and positionality in sustainability research and decision-making. It is critical that we ask: whose meanings, values and concerns are favoured when we consider transformational interventions (Leach et al. 2012).

As was also mentioned in the final plenary and the conference closing reflections, an understanding of stewardship and sustainability in local places has been our focus, and there is a need to understand how regional, national and global drivers affect local places and dynamics (e.g. Seto et al. 2012); and how local engagements and attachments can be scaled up to care for biosphere (e.g. Heise 2008). As was explored in the panel, it is vital that we understand the feedbacks and responses between local places and global processes, in

order to find leverage points for change. These perspectives all emphasize the dynamism of culture and cultural values, and how it is crucial to consider this when trying to understand why people engage in stewardship as well as how this could be harnessed for sustainability transformations.

Vanessa Masterson

Stockholm Resilience Centre, Sweden

Literature:

- Berkes, F., Colding, J. & Folke, C., 2003. *Navigating Social-ecological Systems: Building Resilience for Complexity and Change (Google eBook)*, Cambridge University Press.
- Berkes, F. & Folke, C. eds., 1998. *Linking Social and Ecological Systems: Management Practices and Social Mechanisms for Building Resilience*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chapin, F.S. et al., 2011. Earth stewardship: a strategy for social-ecological transformation to reverse planetary degradation. *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences*, 1(1), pp.44–53.
- Devine-Wright, P., 2009. Rethinking NIMBYism : The Role of Place Attachment and Place Identity in Explaining Place-protective Action. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 19, pp.426–441.
- Devine-Wright, P. & Howes, Y., 2010. Disruption to place attachment and the protection of restorative environments: A wind energy case study. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 30(3), pp.271–280.
- Folke, C. et al., 2011. Reconnecting to the Biosphere. *Ambio*, 40(7), pp.719–738. Available at: <http://www.springerlink.com/index/10.1007/s13280-011-0184-y> [Accessed March 8, 2012].
- Heise, U.K., 2008. From the Blue Planet to Google Earth. In *Sense of Place and Sense of Planet : The Environmental Imagination of the Global*.
- Leach, M. et al., 2012. Transforming innovation for sustainability. *Ecology and Society*, 17(2).

Stedman, R.C., 2002. Toward a Social Psychology of Place: Predicting Behavior from Place-Based Cognitions, Attitude, and Identity. *Environment and Behavior*, 34(5), pp.561–581.

I was invited to present in the Thursday session on “Local movements in sustainable transitions”, together with Leonardo Valenzuela (University of Sydney) and Nuria Spijker (KU Leuven). The session was moderated by Jennie Stephens (University of Vermont).

Valenzuela began by presenting his work on “patrimonialization” in Quintero Bay, a coastal town in Chile degraded from decades of industrial-chemical activities. This is a term that Valenzuela used to describe local activities that are aiming at countering the negative image of certain sites, and creating new meanings of places as a part of the areas cultural heritage. Both examples given (recreational skate parks, and a proposed “Geopark”) incorporate the anthropogenic impact on the landscape as a part of the place rather than trying to restore it to some “pristine” condition. Valenzuela argued that these are partly political processes that seek to redefine the areas as worthy of protection, despite the disastrous environmental impacts.

Spijker’s presentation focused on guerilla gardening in Groningen and London. These are not only bottom-up initiatives, but “bottom-linked”: originating from the local initiatives, but facilitated by municipal authorities and/or activist networks. Spijkers describes the activities as socio-ecological practices and place-keeping, which both represent social innovations that empower people to find new values. She argues that while reasons for engagement varied, a common theme was

people feeling of “self-efficacy”: the recognition of one’s own ability to provide relief. The initiatives impacted the local neighborhoods in three main ways: by increasing greenery, by creating meeting places for increased social interaction, and by increasing the bottom-linking in urban policymaking.

My own contribution focused on local lake restoration groups in Bangalore, India. Combining findings from two related papers, it describes both the personal motivations and biocultural experiences that have underpinned local initiatives, as well as the impact they are having on the formal governance of water supply. Recent collaborative management has brought in new perspectives on the values and benefits generated by lakes to local communities, and started to challenge the dominant view of lakes as recreational parks. By (re)articulating their former role as man-made water-harvesting units, the view of lakes as part of a cultural landscape creates a new foundation for sustainable management that better recognizes lakes as multifunctional units.

These presentations fit quite nicely together and contributed to a reflection of the conference’s theme that focused on how local cultural expressions can be an active force in pushing for more sustainable futures, and how the need to redefine what urban, often degraded spaces can and should be used for. I think this was visible in all three cases, although much of the discussions came to focus on the groups in Groningen, London, and Bangalore. Both Spijkers and myself were quite interested in how we can understand the motivations behind civic engagement in restoration and protection of urban ecosystems. It was clear that personal values and priorities as well as the social/cultural context mattered, but the actual

biophysical landscape also seemed to be a relevant factor for when and where initiatives emerge. I found this important because I think it is not always properly explored how the role of “nature” can be integrated into our understandings of culture, at least not in a way that also recognizes biophysical processes and complexities. Greening, and the process of greening, requires knowledge about specific conditions of a location that are sometimes engrained in cultural practices. Similarly, the process of greening not only shapes the physical landscape but also ties social bonds between community members. I think this points to the importance of understanding culture as something that is constantly in motion, evolving or shifting shape in some way or another. And acknowledging this (need for) development along with people’s needs and wants is arguably very important for finding sustainable futures – especially in cities that are often undergoing rapid changes.

Johan Enqvist

Stockholm Resilience Centre
Stockholm University, Sweden

The main point of the session is to discuss the interaction among culture, sustainability and design. It tries to solve the general questions like, how to make the design representing cultural sustainability; how to use cultural design to realize the aim of sustainability and how to relate this three terms better to make them enhancing with each other. As culture could be defined in many different ways, among which could be ideas, values, attitudes and everything that people do refers to behavior patterns. Other definitions of culture would be from some narrow

perspective as a certain type of art works, clothes types. In this session, there are topics about the wide catalogue like how to use design to improve the ideas and values to be sustainable; also make design used on consumption habits. For the other perspective of cultures, the session work make them related by doing researches such on changing clothes cuttings and pattern to achieve the aim of sustainability.

There are several very interesting topics in this session. Laura Santamaria gave the presentation on her article 'Switch the Channel: using cultural codes for designing and positioning sustainable products and services for mainstream audiences', in which she tries to connect semiotics and sustainability. In the presentation, Santamiria pointed that a main approach to sustainability is to simulate the 'mainstream' group of the society to comprehend the more resource-efficient consumption mode, which show that sustainable lifestyle is 'liberating and beneficial'. As design is a more visual way, it could give people the direct and strong image that sustainable products, services, and systems can improve well-being and happiness. Effectively using a Culturally relevant discourse is an effective auxiliary mean to enhance and promote this process. Cultural codes within a particular context as a semiotic method in the design would make a twice improvement in switching lifestyle to achieve sustainability with less effort.

Another interesting speech was given by Tore Gulden on his research 'Toys and product longevity'. In his research, he explores how a child’s personalization of play themes is connected to the experience of play and furthermore how such creative activity can

influence feelings toward toys, and subsequently how this affects the degree of pleasure elicited by play, and finally how this influences the toys' longevity. He made observations on the performance of a group of children who are at the age of six to nine when they are purchasing and playing the toys. He suggests using associated media to make proposed theme for the play activity and the new toys would enable the children to create personal experiences, furthermore, they would get higher degree of pleasure, result in the delay of replacing the toys and achieve the aim of being sustainability. Therefore, the toy designer would create toys that make children possible to create and alternate the play themes. This idea is very recommended as the research subjects are children and it could be considered as a part of sustainability education.

There are also many other presentation which make various topic, which include sustainable education, cultural education and clothes or architectures design from the perspective of sustainability. All these researches presented and combined together in this session make an overall view of the interrelationship and connection that could be done to enhance and promote cultural sustainability.

Mao Wang

University of Jyväskylä, Finland

In looking at local movements as the drivers or tools through which we can move towards sustainability transitions, the session I attended approached the theme of the conference from the angle of impacts (intended and unintended) of the cultures that we foster. Not only do we make an imprint on the world around us, the world around us makes an imprint on us as well. This imprint can

alternatively be called culture. From no waste cooking and environmental justice to sustainable water and energy transitions, the culture which grows from and takes root in local movements is inextricably linked with the future(s) of our planet and in the efforts to grasp the multiple dimensions of sustainabilities which are simultaneously shared and individual.

What I found most interesting and relevant in the session was how researchers from very different backgrounds and who are pursuing very different objectives somehow found a convergence of understanding. This convergence surrounds the idea of the individual who thinks in a particular way and chooses to act on these thoughts in particular ways. Though expressed differently by the different researchers, all of them tackled issues surrounding how an individual or group of individuals chooses to see the world differently from the status quo. In the instance of no waste cooking, this was looking at old food which would normally be categorized as trash, as a viable resource to cook with. In the presentation of ecosystem governance in India, this was through people recognizing the values in lakes that are swiftly being degraded and taking a stand to protect and conserve them through citizen-driven initiatives.

All of the presentations and the discussions that followed brought to the foreground issues of behaviour, values, justice and power surrounding socio-ecological challenges we face (and shape) today and in the future. This also raised the very interesting question: for whom? Whose values? Whose justice? Whose behaviour? Whose power? Of course, we did not unearth any life altering conclusions, but the fact that we live in a time when people from

all over the world can come together and raise this as an issue is a step in the right direction.

Stephanie Nuria Spijker
KU Leuven, Belgium

According to Unesco's documents we can define culture as a way of life. Generally it is values, attitudes and principles that guide people's actions. As cultural meanings are rooted in values, the approach of this session reflected the overall theme of the conference by examining what is the role of values in sustainable development and how could they have transformative power.

In the wider discussion on the relation of culture and sustainable development I would locate the theme of this session in the question: How can the change towards more sustainable future be mobilised? As John Robinson stated in his key note speech, sustainability calls into question our deepest beliefs and assumptions about knowledge, meaning, nature, humans and their inter-relationships. All these emerging practices, transitions and transformations change our ways of life at the individual, communal and societal level. In order to steer this change towards greater sustainability we need a value-oriented perspective. The interior or inner dimension of sustainability, rooted in human values means the practical, political and personal sphere, the local level where people collectively make sense and experience their relations to surroundings. What is the part of art, imagination and narratives in these processes? How does the relationship to place enhance the willingness to protect and develop one's environment in sustainable ways?

I followed all of the 15 presentations of research

papers, which were about following topics: Value-oriented approach towards sustainable places, Regionalisation in agri-environmental governance, Territorialisation as a new frame to bridge culture and sustainability, Soundscapes and the commodification of silence, A notion of environmental well-being, Narrative ethics and social imaginary, "Avatar" as a sustainability tale, Archaic magic and ritualised harmony, Territorial bond in cultural identity, Education for sustainable development, Artist-in-residence performances, Arts education in crafts in Finland and its relationship to place, "Happy we are from" -videos as statement about places and values, Embodied experiences of art, and The role and potential of the cultural products to mobilise action on sustainability.

All topics were really interesting and relevant, but for me the most interesting topics were discussed in the two last mentioned presentations, Gudbjorg R. Johannesdottir's "Coming to our senses: Understanding our place in the natural world through embodied experiences of art" and Frederikke Oldin's "Imagination is a key in moving towards sustainable societies".

I think that these presentations had important points of view because it seems that getting more information and knowledge - in other words the Information Deficit model - is not enough to change the ways people behave. We all know what we should do concerning ecological problems and yet we keep on living and consuming in unsustainable ways. There exists a "value - action gap". So how could values be part of our everyday experience and not only held knowledge? Imagination, narratives and art can help us to embody our cognition and learn in embodied ways. They offer ways to go back to our senses. On the

other hand dystopic narratives of futures and disaster films can hamper the mobilisation and cause fear and passivity. It is very important that culture could supply appealing, somewhat positive narratives of sustainable futures to share and to internalize.

One example of art's possibilities to make us understand our place in the natural world through embodied experiences of wholeness and connectness was Ólafur Elíasson's sitespecific project "Riverbed" (2014) in the Louisiana Art Museum in Denmark, which reversed the relation between nature and art (<http://en.louisiana.dk/exhibition/olafur-eliasson>). It has connections with environmental ethics and aesthetics and post-humanistic ethics, which are based on the sense of embodiment and which advance a different understanding of man not separated from but integrated into the environment. The "Riverbed" project creates an aesthetic mode of being and an opportunity to bodily sense of landscape. Outside museum we take nature for granted, we distance ourselves, which makes the technical attitude towards nature possible so that nature can be used as a resource.

In this session there were overall six papers; Charlotte Prové presented *Scaling the 'Environment' in Urban Agriculture Movements through the Lens of Environmental Justice*, Jennie C. Stephens' paper *Cultural Change in Energy Transition: the Emerging Local Power Movement, No Waste Cooking and Exploration of Politics as a Redistribution of the Sensible* by Sissel Gunnerød, Leonardo Valenzuelas presentation of his paper *Of Skateparks and Geoparks: the Sustainability of Patrimonialised Disaster*, Johan Enqvists *Localization of Urban*

Ecosystem Governance in Bangalore, India and finally Stephanie Nuria Spijker talked about paper called *Knitting Green Spaces with the Trends of Social Innovation in Groningen and London*.

This session consisted of themes considering cultural and ecological transitions performed by local movements. In these cases presented in the session culture was seen quite instrumentally. The main goal of these actions was to increase ecological sustainability and raise awareness in the communities. There was also a great social approach involved because of the input of the community. In these cases the social and the cultural are highly connected and for that reason I wouldn't necessarily see culture as a fourth pillar of sustainable development in these particular cases. Instead culture can be seen as driver or creator of these processes. I would say that the role of the culture here is quite transversal in which case it is intermediating between the different dimensions of sustainability.

If thinking about the seven storylines of cultural sustainability as in Soinis and Birkelands analysis in GeoForum14 the papers in this session would belong under environmentalist storylines. 'Eco-cultural resilience' -storyline focuses on the human-nature relationship seeking balance between them. Ecological and cultural processes are interlinked. Storyline of the eco-cultural civilization tries to achieve an ecological turn of the values and behaviour of people. Culture is seen as a system of values, beliefs and principles. This storyline emphasizes cultural aspects and cultural change in achieving the aims of sustainability. As noticed in this session there is a need for cultural change to modes of thinking about the sustainable future. It all starts in communities.

The main topics of discussion in the session were about public space and cultural expressions. Public space is rather interesting concept since it is public and no-one is really responsible for it. That is why there is often lack of engaging when developing public space. Participants of the session talked about entitlement and resistance and the ways public spaces could be used. They also talked about resistance to change and how it complicates the actions. For that collaboration with the public authority might be more productive way to accomplish targets. So the question is how we manage public spaces. Normally it is easier to get public spaces for community purposes in short-term because long-term plans of the cities may include some building in those areas. Anyway, there is a growing recognition of collective activities which play remarkable role in sustainable transitions and foster connection with our environment. Social innovations are also empowering which was seen important in discussion. Local communities realize their potential and take control by them. Policy-relevance was seen problematic because these issues are often intangible and unmeasurable.

After Sissel Gunnerøds presentation about no waste cooking there was discussion about the legislation and what could be done to this food waste problem. Somebody brought forth the fact that most grocery stores are preventing people from dumpster diving. The latest news tells that France is to force big supermarkets to give away unsold food to charity or for use as animal feed. By this France is trying to crack down on food waste. It will be interesting to see how they manage in this.

Veera Mäkirinta

University of Jyväskylä, Finland

The first key topic raised in this parallel research paper session *Artistic urban interventions: a sustainable urban heritage?* was the issue of interventionist art and public space by Katrin Sten. The overall feeling from this paper was that the use of interventionist art in public spaces is an important factor within social sustainability. Various examples were given that highlighted the way in which art can be used as an intervention in public spaces in order to change existing conditions, as the name would suggest. If art can be used to change existing physical conditions in public space, then it is a fair assumption that this can drive behavioural change within these spaces too. Therefore, art can be seen as an intrinsic factor in creating social sustainability, which might suggest that culture falls in the “culture as sustainable development” model, rather than a standalone pillar. This topic of interventionist art was quite interesting to me (coming from a more “three pillars” background), as it got me thinking, if art can be used to create social sustainability, could it be used as well to encourage ecological sustainability. By this I mean could art in public spaces be used in a way to connect with, and learn about our natural surroundings in a way that makes us appreciate and value them more. In this sense, culture could be seen as a method or tool to alter social behaviour towards a more sustainable future.

The second presentation that resonated most deeply with me was that of Stine Avlund, who spoke about this connection of culture/art with sustainability. The example she gave of Olafur Eliasson’s Ice Watch project, was particularly thought provoking. The project took a huge chunk of ice from Greenland and transported it to Denmark in order to give the local community a chance to see and feel the reality

of all the ice that's portrayed in the media relating to climate change. I think this is a powerful tool that can be used not only to create a connection between society and the damage climate change is doing, but also as a tool to spark the conversations about climate change. It is commonly explained by psychological behaviour that we only act in certain ways towards matters that are personal for us. For example, we are much more likely to protect our family than a random stranger. By this argument, creating a personal connection with something so fundamentally rooted in the understanding of climate change (ice), could significantly alter the behaviour towards the climate. This first example was about cultures role in ecological sustainability. Whereas, the second example of "Superflex – Superkilen" is more in line with Sten's approach of public spaces and social sustainability. It was the participatory process the project took that struck me as most interesting, involving locals to be part of the process can create a strong sense of pride and connection with the local areas. This again relates back to creating connections with our surroundings in order to increase our value of them, and thus sustainable behaviour.

How can a farmer act in a more sustainable way? - panel discussion based around the question how can a farmer act in a more sustainable way, which featured a chef (Sasu Laukkonen), a farmer (Michael Hornborg), a researcher (Annukka Vainio), and a representative of Fazer Food Company (Niina Elomaa). One of the first points made was that consumerism and competitive markets are driving the farmers to cut out the chain and sell directly to the consumer in order to make any money. Due to the markets becoming so competitive on price, the sustainability of

produce could come under fire. In my opinion this shift towards a more direct relationship from farmer to consumer could be a good thing for sustainability. Without big supermarket chains driving prices, farmers can become focused on quality and sustainability rather than just cost margins. Furthermore, consumers in general are becoming more aware towards sustainability issues of food which will drive changes in the market. The discussion between the panellists regarding this issue was somewhat of a breath of fresh air, replacing all the theoretical viewpoints with some experiences and perspectives from real-life situations.

The entire panel discussion was intriguing and the overriding message was one of "responsibility". There was a calling for more responsibility to be shown by every actor in the chain, from producers to consumers. This is where culture comes into the equation, there needs to be a change in actions towards food consumption and production which can be heavily influenced by culture. One example given was the "culture" of certain chefs to prepare dishes in the way in which they always have, which in some cases can create a lot of food wastes. In order for the food industry to transform into a more sustainable approach, damaging "cultures" such as ways in which food is prepared or eaten need to be re-thought. This highlights the calling for "responsibility" in decision making, and not just doing things as they are usually done.

Ben Gibson

University of Jyväskylä, Finland

I was a co-organiser and a co-chair of the session "Local museums and heritage sites: What roles in community transitions?". Our background and on-

going research activity has been showing us, over the last few years, how the local initiatives, when build upon the plurality of voices inhabiting the place, can help local populations to create and develop deep changes. Changes that allow people to better understand their past, to better define their evolutionary identities in a global context, to better identify and exercise their roles in the recognition and valorization of place-base experiences and knowledges and, consequently, to be part of the building process of a better present. The main reason to organize and focus this session on “small scale projects” was based on the interest on sharing ideas, experiences, points of view and also different results about projects with a common characteristic: being made by local collectives and inhabitants, with local resources, and centered in the most diverse dimensions of local culture and nature.

Our objective would consist on analysing how they are actually contributing to the recognition of diversity by re-using local experience and resources, facing collective responsibilities, and building new formulas based on transversal dialogue and shared authority. This means that, hovering the conference room of our Session, we could find questions related to the nature, meaning and actual uses of concepts like heritage and heritagisation, collective management based on alterity, or participatory museology, but also open formulas made by locals to satisfy their social, cultural, economical and environmental needs. Secondly, and now under another perspective, we could probably free ourselves and our audience from those invasive presentations where culture appears as a political tool, used by decision makers who frequently seem to have some hearing disorder preventing them from listening to the voices below.

As a matter of fact, the questions that link all us, people working at/with/in these “local made

museums”, is something that could be described as “sociomuseological activism”, meaning we strongly believe museum can be the way and the process to know the other, and to walk with him/her to build an open concept of culture, an evolutionary shape of identity and a sustainable sense of place.

Sharing realities, sharing Springs...

With this objective, we welcomed 6 communications. The main themes where related to: the emergence of new forms of participatory museology in Europe, the role of community in creating local artistic knowledge in Portugal, the challenge of dealing with difficult heritage, negative memories and community consensus in Denmark, the echoes of a collective recovery process of local plants as a way to know the previously (and unknown) dimensions of local culture in Finland, the community museums and the evolution of local narratives linked to historical facts in Greece, or the actual challenges and commitments of Ecomuseology in France.

This way, by having different worlds naturally complementary between them, and above all a huge desire to listen, learn and walk alternative paths, along our Session we could explore and discuss new ideas, responding to the social, political and economic challenges that these museums are currently facing, and also new ways of working in/building these museological processes in order to contribute to healthier, more resilient, diverse and adaptable organizations.

In the end, we could find our own “conclusions-in-the-making” by highlighting that

- We all believe in local action, plural senses and collective processes as a way to produce positive transformation;
- We do understand this kind of museums “as political, poetic and pedagogical processes in permanent construction, and

linked to very specific world-views” (MINOM, 2013);

- We all decided to thank the organization for welcoming our Museums Session, but also for speaking loudly, in the direction of all winds, their way of understanding culture as the foundation of a Sustainable Present.

Lorena Sancho Querol.

University of Coimbra, Portugal

References

MINOM (2013): *Declaration Rio 2013*, MINOM XV Internacional Conference, Rio de Janeiro, 8-10.08.2013. Available at: <http://www.minom-icom.net/reference-documents>

I had the opportunity to attend to the Local Museums and Heritage Sites sessions, about the papers presented there, I wouldn't consider to share the same perspective overall, instead although they all shared similar topics the approaches to them came from different standpoints, which reflects also, the variability of definitions of cultural sustainability. However most of the discussions were about a certain perspective of preservation of culture.

The classic museum traditions still influence this discussions having a strong connection to cultural sustainability around the preservation of heritage. However also there was a common understanding than the local or smaller communities activities and changes are able to have an impact into a bigger scale.

One of the issues that resonated the most on me was on the presentation of Participatory Museology in Europe, which stated Museums in a more open way, with the idea to place them closer to the communities where they are

located, and that closeness having an effect also on the management of them.

Is not a difficult to believe that cultural institutions, such as museums have been threatened by the new technologies, therefore the proximity to the people, to create a participatory dimension in order to try to answer their needs is an interesting and important question to be asked and research about. It seem challenging the change of perspectives from a museography lean, sometimes, to the economic results towards a decision making which seeks that what the museum does comes useful for the people, their uses, and their community. This social museology is a more effective way to engage the community as an audience, because it comes from and for themselves, without becoming unattractive to nonlocal visitors.

The perspective presented from Greece, comes as a reinforcement of the previous statements, as result of the lack of commitment from the community towards local museums that only tried to attract tourism for the economical development of the region. The lack of resources and the lack of approach from the community have contributed to the closure of those museums.

What was formulated was the need to evaluate the role of this - local museums not as touristic and economic resources, but as an instrument to bring local regions some encouragement to creativity, identity and community enhancement which will be part of the cultural sustainability. One of the last statements of this presentation was the need to encourage local museums to learn an operative approach, *know-how*, but also incite them to develop creatively a place into their community, a sense of belonging. A third paper presented a

proposal for achieving a participatory interaction between the museum and the community. This propound the role of the *curator* in a way as a mediator between the museum (as institution that include all the individuals within it) and the local inhabitants to “co-build’ actions that recognizes the value of inhabitants cultural practices as a collective memory”. In this case the stronger understanding of culture is as a cultural heritage that the museum tries to preserve.

It is important to point out the differences between this and the first paper which was focused on a change of the core of the cultural institution to achieve the community commitment that comes from the community. The perspective presented in the latter case opposes to a horizontal approach to communicate, with a strong influence of the classic museum traditions, keeping the figure of the *curator* as the qualifier, a vertical communication in which the community opine.

Another interesting perspective was presented concerning the case of the attacks in Norway of the year 2011 and the reaction of the community of residents of the island of Utoya to the memorial placed there. In this case is interesting to observe how the community opinions have clashed about how the place where the massacre happened should be viewed (and used) afterwards. This leads to the need to have also authorities to mediate to achieve consensus among the members of the community with different opinions.

In any of the cases I think that one of the coincidental topics between all the papers resented on the session was about the relationship with the community, but, as said before with different approaches to it.

Mario Alviso Becerril
University of Jyväskylä, Finland

My paper in the session Values in Place: The Interior Dimension of Sustainability reflected the overall theme of the conference, by suggesting conceptual frameworks that help to indicate the impact of the use of social media by 35 artists-in-residence, in a context of sustainable cultural production. Results focused on presenting identified artist’s main motives for travel and engagement with a constellation of cultural environment(s), constituted essentially by mobility programs in Europe and Asia. The presented session also focused on characterizing purposes of the use of social media and digital communication by selected artists, which are functioning as parallel context(s) of the display and circulation of their creative processes. Artists’ use of technology is based on strategic performances, which support, influence networking and recognition. As a consequence, new meanings and roles of artists have been developed and characterized (e.g. types of behavior), accordingly to the used social software (which include different mechanisms of interaction and communication channels). Artists’ strategies for sustainable cultural production were characterized by an overall restless wish for cultural maintenance understood as life-long learning, which works side by side with issues related with increasing competition and high degree of uncertainty.

The presented session also discussed social, technical, cultural dimensions and organizational/contextual barriers, as well as suggested recommendations for reciprocity between artists and stakeholders (e.g. artistic residences, local host communities). Identification of several barriers were, in fact,

the most interesting topic of discussion, since there is a lack of written recommendations in this field of cultural production, especially into what concerns artists working in mobility programs, where cultural distances differ in values, perceptions, viewpoints and practices. Also, interestingly, visual analysis of selected artists' artworks revealed trends such as: a) environmental awareness, based on multisensory experiences towards nature and human constructed landscapes, and b) the recalling for the importance of everyday routines to question materialistic culture). These trends appear to be in tune with what was discussed by Dr. L. G. Horlings as the "sense of place" and other concepts approached by practitioners, researchers and scientists during the conference activities. These include a focus on the connection between humans and surrounding environment(s), its implications and consequences at different levels.

Identification, recognition and support of cultural production should be considered as a priority, because artists are working with non-permanent social integration issues, interaction(s), and connectedness between place(s) and communities. Performances of artists-in-residence are based on understanding, developing and revealing through their artworks identity complexities, and communication between individuals, which are promoting as a consequence, a cross boarding sustainability at an economic, social and environmental level. Their activities should be then, acknowledged by cultural policy makers as "key" cultural actions, which help on identifying purposes and strategies for creative life-long learning processes, in a context of a global economy and cultural production.

The recognition of differences for a global consciousness based on environmental awareness and justice, along with capacity for being open to learn *within* an interdisciplinary research is, perhaps, the best way to integrate collaborative "modes of being in the world", as mentioned by Prof. Francis Whitehead (inverting hierarchies among politicians, researchers and artists). However, working *within it* and recognizing *it* is not an easy task, due to the degree of complexity in a necessary construction for a multi-layered cultural policy. It demands an effort from top down and bottom up willingness for building a common sustainable future(s).

The topic "The role of cultural policy/ies in sustainable development" is the session which interested me the most. I was inspired by this topic a lot because of the discussion of policies practice in different countries are in a diverse ways. The session gathered people from different institutions to present the real issues in their society was a very important experience for me. In my research, there is often a gap between policy and the reality, one of the reason for causing this result is because the policy-makers did not seek the opinion from the perspective from the bottom part of the social structure. Therefore, it was very interesting to hear what people from government body will introduce the "problem" in their perspective. I was especially inspired by the presentation from people who from the Ministry of Culture in Finland and Italy. It was an opportunity to meet experts from the government institution of different countries to share their experiences and achievement in contributing to art education and promoting cultural differences.

The issue of Sami people was also a new area for me. My presentation is about cultural

discrimination of the indigenous people in Taiwan. In my opinion, the way that government sees the indigenous culture can be reflected how the country value the sustainable culture. I've learned the issue of preserving the indigenous culture is not only a cross-sectoral policy system, but an issue which is crossing national borders. It would be difficult for Taiwan to preserve the indigenous culture crossing the national border because of her weak diplomacy and the political pressure from the PRC. The challenge for Taiwan to register for the Austronesian's world heritage together with Indonesia from UNESCO is because the missing independent sovereignty. As a result, what I would like to express is that the issue of cultural sustainability could be very complex in the case of different countries.

New discussion about immigrants in different countries would be a good perspective to enrich the context about the way of preserving our own cultural identity and the cultural sustainability. While we are looking and tracing our original culture, where we cannot avoid the impact of globalization, what strategies should be suggest to encounter cultural differences and at the same time to build a sustainable society? I cannot see a solution so far. However, I would be my goal to discuss with participants of the conference to know more about examples from different countries.

Rita Vargas de Freitas Matias
University of Jyväskylä, Finland

Gardens are often defined in cultural aspect as constructed heritage gardens. However, gardens are more versatile also in our postmodern culture and showing similarly trends of globalism. It has been realized that

gardens can play and will play an increasingly important role in sustainable futures in many different ways. The meanings are intertwined within sustainable food production, esthetics, biodiversity, importance of pollination, arts, collectiveness, health and heritage as well as living comfort when taken into consideration in architecture and designing living areas and urban environment for example. Gardens have different meanings and priorities to different people, but can provide these things also simultaneously.

The approach of the session Strategic gardening: Mobilizing cultural aspects of gardening in sustainable development provided interesting reflections to sustainable futures and gardens' ability to realize sustainability in individual level as well as on societal level. The presentations considered strategic gardening (Dewaelheyns) as a basis for how we perceive gardens and all the green areas around us. The basic idea of strategic gardening is to make gardening, be it a vegetable plot or a butterfly garden, low threshold activity and easily accessible services. In our built environment there are areas or plots of abandoned, unstructured land that can be utilized and taken care of by applying the ideology of strategic gardening.

The topics in the session included a versatile representation of the research done about the issue: The multiple meanings and cultural aspects of the own-home garden in the early 20th century Sweden by Jacobson; Plant propagation practice: the start of horticulture, Westerlund; Exploring the sustainability potentials of the private garden presented by Gunnarsson, Sjöholm & Saltzman; Allotment garden as human habitat: Environmental experience in architecture design, Djokic, Ristic

Trajkovic & Medjo and Garden conservation and sustainability: A philosophical reflection and examples of Norwegian private gardens written by Lei Gao & Dietze-Schirdewahn.

It was a joy to get to listen to all the presentations and learn about the research done in the field. All the papers discussed the importance of gardens in sustainability from their own view point and showed the interdisciplinary benefits of sustainable development in a cultural setting. The most interesting ones from my point of view were the ones that considered and discussed the private gardens and the social as well as economic signification that individuals have gained and perceived as benefitting in their lives. Private and communal gardens economic benefits to individuals and the economic influence on society would also be intriguing to study. The session gave valid and interesting viewpoints to “How gardening could become a fully-fledged part of sustainable urban and rural development.” (Dewaelheyns), which could be seen as the objective of session.

Sirpa Kortelainen

University of Jyväskylä, Finland

Design is not generally considered a cultural discipline, in the way that, for example, art is considered so. However, design is intrinsically linked to the representation of values in culture, often playing an important role in mediating between consumption and production practices. Designers, as cultural intermediaries, are considered taste creators (Bourdieu). Having a considerable influence in what is ‘desirable’ and what is not, they constantly contribute to legitimise certain cultural values

and practices through designed artefacts.

Reflections on this aspect of design and its impact in culture, especially in relation to sustainable development are scarce. Therefore, the inclusion of this track in the conference is probably the first formal recognition of the above. The presentations and discussions in this track were well-aligned with the theme and purpose of the conference, especially in aspects such as the envisioning new scenarios, transmission and consolidation of sustainability values and the importance of mediating, communicating and synthesising ‘richness and complexity’.

The papers presented in this track reflected the complexity and ubiquity of the issues that design engaged with sustainable development needs to tackle.

Both the macro and micro levels of the problematic were well represented in the selection of papers for this track: on a global level, we had presentations that proposed theories and methodologies for dealing with societal transformation from ‘cultures of consumption (or overconsumption)’ to ‘cultures of sustainability.’ On a micro level, the engagement with sustainability took a more pragmatic and contextual approach, with case studies serving as points of reflexion on how generic understandings, positions and policies have a direct impact on practice. Equally, these punctual examples also represented the now widespread engagement in of the many design disciplines in transforming their ‘business as usual’ practice, taking a more reflective and critical approach, and adopting strategies for change in line with sustainable development goals.

There was strong consensus and agreement among participants in the following issues:

- Design needs to support the intrinsic values that underpin sustainable development and quality of life, rather than the extrinsic, more materialistic values that are currently fuelling the dominant cultures of overconsumption and waste.
- Design needs to challenge cultural misconceptions of sustainability: i.e. that sustainable lifestyles mean lesser quality, variety and freedom, by providing alternatives that are desirable, accessible and culturally relevant.
- Design could assume a more strategic role in societal transformation by leading users to new ways of producing and consuming that are not only more sustainable, but also more meaningful, through positive aesthetic and cognitive experiences.
- Design & art educators have a responsibility for educating the younger generations to be critical thinkers, 'envisioners' and active leaders for change, rather than to just 'tackle problems'. Therefore, it is essential that the curricula reflect this stance, and provides students with the skills to innovate at systemic, as well as at topical level.

At a personal level, the conference was for me a wonderful opportunity to learn, share, and reaffirm the sense of urgency and hope. I came away inspired, more connected, and proud to be part of the 'transition' generation working to bring about a fairer and more healthy world.

Laura Santamaria
Loughborough University, UK