

**This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.**

**Author(s):** Koistinen, Aino-Kaisa; Kortekallio, Kaisa; Santaoja, Minna; Karkulehto, Sanna

**Title:** Towards cultural transformation : Culture as planetary well-being

**Year:** 2024

**Version:** Published version

**Copyright:** © 2024 selection and editorial matter, Merja Elo, Jonne Hytönen, Sanna Karkuleht

**Rights:** CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

**Rights url:** <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

**Please cite the original version:**

Koistinen, A.-K., Kortekallio, K., Santaoja, M., & Karkulehto, S. (2024). Towards cultural transformation : Culture as planetary well-being. In M. Elo, J. Hytönen, S. Karkulehto, T. Kortetmäki, J. S. Kotiaho, M. Puurtinen, & M. Salo (Eds.), *Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Planetary Well-Being* (pp. 231-245). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003334002-23>

# 17

## TOWARDS CULTURAL TRANSFORMATION

### Culture as planetary well-being

*Aino-Kaisa Koistinen, Kaisa Kortekallio,  
Minna Santaoja and Sanna Karkulehto*

#### Introduction

Culture is often mentioned as the fourth pillar of sustainability, alongside its social, ecological, and economic dimensions. Whereas “social”, “ecological”, and “economic” are relatively clearly distinguished concepts and attributes of sustainability, “cultural sustainability”—let alone the of concept “culture”—remains vaguer (Soini and Birkeland, 2014; Sabatini, 2019). Culture is, indeed, an elusive and multidimensional concept that can include everything from Hollywood films to heritage sites and lifestyles—not to mention divisions into “high” and “low” culture or mainstream and sub-cultures. Culture can thus be defined in multiple ways. According to cultural studies scholar Raymond Williams (1985, p. 64), there are three common definitions: (1) “[A] general process of intellectual, spiritual and aesthetic development”; (2) “a particular way of life, whether of a people, a period, a group, or humanity in general”; and (3) “the works and practices of intellectual and especially artistic activity”.

Williams’ third understanding of culture has become the most common. This is a concept of culture as visual and fine arts, literature, music, theatre, architecture, films, games, concerts, and performances—and institutions such as libraries and museums that foster these practices. Quite often culture is understood more broadly as ways of life that encompass intellectual/artistic activity as well as habits, lifestyles, traditions, beliefs, values, and worldviews (see also Pirnes, 2009; Dessein *et al.*, 2015, p. 21). Understood broadly, culture is part of the life of every human being—or even, culture is *human life* in all its aspects. Cultural practices, understood as shared habitual and customary ways of life, shape human lives, and culture as ways of life is simultaneously shaped by the practices and activities of individuals.

Building on and rethinking culture and cultural sustainability in the framework of planetary well-being, this chapter outlines how culture can be regarded as planetary well-being. In their influential report, Dessein *et al.* (2015) define cultural sustainability in terms of three roles that reflect the multidimensionality of culture as a concept. The first role, (1) culture *in* sustainable development, defines culture as something with intrinsic value (*i.e.*, valuable “as such”). This can refer to individual artworks, architecture, or heritage sites. When culture is seen as the fourth pillar in sustainability discourse, it is understood in line with this first definition. The second role, (2) culture *for* sustainable development, frames culture as a mediator for sustainability, with the capacity to frame, contextualize, and balance the requirements of social, ecological, and economic aspects of sustainability. This can encompass for example films, literary works, and visual art that carry messages relevant to sustainability. The third and most comprehensive role, (3) culture *as* sustainable development, refers to culture as a broader shift towards more sustainable lifestyles and worldviews.

Culture *in* sustainable development corresponds roughly to the narrower understanding of culture as intellectual or artistic activities, whereas the second and third roles refer to the broader understanding of culture as ways of life. The different roles and definitions are interlinked and overlapping, and the two first roles of culture—culture *in* and *for* sustainability—are at least partly nested in culture *as* sustainable development. According to Dessein *et al.* (*ibid.*), culture, in the broadest sense, forms a foundation for sustainable development and can even be considered the most important dimension of sustainability. Recognizing culture as an overarching concern in sustainability thinking, in all its forms, may allow culture and sustainability to intertwine in ways that can help dissolve the tensions between social, economic, and ecological sustainability.

In this chapter, we suggest that in the current ecological and well-being crises, cultural transformation has to denote a process towards *planetary well-being*, in which the well-being and needs of humans, other species, and ecosystems are considered both intrinsically important and interlinked. By *cultural transformation*, we refer to a large-scale change in shared knowledges, lifestyles, traditions, beliefs, morals, laws, customs, values, institutions, and worldviews, and how they are practised in everyday life. Large-scale cultural transformation requires simultaneous work and changes on different levels of society, from individual to institutional and structural. As cultural practices are renewed in everyday actions, they are open to change, and the changes may give rise to broader cultural transformations.

Cultural transformation—including changing unsustainable production and consumption patterns—needs to be considered with respect to multiple levels of society (*e.g.*, Raatikainen *et al.*, 2021). In other words, culture as a whole—what is considered meaningful and how life is organized based on that—needs to transform. To put it simply, we suggest that cultural transformation is critical for achieving planetary well-being, and the required cultural transformation can be called *culture as planetary well-being*. We emphasize that a narrower understanding of

culture as intellectual and artistic activity is relevant in this transformation. We focus specifically on the potential of contemporary art in evoking and developing planetary thinking and action. The potential of arts and literature to influence or transform people, for either good or bad, has been widely researched (*e.g.*, Keen, 2007; Fialho, 2019; Lähdesmäki and Koistinen, 2021; Schneider-Mayerson, 2021). More broadly, imagination—or symbolic meaning-making—has been considered one of the key drivers of cultural practices, including social cooperation, and thus the formation of societies. By evoking imagined entities such as gods, nation-states, and theoretical concepts, human communities can explain and organize events and dynamics that are not readily available to their senses (Thrift, 2008, pp. 158–159).

As an example of how art can contribute to cultural transformation and promote culture as planetary well-being, we examine the art exhibition *Siat—Pigs* (henceforth *Pigs*; 2021) by the internationally renowned Finnish artist duo Gustafsson&Haapoja.<sup>1</sup> The exhibition highlighted the simultaneous societal presence and absence of pigs by exploring the experiences of a nonhuman animal commonly reduced to a mere resource for human exploitation (see also Bolman, 2019). Furthermore, the exhibition discussed how pigs are connected to class struggles, industrialization, global capitalism, environmental crises, and colonialism by emphasizing the poor working and living conditions on pig farms and in slaughterhouses. The exhibition was considered controversial by some, as it was interpreted as criticism towards the treatment of pigs in animal husbandry. We argue that the exhibition engaged in culturally transformative imagination by underlining the human and nonhumans' vulnerable, interconnected lives. By doing so in the context of animal husbandry, it also invited cultural negotiation on what forms of work and livelihood are viable in sustainable societies. The empirical case allows us to address culture as planetary well-being on different scales, from the perceptions of an individual visitor to the broader societal contexts of the artwork.

### Art and the shared vulnerability of humans and nonhumans

In September 2021, *Pigs* opened in the Kunsthalle exhibition space in Seinäjoki, a town of approximately 65,000 residents in a farming region, Western Finland. The exhibition was held in three interconnected exhibition rooms. It included a sound installation *Waiting Room* (2019), consisting of a 16-channel recording of pigs' voices (recorded the night before they were slaughtered), set up in a dim-lit hall, and two videos. *Untitled (Alive)* (2021) portrays the life of a pig called Paavo, saved from slaughter, and since living in an animal shelter. *No Data* (2021) is a collage-like piece based on online data concerning the global pig industry.<sup>2</sup> The video brings together the use of pigs and the conditions of animal industry workers through often overlapping black and white images (primarily as negatives) of the pig industry, such as slaughterhouses and their surroundings, and fragments of text (in both English and Finnish). It includes a synthetic soundscape with a dark undertone that the visitors could listen to through headphones.

The exhibition developed on the themes expressed in Gustafsson&Haapoja's previous exhibitions, such as *The Museum of the History of Cattle* (2014) or *Museum of Nonhumanity* (2016–), that criticized the role of museums as institutions and spaces for preserving only human history and cultural heritage without recognizing the role of nonhuman animals in history and culture. In *Pigs*, Gustafsson&Haapoja called attention to the well-being of both humans and nonhumans by presenting the visitors with the experiences of pigs and pig industry workers, both suffering from poor living and working conditions. Thus, the exhibition was thematically intertwined with global contexts and critical questions on ecological, economic, and social sustainability and well-being on a planetary scale.

The sound installation *Waiting Room* consisted of speakers playing pigs' voices and nothing else, but it was framed by an exhibition text in the room leading to the sound installation, stating that the pigs were recorded on their last night before slaughter. The minimalist setting of the exhibition room highlighted the effect of the voices: There was not much else that the visitor could focus on (see Figure 17.1). The visitor was thus forced to encounter the pigs in a manner to which most city-dwelling museum-goers are not accustomed—that is, by their overwhelming auditive presence. The lack of visual representation of the pigs also emphasized the simultaneous absence and presence of pigs in society that the exhibition sought to address. Scholars such as Carol J. Adams (2010) and Timothy Pachirat (2011, p. 3; see also Creed, 2017, p. 114) have noted the cultural invisibility of animals reared for their meat: The animals become products, meat, and the actual living and dying animals are concealed from sight. The pigs' voices even seeped through the headphones when viewing the videos in the other rooms, thus contributing to the viewing experience. The fact that the voices were recorded on their last night before slaughter highlighted the pigs' vulnerability and dependency on humans and confronted the visitor with questions such as the pigs' possible awareness of their approaching death.

The visual absence of the pigs in *Waiting Room* was in stark contrast to the video *Untitled (Alive)* displayed in the preceding room—even the title of the video serves as a counterpoint to the soon-to-be-dead animals. The video was captured by attaching a camera with a harness to the pig called Paavo, now living in an animal shelter. The camera was attached to Paavo's neck, so his ears and snout were visible from the back (see Figure 17.2). In this sense, the video not only offers a visual representation of a pig (that was lacking in *Waiting Room*) but invites the viewers to see the world through the eyes of one. Unlike the pigs in the sound installation, Paavo is roaming freely on the farm, sniffing and digging the ground, napping, and receiving human caresses. Watching the video, it is easy to describe Paavo as a happy hog who gets to act according to his species-specific behaviour. The video portrays him as an individual, not as a resource to be consumed.

In the exhibition catalogue, Gustafsson&Haapoja describe the video *No Data* as “an attempt to examine what kind of world is created by animal husbandry”.<sup>3</sup> They also note the difficulty in attempting to grasp the whole picture of pig husbandry,



FIGURE 17.1 *Waiting Room*. Copyright: Jenni Latva. Courtesy of Kunsthalle Seinäjoki.



FIGURE 17.2 *Untitled (Alive)*. Screenshot. Courtesy of Kunsthalle Seinäjoki.

where the well-being of both humans and nonhumans is connected to bacteria, feed production, and industrial infrastructure. The name *No Data* thus highlights the enormous scale and inaccessibility of the animal industry. The fragmented poetics of the video communicates this scale and inaccessibility: The viewers are presented with changing images and texts that do not provide enough data to see the whole

(see Figure 17.3). The effect is further emphasized by the fragmented nature of the presented texts, as the following excerpts illustrate:

the bloodier incidents really bothered her, she said, such as when a new hire caught his

an employee working on a sanitation crew pushed a button after removing parts from the upper of a machine. the employee then placed his foot into a

a worker was reaching to pick up a box of clear a jam when his jacket became caught in a roller. As he tried to pull out, his

The fragments leave the sentences open, allowing viewers to fill in the gaps. The promise of “bloody incidents” in the first fragment invites viewers to assume that the omitted texts would contain something violent for the workers. It is noteworthy that *No Data* also encompasses the experiences of the pig farmers in the fragment: “Farms facing distress have relied on short-term loans”.<sup>4</sup> The precarious conditions of the pig industry workers discussed in the video thus extend to the farmers. Precarity is commonly understood as uncertainty of employment and human livelihood within the global capitalist economy (see, e.g., Precarias a la deriva, 2009, pp. 100, 387). In the era of ecosocial crises, precarity has become an existential question about the possibility of future human and nonhuman life on Earth. In this precarious condition, humans and pigs are both culprits of environmental disasters via complex ecological and economic interlinkages, and simultaneously the victims of conditions.

The fragmented texts borrow their aesthetics from poetry. Discussing the possibility of writing the life of another meat animal, the cow, Jessica Holmes (2021) connects poetry to activism in its potential to lend voices to those who are silenced, “in part due to its capacity to embody loss, fragmentation, and absence”. Thus, “poems offer alternative methods of seeing or bearing witness to, remembering and assigning value to individual subjects” (*ibid.*, p. 229). Within the context of the *Pigs* exhibition, the poetic language of *No Data* invited the viewers to bear witness to the vulnerabilities and interconnected lives of pigs and pig industry workers, habitually rendered invisible by the sheer logistics of technological civilization.

It is often claimed that the potential of art and literature to instigate societal changes lies in their capacity to allow people to grasp the experiences, feelings, and emotions of others, including nonhuman animals (Rifkin, 2010, p. 312; Creed, 2017, pp. 123–124; Weik von Mossner, 2017; Lähdesmäki and Koistinen, 2021). In *Pigs*, the visitors were invited to share some parts of the experiences of both pigs and pig industry workers. In *No Data*, the fates and well-being of both humans and nonhumans are deeply entangled, speaking of their shared vulnerability and precarity. The images and texts depict conditions that are hazardous and deadly for both—and even for the broader natural environment that is affected by pig industrial waste. Some of the fragments also underline the role of immigrants as pig industry workers in poor conditions, highlighting how some humans are in more precarious situations than others (see Butler, 2004).



FIGURE 17.3 The fragmented poetics of *No Data*. Copyright Jenni Latva. Courtesy of Kunsthalle Seinäjoki.

In the case of the voice installation and the text fragments of *No Data*, *Pigs* can also be interpreted as “giving voice” to cultural “others”. The idea of speaking for others may be contested in the case of humans, since instead of “speaking for” one might instead need to listen to others capable of speaking for themselves (e.g., marginalized, indigenous, or racialized people; see Montero-Sieburth, 2020). However, as the texts in *No Data* represent the words of actual workers, the artists are borrowing their own words to speak for them, which emerges as a form of listening. When it comes to nonhumans, “speaking for” becomes somewhat problematic, and the possibility of human beings representing nonhumans via language has been criticized (Karkulehto *et al.*, 2020; MacCormack, 2020, p. 56, pp. 79–80). That said, in human legislation and cultural practices, nonhuman animals need humans to speak for them, but this “speaking for” always requires listening to nonhumans first. The sound installation *Waiting Room* can be interpreted as inviting the visitors to listen to the pigs as living, breathing, and sometimes noisy animals. It is not always possible to concretely listen to nonhumans, but listening can be understood as turning human attention to nonhumans and their experiences.

Approaching the experiences of others through arts and literature has been argued to lead to empathy towards other people (e.g., Keen, 2007; Fialho, 2019) and perhaps even to other species (e.g., Creed, 2017, p. 19; Weik von Mossner, 2017, pp. 1–16)—even though it cannot, of course, be argued that this is always the outcome of reading literature or experiencing art (Lähdesmäki and Koistinen,



2021). It can, however, be claimed that the *Pigs* exhibition used the imaginative potential of art to expose museum-goers to the experiences and living/working conditions of both humans and animals in the pig industry.<sup>5</sup> Depending on the viewer, this may have been an affective and emotional experience that involved empathetic feelings towards the pigs and meat industry workers and reveals the more-than-human vulnerability, injustices, and (political) struggle in the industrialized, neoliberal, and postcolonial market economy.

### Art and the changing meanings of work

The site of the exhibition brought another level to the discussion on the animal industry. Until the 1980s, the building was used as a cowshed, with a slaughterhouse and a meat processing plant in its immediate vicinity. Kunsthalle Seinäjoki's exhibitions address issues arising from its location on the intersection of urban and rural contexts. The animal industry is still an important livelihood in the region, and Gustafsson&Haapoja wanted to bring the exhibition to discuss the future of food production on-site. The exhibition hit a pressure point at the intersection of local livelihoods, animal ethics, and sustainable transformation of (food) culture. In November 2021, *Pigs* attracted a lot of media attention. After two middle school classes from the nearby town of Kurikka had visited the exhibition, the mayor of Kurikka forbade further elementary school classes from visiting it. Parents, many of them pig farmers themselves, had contacted the mayor. The ban was based on the claim that the exhibition gave too one-sided an image of pig husbandry. According to the head of the local education and culture department, the decision aimed to protect children from offensive content (Koi-vuranta and Ahola, 2021).

The media debate that followed the ban on school visits questioned whether the mayor had the authority to intervene in the curriculum. After all, animal welfare has been part of the Finnish school curriculum since 2016, although it varies significantly how this is implemented in schools. In an interview (Mäenpää, 2021), the exhibition curator claimed that people who had not even seen the exhibition gave too scandalous an image of it. According to the curator, many of the people who had seen the exhibition said that they were rather positively disappointed than shocked, as everything was presented in a sensitive manner. The local pig farmers, for their part, took the exhibition as part of a broader attack on their livelihood, even though the exhibition did not directly comment on local pig husbandry. What was forgotten in the media discussions around the exhibition was that *No Data* also highlights the precarious situation of pig industry workers, as discussed above.

The farmers' reaction to the exhibition stresses the need for reimagining and transforming livelihoods and work for planetary well-being in ways that no one is left behind, even when the transformation becomes a site of heated cultural negotiation and political struggle. We suggest that the imaginative potential of art can be

used to transform the normalized perceptions of work, as made visible by the *Pigs* exhibition and the media discussions it spurred. Especially in the video *No Data*, pig industry workers' precarious experiences and vulnerability can be interpreted on the larger scale of planetary well-being, including both human and nonhuman beings in critical discussions on ecological, economic, and social sustainability. In these contexts, it is interesting that ecological crises are often discussed in terms of consumption—both on the level of individual consumer choices and the multi-lateral political negotiations and agreements for sustainability—but not so often in terms of work. Nevertheless, most environmental harm is connected to some kind of work, and work causes many social and environmental injustices.

Work, like culture, is a multifaceted concept, both a noun and a verb. Work may refer, for instance, to the effort of converting matter into a desired form, or to the diverse ways people contribute to society in exchange for salary or goods—or to services, charity, and care that people offer or share without any monetary exchange. Along with numerous changing practices regarding what we eat, how we produce energy, and how mobility is organized, the transformation entails fundamental cultural changes concerning work. Many occupations will become obsolete, whereas many new professions will be formed. At best, individuals and communities would receive sufficient economic, social, and psychological support when transitioning to new livelihoods, and the cultural transformation could leave more time for care, societal participation, and cultural practices such as art (*cf.*, BIOS, 2019; Järvensivu and Toivanen, 2018). The ongoing cultural transformation of work requires a new kind of political economy, including novel solutions for income that could facilitate meaningful lifestyles, economic, ecological, and social sustainability, and planetary well-being.

The conflict raised by the *Pigs* exhibition can be perceived as a conflict of values that entails a wicked moral choice: Should society prioritize the well-being of pigs or the current livelihoods of farmers? The exhibition was probably perceived as offensive as it showed pigs as individuals with desires that the visitors could and should empathize with. The moral conflict was highlighted in *No Data* by presenting the viewer with images and texts featuring the ill-being of pigs, followed by a question that brings to the fore the anthropocentrism of pig husbandry: “Raising pigs on concrete—is it right for me?” Here, the well-being of pigs remains concealed, and the focus remains on the human farmers: No one is asking whether it is right for the pigs to raise them on concrete. Regardless of our moral preference, the persuasive power of art matters for the public discussion about pigs and farm workers—and this discussion may, then, ultimately affect the material living conditions of both.

Upon opening of the *Pigs* exhibition in September 2021, Gustafsson&Haapoja organized a seminar discussing pigs in society.<sup>6</sup> They had invited several experts from different fields to address the topic: An animal welfare representative, a researcher of regenerative agriculture, an animal rights lawyer, and an activist secretly shooting videos on animal farms. The seminar posed the question of how

to live more ethically with nonhuman animals while acknowledging the problematic position of the farmers. In light of the seminar, the media debate on the exhibition oversimplified it by constructing a bias between local livelihoods and animal welfare. Laura Gustafsson recognized how farmers are caught between a rock and a hard place, as they are bound to the current production system by agricultural subsidies and an emphasis on the efficiency and growth of the agricultural sector. Galina Kallio, a researcher in regenerative agriculture, described the many ways producers are already experimenting with re-organizing food production. “Invisible work” done by humans and ecosystems is not explicit in political talk, market prices, or official statistics but nevertheless increases the well-being of both humans and ecosystems. Currently, these new forms of organizing work transpire mainly outside formal organizations (see also Kallio, 2018), but making them visible through art and research may make different ways of organizing livelihood more widely available to producers.

In farms where forms of regenerative agriculture are already practised, relationships between humans and nonhuman animals such as pigs are configured very differently from the “conventional” industrial pig husbandry. The animals on the farm do work—they may contribute, for instance, by keeping the grass short and processing it into manure, thus recycling nutrients back to the soil. They do not exist only to be killed and eaten, and they get to live according to their species-specific and individual needs. Working for the well-being of the ecosystems, animals, and humans could provide farmers with new meaningful livelihoods and work.

The *Pigs* exhibition and the seminar exemplify art’s potential to invite the visitors to imagine a transformation towards more sustainable living. It shows the potential of art in raising questions about planetary well-being and making visible the subordinate role of many, especially nonhuman, others in culture and society. While the exhibition may have contributed to the cultural transformation towards planetary well-being by questioning the justification of industrial meat production and related work, it also showed how daunting the transformation may be. Pig farmers have been accusing urban dwellers and green politicians of aiming to reduce meat production without understanding where domestic meat comes from and how the animals are treated. During the exhibition, however, the farmers strongly opposed the artists’ attempt at educating audiences about pig farming practices—and, as the media debate shows, even deemed the topic unsuitable for their children. The farmers appeal for their right to practise their legal livelihood, but the debate goes deeper. By questioning the morality of industrial animal husbandry, art challenges the farmers’ identities, exposing their vulnerability by drawing parallels between the suffering of the pigs and of the animal industry employees.

The example highlights how art’s affective and political impact can be considered threatening. This potential threat is intimately connected to art’s capacity to imagine the perspectives of others—even of people and creatures usually considered aliens or enemies. In transitioning to culture as planetary well-being,

such concerns should be addressed by listening to the voices of all concerned—consumers or producers, pigs or farmers, artists or politicians.

### **Conclusion: Culture as planetary well-being**

Cultural transformation is a matter of both visions and practices. It encompasses the imagination of what planetary well-being would look like in more-than-human societies and the ongoing realization of such visions as concrete actions. Sometimes, promoting cultural transformation entails paying attention to cultural practices that already contribute to planetary well-being. In this chapter, we have sought to highlight the work of societally engaged artists such as Gustafsson&Haapoja. As our examination of *Pigs* shows, Gustafsson&Haapoja's work invites broad audiences to rethink how their lives are entangled with the lives of others—human and nonhuman.

The power of cultural productions, like art, lies in the possibility of creating such visions of planetary well-being. More broadly, culture as ways of life has the potential to shift the emphasis from current consumer culture and its practices to planetary well-being. Planetary well-being is based on “needs-based, nonsubjective conceptions of human well-being”, meaning the fulfilment of human needs such as “the need for physical and mental health, for relationships, and for autonomy in action and thought” within planetary boundaries (Kortetmäki *et al.*, 2021, p. 5). When art brings us to realize and rethink our material embeddedness in the lives of others and our shared vulnerability, it can deepen our understanding of what these needs are—for ourselves and others.

Moreover, art can help fulfil social and psychological needs in ways that are less destructive to ecosystems. Enjoying and practising art and cultural products can enhance mental health (Fancourt and Finn, 2019), for example, by supporting one's experience of living a meaningful life (*e.g.*, Thiele, 2013, pp. 168–193; Aholainen *et al.*, 2021). The sense of meaning is essential in inspiring people to work for the greater good of the community, which may extend to the broader environment (Thiele, 2013, pp. 168–193; Salonen and Bardy, 2015, p. 9). The sense of meaning may also lessen the need to consume material goods and inspire hope for a sustainable future (Salonen and Bardy, 2015, p. 4, 12). In this sense, the potential of art to bring meaning to life should not be overlooked.

It should be acknowledged that art is not independent of unsustainable material conditions (see Parikka, 2018; Brennan *et al.*, 2019). The ecological footprints of cultural productions and practices vary greatly. Compared to energy-intensive digital media services, large music festivals, or big Hollywood films, smaller-scale practices such as drawing and writing, meditation, dancing, or loaning books from the library have a significantly lower ecological footprint. Sustainability is a growing concern for the cultural sector (*e.g.*, Brennan *et al.*, 2019). Acknowledging their current ecological impact, many cultural organizations have begun to reimagine and reconstruct their working practices.

In our vision of culture as planetary well-being, engagement with art contributes to social and ecological sustainability by providing opportunities for reflection, creativity, connection, and enjoyment. Working towards culture as planetary well-being could involve what botanist and Potowatomi philosopher Robin Wall Kimmerer (2020, p. 336) calls “biocultural restoration”. Kimmerer uses the term “culture” in the broad sense, as complete ways of life. In their view, biocultural restoration means that local people restore damaged lands and ecosystems, such as former mining areas or polluted rivers, which in turn contributes to the restoration of cultures that value respectful and reciprocal relations to the land:

Like other mindful practices, ecological restoration can be viewed as an act of reciprocity in which humans exercise their caregiving responsibility for the ecosystems that sustain them. We restore the land, and the land restores us.

As we have argued in this chapter, engagement with art may be essential to such restoration. Not only can it alert us to the destructive ways of contemporary cultural practices but it can also orient us towards culture as planetary well-being.

## Notes

- 1 Laura Gustafsson and Terike Haapoja.
- 2 These works were accompanied by English and Finnish translations of the texts seen in *No Data*; Laura Gustafsson’s essay on Paavo, the pig from *Untitled (Alive)*; and an exhibition catalogue, which includes a brief description of the exhibition and discusses the use and well-being of pigs in Finnish society. For our examination, the first author took notes upon visiting the exhibition. We also collected media coverage of the exhibition from diverse electronic outlets. In addition, the research material includes some related videos and a recording from a seminar organized in connection with the exhibition. We are grateful to Gustafsson&Haapoja and Kunsthalle Seinäjoki for providing the needed materials and to Gustafsson for providing information on the source materials for *No Data*.
- 3 Translated by Koistinen.
- 4 Translated by Koistinen from the Finnish transcript that accompanied the video.
- 5 Museum-goers’ reactions to exhibitions are difficult to predict (see Landkammer, 2018; Sommer and Klöckner, 2019), and exhibitions may therefore not produce the expected effect. People tend to visit museums to strengthen—rather than challenge—their own values and beliefs, and demographic factors may have an effect on the choice of the museum/exhibition (Smith, 2021, pp. 3, 161–174). Museums have also been critiqued for catering to elite audiences (e.g., Hall, 2008; Dixon, 2016; Turunen and Viita-aho, 2021). The media discussion around *Pigs* nevertheless highlights the potential of museums “to expand beyond their walls” (Turunen, 2020, p. 1022; see also Kros, 2014), reaching people not interested in visiting the physical museum space.
- 6 The seminar was part of a series entitled Art and the Rural Gathering, organized at Kunsthalle Seinäjoki.

## References

- Adams, C.J. (2010) *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory*. 20th anniversary edn. New York: Continuum.

- Aholainen, M. *et al.* (2021) 'Miten taide vaikuttaa? Kulttuurisia näkökulmia hyvinvointiin ja terveyteen', *Lääkärilehti* 76(9), pp. 564–568. Available at: <https://www.laakarilehti.fi/tieteessa/katsausartikkeli/miten-taide-vaikuttaa-kulttuurisia-nakokulmia-hyvinvointiin-ja-terveyteen/?public=29e7a5eeae789608f35becb2cc8ef7a4> (Accessed: 26 August 2022).
- BIOS (2019) *Ecological Reconstruction*. Available at: <https://eco.bios.fi/> (Accessed: 26 August 2022).
- Bolman, B. (2019) 'Carnivorous anatomies art and being beasts', in Karkulehto, S., Koistinen, A.-K. and Varis, E. (eds.) *Reconfiguring Human, Nonhuman and Posthuman in Literature and Culture*. New York: Routledge, pp. 163–181. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429243042>
- Brennan, M. *et al.* (2019) 'Do music festival communities address environmental sustainability and how? A Scottish case study', *Popular Music*, 38(2), pp. 252–275. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261143019000035>
- Butler, J. (2004) *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. London and New York: Verso.
- Creed, B. (2017) *Stray. Human–Animal Ethics in the Anthropocene*. Sydney: Power Books.
- Dessein, J. *et al.* (2015) *Culture in, for and as Sustainable Development. Conclusions from the COST ACTION IS1007 Investigating Cultural Sustainability*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä. Available at: <https://jyx.jyu.fi/handle/123456789/50452> (Accessed: 26 August 2022).
- Dixon, C. (2016) *The 'Othering' of Africa and Its Diasporas in Western Museum Practices*. PhD Thesis. University of Sheffield. Available at: <https://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/17065/> (Accessed: 26 August 2022).
- Fancourt D. and Finn S. (2019) *What Is the Evidence on the Role of the Arts in Improving Health and Well-Being? A Scoping Review*. Health Evidence Network synthesis report 67. Copenhagen: WHO Regional Office for Europe 2019. Available at: <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/329834> (Accessed: 26 August 2022).
- Fialho, O. (2019) 'What is literature for? The role of transformative reading', *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 6, pp. 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2019.1692532>
- Hall, S. (2008) 'Un-settling 'the Heritage', Re-imagining the post-nation. Whose heritage?' *Third Text*, 13(49), pp. 3–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09528829908576818>
- Holmes, J. (2021) 'Writing the cow: Poetry, activism, and the texts of meat', in White, J. and Whitlock, G. (eds.) *Life Writing in the Anthropocene*. New York: Routledge, pp. 228–241. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-77973-3>
- Järvensivu, P. and Toivanen, T. (2018) 'Miten järjestää työ ja työllisyys ekologisen jälleennakennuksen aikakaudella?', in Suoranta, A. and Leinikki, S. (eds.) *Rapautuvan palkkatyön yhteiskunta*. Tampere: Vastapaino, pp. 44–61.
- Kallio, G. (2018) *The Visible Hands: An Ethnographic Inquiry into the Emergence of Food Collectives as a Social Practice for Exchange*. Aalto University publication series Doctoral dissertations, 170/2018. Available at: <https://aaltodoc.aalto.fi/handle/123456789/34034> (Accessed: 26 August 2022).
- Karkulehto, S. *et al.* (2020) 'Reconfiguring human, nonhuman and posthuman: Striving for more ethical cohabitation', in Karkulehto, S., Koistinen, A.-K., and Varis, E. (eds.) *Reconfiguring Human, Nonhuman and Posthuman in Literature and Culture*. New York: Routledge, pp. 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429243042>
- Keen, S. (2007) *Empathy and the Novel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kimmerer, R.W. (2020) *Braiding Sweetgrass. Indigenous Wisdom, Scientific Knowledge and the Teachings of Plants*. London: Penguin Books.

- Koivuranta, R. and Ahola, S. (2021) 'Kurikan kaupunki perui yläkoululaisten vierailut sikoja ja lihateollisuutta käsittelevään näyttelyyn, syynä nuorten suojele: 'Joidenkin kestokyvyt alkavat olla rajoilla'', *Helsingin Sanomat*, Kulttuuri & Kuvataide, 4 November. Available at: <https://www.hs.fi/kulttuuri/art-2000008381115.html> (Accessed: 26 August 2022).
- Kortetmäki, T. et al. (2021) 'Planetary well-being', *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 8, 258. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-021-00899-3>
- Kros, C. (2014) 'Tainted heritage? The case of the Branly museum', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 20(7–8), pp. 834–850. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2013.860393>
- Lähdesmäki, T. and Koistinen, A.-K. (2021) 'Explorations of linkages between intercultural dialogue, art, and empathy', in Maine, F. and Vrikki, M. (eds.), *Dialogue for Intercultural Understanding: Placing Cultural Literacy at the Heart of Learning*. Cham: Springer, pp. 45–58. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-71778-0\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-71778-0_4)
- Landkammer, N. (2018). 'The museum as a site of unlearning? Coloniality and education in ethnographic museums, a study focusing on Germany, Austria and Switzerland', in Ender, S., Landkammer, N. and Schneider, K. (eds.) *The Museum as a Site of Unlearning: Materials and Reflections on Museum Education at the Weltkulturen Museum*, pp. 2–23. Available at: <https://another-roadmap.net/articles/0003/4909/the-museum-as-a-site-of-unlearning-nora-landkammer.pdf> (Accessed: 26 August 2022).
- MacCormack P. (2020) *Ahuman Manifesto. Activism for the End of the Anthropocene*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Mäenpää, T. (2021) 'Seinäjoen taidehallin Siat-näyttelyn kävijämäärässä nähtävissä selvää nostetta runsaan keskustelun ja kohun keskellä', Yle Uutiset, 18 November. Available at: <https://yle.fi/a/3-12192810> (Accessed: 23 January 2023).
- Montero-Sieburth, M.A. (2020) 'Who gives 'Voice' or 'Empowers Migrants' in participatory action research? Challenges and solutions', *Migration Letters*, 17(2), pp. 211–218. <https://doi.org/10.33182/ml.v17i2.806>
- Pachirat, T. (2011) *Every Twelve Seconds: Industrialized Slaughter and the Politics of Sight*. New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press.
- Parikka, J. (2018) 'Medianatures', in Braidotti, R. and Hlavajova, M. (eds.) *Posthuman Glossary*. London: Bloomsbury, pp. 251–253.
- Pirnes, E. (2009) 'Cultural policy in the sectoral trap—but how to escape it', *Nordisk Kulturpolitisk Tidskrift* 2/2009, pp. 155–174.
- Precarias a la deriva (2009) *Hoivaajien kapina. Tutkimusmatkoja prekaarisuuteen [A la deriva por los circuitos de la precariedad femenina]*. Helsinki: Like and Tutkijaliitto.
- Raatikainen, K.J. et al. (2021) 'Pathways towards a sustainable future envisioned by early-career conservation researchers', *Conservation Science and Practice*, 3(9), e493. <https://doi.org/10.1111/csp2.493>
- Rifkin, J. (2010) *The Empathic Civilization. The Race to Global Consciousness in a World in Crisis*. New York: Polity Press.
- Sabatini, F. (2019) 'Culture as fourth pillar of sustainable development: Perspectives for integration, paradigms of action', *European Journal of Sustainable Development* 8(3), pp. 31–40. <https://doi.org/10.14207/ejsd.2019.v8n3p31>
- Salonen, A.O. and Bardy M. (2015) 'Ekososiaalinen sivistys herättää luottamusta tulevaisuuteen', *Aikuiskasvatus*, 35(1), pp. 4–15. <https://doi.org/10.33336/aik.94118>
- Schneider-Mayerson, M. (2021) 'Does climate fiction make a difference?' *Literary Hub*, 16 December. Available at: <https://lithub.com/does-climate-fiction-make-a-difference/> (Accessed: 26 August 2022).

- Smith, L. (2021) *Emotional Heritage. Visitor Engagement at Museums and Heritage Sites*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Soini, K. and Birkeland, I. (2014) 'Exploring the scientific discourse on cultural sustainability', *Geoforum*, 51, pp. 213–223. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2013.12.001>
- Sommer, L.K. and Klöckner, C.A. (2019) 'Does activist art have the capacity to raise awareness in audiences?—A study on climate change art at the ArtCOP21 Event in Paris', *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 15(1), pp. 60–67. <https://doi.org/10.1037/aca0000247>
- Thiele, L.P. (2013) *Sustainability*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Thrift, N. (2008) *Non-Representational Theory. Space/Politics/Affect*. London: Routledge.
- Turunen, J. (2020) 'Decolonising European minds through Heritage', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 26(10), pp. 1013–1028. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527258.2019.1678051>
- Turunen, J. and Viita-aho, M. (2021) 'Kriittisen museon mahdollisuus? Gallen-Kallelan Afrikka-kokoelman uudelleentulkinnat 2000-luvulla', in Koivunen, L. and Rastas A. (eds.) *Marginaalista museoihin*. Tampere: Vastapaino, pp. 93–113.
- Weik von Mossner, A. (2017) *Affective Ecologies: Empathy, Emotion, and Environmental Narrative*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv11hpszq>
- Williams, R. (1985) *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.