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Abstract

Towards an ecological consciousness
A qualitative narrative of a research journey

My overall aim with this Masters thesis is to create an understanding of the need for social change and inspire individuals and communities to think and live nature-friendly (Schostak & Schostak, 2008). This perspective has evolved from a qualitative case study of a specific approach to addressing the human-nature relationship. My case study is The Joy of Living Nature-friendly, an approach that came to be through The Stetind Project in Norway. “Central to this project is the belief that it is possible to change the ways in which we think and act, in particular by focusing on deep joy as an impetus for inspiration and change” (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2009, home page: project description).

Through my research journey I have experienced a change in the way I think about the world around me and how I relate to it. Through this process I have developed my ecological self (Naess, 1989). I understand this, a development of an ecological consciousness, as the essence of what The Stetind Project is aiming for through the Joy of Living Nature-friendly. This Masters is a reflexive narrative that unfolds the process I have gone through to exemplify how the case study has functioned as my change agent (Dillow, 2009; Ellis & Bochner, 2000). The material that the qualitative case study is based on is the sum of texts and events that have been interpreted in light of the context. The narrative has an emerging design inspired by the concept of a qualitative bricoleur that “edits and puts slices of reality together” to form a holistic understanding of the information at hand (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003, p 7). I have done this through active engagement with my research and by collecting empirical material that has been stitched together to represent different elements of the research process (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). The pieces of empirical material are reflected upon in light of an holistic understanding of the case as well as my research journey. The Masters thesis can therefore be seen as an ongoing hermeneutic process (Strong, Pyle, deVries, Johnston, and Foskett, 2008).
Through my personal involvement and engagement I am aiming at conveying the experiences and the research process that changed my way of thinking. I use the *deep questioning model* from the *Deep Ecology Movement* to derive my own integrated approach to how I think about the world and how this way of thinking can be lived out (Naess, 1989). This surfaced as my personal eco-philosophy: *Ecosophy M*. The different levels of *deep questioning* are based on my fundamental norm: *Relational Empathy*! Through an explicit narrative of how I developed an *ecological consciousness* I hope to inspire you to reflect upon your own way of being in the world: how you relate to people, living beings, places and the ecosystems they form as parts of the ecosphere (Ellis, 2002; Ellis, 2009; Ellis & Bochner, 2000).
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Part One

Introduction

~ Revolutionising the way we think

“Reform or Revolution?

The direction is revolution, the steps are reformatory.”

*Arne Naess' on the approach of the Deep Ecology Movement
(Witoszek, 1997, p 65)

Preamble

My aim with this Masters is to create an understanding of the need for social change and inspire action, starting with individuals and communities. I believe that a synergy of experiences with nature combined with deep reflection can change the way we think about ourselves, and our world. This is not about provoking reactionary measures to problems that can be identified at all levels in society, but it addresses the fundamental way we think and deals with the root causes to what can be defined as the ecological and social crisis at hand (Naess, 1989). The crisis of modern times is driven by the model of industrial progress and human population growth and threatens the integrity of ecosystems on Earth and the accumulated wealth of diverse forms of life, cultures and worldviews (Drengson, 2005).

1 Naess is written with the vowel ‘æ’ in Norwegian [Næss], but this is replaced with the international spelling ‘ae’ for readability. Throughout the text the Norwegian vowels ‘æ’, ‘ø’ and ‘å’ have been replaced with the international spelling ‘ae’, ‘oe’ and ‘aa’.
We cannot expect a revolution in the literal sense in the developed world, but being inspired by Arne Naess I envisage “a change of revolutionary depth and size, by means of many smaller steps in a radically new direction” (Witoszek, 1997, p 65). Figuratively speaking this means revolutionising the way we think. A shift in my understanding has been stimulated by a case study of a specific approach on addressing the way we think and live; this is The Stetind Project in Norway. Their approach seeks a joyful response to the challenges of our time, focusing on an increased quality of life instead of a narrow perspective seeking only higher standards of living. This is coupled with a deepened and widened perspective on self-realisation through identification with other human beings as well as more than just humans. This replaces the narrow perspective in modern times of materialistic-realisation (Faarlund, 2008; Naess, 1989; Naess, 2002).

This Masters thesis has emerged to become a narrative that embraces a holistic approach to an educational journey. Throughout the text this is framed as creation of knowledge, based on insight, discoveries, interpretation and reflection. Through my research journey I have experienced a change in the way I think about the world around me. The process leading to and surrounding the Masters; the project being studied; and the supporting literature have had a profound effect on me. Through this journey of exploration, I have developed what I have come to know as my ecological self. I understand this, a development of an ecological self, as the essence of what The Stetind Project is aiming for. For this reason I will go through my research journey as a reflexive narrative that unfolds the process I have gone through. This means that I will tell the story while reflecting on the research act itself. This narrative has developed from a qualitative case study of The Stetind Project. The material that the understanding of the case is based on is the sum of texts and events that are interpreted in light of the context. My Masters Thesis can therefore be seen as an ongoing hermeneutic process (Dillow, 2009, Ellis, 2009; Ellis & Bochner, 2000).

I recognise postgraduate studies as creation of knowledge through research journeys. For the conscious student this process of knowledge creation is empowered self-
development. I was seeking a meaningful content in my Masters project, but I am fascinated by the symbiotic development of research and researcher that I have experienced. My awareness of this comes from what I have identified as the instrumental dimension of *The Stetind Project*: to facilitate development towards an *ecological self*. For me, studying the project has been a catalyst for developing towards *my ecological self*. My aim is that my combined experiences, insights and interpretations can create an understanding of *The Stetind Project*, and more importantly the process of maturing towards an *ecological self*.

Through my personal involvement and engagement I am aiming at showing the process and the lived experience of the research that changed my way of thinking (Strong, Pyle, DeVries, Johnston & Foskett, 2008). Through this I hope to inspire others to reflect upon their own way of being in the world, and how they relate to people, other living beings and places (Ellis, 2002; Ellis, 2009; Ellis & Bochner, 2000).

**Navigating this narrative**

This Masters Thesis will be constructed as a personal narrative that follows the interrelated development of the research and the researcher. The structure will therefore differ from that of a thesis that follows a “traditional” five chapter approach. This narrative will instead have an emerging design inspired by the concept of a *qualitative bricoleur* that “edits and puts slices of reality together” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003, p 7). I have done this through active engagement with my research and by collecting *empirical material* that has been stitched together so they represent different elements of the research process (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). The intention is to mirror the psychological and emotional unity I have experienced in the interpretive process (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003).

*Part One* will describe the starting point and provide a foundation for a qualitative narrative as a hermeneutic process. The following parts will unravel the research

---

[A 'traditional' thesis approach: 1) introduction, 2) literature review, 3) methodology of data collection, 4) analysis of data, and 5) conclusions and implications (Perry, 1998).]
journey. Part Two will position the researcher and the research, so that the rationale behind the approach can be understood. Part Three presents the qualitative case study, creating an understanding of the background, aims and approach of The Stetind Project. This in-depth study has functioned as a change agent triggering the realisation of an ecological consciousness for me. This leads to Part Four, which is a reflexive account of my research journey and presents my personal outcomes of studying The Stetind Project. In Part Five I sum up the hermeneutic process. This brings the different parts of the narrative together and I reflect upon the insights that have been gained from the research journey. Because this is a personal narrative I will be present in the text in the form of a first person narrator.

The general context

The main themes that I will present in this Part One need to be understood in the general context for this Masters Study. As I am writing this, an international campaign has just been organised to coordinate actions that can be carried out locally to help combat climate change. The ‘10/10/10 Global Work Party’ engaged people from 188 countries in 7,347 events. The events joined people together to dig community gardens, install solar panels, fix bicycles, plant trees, hold workshops on sustainable and re-generative solutions and much more. The organisation behind the campaign, ‘350.org’, was clear that the objective with ‘the day of environmental action’ was not to solve the climate crisis one project at a time, but to send a strong political message: “if we can get to work, so can you!” (350.org, 2010: home page).

This was a direct response to the 2009 United Nations Climate Change Conference in Copenhagen (COP15). The Copenhagen Summit, which was based on the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), was held to negotiate and agree on a treaty that would provide a framework for mitigation of climate change. These negotiations could not be concluded because some nations were not willing to commit to the emission cuts expressed in the Bali Roadmap. Instead a Copenhagen Accord was drafted and ‘taken note of’, but no legally binding agreement was ratified (UNFCCC, 2010 : COP15 CMP5).
The *Copenhagen Accord* recognises that climate change is one of the greatest challenges of our time and that action should be taken to keep any temperature increases below 2°C (United Nations, 2010: The Copenhagen Accord). Both the top-down approach as exemplified by the international work through UNFCCC, and global grass-roots movements like 350.org are emphasising and advocating the need for change. The UNFCCC’s objective is to “stabilise greenhouse gas concentrations in the atmosphere at a level that prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system” (United Nations, 2010: article2). This means large-scale changes for industry and the general organisation of society. 350.org has a bottom-up approach clearly expressed in their ‘theory of change’: “if an international grassroots movement holds our leaders accountable to the latest climate science, we can start the global transformation we so desperately need” (350.org, 2010: mission).

This emphasis on the need for change on different levels of society is what I identify as the general context for my Masters study. *The Stetind Project* is a specific approach to addressing this process. Through the sub-project ‘The Joy of Living Nature-friendly’ value-orientation is used as a tool to change how we as individuals and communities prioritise and navigate through life.
The main themes

Before I start to narrate the research process surrounding my case study, I will present the main themes in my study so that a mutual space for understanding is created. The two key themes are: the concept of ecological self and; the case study, The Stetind Project. With an understanding of these as themes in my study they function as threads that link the qualitative material.

The ecological self

The term ‘ecological Self’ is used by Naess in his ecological writings when referring to the metaphysical self. This is a matured perspective of one’s self, based on a deep and extensive identification with other life forms and places (Naess, 1989). This concept of self develops from a healthy and well integrated ego to a social self, and then beyond that to an ecological self (Drengson, 2005). Naess points out that we as humans can be said to be “in, and of, nature from the very beginning of our selves. Society and human relationships are important, but our self is much richer in its constitutive relationships” (Jakobsen, 2009, p 122). Naess emphasises the development of the self, as being the key bridging-point between humans and nature:

[R]elationships are not only those we have with other humans and the human community. The meaning of life, and the joy we experience in living, is increased through increased self-realization: that is, through the fulfilments of potentials each of us has (Jakobsen, 2009, p 123).

This form of self-realisation implies a broadening and deepening of the self. According to Naess the process of identification with others is then inescapable. This is a matured perspective on the self. To “see our selves in other” (Jakobsen, 2009, p 123) is the crucial link. We as individuals will then realise that what is done to the planet, is a violation of both the enlightened self-interest of humans and non-humans, and the decreased potential of a joyful existence for all. To develop such a perspective on the self requires empathy or identification (Naess, 1989).
The following is an example Naess uses to illustrate the process of identification, and through this identification he conceptualises ecological self:

I was looking through an old-fashioned microscope at the dramatic meeting of two drops of different chemicals. At that moment, a flea jumped from a lemming, which was strolling along the table, and landed in the middle of the acid chemicals. To save it was impossible. It took many minutes for the flea to die. Its movements were dreadfully expressive. Naturally, what I felt was a painful sense of compassion and empathy. But the empathy was not basic; rather it was a process of identification: that ‘I saw myself in the flea.’ If I had been alienated from the flea, not seeing intuitively anything even resembling myself, the death struggle, would have left me feeling indifferent. So there must be identification in order for there to be compassion and, among humans, solidarity (Jakobsen, 2009, p 123).

This illustrates identification as a key concept of ecological self. “This place is a part of me” is a common and non-philosophical expression of ecological self. A person’s home and surroundings make up the obvious elements of the ‘extended self’, and for some the place they come from is an important part of their identity. If a place one identifies with is harmed or damaged, this feels like a part of themselves is being ruined. This understanding makes ecological self tangible (Naess, 1986).

Experiences of ecological self are synthesised by Bragg (1996) to involve three different, but clearly connected perspectives: “an emotional resonance with other life forms; a perception of being similar, related to or identical with other life forms; spontaneous behaving towards the ecosphere as one would towards one’s self (with nurture and defence)” (p 95).

The essence of ecological self is that a deeper and wider perspective on the self creates a more ecologically conscious way of thinking and living. Supporters of The Deep Ecology Movement have suggested a variety of techniques for developing and enhancing the ecological self: from spiritual disciplines like Zen Buddhism, to becoming interested and involved with modern science and natural history (Bragg, 1996). For the case study that this narrative is based on, the development of ecological self is initiated through direct experiences with nature (Faarlund, 2008).
The Stetind Project

*The Stetind Project* will be studied throughout Part Three, and my interpretation and understanding of the background, aims, and approach will be presented there. Here I only present what it is, to have a starting point for the narrative and a thread that will link the qualitative material of the research journey.

I understand *The Stetind Project* as an approach to creating a renewed awareness of human-nature relationships and aims at fostering nature-friendly ways of thinking and living. I have focused on understanding ‘*The Stetind Project*’ and how ‘*The Joy of Living Nature-friendly*’ (JLN) is a part of it. The JLN is a specific approach on getting individuals to reflect upon their way of living. *The Stetind Declaration*, which clarifies and expresses an ecocentric value-orientation, opens for reflection on individual and societal values and the fundamental conception of what it means to be human. *The Declaration* is the cornerstone of *The Stetind Project* and a tool for reflection in the JLN (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008). *The Stetind Declaration* is presented in *Part Three – The Case Study*. In Part Three the elements that make up the approach of the JLN, such as *The Stetind Declaration*, are presented as the building blocks of the project.

*The Stetind Project* is anchored in the traditional Norwegian way of experiencing nature, known as *friluftsliv* (literally *free-air-life*)³, and builds on this to reconnect individuals as well as communities with nature. The approach of *The Joy of living Nature-friendly* combines experiencing nature with reflection on the human-nature relation, and through this builds a commitment to enhance and protect the connections (Faarlund, 2008). *The Stetind Project* is not created to spread a radical approach to thinking and being, but because of how society has developed, reconnecting with nature can be perceived as being in opposition to mainstream society and therefore seem radical.

---

³ *Friluftsliv* is discussed in Part Three – The Case Study: Supporting literature.
The Stetind Project came out of an analysis that looked at business opportunities and the tourism potential of the Tysfjord-region in Northern Norway. The mountain ‘Stetind’ was identified as the main attraction of the area as it had both a national and an international significance (Aasheim, 2008). Exploring what Stetind represented for different groups uncovered that the roots of eco-philosophy were directly tied to the mountain (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008). Eco-philosophy is understood as a way of thinking that is based on a holistic perspective on people as part of nature, where the absolute value of nature resonate with individual backgrounds and approaches. More precisely, it means using basic concepts from the science of ecology – such as complexity, diversity, and symbiosis – to clarify the place of our species within nature through the process of working out a total view (Rothenberg, 1989).

During the United Nations “International Year of Mountains” in 2002⁴, Stetind was voted to be Norway’s National Mountain by the Norwegian public. People recognised the historical and cultural dimensions of the mountain, and an important aspect of this was that Stetind was the birthplace of eco-philosophy (Tysfjord Kommune, 2003, Faarlund, 2008). The overall aim of The Stetind Project is to make Stetind an international icon for nature-friendly ways of thinking and living (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008).

The Stetind Project is the umbrella-project that covers sub-projects aiming to create a renewed awareness and understanding for eco-philosophy. The Stetind Seminar 2009 was held in Tysfjord to inform about The Stetind Project and the sub-project The Joy of Living Nature Friendly. The seminar involved interested and affected parties and the national and local government in the development of the JLN. The JLN is the first initiative of The Stetind Project.

With the intentions for my Masters thesis clarified; the general context explained and; a basic understanding of the main themes presented, the narrative can start to emerge.

⁴ The United Nations declaration for the ‘International Year of Mountains’ is in Appendix D.
Part Two

The research journey

~ An emerging design

“You have to step into the stream to be grabbed by something outside your private soul, something you do not control.”

*The karma-yoga message of Gandhi (Reed & Rothenberg, 1993, p 128)

Introduction

The Norwegian environmentalist and eco-philosopher Sigmund Kvaløy Setreng uses the karma-yoga message of Gandhi to illustrate the ineffectiveness of revolutionising yourself separately from the world around you. My Masters incorporates this perspective both theoretically and methodologically. By getting involved with The Stetind Project and exploring how I have been affected by my research journey, I am shedding light on what Kvaløy Setreng describes as “being shaken so that you’re changed, and through that already contributing to changing the system” (Reed & Rothenberg, 1993, p 128). This reflects my engagement with research as an active process contributing to personal and social change. This process is the main subject of my thesis.

Part Two of my narrative will first explain how the design of my Masters emerged and how the methodology and methods evolved with the research. This is then seen in light of how I became personally involved and developed with the research.
A qualitative inquiry

Several of my seminal readings are in the Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research edited by Denzin and Lincoln (2005). In their introduction they define qualitative inquiry as “a set of interpretive activities” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p 6) that separates it from quantitative inquiry, by situating the researcher in the context where he actively contributes to the study. When applying qualitative methods, meaning and insights are constructed from interpreting experiences or other forms of qualitative material. In this sense my research is an example of qualitative inquiry (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005).

To get a thorough understanding of the complexities of The Stetind Project, I attended The Stetind Seminar 2009. For me to convey the experience of attending the seminar it is necessary to describe The Stetind Project and The Joy of Living Nature-friendly first, since this was the focus of the seminar. In tune with how Crotty (1998) writes about the research process as bewildered by methodologies and methods, I find it hard to label my research. One reason for this is that my research project evolved through phases that can be labelled differently. One of my supervisors used an analogy that conceptualised these research labels as buckets. To structure the research process I have to make sure I know which one is the bigger bucket, so that the smaller ones can fit into it. In other words, my theoretical perspective needs to work within the same epistemology, and the methodology needs to fit in the associated theoretical perspective.

The structural process that Crotty (1998) describes starts with the methodologies and methods that are purposeful to unfold the justification (p 2). In contrast to this process I see the purpose of my research as the structural element. For me it became logical to explore the topic and then see what methodology and methods were suitable to create the relevant insights. This took time and the design changed as both the
research and the researcher developed. This is the main reason why my Masters can be labelled as having an emerging design.

**Epistemology**

At the very core of my research are the assumptions about the reality that my research and I are a part of, and how these assumptions influence how I do my research. This forms my epistemology and guides how I as the researcher can create insights. This is embedded in my theoretical perspective and therefore also my methodology (Crotty, 1998). My research is engaging with philosophy, therefore I find it necessary to touch upon my ontological ground. This deals with us as human beings and the assertion of meaning.

I see humans and our consciousness as part of a larger whole, an ecosphere\(^5\), but at the same time the ecosphere existed before humans and eventually our consciousness developed. It seems like only *human beings*\(^6\) have developed the meaning-making ability relevant for knowledge construction. This has developed from a combination of self-awareness and intelligence. I accept both that there is a world that exists independently of our consciousness, but also that meaning exists separately from human consciousness in the sense that all living things get to use their abilities and develop. The concept of ‘what meaningful existence is’ relates to the value of what is seen as ‘to be human’, as well as the relationships between organisms and their physical surroundings. Based on this I endorse *ecocentrism*. This has been described as post-humanism because it transfers the focus of reality from humanity to the Ecosphere, or from the part to the whole (Mosquin, 2009). My perspective has developed through the research journey and this will be discussed in the closing remarks in *Part Five*.

---

5 The ecosphere is an holistic understanding of Earth based on ecology, emphasising the interaction between the living and nonliving components that make up the vitality of the planet.

6 Human beings are understood as the species Homo sapiens.
The core assumption for me is that there is no objective truth waiting to be discovered. Instead I see meaning as coming out of our engagement with the realities in our world and our perceptions of them (Crotty, 1998, p 8). These perceptions are individual and therefore meaning is constructed based on this. This is constructionism and serves as the bigger bucket that can hold the other rationales that my research is based on. Crotty (1998) describes this view as the emergence of subject and object as partners in the generation of meaning. This theoretical perspective is the context for the methodology.

This Masters study developed to a personal narrative that combines a participatory inquiry with autoethnographic reflection. My participation in the research process is supported by interpretivism, with the sub-category of a hermeneutic approach. Through this I could get involved, and stay involved, in the interpretive process. This is related to critical theory research and typical traits are that it is subjective and conducted with “emotional and ideological bias in the ‘real world’” (Willis, 2007, p 91). This approach merged well with the genuine interest I had in the project and the outcomes I was aiming for. It seemed like the best possible way to have a meaningful journey, where the research process itself was emphasised and had meaning.

I am therefore both the researcher and the researched. This triggers a reflexive approach where I need to consider how this process influences me as an individual, while at the same time, I let my engagement and reflection guide my inquiry. Meaning is then negotiated mutually in the act of interpretation and is not simply discovered (Schwandt, 2003, p 302). As methodology a hermeneutic inquiry covers the actual process that seeks to uncover perceptions and meanings.

Through combining an emerging design with a narrative style I had to have confidence in the research process without truly controlling the development. The feeling of an organic project that was healthy and growing, but not fully tamed by the researcher, added an exciting dimension. Believing that the process and the outcome of studying The Stetind Project would be meaningful, supported by confidence in my supervisors and their ability to guide me, created an incubator for this organic
approach. Reading peer-reviewed literature that supported this research approach, created confidence in the process and informed the academic structure that was needed (Crotty, 1998; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Jennings, 2009; Phillimore & Goodson 2004; Schostak & Schostak, 2008; Willis, 2007).

The hermeneutic process
I recognise the work with this Masters project as an ongoing hermeneutic process. It is based on an understanding that knowledge or insights are co-produced between self and other. My approach cannot produce definite claims, but will interpret what has been experienced and the literature that has been linked to the interpretation and understanding. I am aware that the reader will interpret my text in light of their own experiences (Crotty, 1998).

The hermeneutical approach that this research is based on interprets and creates insight from texts and events. To find understanding and construct meaning through a hermeneutic lens, the researcher immerses himself in the context and becomes the lived experience of the research (Strong, Pyle, deVries, Johnston, and Foskett, 2008). The central principle of hermeneutics is that meaning is co-constructed by relating ones understanding to the whole discourse or worldview from which it originates. The 'hermeneutic circle' relates the part to the whole, and the whole to the part. As a qualitative method the hermeneutic circle involves relating the qualitative material at hand to the greater understanding of it, and then relating the holistic understanding back to the specific information (Strong, et al, 2008). This process is continuous throughout the work, and it will continue as the reader constructs meaning from my text (Willis, 2007).

The becoming of an autoethnographic narrative
The shape and form of my Masters study has shifted from attempting to understand The Stetind Project through a qualitative case study, to writing my story surrounding my Masters project. It surprised me when I became aware that my research journey was representative of the sole purpose of the project I was studying. Early in the
research I found that an open and dynamic inquiry was ideal because so little was known about *The Stetind Project* and their new approach on combining ecological awareness and philosophy with the experience of being in nature. For this reason it was difficult to be specific about the research design and research question. This led to an emerging design with research that adapts to the real world, as it is lived and experienced. I chose this instead of forcing a method onto a phenomenon or defining research constructs so that it could be studied. My motive was that I wanted my research to support what *The Stetind Project* was working towards; social change inspired by an ecological worldview.

I have developed myself in a way that is directly tied to what the project being studied is aiming to achieve. I have for this reason chosen to write myself into the research narrative to exemplify the awareness and change process that *The Stetind Project* aim to achieve. The transformation I have gone through will serve as a backdrop for deeper understanding of the case study. This Masters narrative will therefore combine a reflexive engagement with a qualitative case study. The narrative aims at revealing an understanding of the processes I have gone through in the role as both the researcher and the researched. This is associated with autoethnography as it foregrounds subjective experience and story as meaning making enterprise. Autoethnography is about rejecting the positivistic norm of distance between researcher and research. An autoethnography is a reflexive account of one’s own experiences that focuses on specific elements of a story (Reed-Danahay, 1997).

Reporting on my research through autoethnography is beneficial for several reasons. The main benefit is the in-depth and holistic understanding a self-reflective narrative enables (Chang, 2008). This is particularly relevant because this narrative is dealing with the thought process that lies behind actions and thereby how values are oriented and in turn how they are expressed. This is understood as being a full insider and the discoveries and interpretations in *Part Four* are created through autoethnographic reflection (Ellis & Bochner, 2000).
The narrative voice

I am aware that my narrative is a subjective account and I recognise that the researcher’s voice is one amongst many that influence the research process. It is not a single voice that mediates the research, there are multiple voices representing different sides of the researcher (Connelly, 2007). The narrative voice is influenced by the researcher's standpoint, values and biases. This is shaped by the cultural background, ethnicity, age, class, and gender of the researcher and is an important part of the historical trajectory. This creates an understanding of what has, and to some extent how the research approach is informed. This gives a backdrop for the way phenomena are interpreted and texts are constructed (Jamal & Hollinshead, 2001).

The strongest influence on my research is the cultural heritage I have gained through my upbringing. Having grown up in Norway gives me a deep understanding of the culture where the case study, and the concepts it is based on, has its origin. Understanding concepts related to cultural heritage is better perceived when experienced over time because this gives an insider’s perspective. At the same time it is beneficial that I have an understanding of a different perspective, from living in the United States when I was aged ten and eleven. Extensive travel with my family and later through work, studies and leisure has given me a more reflective view on the familiar. This also gives me an outsider’s perspective. The last two years of living in New Zealand, combined with reflection through postgraduate studies have had great impact on the development of my cultural awareness and understanding, as well as my philosophical consciousness. This is discussed under 'Towards ecological self' later in this part of the narrative.

I believe that this gives me a balanced combination of both an insider and outsider’s perspective. The insider’s perspective supports intuition and understanding, while the outsider’s perspective can be positive for sensitivity in the research context. I believe I am not blinded by the potential familiarity of research constructs. Instead the element of fascination sparks interest and engagement in the research act (Connelly, 2007).
I recognise that when people talk about their lives they sometimes lie, forget a lot, exaggerate, become confused, and get things wrong. Yet, narratives reveal truths. These truths do not reveal the past ‘as it actually was’, aspiring to a standard of objectivity. Narratives give us instead the truths of the experiences (DeVault, 1997). I understand the process as extracting meaning from experiences rather than to depict experience exactly as it was lived (Adams & Jones, 2008).

**Autoethnography as a research tool**

The challenge with autoethnography is to have this inward focus but avoid that the work becomes idiosyncratic and narcissistic; meaning too personal and specific or just self-absorbed. Therefore the inward focus needs to reflect upon the greater context of the experience, and must be seen in light of the research narrative as a whole (Chang, 2008). This means that no matter how personal the autoethnography is, that the narrative should always connect to some larger element of life (Krizek, 2003).

My approach is inspired by Carolyn Ellis’s writing on personal narratives as it intends to open up rather than close down conversation (Ellis, 2002). Considering this in the context of my research it becomes one of the key dimensions. In addition to helping me make sense of my experiences, the narrative is political in nature as it engages the readers in an important issue and asks them to consider their way of thinking (Ellis, 2002). Adam & Jones (2008, p 374) formulate their wider understanding of autoethnography as

 [...] whether [it is seen as] a practice, a writing form, or a particular perspective on knowledge and scholarship, [it] hinges on the push and pull between and among analysis and evocation, personal experience and larger social, cultural, and political concerns.

I hope that the contrast in my narrative between an inward and outward focus will create a balance between the thoughts and actions of the individual and the individual as a community member and an important actor in society.

In a text discussing ‘new social movements’ Ellis (2002) argues that the emphasis of social activists has been shifted from focusing on the macro-levels in society to
identity and cultural change. She argues that increased self-understanding may provide a quicker and more successful route to social change, than changing laws or other political structures. New social movements are more specifically about the politicisation of self and daily life, and how injustice is translated into the everyday lives of collective players. Social movements are thereby connected to individual stories and emotionality, and narrative allows us to tie abstract theory to lived experiences (Kling, 1995). Ultimately, both are about making our world a better place. Thus, social movements and personal stories are intimately and inextricably connected (Ellis, 2002).

Arguing the use of personal narratives in social science, Ellis continues:

I hope that those investigating social action/social movements will continue moving in the direction of personal narrative. I hope they come to take seriously the value of evocation as an important goal of good social science research. I’d appreciate stories that self-consciously invite me into the lives of activists, to feel what they feel, see what they see, and do what they do. If these activists also are authors and researchers, so much the better, for I think they are the people who will be able to access subjectivity and make us feel we are there. That’s the kind of understanding that would make me continue to want to do as well as understand (Ellis, 2002, p 404).

Being aware of how the narrative form can be used as a tool supporting social change, I adopted the approach. This way of seeing research texts brings different elements of my research together and boosts my confidence in an emerging design. The overall focus can be on the purpose and instrumental dimensions of the research; a tool to create awareness, evoke and motivate change. It means that my narrative is as much about ‘the other’ as it is about me. Coles (1989) says that “a good story is one that others can take in and use for themselves”. This is further developed by Ellis (2002) who says that “good stories make others feel liberated, freer to speak without feeling their stories are not worth telling. This means that personal narrative provides a substantial avenue to understanding ‘the other’ as well as ‘the self’, and an enticement to others to examine social problems, act in the world, and consider how to make the world a better place” (p 401). Through research narratives that are written with a focus on society, civic-minded academics can involve ‘the other’ and thereby realise what they see as their public responsibility (Ellis, 2002).
A reflexive engagement

The social significance of narrative inquiry lies in the transition from field texts to research texts. Field texts are the stories that are woven together while research texts are the analysis and interpretations of them (Clandinin & Connelly, 2004). When writing this I am producing a personal narrative that has reflexive elements, all related to the qualitative study of *The Stetind Project* and my experiences from the research journey. As a reflexive narrative the research and the researcher cannot simply be separated, nor can the field form the non-field. The act of reflection is linked with a reflexive engagement with the research. For the narrative to differ from a first-person description of my research process and personal development, similar to an autobiography, it needs to be informed by academic literature, and be organised around the understanding of *The Stetind Project* and *The Joy of Living Nature-friendly*.

Reflexivity is not to be confused with reflection. The act of reflection is an important part of all research when empirical data are seen in light of existing research literature. A reflexive methodology is when there is reflection in the research act itself, and this guides or has implications for the process. As well as this reflexivity in the research act there is reflection on the research. This reflection is in contrast to the reflexive engagement because it does not have direct implications for the course of the research. In a traditional fieldwork setting this would be post-event and separated from the field (Clandinin & Connelly, 2004). Being a participant with this reflexive approach is part of my embedded position that supports an emerging design.

Embodied experiences

Contemporary or modern hermeneutics encompasses not just issues involving the written text, but everything in the interpretative process. As a participant and insider this involves the process of being embedded in the research, and conscious of all experiences (Strong, et al., 2008). When researching what *The Stetind Project* was, I established contact with the managing committee of the project. This led to e-mail correspondence with different members of the committee, or the ‘Council for Eco-
philosophy’ as they are known in the research context. The correspondence was mostly about the up-coming seminar and the project itself, but also the background and development of the project. I was invited to present my research proposal and through this preparation I started developing my own perspective on the background and context of the project.

The initial contact lead to thorough information on the project, including the unpublished project description\(^7\). My participation involved contact with the ‘Council for Eco-philosophy’ in different contexts related to the seminar. This was the e-mail and telephone contact leading up to the seminar; the act of travelling to the location of the seminar together with the ‘Council for Eco-philosophy’\(^8\); interaction and engagement during the seminar presentations; my formal presentation of my research intentions and the discussion of these; and social activities both as part of the seminar program and informally during the day and in the evenings. Participating at The Stetind Seminar 2009 was how I got involved with the ‘other’. I got the chance to be explicit about my research intentions while I at the same time was ‘just another participant’ (Connelly, 2007). Based on participating at The Stetind Seminar 2009, I experienced how the research was influencing me and how I interacted with the Council for Eco-philosophy in the research context.

Through the embodied experience of participating and actively contributing in the research context, both emotionally and professionally as a researcher, I became aware that my research journey was an example of what The Joy of Living Nature-friendly was working towards: fostering nature-friendly thinking.

\(^7\) My translation of the project description is in Appendix C.
\(^8\) This was a 24 hour journey from Oslo in the South to Kjøpsvik in the North with train, bus and ferry.
The qualitative material
The qualitative material for my Masters project was empirically collected through studying *The Stetind Project* and *The Joy of Living Nature-friendly*, participating at *The Stetind Seminar 2009* and my work with a reflexive ecological diary. The diary focused on the development of my ecological consciousness while sailing in the South Pacific the first half of 2010. Through an active engagement with my research I collected representations that have been fitted to the specifics of a complex situation. This is the concept of an interpretive bricoleur as described by Denzin and Lincoln (2005, p 4). Different representations will be brought together and interpreted in light of the overall understanding as a hermeneutic process. The sum of all information at hand will help me interpret the different pieces of qualitative material.

This has also been described as a qualitative quilt maker: “the quilter stitches, edits and puts slices of reality together. This process creates and brings psychological and emotional unity to an interpretive experience” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2003, p 7). Through this approach I can apply a complex of methodologies and tools that I can link together in a unique way. The bricolage can be pieced together with different forms of narratives, self-commentary, other voices, field notes and even meta-autoethnography (Ellis, 2009) and by alternating my gaze inward and outward I will fulfil the need to be analytical while remaining evocative (Dillow, 2009). The result of this is an emerging research process were choices regarding which interpretive practices to employ are not necessarily made in advance but instead depends on context and what the researcher can do in the given setting (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005).

The conversations and the embedded experience of participating at *The Stetind Seminar 2009* gave me a chance to glimpse the “complicated character, organization, and logic of the culture” that I was immersed in (McCracken, 1988, p 17). I carried a notebook at all times and wrote down perspectives that were presented and the thoughts and ideas that they triggered (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995). I did this during seminar presentations as well as when less structured discussions and conversations occurred. It was easy to do this because I had been explicit about my intentions so all
involved were understanding and helpful. I participated after having studied *The Stetind Project* and the building blocks of the *JLN* for two months, so I had a thorough understanding of the concepts at play. The building blocks are presented in *Part Three*. The qualitative material from participating at the conference forms the representations that substantiate my understanding of the approach of *The Stetind Project* and specifically the building blocks of the *JLN*.

Later in my research journey I used an *ecological diary* as a research tool that could be reflected upon to find evidence of how I had integrated an ecological consciousness. The process of writing the diary helped me to think and guided the process, just as thinking helped me to write (Dillow, 2009). I worked on the diary over 17 weeks, while sailing from Panama in Central America to Tahiti in the South Pacific. This was done on a 43.5 foot catamaran together with my brother as the captain and three other crewmembers.

The eco-diary consists of 73 handwritten A5 pages of notes with thoughts, ideas and reflections related to my ecological consciousness. Some excerpts are just a couple of words, others are several pages. Some excerpts were written hours apart, others several days apart. The diary excerpts were written both at sea during passages and when we had landfall. The passages we sailed lasted from one day and up to three weeks. We were a crew of five and at sea we split the 24 hours into six hour day shifts and four hour night shifts. There were always two of us on shift, and we rotated so that each person would do the first half of the shift with one person, and the other half with another. The first half of the shift you were responsible, and the other half the person that just came on shift would be in charge. With five of us in the rotation this meant we had the day shifts off every fifth day.

The excerpts can be tagged with three different labels. One is notes and comments on the setting. This gives insight into the physical surroundings, how I relate to the surroundings and reflections on myself in the setting. A second category focuses on the notes and excerpts from readings I did. This was mostly from academic and philosophical literature, but also some fiction. I used an active reading technique
where ideas or concepts related to individual or societal change were registered as annotated citations. The third category is the notes I made in relation to a conference paper and presentation I worked on while sailing. This was the conference I was planning on attending just a couple of weeks after returning to Norway: The Spirit of Place 2010. This was a conference related to The Stetind Project and I was producing a conference paper titled ‘Fostering Nature-friendly thinking: alternative approaches’. Some reflection on my writing was done along the way, but the excerpts were mostly interpreted and reflected upon after having returned to Norway.

This qualitative material is valuable in light of the process of integrating an ecological consciousness. This materialises through reflection on my relationship with nature. The discoveries and interpretations are based on a hermeneutic approach where the process with the Masters as a whole is understood in light of events and different impulses.

My research followed the ethical considerations that are approved and supported by the University of Otago’s Human Ethics Committee. This ensures the safety and anonymity of the participants, integrity of the researcher, as well as the quality of the research. I was granted ethical approval for research involving human participants, based on my proposed approach on focus groups and semi-structured interviews. In spite of not hosting focus groups or conducting semi-structured interviews the ethical considerations guided my research process. The only names that will be mentioned are those of members of the Council for Eco-philosophy since this is available in the public domain through their website, and they are essential to the context and therefore the understanding of the case being studied.
Towards an ecological self

My interest in studying towards a Masters degree was sparked by the program coordinator at my home university in Stavanger, Norway. He said that “it isn’t about the degree, it’s all about the journey”. This does sound like a cliché, but because of the authority and genuine moral fibre of the 60-something adviser channelling his enthusiasm towards me, this appealed. He emphasised that the journey would change the way I saw the world around me. He explained that I would advance in how I relate to information and develop my analytical skills throughout the journey. He pushed the right buttons. At the time of this meeting I worked as a rafting and glacier guide in central Norway, before I knew it I found myself at the opening lecture on scientific methods at the University of Stavanger.

When the introductory lectures were completed I started exploring what I could fill my educational journey with. Having worked full time in the hospitality industry before, during and after my Bachelor’s studies in Hotel Management, I emphasised the importance of having a focus that was applicable in the real world. I wanted to have skills that were meaningful and that could be useful beyond creating revenue for some kind of hospitality business. With time I became aware that I wanted to relate the insights that I was to gain, to people's relationship with nature. I had lived and worked at a mountain lodge the last two years before commencing the Masters studies. The shoulder seasons brought few guests and we were closed down for periods of up to eight weeks both early winter and early summer. I felt like I had a different focus than the ‘business/industry oriented’ students around. This feeling was influenced by two specific readings; Life’s Philosophy: reason and feeling in a deeper world by Arne Naess and; Daily advice from the Heart, the great Dalai Lama in conversations with Matthieu Ricard that I had read while living in the mountains. These readings had given me an urge to contribute to my surroundings in a meaningful way, and having

---

developed closeness with nature through living in the mountains, I linked my growing concern for how we were treating the natural world with my research focus. This developed through different stages and was influenced by events in my life as well as a heightened focus on these issues in parts of society. In sum, this shaped my research interest and sharpened my focus.

My drive and motivation, my research interest, and the worldview I had, developed interdependently and affected each other more than I first was aware of. I cannot separate myself from my research, and my research is currently shaping me. The concept of ‘transformative ecological learning’ (Jakobsen, 2009) will serve as a backdrop for understanding these relationships. This theory relates to both how I am engaging with my research, but also the processes that The Stetind Project are promoting. The focus is on advancing society through social change. More precisely this is a change towards an ecological and sustainable way of living.

*Transformative ecological learning* builds on the theory of *self referential learning*. This is central to the concept and process of up-rooting one self from established ways of thinking. By taking a step back and being critical to how we live as individuals and how we function in society; we can create an awareness that initiates constructive changes. Combined with *transformative learning*, which is seen as “experiencing a deep structural shift in the basic premises of thought, feeling and action” (Jakobsen, 2009, p 120), it is possible to reflect upon how society is developing and aim towards more nature-friendly ways of thinking and living.

Jakobsen (2009) discusses that willingness to learn about oneself through contrasting interpretation can lead to stronger consciousness of oneself and thereby being able to learn from others. Openness to dialogue based on other perspectives enhances this process. This is what I have experienced through moving from Norway to New Zealand for a two year period, and combining this with a post graduate bridging year\(^\text{11}\) which gave me the opportunity to engage with diverse readings and teachings from different

\(^{11}\) A Diploma for Graduates that combined postgraduate papers from four different university départements.
departments at the University of Otago. As described above; I was conscious of my research interests and the focus I wanted and this gave me a framework for engagement. Having an inward focus was combined with experiencing a great variety in presentations, discussions and assignments. Jakobsen (2009) advocates that encountering differences can enlighten people’s knowledge in three important ways: a conceptualising effect; an emancipating effect and; an imaginative component (p 121). I see this as a valuable perspective on the process I have gone through and will look closer at this to create a solid backdrop for later reflection.

The *conceptualising effect* is based on articulating assumptions about your own culture and cultural knowledge. This can be the outcome of encountering ways of living that are different from the familiar. Expressing these assumptions creates an awareness of deeply seated beliefs about your own culture. An awareness of different cultural practices and worldviews thereby opens for questioning the taken-for-granted notion of your own culture. This openness to the ‘other’ is the *emancipating effect*. By freeing yourself from a specific perspective and being aware of others, an *imaginative component* can then be triggered. This gives people the ability to develop their imagination so that they can conceptualise what is not present and new perspectives and future solutions can develop (Jakobsen, 2009, p 121).

These ideas can be conceptualised eco-philosophically if related to the principles of Deep Ecology. Jakobsen refers to O’Sullivan & Taylor (2004) who argue that in this last century we (in the western world), have fostered a ‘minimal self’ that primarily serves a shallow perspective of economic gain. This minimal self can be described as an instrumental self or an economical self. The threat of a minimal self is that an instrumental consciousness apprehends only instrumental values. The minimal self alienates us individuals and society from the human spirit. “We must be gripped by the inherent worth of ourselves, of others, and of our world in order to sustain our commitment to what is likely to be a very long journey out of the wasteland” (O’Sullivan & Taylor, 2004, p 11).

---

12 Deep Ecology will be discussed in Part Three - The Case Study.
Jakobsen (2009) builds his argument on Arne Naess’s understanding of the self in the process of developing nature friendly ways of thinking and living. Naess (1989) substantiates this development as identification. This is an active term that can be thought of as ‘identiting’. This is derived from the Norwegian term ‘identifisering’ which is understood as the actual process of manifesting your existence through experiencing identification. “We discover that parts of nature are parts of ourselves” (Naess, 1989, p 10).

Experiencing and being exposed to another culture has made me more aware of my assumptions about the context I am coming from. This is the conceptualising effect. This awareness of Norwegian culture and heritage has led me to question and critically engage with how the cultures in both Norway and New Zealand are enacted. This is the emancipating effect. Relating this reflection to the now and the future can spark creative responses. This is the imaginative component.

At the same time as I encountered these differences I removed myself from the everyday work routines that most people in western culture have. I had the chance to take a step back and observe society and the culture I am part of and that I am also presently enacting13. This was possible through the educational funding scheme from Norway, which allowed me to be a full time student and having the luxury of not worrying about generating an income. This idealistic situation creates a framework for the reflection that The Joy of Living Nature-friendly is aiming at generating. Facilitated by the concept of a research journey I have developed a deep concern for the current state of the planet. This concern has different roots, and through this Masters I explore some of these roots as I gain insights and construct knowledge related to the specific approach on re-connecting humans with nature that The Stetind Project is aiming for.

---

13 Enacting a culture is understood as living out the cultural attitudes and behaviours that are collectively expected and understood as the norm, so that they become a reality. This understanding is inspired by Daniel Quinn’s writing in Ishmael (Quinn, 1992, p 41).
The concept of a research journey that appealed to me has ended up changing not only how I see the world around me, but also how I relate to it and interact with it. It is tempting to use a bold statement like *a life changing experience*, but ultimately it is affecting how I am enacting the culture I was born into and how there can be a meaningful development within it. This ties together my research, me as the researcher and the world around me.

**The research journey**

Initially I built a proposal for my masters study much like how Crotty (1998) describes the typical approach in *Foundations for Qualitative Research*: “[w]e [...] start with a real life issue that needs to be addressed, a problem that needs to be solved, a question that needs to be answered. We plan our research in terms of that issue or problem or question.” (p 13). My application for the 'Twelve month research masters’ was focused on investigating causal relationships. I was interested in the philosophical underpinnings of outdoor skills programs, how the philosophies were applied in practice and how they affected the participants. My proposal stated the aims of studying the programs as:

(a) investigate the environmental philosophies and how they shape the pedagogical approach used, and (b) what impact it has on the participants. More precisely, does the approach influence the positive outcomes for the participants: does it influence respect, appreciation and spiritual connection with nature and does it lead to commitment to conservation and stewardship of the environment? (Proposal for Masters of Tourism, 2009, p 314).

This is derived from the research focus I had developed, but the initial proposal was constructed from and around the methods. I was trying to make it fit within the guidelines that were provided. This was hard because I was driven by a search for a meaningful process: boldly expressed as ‘how to create and refine environmental ambassadors’. This was not particularly structured by methods. I believe this is a direct result of the inspiring postgraduate year I had at the University of Otago. I discovered

---

14 In Appendix A.
the option of taking papers that I had a genuine interest in, independent of university departments or programs they were part of. In hindsight the combination of topics and approaches gave me a solid foundation for this narrative approach. To clarify what this is based on I will explain how the papers merge through the specific approach they had. The seven papers I studied were ‘Developments in Environmental Management’, from the Geography Department; ‘Research and Issues in Outdoor Education’, as well as the ‘Ecology of Adventure’, from Outdoor Education; ‘Wilderness and Marine Tourism’ and ‘Tourist Behaviour’ together with ‘Entrepreneurship in Tourism’, from Tourism and; ‘Communicating Science’, from the newly established Centre for Science Communication.

For me, these papers came together in a fulfilling way because of the freedom to explore specific topics that postgraduate studies allow. ‘Developments in environmental management’ gave me insights into local, regional and national approaches on dealing with and managing resources and the environment (Aplin & Batten, 2004; Bryant & Wilson, 1998; Department of Conservation, 2008; MAF Information Services, 2005; Mead & Black, 2001; Mead & Black, 2002; Upreti, 2006; Valentine, Hurley, Reid & Allen, 2007). This was a very structured paper that used holistic evaluation to challenge ‘taken for granted assumptions’ about what a good solution is in environmental management.

‘Research and issues in outdoor education’ gave me the opportunity to explore research related to experiential learning and the complicated links between the formation of values, attitudes and behaviour (Bragg, 1996; de Wet & Robertson, 2007; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1974; Kaplan, 2000; Kellert, 1998; Winter, 2000). This gave my initial interests a direction. Related to this was ‘The Ecology of Adventure’ which was a highly critical and reflexive paper that made me redefine how I engage with the outdoors and the natural environment (Borrie & Roggenbuck, 2001; Bulbeck, 2005; Cottrell, 2003; Csikszentmihalyi & LeFevre, 1989; Davidson, 2001; Henderson, 2003). This was an eye opener that gave me the opportunity to explore the roots of the

---

15 University courses that last one or two semesters.
Scandinavian approach to being in the outdoors (Devall, 1980; Faarlund, 2005; Reed & Rothenberg, 1993; Setreng, 2005; Silvera & Seger, 2004).

‘Wilderness and Marine Tourism’ has similarities with ‘The Ecology of Adventure’. For me this tourism paper gave theoretical backing as well as providing the chance to experience theory through reflexive engagement with the outdoors. Challenging theories related to what wilderness and nature is, was conceptualised in the classroom and experienced through the field (Brooks, Wallace & Williams, 2005; Cronon, 1996; Nash, 2001; Powell & Ham, 2008). ‘Tourist Behaviour' also had reflexive elements where topics on self and other were explored in relation to both behaviour and culture (Cohen 1974, 1984; Dann, 1996; Doorne, & Ateljevic, 2005; Green & Jones, 2005; Tucker, 2003; Uriely, 2005; Wang, 2000). This was a paper that opened reflection on my own experiences and gave the opportunity to explore and link this with theory.

‘Entrepreneurship in Tourism’ is the paper that stands out. Not directly linking in with the other papers, but it provided a framework for bringing creative concepts into the real world (Ateljevic & Doorne, 2000; Littunen, 2000; Morrison, Rimmington & Williams, 1998). Through entrepreneurship abstract and idealistic ideas can be animated to create a livelihood for the initiator/entrepreneur. This has parallels to ‘Communicating Science’ which gave me the chance to bridge theories and philosophies of interest so that they would appeal to the general public – or at least a defined audience, and especially those who were not necessarily interested in the message in the first place. ‘Entrepreneurship in Tourism’ and ‘Communicating Science’ can be seen as opposite approaches on working with specific messages and the audiences that are targeted, but this gave me the chance to cover a wide range of approaches on the theories and philosophies I was genuinely interested in.

The one piece of work that shaped my thinking the most was a literature review I did for the paper ‘Research and Issues in outdoor education’. This work can be compared with that of an honours dissertation, considering scope and depth of the work and was meant to function as a foundation for a Masters proposal. It provided an overview of selected studies directly related to 'pro-environmental behaviours'. The purpose was to
do a systematic review of research literature to identify what was currently known on environmentally responsible behaviour and its component constructs. An important part of the study was an evaluation of the research instruments that were used and the research constructs they were designed to measure. This approach came from some initial readings that were part of the process leading to my first Masters proposal.

The literature review of constructs related to pro-environmental behaviour (PEB, in general covering both environmentally responsible behaviour and responsible environmental behaviour) was the outcome of a research process that developed from an area of interest through some inspiring readings. The literature dealt with processes and approaches on environmental and outdoor education and different aspects of human-nature relationships that could trigger change and effect actions (Bragg, 1996; de Wet & Robertson, 2007; Dunlap, Van Liere, Mertig, & Jones, 2000; Evans, Brauchle, Haq, Stecker, Wong, & Shapiro, 2007; Ewert, Place, & Sibthorp, 2005; Fishbein & Ajzen, 1974; Fransson & Garling, 1999; Grimwood, 2004; Kaplan, 2000; Kellert, 1998; Koger & Scott, 2007; Patterson, 1998; Schroll, 2007). Initially it was the human-nature relationship, and what affected the connection that was the area of interest. One of my first readings was by De Wet and Robertson (2007). It brought together several different dimensions of being in the outdoors and reflected upon this in a wider educational and socio-psychological framework. In this paper ‘environmentally responsible behaviour’ (ERB) was defined as one of the primary goals that environmental education was attempting to achieve.

With ERB defined as the area of interest further literature searches led to research approaches that covered all dimensions of this concept. At this point it was of importance to explore and grasp the underlying concepts of pro-environmental actions. Two articles that had an effect on the approach taken in the literature review looked at the motivations or psychological processes that catalysed ERB. Winter (2000) presented a holistic approach on the psychological aspects on environmental psychology and how psychologists can effect society towards more sustainable behaviour. When mixed with Kaplan’s people-oriented approach, defined as the ‘Reasonable Person Model’ (2000, p. 497) a broad spectre of psychological aspects are
covered. These range from Winter’s (2000) psychological foundation, which focuses on individual mental processes, to Kaplan’s (2000) broader social psychological aspects of interaction between individuals and formation of social structures that support a pro-environmental development. To identify and grasp the underlying concepts related to pro-environmental actions, Bragg (1996) includes the fundamental dimension of an ecological worldview. Two different approaches are combined and present theory that shed light on deep ecology and how this mind-set can be related to the approach of academic psychologists. These readings created a melting pot of constructs that relate to pro-environmental behaviour. With this as a backdrop, an approach to explore and gain further understanding of the constructs and instruments related to measuring different dimensions of pro-environmental behaviour was created.

When I concluded this research report I reflected upon the inconsistencies in terminology and the research constructs that were used, and how this complicates the ability to build on others’ research. The challenge with researching behaviour related constructs is that they are complex and multi levelled (De Young, 2000; Kilbourne & Pickett, 2008; Stern, 2000). I realised that this seems to be the ‘catch 22’ for behavioural research: because of the complexity of human behaviour, the research constructs are created especially for specific studies, and consequently the constructs and instruments have limited transferability and applicability in other contexts.

In sum this ‘bridging year’ led me to my topic of interest, ‘how to create and refine environmental ambassadors’ which was what my first master’s proposal in essence was about. The greatest difference between my initial proposal and this narrative is within the methodologies that were proposed and the approach that has evolved. Because my topic and approach overlapped with different university departments, I requested to have an advisor from physical education/outdoor education as well as my primary supervisor from tourism. This was accepted and the supervisory panel consisted of a professor and a senior lecturer that had great combined insights and experience related to my topic. Without elaborating further they complemented each other to a whole that gave me great confidence in the journey that lay ahead.
When going through the proposed study with my supervisors and reflecting upon alternative methods, the focus of my study shifted. When researching outdoor schools and programs that had explicit environmental philosophies I came across a new approach that was under development in Norway. It was linked to a well recognized outdoors skills centre that was a national resource on environmental education through traditional Norwegian friluftsliv. The new project was led by a managing committee of eco-philosophers, academics, spiritual leaders and outdoor and environmental educators. It grabbed my attention and sparked my enthusiasm because it came across as a holistic approach that incorporated deep reflection with the experience of being in and with nature. The agenda was meaningful and the approach was practical as well as philosophical.

When discussing this project with my supervisors, it became clear that this was an approach that was representative for what was to come in environmental education, a new development that had not been conceptualised this way before. It became clear that this project was in tune with how these issues most beneficially could be addressed, and therefore more future-oriented than studying approaches that were being replaced. My attention was now shifted to this specific project.
After looking into it for a week I reported on my initial understanding as follows:

I have mainly focused on understanding ‘The Stetind Project’ and how ‘The Joy of Living Nature Friendly’ is part of it. Attached is a translation of ‘The Stetind Pledge’ which is the fundamental building block of the project defined as ‘The Joy of Living Nature Friendly’. This is part of a larger project which aims to develop business opportunities and tourism in Tysfjord municipality in the northern part of Norway. After an analysis of the regional industry potentials, the mountain 'Stetind' is identified as the main attraction (after being chosen as the National Mountain in 2002 – the international year of the mountains)\(^\text{16}\) that has national and international significance. ‘The Joy of Living Nature Friendly’ is further advancement of concepts that were identified and developed during the international conference ‘Being in Nature’ in August 2007. The themes during this conference were ‘Humans relationship with nature’ and ‘Different pedagogical approaches on working with ‘friluftsliv’’. [...] One of the papers I find relevant for understanding the framework from which the project has originated is "Social Pragmatism and Transformative Ecological Learning" by Professor Trond Gansmo Jakobsen (Communication with supervisors, 1\(^\text{st}\) April 2009).

With this shift, the theme and topic was emphasised instead of the initial focus on methods. The Stetind Project had the dimensions I was looking for in my research: solid theoretical underpinning as well as being historically and culturally anchored. As I saw it, the project and its approach were not produced, they had developed. It was genuine and meaningful.

To be able to incorporate attending The Stetind Seminar 2009 in my research, I had to get ethical approval from the University of Otago. The purpose of my research was then defined as focusing on the transferability of The Stetind Project (SP) to a setting outside of Norway. More precisely the application stated

> In my study the SP will be approached as a framework that is facilitating the adoption of eco-philosophy (specifically nature friendly ways of thinking and living) for individuals. By identifying what constructs the SP is made up of, it is possible to reflect upon the transferability of the approach used to an international setting in a way that maintains the defined purpose of the SP (Human Ethics Approval, 2009, p 117).

---

\(^{16}\) The intention with the 'UN international year of the mountains' is described in Appendix D.

\(^{17}\) In Appendix B.
Further the application needed to define how I was going to go about with my research and therefore I had to be explicit about the methods I was planning on applying. This led to three intense months of building a framework for my study. It was intense, because I ended up addressing the fundamental assumptions that my study was based on both epistemologically and ontologically. This engagement with theory can be seen as beyond the scope of my project, but because of the topic of study as well as the approach that emerged, it became a necessity.

My discovery of defined styles of research, labelled as moments, helped me gauge my approach. I initially identified with how Phillimore & Goodson (2004) described Denzin and Lincoln’s (1998) fifth moment in qualitative research. “Studies were seen as context specific, and the authority of the researcher as an objective expert had been rejected. Research within this interpretive, qualitative research stage was more dynamic, experiential and reflexive” (Phillimore & Goodson, 2004, p 17). Another aspect was that the researcher’s voice was one among many that influenced the research process. This understanding has continued to develop since Phillimore & Goodson’s text in 2004, and even the nine moments Denzin and Lincoln (2005, p 26) explore just a year later have shifted and merged. These moments are therefore not meant to be interpreted as progressive steps in the development of qualitative research, but moments that encompasses different approaches. The moments are “breaks and ruptures that move in cycles and phases, so that what is passé today may be in vogue a decade from now, and vice versa” (Lincoln & Denzin, 2003, p 611).

With this understanding my research can be seen as encompassing elements of the fifth, sixth, seventh and eighth moment: the fifth moment being labelled as postmodern, a period of experimental and new ethnographies exemplified with research between 1990 and 1995; the sixth moment as post-experimental inquiry from 1995 to 2000; the seventh as the methodologically contested between 2000 and 2004 and; the eight moment being the fractured future roughly 2005 and leading to the present. These moments overlap and simultaneously operate in the present (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p 3). For this reason understanding research in relation to these moments does not function to label the research in a tidy category. The moments help
exemplify approaches on research and the focus it has. It is more correct to say that my research has developed from the fifth moment, but is an example of eight moment research associated with the evidence-based social movement. “The eight moment asks that the social sciences and the humanities become sites for critical conversations about democracy, race, gender, class, nation-states, globalization, freedom, and community” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 3). This ties in with the issues I am addressing in my research. Because my approach is critical to, and in opposition to what I see as the mainstream way of thinking, it can be labelled as radical. “The question of the radical emerges in conflict, where fundamental approaches to life, to ways of thinking, to ways of seeing the world are in dispute” (Schostak & Schostak, 2008, p 6). The purpose of radical research is to deal with these contradictions and suggest new pathways, new ways of thinking and being. This calls for an encompassing approach that critically refocuses research on the political, the cultural and the social without splitting them into separate disciplines.

Summing up

Part Two of my narrative clarifies how I am approaching this research, and how the research journey has become the topic of my research. It can be summed up as the interconnected development of my self and my research journey. This has not been a part time involvement in research but an active engagement and the sum of all experiences. The concept of an interpretive bricoleur that uses the qualitative material at hand is a good analogy for the design that has emerged. By getting whole-heartedly involved with The Stetind Project, following the karma-yoga message of Gandhi I have stepped into the stream and let myself be grabbed by something outside my private soul, something I do not control. With an understanding of how this masters study developed, and on what terms this happened, the project at the centre of attention can now be presented in detail. The following case study of The Stetind Project has functioned as my vehicle for change.
The case study

~The joy of living nature-friendly

“There is no way leading to nature-friendliness, being nature-friendly is the way!”

*The motto for the Council for Eco-philosophy*
(Council for Eco-philosophy, 2009)

Introduction

The above quote is the motto for the Council for Eco-philosophy and their ways are based on Gandhian principles. The essence of this is what Gandhi expressed as applying eternal truths to our daily life and problems (Faarlund, 2008; Faarlund 2010 b). The Council for Eco-philosophy conceptualised The Stetind Project and function as the managing committee. They acknowledge that “the incidence of environmental crisis is on the rise and that we will undoubtedly face major challenges in the future” (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2009, home page: project description). The Stetind Project has different sub-projects, but the first initiative from the Council for Eco-

---

This is a combination of “There is no path leading to harmony with nature. Harmony with nature is the path” from the Stetind Declaration (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2009, online version of The Stetind Declaration) and “There is no other way to nature friendliness – nature friendliness is the way!” from the on-line project description (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2009, online project description). This is derived from the Gandhian saying “the way is the goal” (Reed & Rothenberg, 1993, p 128).

Council for Eco-philosophy is written without the definite article ‘the’. This is intentional by the Council and it symbolises that this ‘Counsel for Eco-philosophy’ is not ‘the one and only’, but more a leading example for other local councils to be established, nationally and internationally. It will be written with a definite article when I am referring to this specific Council for Eco-philosophy.
philosophy is defined as the project ‘The Joy of Living Nature-friendly’ (JLN). “Central to this project is the belief that it is possible to change the ways in which we think and act, in particular by focusing on deep joy as an impetus for inspiration and change” (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2009, home page: project description). The JLN is the essence of what The Stetind Project is trying to achieve. Part Three will focus on the cornerstone of The Stetind Project: the JLN, its main components and the literature that supports the approach.

The focus will be on the JLN by studying the different contexts it developed in and from. This implies the historical and cultural setting as well as the academic and philosophical background of the components of the approach. As a case study, the components are defined as building blocks. The JLN consists of three building blocks: Council for Eco-philosophy, The Stetind Declaration and The Place of Nature by Stetind.

An in-depth perspective on these building blocks and the rationale behind them will increase the understanding of what has inspired my personal reflection. This has fostered awareness of my own values and priorities. For me, the case study is understood and addressed as my change-agent. I am aiming at creating a synergy between a deep understanding of the approach of the JLN on one hand, and my process of developing an ecological consciousness on the other. The one is meant to increase the understanding of the other, and vice versa.
The case study approach

As a form of research, case study is defined by interest in an individual case, not by the methods of inquiry used. For the qualitative research community, case study concentrates on experiential knowledge of the case and close attention to its social, political, and other contexts (Stake, 2005). This knowledge will arise from the qualitative material that is collected in relation to studying the case.

This study is focused on the understanding of the individual case, rather than attempting to generalise beyond it. This is in line with a qualitative understanding that does not see a specific empirical study as representative for all similar cases. This study will instead focus on interpreting different sets of qualitative material for deeper understanding of the case being studied. This focus can point the study in the direction of what Stake (2005) defines as an “intrinsic case study” (p 444), where it is the specific case that is of interest, and not what the case is an example of. If the study facilitates understanding of something beyond the specific case, it is defined by Stake as an “instrumental case study” (p 445). I am studying The Joy of Living Nature-friendly to facilitate understanding of how the case is addressing critical ecological and social issues, and thereby being an example of how changing the way we think and live is approached. Because this study simultaneously addresses the particular and the general for a holistic understanding of the case, it can be labelled as having a “combined purpose” (Stake, 2005, p 445). This incorporates both the specific building blocks of the project and the purpose and effect of these building blocks.

The JLN has been created to support and generate interest for nature-friendly ways of thinking and living. Through this sub-project the managing committee is in general aiming to generate interest nationally and internationally for the umbrella project: The Stetind Project. The JLN combines the experience of being in nature with reflecting upon nature-friendly ways of thinking and living. This reflection will be facilitated
through a document defined as “The Stetind Declaration” (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008, p 6). This document is a declaration of dependence\(^{21}\) between humans and nature, and therefore the interdependence of all life on Earth. The Council for Eco-philosophy describes the purpose of the declaration as:

> [T]o unify international efforts promoting nature-friendly endeavours and to call attention to the need for joyful and hopeful responses to the environmental crisis. We believe that the impending challenges we face need to be addressed individually and collectively. We believe that the challenges are not merely economic and technological, but rather, that they implicate our values and our fundamental self-understanding as human beings. Our aim with this declaration is for each person who signs it to visualise his or her own values orientation (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2009).

The intention with the approach of the JLN is that the reflection that the declaration triggers, is done in a setting where the individual can experience nature. For this reason the Council for Eco-philosophy are developing a concept that is a place for nature enjoyment, “a place of nature” (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008, p 6). A place of nature is to facilitate closeness with nature, and the idea is that the experience is to be combined with reflection with protocol in the declaration of dependence.

Stake (2005) stresses the importance of specific parameters that define the subject being studied. The JLN is the unique and bounded system I am studying. To understand the complexity of the case, and to accommodate the combined purpose of studying the JLN, I will relate the study to what I understand as the intrinsic elements and the instrumental dimension. I see the intrinsic elements as the Council for Eco-philosophy, The Stetind Declaration, and The Place of Nature by Stetind. They are the components of the specific case and the building blocks of the approach. The instrumental dimension is what the synergy of these elements are working towards: fostering nature-friendly ways of thinking and living.

---

\(^{20}\) The Stetind Declaration is presented under ‘Approach’ later in Part Three.

\(^{21}\) This was said by Finn Wagle (member of Council for Eco-philosophy) during the Stetind Seminar 2009 when talking about the Stetind Declaration.
The study requires thorough attention to the approach used (or that is proposed\(^{22}\)) by the managing committee on the components of the project.

*The Stetind Project* came out of a regional development plan. It is partly a result of an identified potential in relation to the national mountain Stetind, but this has merged with a confluence of academic, political and philosophical events. In sum, it is a multi-faceted project that has several dimensions working for the ultimate goal of creating a renewed understanding of, and connection with nature.

The narrative approach on this Masters highlights the process of inquiry while the case study addresses the specifics of the *JLN*\(^{23}\). In case study theory it has been attempted to separate the process and the product by defining the end product as the *case record*, but in spite of this, it is widely established as the *case study*. The different elements of a case study are in many ways inseparable because of the interrelated nature of the case itself, the process of inquiry and the end report (Stake, 2005).

A holistic approach in this study goes well with the nature of the project itself. The *JLN* is infused with a holistic way of thinking. An important element of the project is that there is not a specific way leading to nature-friendliness, but being nature-friendly is the way (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008; 2009; 2010 a; Faarlund 2010 a; 2010 b). This emphasises the importance of the process, or in many ways that the process is the purpose. The building blocks of the *JLN* have this purpose inherent. More precisely, combining awareness for nature-friendly ways of thinking and relating this to the individuals’ values is inherent in the building blocks. The building blocks of the *JLN* are only parts of a process. The case study will describe the *JLN* by going through the different contexts the project developed from. This will be related to the specific building blocks of the project and their combined purpose.

\(^{22}\) The Stetind Project has several sub-projects, some are implemented, some are being implemented and some are still under development. For an overview see ‘Tasks’ later in Part Three.

\(^{23}\) The implications of this is discussed in Part Two when the rationale behind the narrative approach is explained.
The contexts

*The Stetind Project* has its name from the mountain *Stetind* and the project is directly tied to the mountain. *Stetind* is located in northern Norway, north of the Arctic Circle, in Tysfjord municipality. The following section will give a backdrop for understanding the cultural context of *The Stetind Project* and its sub-projects.

About the area

Norway is said to be “a country where nature, rather than settlement, dominates the landscape” (Reed & Rothenberg, 1993, p 5). With a population of 4.8 million and a land area of 305 thousand square kilometres, Norway has the second lowest population density in Europe\(^{24}\). Only one and a half percent of the land is built-up, and over eighty percent is defined as forest, mountain or mountain plateau (Statistics Norway, 2009). Most people live along the coastline so the interior has large areas that are unpopulated. Because of the rugged coastline broken with deep fjords, Norway has one of the longest coastlines in the world, stretching over 25 thousand kilometres. In spite of its northern latitude, the warm waters of the *Gulf Stream* moderates the climate, so that settlement and agriculture is possible significantly further north than its equivalents in the northern and southern hemispheres (Reed & Rothenberg, 1993). Because of Norway’s northern location summers bring very long days and, in the far north, in mid-summer the sun does not set (this is known as *polar day*). Towards winter this gradually changes into the dark season, when the sun does not rise (*polar night*). The old pattern of living in two seasonal places, in the valley in winter and in the high country in the summer, contributes to rich cultural practices and traditions. It adds to the complexity and diversity of Norwegian life and culture (Drengson, 2005).

The distinguishing characteristics for the region are the long deep fjords, the tall steep mountains and small coastal communities. In-between there are glaciers, steep valleys,

---

\(^{24}\)Norway has 13 inhabitants per km\(^2\) and is ranked number two, after Island which has the lowest population density in Europe with 3 inhabitants per km\(^2\) (Reed & Rothenberg, 1993, p 5; Central Intelligence Agency, 2009).
deep gorges and waterfalls. The Tysfjord Municipality has three protected nature-areas: Bekkenesholmen, Mannfjordbotn and Ramnholmen Naturreservat. Bekkenesholmen was established in 1928 and was the first one of its kind in Norway (Miljøstatus i Nordland, 2010). The municipality has just over 2 000 inhabitants centred around three main towns, where Kjøpsvik is the largest. Tysfjord has two official languages, Norwegian (bokmaal) and Sami (lulesamisk). The area has traditionally had two different indigenous Sami cultures, the Sea Sami and the Mountain Sami, along with Norwegians. Tysfjord is an example where different cultures live alongside each other and with nature. In this area the cultures have a unified aim to take care of nature and live in a nature-friendly way (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008).

The characteristic landscape is the main attraction of the area, but wildlife such as orcas that come to feed of spawning herring is an attraction as well. There is also a steady stream of climbers and mountaineers from all over the world who come to climb Stetind. Besides this, the most significant cave system in Northern Europe and the biggest gorge in Norway are located in the municipality. To add to the historical dimensions of the area there are 10 000 year old stone carvings in the vicinity of Stetind (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008).

**Stetind**

The mountain Stetind, or Stáddá as it is in Sami, was voted by the Norwegian public to be Norway’s National Mountain in 2002, during the United Nations’ International Year of the Mountains. The mountain itself has several Sami myths related to it and has traditionally been a landmark for seafarers along the coast of Nordland. Stetind has a well documented mountaineering history. The south face is a climber’s dream with almost one thousand vertical meters in solid granite and has given the ‘Tower of the Arctic’ its reputation amongst mountaineers (Faarlund, 2010 a). It was summited the first time in 1910 and has a rich climbing history. *Arne Naess*, who is a key figure for

---

25 The ‘2002 Tokyo Declaration for the International Year of the Mountains’ is attached in the Appendix D. This explains the purpose of this event.
the development of *The Stetind Project*, did the first successful winter climb of the east-wall in 1963 together with two other climbers. In 1966 **Arne Naess, Nils Faarlund** (who is another key figure for the project) and three other climbers were the first ones to summit via the west-wall. That same year **Nils Faarlund** and a climbing partner established a route called ‘Kongelosjen’ [The Kings Club]. The two first ascent routes that were established in 1966 took place during a climbing trip instigated by **Nils Faarlund**. This climbing trip has later become known as *The Stetind Seminars of 1966* (Faarlund, 2010 a; 2010 b). The foot of *Stetind* was the setting for a climbing camp that developed a way of thinking that underpins *The Stetind Project* (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008; Faarlund, 2010 a; 2010 b).

**The foundation**

The case study needs to be examined based on the background and context it came to exist in (Stake, 2005). For the Stetind Project the historical, cultural, political, academic and philosophical contexts are directly linked with the coining of ideas that led to the project. This confluence happened at *The Stetind Seminars of 1966*. Before exploring some of the specific contexts that create the foundation for the project, the theory behind the approach will be investigated.

**The Stetind Seminars of 1966**

During the winter of 2008 Assistant Professor **Boerge Dahle** from The Norwegian School of Sport Sciences [Norges Idrettshoeyskole (NIH)] started his work with “Nature friendly friluftsliv - seen in a global environment and educational perspective”. Through working with this project it became evident that *Stetind* was the place where philosophy and ecology merged to form eco-philosophy (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008; Faarlund, 2010 b). Boerge Dahle traced the origins of an eco-philosophy back to a specific climbing trip in 1966. This was when **Nils Faarlund** and three**27** fellow
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26 This understanding of how the Stetind Project evolved is primarily based on the Project description in Norwegian by Boerge Dahle and Nils Faarlunds attachment on the ‘Origin of eco-philosophy/eco-politics’, also in Norwegian.

27 Only two of the other climbers were actually members of the Alpine Club, these were Knut Stoeren and Jon Bruskeland. Jon Voll was an ‘invited outsider’.
climbers from the Alpine Club at the Norwegian Technical College (NTH)\textsuperscript{28} in Trondheim headed north to climb the dreaded south-wall of Stetind. They invited \textit{Arne Naess} along, who was the \textit{Stetind} connoisseur\textsuperscript{29} of the time, as well as an established Professor of Philosophy. He joined and brought with him his wife \textit{Siri Naess}, their young daughter \textit{Lotte} and \textit{Arne Naess}'s Masters student \textit{Sigmund Kvaloey} [later \textit{Setreng}\textsuperscript{30}]. They travelled by boat on \textit{Stefforden} [The fiord Stefjorden] to the foot of \textit{Stetind}, with an agreement to be picked up two weeks later. To get an understanding of the critical and creative processes that occurred at the foot of \textit{Stetind} during these two weeks, it is beneficial to know some details about the key participants and their background at the time of the first \textit{Stetind Seminars}.

\textbf{The participants}

At the time of this trip \textit{Arne Naess} was already a Professor of Philosophy. He had written two large works on language and logic. In 1953 he published \textit{Interpretation and Preciseness}, and in 1966 he published a simplified version under the title \textit{Communication and Argument}. He was also known as an expert on the history of philosophy (Notario, 2006). Naess was the supervisor of \textit{Sigmund Kvaloey Setreng} who was working on his Masters in philosophy and working towards a dissertation on communication theory. \textit{Setreng} had growing environmental concerns and was an involved environmental activist. This was rooted in seeing the industrialised world in contrast to his upbringing on a small rural farm where he had experienced a satisfying cultural life built around nature's rhythms (Reed & Rothenberg, 1993). \textit{Siri Naess} was married to \textit{Arne Naess} and a sociologist working on dimensions of quality of life. \textit{Nils Faarlund} was studying towards becoming an engineer, but had studied ecology when he was a research fellow in Germany. In addition to the four mentioned, there were\textsuperscript{28} Now ‘Norges Tekniske og Naturvitenskapelige Universitet’ (NTNU) [Norwegian University of Science and Technology].\textsuperscript{29} \textit{Connoisseur} is a translation of ‘\textit{kjenner}’ in Norwegian, and is used in the original text to mean more than just knowing the mountain and the climbing routes. Naess was thought of in an almost mythical sense in relation to the mountain Stetind (Faarlund, 2010 b).\textsuperscript{30} Sigmund Kvaloey later moved to a small self-sufficient farm called \textit{Setreng} (where his mother grew up). He took the last name from the farm, which is traditional custom in Norway (Reed & Rothenberg, 1993). I will use his full name for practical reasons.
three other students who partook in some of the discussions, but were not as involved or influential as the individuals I have chosen to focus on.

The seminars
After being dropped off and establishing camp at the foot of Stetind they had plenty of time to ponder and discuss, because the weather kept them from climbing the first couple of days. When the weather eventually cleared, Arne Naess only climbed every other day. He would stay around base-camp in between his climbing days to train. Training for him meant working on philosophical questions. This is how he kept fit both physically and mentally. Initially Naess was busy challenging the engineers from the Norwegian Technical College (NTH) in symbolic logic; this was an important part of the discourse for the philosophical approach that evolved. Inspired by the philosophers Peter Wessel Zapffe and Baruch de Spinoza, they moved on to questioning why they did mountaineering (Faarlund, 2008; 2010 a).

An important influence was Spinoza’s take on the self. Spinoza differentiated between self spelled with a lower case s, and Self spelled with a capital S. The lower case self is the individual self or ego. The Self spelled with a capital S is the greater self that includes other people and species, and nature itself. The larger world is then part of our own interests (Naess, 1989, p 9). Self-realisation, as developed in the Ethics of Spinoza, is understood as maturity of the self that leads to increased compatibility with others. This is in contrast to the typical individualistic and utilitarian thinking in Western industrial countries. Here the terms self-realisation, self-expression and self-interest are interrelated and in great contrast to Spinoza’s concept (Naess, 1989, p 85). Spinoza’s Self-realisation is linked with the idea of self-preservation. This concept cannot develop without identification with others. This is described as: “sharing joys and sorrows with others, or, more fundamentally [through the] development of the narrow ego of the small child into the comprehensive structure of a self that comprises all human beings” (Naess, 1989, p 85). This way, joy can only be experienced through universal engagement and a self-understanding that opens for identification with The
greater Self. In Spinoza this also includes Nature with a capital N – seen as free nature\(^3\) (Faarlund, 2008, p 16).

During the *Stetind Seminars of 1966* they linked these concepts with why they did mountaineering. Driven by other perspectives related to quality of life and environmental issues, this evolved to include other concepts from philosophy. Building on Spinoza’ philosophies, Naess identified the need for “the development of a deep identification of individuals with all life forms” (1989, p 85). This concept of Self-realisation (and Self) is known in the history of philosophy through various names such as the universal self, the absolute and the ātman (Naess, 1989).

*Mahatma Gandhi’s* teachings influenced the participants’ take on the world, and this is essential for the development of *The Stetind Project*. *Arne Naess* and some trusted colleagues went on a pilgrimage to India because of their admiration for Gandhi’s non-violence philosophy. They were particularly inspired by the slogan: *There is no way to peace, peace is the way!* (Faarlund, 2008, p 16). His teachings had elements of Spinoza, such as the concept of universal engagement, but it is more obvious that Gandhi was inspired by the nature philosopher *Henry David Thoreau* (Faarlund, 2008, p 16). The key element that was adopted in the discussions at the foot of Stetind was the Gandhian principle of corresponding means and ends through all-encompassing or universal engagement. Principles became praxis (Faarlund, 2008, p 17).

Elements from *Thoreau’s* and *Spinoza’s* philosophies were combined with insights that Faarlund had gained during his research fellowship in Germany in 1958-59, when he studied a newly developed paper in natural science called *ecology* (Faarlund, 2010 b). The philosophies they were discussing were substantiated by the hard facts of natural science concerning the relationships between organisms and their environment. That an ecosystem, or the *big house* (from Greek oikos), had vulnerable inner connections was not new at all, but *ecology* gave the ‘soft’ values of environmentalists solid reasoning. This was in line with *Arne Naess’s* teachings on neutrality and objectivity

---

\(^3\) *Free nature* as understood by the *Council for Eco-philosophy* is nature that has its natural daily and seasonal rhythms (Faarlund, 2008; Reed & Rothenberg, 1993, p 157).
and this shifted the perception of environmentalism and nature conservation in the political arena from emotional sentimentality to respected reasoning (Faarlund, 2008; 2010 b).

At the 1966 Stetind Seminars, philosophy gave their way of thinking a holistic value orientation\(^3\), while ecology gave solid reasoning for the interconnectedness of everything in nature. The joint understanding of these concepts was not immediately symbiotic, but the corner stones were laid and there was a consensus of an outline of an ecological philosophy (Faarlund, 2008; 2010 b).

**Nature-friendly action**
After fourteen days at the foot of Stetind, they were picked up by the boat as planned. When they returned to civilisation, they had an outline of a new philosophy with them. The thoughts and concepts did not remain as just a philosophical approach; it was put into action in various ways.

*Sigmund Kvaløy Setreng*, supported by *Arne Naess*, initiated the ‘Nature and Human beings’ seminar series at the philosophical faculty at the University of Oslo. This triggered the development of an alternative environmental network in 1969 that was called ‘the cooperation group for protection of nature and the environment’ [samarbeidsgruppe for natur- og miljøvern] known as *(snm)*\(^3\), written with the parentheses and lower cap letters to highlight the cause instead of the network (Reed & Rothenberg, 1993). The *(snm)* organised the ‘Mardoela campaign’ in 1970 after Gandhi’s non-violence principals and revolutionised the approach, reactions and results of environmental campaigns in Norway. Further development of the concepts from the *Stetind Seminars* by *(snm)* created a more refined eco-philosophy as well as eco-politics. This influenced how Norwegian society developed throughout the 1970’s. Their work was a catalyst for a social movement that set off green politics that eventually limited the unrestrained mentality to industrialise. Their work was

\(^{32}\)The concept of value orientation is described by Nils Faarlund as *keel and rudder* for thoughts and actions (Faarlund, 2008, p 16).

\(^{33}\) *(snm)* was later called Ecopolitical Ring of Cooperation (Reed & Rothenberg, 1993, p 137).
highlighted in the campaign against the 1972 EEC\(^{34}\) membership, and the popular referendum resulted in 54\% against EEC membership. The (snm) was an important contributor to slowing down and stagnating the construction of hydropower dams as well as stopping the introduction of nuclear energy to Norway. The philosophy of a nature-friendly society was summarised in 1977 by Sigmund Kvaløy Setreng and Boerge Dahle as an ‘eco-political manifest’. This was an initiative to unite all groups in Norway working for the protection of nature and get them to work together.

The most widely recognised outcome internationally from the 1966 seminars is Deep Ecology. Arne Naess presented this holistic way of thinking in 1972 and published it in 1973 as ‘The shallow and the deep, long-range ecology movements’ \(^{35}\). This philosophy seeks a holistic view of the world. It focuses on the causes to the socio- and environmental challenges of our time based on an understanding of the Earth as an ecosphere with ecosystems functioning together as a whole. Therefore environmental problems cannot be solved simply through technical ‘quick-fix’ solutions addressing only symptoms of the deeper lying issues. In practice the philosophy deals with the root causes and sees a particular problem from other perspectives than the narrow interests of humans only (i.e. other species or an ecosystem). The philosophy of Deep Ecology can therfore lead to what Rothenberg (1989, p 4) defines as “full scale critique of our civilisation, seeking out false conceptions of reality at the core”. The reasoning of Deep Ecology and the structure of the Deep Ecology Movement is essential to the The Joy of Living Nature-friendly (JLN) and will be covered extensively under supporting literature.

The year after the Stetind Seminars in 1966, Nils Faarlund established the Norwegian Alpine School (NAS) [Norges Hoegfjellsskole]. The overall aim was to gain supporters for ‘free nature’. Free meant nature that had its natural daily and seasonal rhythms (Faarlund, 2008, p 17). NAS developed their own friluftslivs-philosophy\(^{36}\) which had

---

\(^{34}\) The European Economic Community (EEC) was re-named the European Community (EC) in 1993 and it forms the basis of today’s European Union (EU) (Europa, 2010).

\(^{35}\) Deep Ecology is discussed in the ‘Supporting literature’, later in Part Three.

\(^{36}\) This is covered extensively in the section on ‘Supporting literature’, later in Part Three.
references to the science of ecology with the absolute value of nature as the main concern. The NAS’s approach on being in the outdoors was inspired by Martin Buber’s Philosophy of Dialogue. This focuses on the meeting between self and other. Emotion, reason, intuition and sensation were included in responding to what was met. This is central in the JLN. Through experiencing an authentic relationship, this meeting creates a new entity that did not exist before the meeting (Buber, 1958; 1965). When such a meeting is experienced with free nature, this is seen as epoch-making in our relationship with nature and hence influencing the absolute value of nature. This was combined with Henry David Thoreau’s philosophies which explicitly encompasses the idea that in wilderness is the preservation of the world (Faarlund, 2008, p 17).

The participants at the Stetind Seminars of 1966 combined their different backgrounds and views in a holistic way of thinking. They used their own experiences that had influenced their approach on being in and with nature. An example of this was that some of them saw their climbing and social experiences in Nepal with the Sherpas as an apprenticeship in a culture that had closeness to nature37. There they had experienced a culture that realised traditional ecological principles. The sum of these concepts lead to the understanding that profound changes in the way we live cannot be triggered by theorising and abstract persuading, but only through experiential learning with reflection (Faarlund, 2008, p 17). This is the backbone of the JLN and what it is realising.

Before going into the specifics of the JLN, some of the key concepts that the project is built upon needs to be explored: This will be done based on the topics from the conference ‘Being in nature’ in 2007.

37 An example is the anti-expedition in 1971 to Gauri Shankar in Himalaya to not climb the peak of a sacred mountain, showing cross-cultural understanding (Reed & Rothenberg, 1993, p 156).
Supporting literature

This section is aiming at deepening the understanding of literature related to both the development of *The Stetind Project* and the approach chosen by the *Council for Eco-philosophy*. As mentioned earlier, Boerge Dahle took the initiative to *The Stetind Project* based on the conference ‘*Being in nature*’ 2007. The themes and related papers from the conference will be discussed as well as literature that underpins the themes. For this later purpose I will focus on *friluftsliv* and the cultural heritage that *friluftsliv* represents. With an understanding of this, *deep ecology* will be discussed to present a solid foundation for reflection on the development of the project and the concept of an ecological consciousness.

This section is more descriptive than analytical to substantiate my perspective on *The Stetind Project* as my impetus for ecological consciousness. It was an understanding of the concepts as presented below that influenced me, and not the potential for alternative perspectives or approaches. Understanding the background of the approach, based on the cultural, historical, academic and philosophical contexts it developed from, is critical for my belief in the project. The combination of a focus on the practical aspects related to contact and interaction with nature, based on an experiential understanding of *friluftsliv*, as well as the theoretical underpinnings supporting this, is essential for my perspective. It is a deepened understanding of these concepts that triggered awareness of, and manifested the process of developing an ecological consciousness.
Being in nature

The theoretical framework for *The Stetind Project* has evolved from the topics that were focused on at the international conference ‘Being in nature: Experiential Learning and Teaching’ in the Gisna-valley [Gisnadalen], Norway in 2007. *The Stetind Project* evolved from a combination of the topics at the conference, and how the participants engaged with them, as well as later collaborations and ideas that were sparked based on the conference (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008). The following section examines the conference report and elicits what is relevant for an understanding of the theoretical and cultural foundation for *The Stetind Project*.

The main topics were ‘how humans relate to nature’ and ‘different pedagogical approaches when working with friluftsliv’ (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008). The 27 papers from the conference have been divided into six themes: Friluftsliv; Time and space; Identity; Nature conservation, education and politics; Aesthetics and; Quality of life. This is shown in Table I. The categorisation was done by the editors of the conference report, Dahle and Jensen, based on the contents of the papers. They note in the foreword of the report that most of the papers are linked and could have been categorised differently (Dahle & Jensen, 2009 a, p 2). When studying *The Stetind Project* it is beneficial to base my interpretation and understanding on the themes Dahle and Jensen used, since it is what the managing committee see as the academic foundation for *The Stetind Project*. It is important for the case study to note that Dahle and Jensen only categorised the papers in the themes to sort the contents of the conference report. The interpretation of the themes and the links to the JLN are done exclusively for this case study.
Table I: Themes and papers from Being in Nature 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Author(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friluftsliv</strong></td>
<td><em>Friluftsliv!</em></td>
<td>Faarlund, N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>How is the concept of friluftsliv explained by administrators, teachers and pupils in two chosen primary schools</em></td>
<td>Frenning, I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Czech education in nature: Turistica and connections to friluftsliv</em></td>
<td>Martin, A., Neuman, J., Turčová, I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>An effort to capture an elusive friluftsliv</em></td>
<td>Henderson, B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time and space</strong></td>
<td><em>Wild time</em></td>
<td>Griffiths, J.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Time and boredom – a necessary unity?</em></td>
<td>Jensen, Aa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity</strong></td>
<td><em>A key to processing and conceptualizing experiential winter wilderness travel in the Canadian north</em></td>
<td>Urberg, I., Asfeldt, M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature conservation, education and politics</strong></td>
<td><em>‘On the far side of the moon – the sound of silence’</em></td>
<td>McQuitty, G.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>‘Anerkjennende’ pedagogy</em></td>
<td>Dahle, B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Integrating outdoor education geography: Using experiential wilderness travel in the Canadian north</em></td>
<td>Hvenegaard, G., Asfeldt, M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Outward Bound Canada College: Fostering ecological consciousness through an integrated semester program</em></td>
<td>Root, E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Nature, nurture and narrative: An examination of experiential, wilderness-based rehabilitation for young offenders</em></td>
<td>Northey, B.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The way to natural design: Learning to see and confront the bigger design question</em></td>
<td>Baxter, S. (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>From tomte wisdom to friluftsliv: Scandinavian Perspectives of nature</em></td>
<td>Hulmes, D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Leadership development: An interdisciplinary liberal arts and science approach</em></td>
<td>Asfeldt, M., Hvenegaard, G., Urberg, I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>‘What is this juniper good for anyway...’</em></td>
<td>Nerland, J. E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>A flickering candle in the gloom, ... or... pondering a 35 year friluftsliv journey</em></td>
<td>Vikander, N. O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Social Pragmatism and transformative ecological learning (unfinished paper)</em></td>
<td>Jakobsen, T.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Kinds of learning</em></td>
<td>Bunn, S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Scottish outdoor education centres overview</em></td>
<td>Spence, D.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aesthetics

Acting like a mountain

From aesthetical experience to educational concepts – using the special possibilities of nature in education outdoors

Dettweiler, U.

Liedtke, G.,

Reuter, B.

Quality of life

Deep design and the engineers conscience: A global primer for design education

König, V.,

Baumann, F.,

Schüle, K.

Friluftsliv as a reasonable, natural method to increase the health-related quality of life in cancer patients, a pilot study

Leisgen, A.,

Gerlach, J.

Influences of friluftsliv on the parameters of heart rate variability in consideration of circadian rhythm

Go out for a walk and get paid for it!

Sütterlin, M.,

Gerlach, J.

Friluftsliv as a health programme for corporate health promotion

E-motional recreation in nature

– benefits of friluftsliv to body and mind

Gerlach, J.

Table i: Based on themes from Dahle & Jensen, 2009a.

Interpreting the themes

The first theme is friluftsliv and has four papers covering the concept of friluftsliv from different cultural aspects. Faarlund (2009) starts with the traditions of friluftsliv and reaches deep into the cultural traits that define traditional Norwegian friluftsliv. Frenning (2009) has an empirical approach that probes contemporary perceptions of friluftsliv in Norway. The other two papers see friluftsliv in other cultural or national contexts and reflect upon connections or transferability. Henderson’s (2009) paper is efficient in communicating an outsider’s perspective on friluftsliv. This theme is critical for an in-depth understanding of the context that has shaped The Stetind Project.

Time and space is the second theme. The two papers discuss how we as individuals and society are affected by the concept of time in our lives. Griffiths’ (2009) paper is an excerpt from her book ‘A sideways look at time’ which is a poetic exploration of the way we experience time in our everyday lives. Her section on wild time reflects upon the diverse cycles of nature, and questions the structured and institutionalised time that is one of the main influences on westernised society. In the other paper Jensen
reflects upon the importance of experiencing time, and especially boredom, and how this can lead to a new perspective on your existence and what you value. The theme questions an important part of how we live our lives in the westernised world and this understanding is important for the reflection the JLN is initiating and facilitating.

Urberg and Asfeldt's (2009) paper is the only exclusive contribution to the theme identity. Their paper presents empirical material from students reflecting on their own experiences in nature from winter wilderness travel in the Canadian North. Personal narratives are combined with an awareness of stories, voices and situations of others – past and present – and help contextualise personal experiences. This can be used to reflect critically on personal lives, identity and lifestyles which are at the very core of experiential teaching and learning (Urberg & Asfeldt, 2009, p 49). This is what The Stetind Project is aiming for with the JLN; reflection based on cultural heritage and personal experiences.

The theme nature conservation, education and politics is the theme with the widest spectre of papers. An overview of issues that are relevant for the Stetind Project are presented in Table II.
### Table II: Relevant issues from the theme *nature conservation, education and politics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clusters of Issues</th>
<th>Reference(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Nature as an educational setting; a place for development and enlightenment through reflection on personal experiences. Specific approaches are highlighted that create personal involvement.</em></td>
<td>McQuitty, 2009; Dahle, 2009; Root, 2009; Asfeldt, Hvenegaard &amp; Urberg, 2009; Nerland, 2009; Bunn, 2009; Jacobsen, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Interdisciplinary and alternative approaches on outdoor education to create synergy effects and specific outcomes.</em></td>
<td>Hvenegaard &amp; Asfeldt, 2009; Northey, 2009; Baxter, 2009 (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Perspectives on personal narratives. Friluftsliv as a catalyst to develop the self and self awareness and as a pathway to life in simplicity and with closeness to nature.</em></td>
<td>Humles, 2009; Asfeldt, Hvenegaard &amp; Urberg, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Influences on the development of an ecological mindset. A key concept is ecological self, or how we see our selves in relation to nature.</em></td>
<td>Jacobsen, 2009; Asfeldt, Hvenegaard &amp; Urberg, 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This theme creates a backdrop for the instrumental dimension of the JLN: creating awareness of, and clarifying the concepts of *nature conservation, education and politics*. These papers and the issues related to them are the rationale for what the project is aiming to achieve and why the specific building blocks are used.

The fifth theme is *aesthetics* and deals with some of the visual and artistic dimensions of being in nature and conceptualises these. Liedtke & Reuter discuss the benefits of programs that accommodate “holistic aims like the improvement of quality of life and personal well-being” (Liedtke & Reuter, 2009, p 148). The concept of ‘lively encounter with one’s self’ is discussed and the outcome of this is recognised as the *feeling* of being and liveliness.

The last theme in the conference report is *quality of life*. It starts with a paper that reflects on, and speculates in design’s role for a sustainable future and how it can
enhance the overall quality of live. This is done through considering ecological design and perspectives on ethics and values in the design process. It presents “natural design [as] a truly Gaian strategy” (Baxter, 2009 b, p 158) when all three dimensions are considered. This is followed by a paper on friluftsliv as an influence to achieve a healthier lifestyle based on research on cancer patients recuperating after treatment. Friluftsliv incorporates “the mixture of motion, experiences of oneself, powers of nature and other members of the group and varied, natural stimuli” together with a focus on “being in the outdoors and enjoying being away from stress and civilisation”. This improved health-related quality of life for the participants of the Norwegian project that was evaluated (König, Bauman & Schüle, 2009, p 163). Another study, based on monitoring the heart rate variability of some students during a friluftsliv fieldtrip to Southern Norway found that “being in nature the friluftsliv way is active rehabilitation and prevention of stress and thus a way to a healthier life style” (Leisgen & Gerlach, 2009, p 170).

A similar research project, based on using friluftsliv in a corporate program for health promotion, concludes that “the combination of exercise and being in nature leads to a healthier lifestyle and higher quality of life!” (Sütterlin & Gerlach, 2009, p 177). The last paper in the report is linked to the other three papers related to research on health benefits from friluftsliv. This paper acknowledges that the research presented focuses on short term benefits, but it reflects upon how long term benefits can be created through friluftsliv and outdoor recreation. It indicates that if friluftsliv is in the socialisation process at early age, this can create long-term habitual patterns that are linked with the short term benefits described as increased well being and quality of life (Gerlach, 2009).

The participants at ‘Being in Nature’ 2007 expressed a strong desire to continue the international work with these themes (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008). Boerge Dahle has been the initiator for the continual work that has lead to The Stetind Project. To develop further understanding of these themes I will discuss the main constructs that are relevant for an in-depth understanding of The Joy of Living nature-friendly.
Discussion of underpinning constructs

The purpose of discussing the underpinning constructs is to enhance the understanding of the themes from *Being in Nature* 2007 and therefore also the context that *The Stetind Project* has developed in. The main emphasis is on friluftsliv, the Ash-Lad mentality and Deep Ecology. I have chosen to go more thoroughly into friluftsliv as it is essential for a deeper understanding of the cultural heritage and the focus on experiential learning that the JLN and the approach is based on. The section on *The Ash-Lad Mentality* increases the understanding of the historical and cultural context and a broad understanding of *Deep Ecology* brings important elements of the approach together.

Friluftsliv

When working with anything related to education or recreation in the outdoors in Norway, the concept of friluftsliv will surface. Translated literally from Norwegian to English, friluftsliv is “open-air life” (Reed & Rothenberg, 1993, p 3). Related to day to day vocabulary in English, this can be understood as outdoor recreation, but this does not justify the cultural and practical dimensions of the construct. Friluftsliv is widely recognised as a Norwegian term and the Norwegian playwright and poet Henrik Ibsen pioneered the use of the term in written form in his poem ‘Paa Vidderne’ [On the Heights] in the mid 19th century (Hulmes, 2007, p 224). However, as a broadly recognised concept and an applied philosophy, friluftsliv has a long history also in other parts of the Nordic region (Vikander, 2007, p 10). The friluftsliv idea shares common sentiments with Henry David Thoreau’s quest for the tonic wilderness, Sigurd Olsons’ attention to ancient rhythms, P. G. Downe’s ways of the north, Aldo Leopold’s primitive arts, Grey Owl’s giving a single leaf and Butala’s seeping of the beauty of nature into your bones. These writers and speakers embraced nature and tried to teach reconciliation with nature. Parallel with key concepts in friluftsliv, these writings acknowledge the importance of free nature, with attention to traditional ways of the local culture and place (Henderson, 2007, pp. 5-6).
The concept of *friluftsliv* has a wide range of definitions and larger social constructs attached to it. It can encompass different values and therefore be seen as facilitating therapy and function as a stimulant for reflection, change and personal development. For some it is an alternative life experience, a form of experiential living (Horgen, 2001). The definition of *friluftsliv* used by the Norwegian government is “Visits or physical activity in the outdoors, in leisure time, to get a change of surroundings and experience nature” (Horgen, 2001). Based on a thorough discourse analysis of excerpts of one hundred years of *friluftsliv*-related literature, three core values of *traditional Norwegian friluftsliv* were identified: Use of simple equipment; simple or no accommodation or facilities; skill and experience among participants (Ese, 2007, p 48).

*Friluftsliv* can be approached as a cultural and dynamic concept in between an abstraction and a phenomena. Exactly what *friluftsliv* is understood as, depends on several factors: the era it is being practiced in, where the individuals have a sense of belonging, their place of residence, social class, gender, phase in life, personal situation and which approach one has to practising it (Horgen, 2001). The phenomena can be approached more thoroughly from three different stands: that of the researcher, that of the public and that of the ‘conwayor’ (of *friluftsliv*) (Horgen, 2001). *Conwayor* is the English word *Nils Faarlund* has created to describe a person trained to mediate *friluftsliv* (Faarlund, 2005, p 1). Faarlund is active in the friluftsliv discourse, and is a guardian of traditional Norwegian friluftsliv. The cultural tradition has parallels in other cultures, such as the Czech outdoor culture of *Turistika* (Martin, Neuman & Turčová, 2007), but to communicate its uniqueness *Faarlund* has made efforts to create an understanding of key terms related to it, and created new words and phrases where existing constructs and definitions do not express its meanings sufficiently\(^{38}\) (Faarlund, 2005).

The three different stands that can be used to interpret *friluftsliv*, represent different spheres of this outdoor concept, but all are relevant for understanding how the development and conceptualisation of *The Stetind Project* is related to *friluftsliv*.

\(^{38}\) See Faarlund (2005) for further reading on this.
To *conway frilufts liv* is the process of mediating *frilufts liv*. This can be compared with the role an outdoor or mountain guide has. A distinct difference between their approach and that of a *conwayor of frilufts liv* is that they are in general focused on getting the client(s) to a summit or certain location through an adventurous approach. This can be part of the role a *conwayor of frilufts liv* has as well, but *conwayorship* as defined by Faarlund (2005) is “about sharing the experiences of free nature in accord with the patterns of thought and of the values of the Norwegian tradition of frilufts liv in smaller groups for the joy of identification” (p 1). Through *frilufts liv* the purpose of being in nature is shifted to the journey itself where *the joy of identification* is essential. *Joy* in this context “is not related to modernity’s fun or high sensation seeking activities” (Faarlund, 2005, p 4), but *joy* is “an all embracing experience, absorbing, [and] deeply moving” (Faarlund, 2005, p 4). This is *joy* as it is defined by Spinoza in relation to self-realisation – “*joy* can only be experienced through universal engagement and self-understanding that opens for identification with the greater Self” (Naess, 1989, p 85).

An additional dimension with *conwayorship* that is relevant for understanding the concept, is the intention to “inspire route finding in modernity towards life styles where nature is the home of culture” (Faarlund, 2005, p 1). This urges us to realise that our westernised cultures have become separated from nature. To develop nature-friendly societies our cultures must be re-connected with nature and based on previous generations’ experiences and their relationship with nature. When considering the three different stands on interpreting *frilufts liv*, the *conwayor’s* approach on performing *frilufts liv* has a foundation from philosophy and a background in tradition. It can have a normative or moralistic expression, as well as being liberal. The *conwayor* has a closeness to the phenomena of *frilufts liv* through experiencing and practicing *frilufts liv*. This gives the *conwayor* a solid foundation for practice, pedagogies, didactics, and last but not least outdoor education (Horgen, 2001).
In light of the conwayor's approach to friluftsliv, a researcher's approach can be said to have a foundation from science and a background in research. Within this practice, definitions are based on research constructs and to some extent standardised. The approach is seen to be analytical, but with detachment from the phenomena. This gives a foundation for research, politics and management (Horgen, 2001).

Between these stereotypical definitions of the conwayor and the researcher, is the approach of the general public. The dominant form of Norwegian friluftsliv is that people start from their own homes or cabins, go out into nature on walks alone or together with family and friends, in order to come home later in the day to their own home or cabin. Main motives are to experience nature, to be sociable and to engage in physical activity. The essence is “the simplicity with which people can engage with nature in a meaningful way – without the trappings of expensive gadgets or equipment” (Dahle, 2007, p 24). Table III gives an overview of the significant elements that characterises the cultural phenomenon of friluftsliv.

**Table III: The significant elements of friluftsliv**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant elements of friluftsliv</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experiencing nature is key</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practicing friluftsliv is not dependent on large costs for travelling and equipment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The nature and cultural landscape used is easily accessible from permanent residences and holiday cabins</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The passing of tradition is strongly anchored in natural social groups such as family and friends</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friluftsliv is not dependent on organisations: it is possible for the individual to choose their own time and place for practising it</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table iii: Dahle, 2007, p 27.*
This reveals that there is more to friluftsliv than the straight forward comparison with outdoor recreation. It is also in contrast with what is described by Dahle (2007) as “international outdoor activities” (p 27) which is first and foremost activity-motivated and tied to facilities in nature. This makes the recreational activities organised and often part of a commercialised setting or a travel industry selling experience packages. This “international leisure activity culture” (p 28) has been adopted by many individuals and institutions and is a threat to the traditional friluftsliv.

According to Faarlund, traditional friluftsliv “is nothing less than an agent of paradigm shift” (Reed & Rothenberg, 1993, p 156). To move on from the existing reactionary, or what can be described as reformatory environmentalism, people need to gain a greater understanding of ecology and nature’s own philosophies. He believes that you have to experience the ‘ecos’ itself to know what deep ecology is. As he explains:

There is a deep philosophy in woods, mountains and water, a philosophy we can better dream than describe, a philosophy only first-hand meetings with nature can intimate (Reed & Rothenberg, 1993, p. 155).

This sums up the significance of this approach on being in nature and expresses the identified qualities that are key to The Joy of Living Nature-friendly.

The Ash-Lad mentality
The concept of friluftsliv is inherent in Norwegian culture and can be found in our folk tales. Having a friluftsliv approach to being in the outdoors is mirrored in the hero of these folk tales, the Ash-Lad [Askledden]. This character is somewhat unique and appears more in traditional Norwegian folk tales than in the neighbouring Scandinavian countries. He has been described as the “classical figure of Norwegian eco-philosophy and ecopolitics” (Setreng, 2005, p. 1). For the Ash-Lad, being on his way was what it was all about. He was the youngest brother of three, and coming from humble circumstances he often had to stay at home and look after his older relatives. A lot of the time was spent by the fireplace looking after the fire and stirring in the ashes. In the stories he somehow always ends up going on a journey. Most of the time his older brothers, Per and Paul [Paal], have a defined goal where the fame and glory
of ‘winning’ the princess (to marry) and inheriting half of the kingdom is the sole purpose. Per and Paul often set out before the *Ash-Lad* and he reluctantly has to follow. Per and Paul are focused on the goal and miss all they travel past on their way to win the princess, but for the *Ash-Lad* his travels turn out to be an adventure. He spends time with the people he meets along the way and ends up having experiences on his journeys that seem trivial at the time, but as it turns out this develops both himself and the people around him. A typical trait for The *Ash-Lad* is that he treats every person equally and together with others he is successful. This is the character that has been the hero of Norwegian youngsters for hundreds of years (Setreng, 2005).

The *Ash-Lad* and his impact on the Norwegian people should be seen in light of historical and political events. Norway was under foreign rule for half a millennium: the first 400 years under Danish rule where the Norwegians were heavily oppressed, and then forcefully brought under union with Sweden for another 100 years. Throughout this time period, and especially while under Danish rule, “the majority of the Norwegians were poor, surviving only through an intimate knowledge of nature, inventive resourcefulness and highly developed ability to improvise” (Setreng, 2005, p. 2). The parallels to the *Ash-Lad* stories are obvious, particularly when the Danish overlords are compared with Per and Paul as being ignorant of their surroundings and marching bluntly past people and places.

I choose to link this with what is defined as the ‘Law of Jante’ (*Janteloven*) in Nordic countries. It is the unspoken rules of jealousy, often noticeable in smaller towns because of the transparency of what people say and do. It encourages individuals to not put oneself above the community (Silvera & Seger, 2004). The unspoken rules have been expressed in what can be translated into the ‘ten commandments’ of Jante. The first one cuts right to the core: “Thou shalt not fancy thyself better than us” (Sandemose, 1980 in Silvera & Seger, 2004). This is closely related to the Ash-Lad mentality, and holds some of the same principals. It enforces a direct approach, cutting out what is not seen as necessary or real.
Based on the historical and political circumstances described above, this has significant cultural influence on Norwegians. The socio-democratic society embraces equality between individuals and their surroundings. It can be seen as decreasing the distance between people with different backgrounds or with different stands.

Related to the historical context of the Stetind Project, this ties in with Naess’s first publication ‘Truth as conceived by those who are not professional philosophers’ from 1938 (Notario, 2006). Naess addresses one of the most essential themes of philosophy from every man’s point of view. This is known as ‘folkeliggjoering’ in Norwegian, or people-orientating. In this case, people-orientating philosophy. This expresses an attitude of equality that is evident in the building blocks of the JLN. The Council for Eco-philosophy is through its members, an example of inclusiveness and diversity, and this is the strength of the approach. The declaration of dependence is an explicit expression of the significance of all life and incorporates those values that can be traced back to the cultural and historical context. This is an essential part of the philosophical context as well. More specifically it is fundamental in Deep Ecology which I see as the philosophical context of the project. Building on an understanding of friluftsliv and the Ash-Lad mentality the next section discusses the specifics of Deep Ecology.

**Deep Ecology – moved by philosophy**

Naess introduced the term ‘Deep Ecology’ at the Third World Future Research Conference held in Bucharest in 1972 (Drengson, 2005, p 27) and published it the following year, in the seminal paper entitled “The Shallow and Deep, Long Range Ecology Movement: A Summary” (Reed & Rothenberg, 1993, p. 241). Aware that the meaning of a word and a phrase develops through time and social change, Reed and Rothenberg (1993) have described Deep Ecology in a simple and broad sense as “the belief that today’s environmental problems are symptomatic of deeper problems in our society, and that this belief requires an effort to solve these fundamental problems, not just retrofitting our current practices to be in line with environmentally correct mores” (Reed & Rothenberg, 1993, p 1).
Deep Ecology must be understood as both a philosophy and a movement. Naess asserts two meanings to ‘philosophy’: “1) a field of study, an approach to knowledge; 2) one’s own personal code of values and a view of the world which guides one’s own decisions (insofar as one does full-heartedly feel and think they are the right decisions)” (Naess, 1989, p 36). When the second meaning is applied to “questions involving ourselves and nature” Naess defines this as “an ecosophy” (Naess, 1989, p 36). As an overriding umbrella term, Naess defines eco-philosophy as:

The recognition of the problem and its subsequent study using philosophical methods [...]. More precisely, it is the utilisation of basic concepts from the science of ecology – such as complexity, diversity, and symbiosis – to clarify the place of our species within nature through the process of working out a total view (Naess, 1989, p 3).

Eco-philosophy is therefore seen as the study of approaches, but when addressing practical situations involving ourselves, the aim is to develop individual ecosophies.

The philosophy of Deep Ecology is expressed by Naess as a question of ontology that fosters “a re-examination of how we perceive and construct our world” (Naess, 1989, p 19). Deep Ecology encompasses two inescapable components: “evaluation and emotion in thinking and experience of reality, and how they lead to the ability to mature” (Naess, 1989, p 32). Through the development of an ecological self; one integrates this so that one can “act on the basis of a total view” (Naess, 1989, p 32). Naess emphasises that “the Deep Ecology Movement depend upon drawing the consequences of these necessities” (Naess, 1989, p 32). The philosophy of Deep Ecology is therefore an inspiration and source of support for the Deep Ecology Movement. Elaborating on this, Naess defines a social movement as “not scientific –its articulation must be permeated throughout with declarations of value and value priorities” (Naess, 1989, p 32).

When Naess originally described the Deep Ecology Movement, it was an attempt to outline the main points of Deep Ecology as a practical and applicable philosophy (Drengson, 2005). This was later refined by Naess and Sessions in 1984 to the eight points that make up the platform principles of the Deep Ecology Movement (Drengson, 1999). The platform principles are presented in Table IV.
**Table IV**: The eight platform principles of the Deep Ecology Movement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The well-being and flourishing of human and nonhuman Life on Earth have value in themselves (synonyms: intrinsic value, inherent value). These values are independent of the usefulness of the nonhuman world for human purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Richness and diversity of life forms contribute to the realisations of these values and are also values in themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Humans have no right to reduce this richness and diversity except to satisfy vital human needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>The flourishing of human life and cultures is compatible with a substantial decrease of human population. The flourishing of nonhuman life requires such a decrease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Present human interference with the nonhuman world is excessive, and the situation is rapidly worsening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Policies must therefore be changed. These policies affect basic economic, technological, and ideological structures. The resulting state of affairs will be deeply different from the present.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>The ideological change is mainly that of appreciating life quality (dwelling in situations of inherent value) rather than adhering to an increasingly higher standard of living. There will be a profound awareness of the difference between big and great.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Those who subscribe to the foregoing points have an obligation to directly or indirectly try to implement the necessary changes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table iv: Based on Devall & Sessions, 1985, p 70; Drengson, 1999 pp. 4-5; Naess, 1989, p 29; Reed & Rothenberg, 1993, p 76.

Anyone who endorses these eight principles is seen as a supporter of the deep ecology movement, not a deep ecologist. Naess does not see deep ecologist as an appropriate term (he finds it too immodest) and it would be confrontational in relation to the opposite: a shallow ecologist (which he sees as unkind language). Supporter is in line with the general Gandhian approach of the philosophy and leaves more room for interpretation (Drengson, 1999).
In contrast to this, Devall and Sessions (1985) have been criticised for being unambiguous in their approach on *Deep Ecology*. They categorised ideas and concepts as either deep or shallow, meaning good or bad, in their work ‘Deep Ecology: Living as if nature mattered’. They left little room in-between the extremes for how reality is, so the radical became opposed to all else with distance and contempt (Reed & Rothenberg, 1993). It supported the concept, but its articulation created dispute instead of understanding. The most critical and outspoken text on *Deep Ecology* is by Bookchin (1988). His basic point is that *Deep Ecology* tends to mask social realities in pseudomythical expressions. There is some truth to this in the political naivety that supporters of the *Deep Ecology Movement* have expressed in hope for renewed attention to nature, but recent campaigns by grass-root social movements\(^{39}\) such as *Earth First!, 350.org, cheatneutral.com* and *The Yes Men* have put ecology on the political agenda and reached mainstream media. Tobias (1985) addressed the philosophy of *Deep Ecology* in line with the intentions of Naess, as a tendency and thereby left room for inclusion of a wide span of ideas and concepts rather than pit the deep against the shallow (Reed & Rothenberg, 1993).

To assist individuals in the process of integrating the platform principles, Naess developed a four-level system for deep questioning. The platform principles in Table IV make up *level II* in the deep questioning model. At this level there is meant to be general agreement and the principles need to be flexible and integrative. Much cross-cultural work is done with regards to platform principles, especially related to grass-root social movements. The *Deep Ecology Movement* is developed based on Naess’s experience from the world peace and social justice movements, and his commitment to the way of non-violence taught by Gandhi. As a philosopher of science and logic who has done innovative work on language and communication, and his studies and travels have given him thorough cross-cultural knowledge and perspectives (Drengson, 1999). Based on this, the platform is not meant to be in the direction of a rigid set of doctrinaire statements, but rather a set of discussion points, open to

\(^{39}\) A grass-root movement is when their principles emerge from the bottom up (Drengson, 1999).
modification by people who broadly accept them. The idea is that the platform principles unite the group in terms of shared projects, aims and values. Level II is meant to function as a filter for deep questioning, leading to level I (Drengson, 1999). Table V shows the different levels of questioning and their articulation.

Table V: Levels of questioning and articulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level I</th>
<th>Ultimate Premises</th>
<th>The fundamental norm/intuition/way of thinking: Taoism, Christianity, Buddhism, Ecosophy (individual philosophies), etc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level II</td>
<td>Platform Principles</td>
<td>The level that unites, high level of agreement: Peace Movement, Deep Ecology Movement, Social Justice Movement, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III</td>
<td>Policies &amp; Programs</td>
<td>General consequences derived from the platform principles: Lifestyles, general policies, structure for actions etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level IV</td>
<td>Practical Actions</td>
<td>Practical situations with concrete decisions and actions: Consumer behaviour, methods of transport, engagement with specific political or social causes, line of work, hobbies and leisure time activities, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Level I holds the ultimate premises, or ultimate norms. These are diverse and can be religious views, refined personal philosophies or ecosophies. What unites them in The Deep Ecology Movement is a long-range vision to protect the integrity of the Earth’s ecological communities and values. This is the function of the platform principles at level II. From the level II principles, a great diversity of policies and recommendations can be articulated –they are the level III. From the level III policies comes practical actions. The level IV actions are even more specific and diverse than the level III policies (Drengson, 1999).
Through these four levels The Deep Ecology Movement manifests both plurality and unity: unity at level II and plurality at all other levels. From the platform principles deep questioning leads to diverse ultimate norms or premises. In the process of applying these norms one moves through the platform principles and develops policies and practical actions. This is an organic process, where all levels are relevant in different situations and visited at different occasions. This keeps one’s understanding and practices in line with a changing world. The deep questioning approach then becomes evolutionary, changing with natural conditions and adapting to different situations, places and cultures (Drenson, 1999).

Being founded by Arne Naess it represents his mind-set as well as his philosophies. Naess was known for his endless search “for the naked, authentic individual with original opinions, free from clichés and received phraseology” (Witoszek, 1997, p 65). This is what has shaped his philosophies, how he communicates and what he is (Witoszek, 1997). Deep Ecology can be separated from other ways of caring for the natural world by emphasising that it “seeks transformation of values and social organisation” through structured thought (Devall, 1980, p 303). The system of thought makes up the philosophy of Deep Ecology, and the system for actions makes up The Deep Ecology Movement.
Conceptualising the Stetind Project

Tysfjord municipality has since 2002 (when Stetind was voted to be the national mountain of Norway) worked towards enhancing Stetind as an attraction, associating the municipality with the mountain and fjord landscape in the region. A consultancy company (Transportutvikling AS) was engaged in 2007 to do an analysis of business opportunities in the Stetind region for development of both general business and tourism activity in Tysfjord municipality. The study purposes several possible approaches, but it identified a lacking theme or concept that could be unifying for the area, which is emphasised as critical for building national and international interest (Aasheim, 2008).

In June 2008 Boerge Dahle contacted Tysfjord municipality to explore the possibility of arranging an international conference related to the eco-philosophical history of Stetind and the project described as ‘the joy of living nature-friendly’. Kjoepsvik in Tysfjord was chosen because this is the community-centre closest to the mountain Stetind. Tysfjord municipality was positive to the initiative and gave the conference full support. A collaboration with the municipality was established to develop the Stetind Project further.

Assistant Professor Dahle took the initiative to hold another seminar in the Gisnavalley in 2008. The main task of this gathering was to draft the project plan for The Stetind Project and The Joy of Living Nature-friendly through further development of concepts from the conference Being in nature 2007. They also created a first draft of the ‘Stetind Declaration’. The documents were worded so that they could be used to apply for funding at national and regional levels. The collaboration between The Stetind Project and Tysfjord municipality lead to The Stetind Project being included in the municipality’s regional development plan.

---

40 The report was Contingency Study Stetind [Mulightesstudie Stetind] by Transportutvikling AS (Aasheim, 2008).
Their approach

The overall aim for *The Stetind Project* is to turn Stetind into an international icon for nature-friendly ways of thinking and living (Council for Ecophilosophy, 2008). The *Council for Eco-philosophy* has developed the project ‘The joy of living in a nature-friendly way’ “to unite organisations and individuals [and] [...] support politicians who want to develop a nature-friendly society” (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2010, home page). The *Council for Eco-philosophy* is an example of a council, and their approach on a *place of nature* as well as their *declaration of dependence* are meant to be examples of how eco-philosophical awareness can be created. The ultimate goal is to inspire local approaches nationally and internationally and build a social movement springing out from local councils with their own versions of the declaration of dependence and defining their own place of nature.

This section will cover the *Council for Eco-philosophy’s* proposed actions and tasks to realise *The Stetind Project*. This is based on the project description produced by the *Council for Eco-philosophy* (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008). First are the building blocks of *The Joy of Living Nature-friendly: Council for Eco-philosophy, The Place of Nature by Stetind and The Stetind Declaration*.

Council for Eco-philosophy

This council consists of some of the participants from the *Stetind Seminars of 1966*, as well as personalities that strengthen the council. In sum a broad spectrum of backgrounds culturally and spiritually, represented by recognised and influential individuals that have come together for a defined purpose. Table VI presents the members of the council and relevant information on role and background.

---

41 This section is based on the original project description in Norwegian ‘the joy of living nature-friendly’ (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008).
Table VI: Council for Eco-philosophy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Relevant information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boerge Dahle</td>
<td>Assistant Professor, taught friluftsliv at The Norwegian School of Sport Sciences (NIH) in Oslo, worked on ‘Nature friendly friluftsliv in a global environment and educational perspective’. Author of children’s books concerning friluftsliv. The initiator of the Stetind Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siri Naess</td>
<td>Sociologist, has studied quality of life, living conditions and welfare systems. Was present at the Stetind Seminars in 1966. Was married to Arne Naess.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eirik Myrhaug</td>
<td>Sami Shaman and Healer, has worked with ecological economies and eco-projects for municipalities in Northern Norway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oeystein Dahle</td>
<td>Former leader of the board of the Worldwatch Institute for the Nordic countries for 20 years, and leader of the board for The Norwegian Outdoor and Trekking Association (DNT) as well as for the Organisation for Friluftsliv. Honourable member of DNT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aage Jensen</td>
<td>Teaches pedagogy for friluftsliv students at Nord-Troendelag University College. Has written about conwaying in friluftsliv in different books for students of friluftsliv at all levels. Leader for FOR-UT which works for traditional friluftsliv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nils Faarlund</td>
<td>Nature philosopher, was present at the Stetind Seminars in 1966, has since then worked with and for nature-friendly ways of thinking and living as head of the Norwegian Alpine School. Established friluftsliv as a course of study at The Norwegian School of Sport Sciences (NIH) in 1968. Descibed as a foundational figure to traditional Norwegian friluftsliv. Received the ‘The Royal Norwegian Order of St. Olav’ for his efforts for the search &amp; rescue service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


---

42 Myrhaug has not been actively involved in the later phases of The Stetind Project.

43 For details on conwaying in friluftsliv, see ‘Supporting literature’ earlier in Part Three or Faarlund, 2005.
**The ‘place of nature’ by Stetind**
The purpose of ‘a place of nature’ is to experience nature. This specific ‘place of nature’ is proposed to be located close to Stetind so that it can be linked with the spirit of the place based on its history and cultural significance. The idea is that there should be some kind of structure that is inspired by local traditions and ways of living, including Sami perspectives. The structure must have low impact on the environment and be based on local building techniques and materials. The intention is that a place of nature should open up towards nature and inspire to contemplate and reflect with protocol in a declaration of dependence.

**Table VII: Intended use of The Place of Nature by Stetind**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Description of use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual or group</strong></td>
<td><strong>Primarily a place to go to reflect upon and sign the Stetind Declaration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A place where nature can be experienced next to a significant mountain</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
<td><strong>Information/education about Sami culture and their understanding of nature</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A place where ceremonies can take place</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Facilitate discussions on nature-friendly ways of living and quality of life</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Information/education about mountaineers, the mountain Stetind and the development of an eco-philosophical way of thinking</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Facilitate special cultural events</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>A place where businesses and organisations can meet to discuss issues of value orientation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table vii: Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008*
The intention with the place of nature by Stetind is that it should be within a short walking distance, on a path, from the closest road where the main access point to Stetind is. It should also be possible to arrive by boat (via Storelva). The area must be developed so that the cultural and historical significance of the place is recognised. The place of nature by Stetind is conceptualised to open up towards nature, with focus on Stetind, and is to facilitate reflection with protocol in The Stetind Declaration.

The Stetind Declaration
The Stetind Declaration was created by the Council for Eco-philosophy to create awareness of eco-philosophy for some, and to revitalise and manifest value orientation for others. This declaration is an example of a declaration of dependence. It is a manifestation of the interdependence of all life on Earth (Council of Eco-philosophy, 2009, home page: Sign Up!). The Stetind Declaration is the most essential building block of the JLN, and The Stetind Project as a whole, because it is explicit about eco-philosophical attitudes and behaviours as well as the value orientation it is based on.

At the place of nature by Stetind the declaration is intended to be presented in a format that displays and communicates its distinction, and it is of the essence that individuals and groups that are visiting can sign it.
Figure I: The Stetind Declaration as presented online by the Council for Eco-philosophy:

The Stetind Declaration

We have gradually come to realise:
Our way of life has fateful consequences for nature and humankind, and thus for all life on Earth. The challenges we face as individuals and as a community are not merely of an economical and technological nature. They concern our basic values and our fundamental conception of what it means to be human.

We acknowledge that:
- Nature and humankind constitute a whole and share a common destiny.
  Nature is the home of culture.
- Life is like a woven fabric of relations.
  To live is to be dependent.
- The value of nature and human dignity are intrinsically linked.
  What we do to nature, we do to ourselves.
- All life is vulnerable and therefore under threat.
- Concern for nature implies a concern for greater justice: Our way of life affects in particular the poorest among us, indigenous peoples, and future generations.

We will:
- Work to promote a renewed understanding of the relationship between nature and humankind.
- Strive to base our choices, both as individuals and as a community, on this understanding.
- Discover the joy of living in harmony with nature.

There is no path to harmony with nature. Harmony with nature is the path.

Humankind possesses great capacity both to create and to destroy.

At this crucial point in time we will take responsibility and commit ourselves to thinking and living in a way that promotes life.

I/we will work to fulfill the Stetind Declaration.

[Signed by:]
Siri Naess, Aage Jensen, Oeystein Dahle, Finn Wagle, Boerge Dahle, Nils Faarlund, Sigmund Kvaaley Setreng

Figure 1: Format from Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008; content from Council for Eco-philosophy, 2009, Home page: Sign Up!
Tasks

The managing committee has defined tasks that the project will be working with. Part one will be the responsibility of the ‘Council for Eco-philosophy’, while part two is the responsibility of Tysfjord Municipality. This is presented in table VIII: Stages of the Stetind Project with corresponding tasks.
Table VIII: Stages of the Stetind Project with corresponding tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description of task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part one</td>
<td><strong>The responsibility of Council for Eco-philosophy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the Stetind Declaration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compose a festschrift to nature – a book ‘honouring nature’, comprised of artwork, poetry, photographs, writing, drawings etc from professionals and amateurs, young and old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop ideas for different ‘places of nature’. A place/space for reflection and afterthought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Host the Stetind Seminar 28th-30th June 2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>During the seminar the ideas and thoughts behind the project ‘the joy of living in a nature-friendly way’ will be presented. The project will be developed during the seminar in dialogue with local community and businesses, Tysfjord municipality, and government at regional and national levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare an international conference ‘Stetind Conference 44 30th July -3rd August 2010, together with Tysfjord municipality. To hold the conference it is necessary to establish ‘a place of nature’ by Stetind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop plans to expand the project nationally and internationally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part two</td>
<td><strong>The responsibility of Tysfjord municipality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish solid underpinnings to plan and realise ‘a place of nature’ in the vicinity of Stetind with the necessary infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop plans to host the ‘Stetind week’ a yearly festival that celebrates the joy of living nature-friendly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Build a strategy that supports the development of Stetind as a symbol for nature-friendly ways of thinking and living.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table viii: Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008

44 The Stetind Conference was later titled ‘The Spirit of Place’ (Dahle & Jensen, 2009 b; Council for Eco-philosophy 2009, home page: 2010 Conference)
To develop Stetind as a symbol for ‘nature-friendly ways of thinking and living’ includes establishing a place of nature by Stetind as a destination for nature-friendly travel and experiences (as pilgrimage). Based on this Tysfjord can develop as an attractive destination with added meaning through facilitation of knowledge building and experiential learning related to eco-philosophy (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008, p 6).
Summing up

Part Three has presented The Stetind Project and The Joy of Living Nature-friendly with contextual elements that deepens the understanding of the approach. The focus has been on the specific case by studying the different contexts it developed in and from. Stake (2005) notes that when doing real world case studies the working definition of the case changes as the study develops (p 460). The scope of this case study has moved in and out as it evolved, but the JLN has been the main subject of the study. To grasp the place and significance of the JLN within The Stetind Project I have given an overview of the planned tasks and the other sub-projects within the two phases of The Stetind Project.

With a “combined purpose study” (Stake, 2005, p 445) both the intrinsic elements of the case and the instrumental dimensions are relevant. The JLN has clear and defined building blocks that constitute the intrinsic elements: the Council for Eco-philosophy, the place of nature by Stetind and the Stetind Declaration. To fully understand these building blocks the historical, cultural, academic and philosophical contexts of the project, and the literature supporting the approach has been studied.

The Stetind Seminars of 1966 and the outcomes of them contextualise the historical and philosophical dimensions of The Stetind Project. The historic events show the significance of the place, the culture and the people involved. In sum this gives credibility to the Council for Eco-philosophy and their approach. The approach is further acknowledged through the themes and papers from Being in Nature 2007, and the literature presented that deepens the understanding of the themes.

The themes from Being in Nature 2007 can be linked directly with the building blocks of the JLN. The themes that are of particular significance are friluftsli; identity; nature conservation and politics; aesthetics and; quality of life. The most significant themes from the case study and their relevance for the JLN are presented in table IX.
Table IX: Significant themes from *Being in Nature* 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friluftsliv</strong></td>
<td>Gives a backdrop for the context and the mind-set that the approach to JLN has developed from. The combination of the traditions of friluftsliv, contemporary understandings of friluftsliv and international perspectives gives this element of the context rigidity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time and space</strong></td>
<td>Reflections on awareness of ‘being’ and ‘individual values’ which are seminal to the JLN and the social movement it is working towards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity</strong></td>
<td>Gives insights into experiential learning and how personal experiences can be used to reflect critically on identity and lifestyles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature conservation, education and politics</strong></td>
<td>Clarifies educational benefits of nature as the classroom; the significance of experiencing nature combined with reflection (experiential learning); modes of learning in and with nature and; development of general awareness of surroundings as well as maturity of the self and self-awareness. All vital to the approach of the JLN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetics</strong></td>
<td>Conceptualises the visual and artistic dimensions of being in nature – the outcome of ‘lively encounter with one’s self’ is recognised as ‘the feeling of being and liveliness’ which is essential to the force identified as ‘the joy’ which is the impetus for the social movement the JLN is working towards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of life</strong></td>
<td>The positive influences and outcomes of being in nature, and friluftsliv as a specific approach that shifts the focus to quality of life instead of standard of living, and to self-realisation instead of materialistic-realisation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IX: My interpretation of the themes from *Being in Nature* 2007 and their significance for The Stetind Project.

*The Stetind Seminars of 1966 and Being in nature 2007* are crucial elements for an understanding of the context that *The Stetind Project* came to be in. Norwegian friluftsliv with its culturally specific traits and its development creates a greater understanding of this context. *Deep Ecology* and the *Deep Ecology Movement* encompass these contextual elements in a rational system which mirrors the specifics
of JLN, as well as The Stetind Project. With this understanding The Stetind Declaration functions as a platform where unity is essential, similar to the platform principles of the deep ecology movement (level II), while the different tasks features as diversity in approach. More specifically Council for Eco-philosophy can be seen as a local (philosophical) approach on working with the principals, similar to policies and programs (level III) in the deep questioning model of the deep ecology movement. The Place of Nature by Stetind is an approach which relates to practical actions (level IV) in the deep questioning model. It can be seen as a way of putting the theories and philosophies in concrete terms therefore it is practical actions based on the deeper levels (deep reflection).

Thinking of the intrinsic elements separately from the instrumental dimension is beneficial for an understanding of the dynamics of the project. I see the JLN as greater than the sum of its parts because of the depth of the concepts and the resonance this creates within the holistic approach. The synergy of the concepts at play is the instrumental dimension. In sum they are meant to trigger a social movement with a revised value orientation. Faarlund (2008) expresses this as a need for “profound changes in mode of living” (p 17). He continues that this “can not be triggered by theorising and abstract persuasion, [but instead] experiential learning with reflection is needed” (p 17). This is fully recognised by the approach of The Joy of Living Nature-friendly and has shaped the form and contents of the building blocks.

Considering the wider context of the thesis, the JLN is understood as an approach on changing the way we in the western world think and act. I link this with Mosquin’s writings on ecocentrism (2009) and what I perceive as developing an ecological consciousness. The case study has been an in-depth look at a specific approach and the mechanisms that can trigger this development. These mechanisms are described as the building blocks and studying them has inspired personal reflection. Through this the case study became my change-agent and fostered an awareness of my own values and priorities. The next part of my narrative is a manifestation of this process.
Discoveries and interpretations

~ Developing an ecological consciousness

“Good planets are hard to find.”

*Oeystein Dahle in a presentation on
‘The challenges of our time’\(^45\).
(Dahle, 2010)

Introduction

Parts One and Two have explained how I see the interconnected development of my research and myself. Part Three has described the different dimensions of *The Joy of Living Nature-friendly* so that what I define as *my change-agent* is tangible to the reader. This part of my narrative will report on discoveries and interpretations that represent the development of an ecological consciousness for me. The intention is to make the complex influences on my development visible through a personal narrative of the change process. This will describe the process of increased self-awareness, being affected by the research process and integrating the concepts that have become known to me through the research journey. I see the development I have gone through as the formation of an ecological consciousness. I will address this through three avenues that I believe make the grounding tangible: my relationship with nature and how this has developed; my thoughts around thinking and living nature-friendly and; the outcome of the reflection facilitated by my research journey.

\(^{45}\) Presentation at the Stetind Seminar 2009. Some of the same material is published in ‘Romskipet Jorden er et unikt fenomen i universet’ [The spacecraft Earth is a unique phenomenon in the universe] in Oeystein Dahle (2010).
My relationship with nature will be explored through a discussion of my adventurous self. I will build on this understanding when I use excerpts from my ecological diary from sailing in the South Pacific to exemplify how I relate to nature and reflect upon this and the nature-friendly actions this produces. The actual consequences of the reflection are somewhat apparent in the diary excerpts, but my foundation for a nature-friendly way of thinking and living is made explicit in my personal ecological philosophy: Ecosophy M. This is my take on eco-philosophy inspired by Naess’s work on Ecosophy T, and his call for people to define individual ecosophies as part of developing towards an integrated self (Naess, 1989). Going through this process was a result of the ongoing work with my masters and uprooting myself again and having the chance to reflect upon it through an ecological diary while sailing in the South Pacific. This enhanced the process of transformative ecological learning (Jakobsen, 2009) as described in Part Two of my narrative. The process is ongoing, but the premises for Ecosophy M are defined.

To understand the deeper layers of developing an integrated ecological consciousness I believe the individual’s relationship with nature is fundamental. For this reason I will go through how I understand that this relationship has developed for me.

A friend of nature

Before starting this Masters project I was already a friend of nature, but I was not consciously living nature-friendly. The shift that has influenced my interaction with the world around me the most is awareness of the impacts of my own decisions and actions, and their effect beyond my immediate surroundings. Through the process of postgraduate studies and a combination of academic and popular literature, I have learned to conceptualise and combine ecological and philosophical ideas.

I developed closeness with nature through living and working at a mountain lodge the two years preceding my postgraduate studies. In many ways I was living nature-friendly then, but it was not consciously. I liked that I had no need for a car, that I
walked to work, that I could only travel by public transport when going somewhere, that it was an un-commercial space and, that I lived in and with nature. To be honest, this was just a bonus. I wanted the job at the mountain lodge to be able to work in the outdoors and have easy access to wilderness areas. But, through living there and reading literature that triggered reflection around ecological perspectives, I started to view this differently. This reflection coincided with increased attention in media and the wider society on climatic changes and the impact human activity was having on the planet.

I believe that the opportunity to be in the outdoors has led to increased involvement with and for nature. Learning and developing skills that have made me capable of mastering the outdoors and wilderness environments, has brought me closer to nature. Reflection on this has given me a sense of deeper experiences with nature. I see this as a self-enhancing process. The following section looks at how this process has developed for me.

**My adventurous self**

During my postgraduate bridging year in 2008 I gained knowledge about the concept of ‘adventurous self’ through studies related to outdoor education. The concept is based on a combination of all of my outdoor adventure experiences and feelings related to being active in nature. This reveals a unique ‘adventurous self’ (Boyes, 2008). To understand my relationship with nature I have explored significant adventure experiences I have had in nature. An understanding of a concept like ‘adventurous self’ and specific experiences can substantiate the development of my ecological self.

I believe that my experiences of the Norwegian mountains from a child-carrier\(^{46}\) have subconsciously affected my attitude towards picturesque landscapes. My childhood was spent at small mountain lodges and hotels where my parents were the hosts. I have several mental images, but most of them are constructed memories from stories

\(^{46}\) A child-carrier is a purpose built backpack frame to carry small children when hiking. A device that is commonly used in friluftsliv.
told by my parents. From the time when I attended kindergarten and started school, I have vague memories from adventuring with family in forests and hills close to home. Around the age of ten, more and more of this happened with friends or on my own. The freedom to roam, or the right of public access [allemannsretten], is a concept that is deeply rooted in Norwegians interaction with nature (Hulmes, 2007, p 231). It gives easy access to experiences with nature and enhances the relationship. This is closely linked with traditional friluftsliv. In contrast, I believe the restrictions I felt when my family lived in Miami, Florida, when I was 10-11 years old, has strengthened my awareness and appreciation of this freedom to roam and explore.

I became conscious of my appreciation of nature when I was 15 years old and worked the summer holiday at Finse, a small mountain village with only 10 permanent residents in southern Norway. This is the same place I lived and worked about 10 years later after finishing my Bachelors studies. Back then I worked at Finse 1222, a mountain lodge at 1222 meters above sea level, close to Hardangerjoekulen, the second largest plateau glacier in Northern Europe. I remember going tramping when I was off work, exploring the glacier and hills close by. My wilderness experiences were intense, because the village is remote and the location has some exotic characteristics. First and foremost the village is isolated from the surrounding world with no open access roads. The most common methods of communication are therefore limited to: the railroad (45 min to nearest town), walking (approximately 8 hrs to nearest road), biking or skiing (both approximately 4 hrs to nearest road). Secondly, Finse has a sub-Arctic climate and snow on the ground approximately eight months of the year. The fact that adventurers47, both past and present, use Finse as a training ground for expeditions to Polar regions enhances the outdoor culture and creates place awareness at the small mountain village. Having spent the summers at Finse, and gained more outdoor experience, I had the confidence to go tramping and tenting in the lowlands closer to my home on the south-west coast. I would go with friends for the sake of being in the outdoors.

47 Fridtjof Nansen and Roald Amundsen were there in the late 1800’s and early 1900’s, and Borge Ousland and Erling Kagge belong to the modern-time adventurers that frequently spend time there about 100 years later.
The next significant adventure experience worth noting was during boot camp for officers school. This was when I was 19 years old and it was time for the compulsory military service. If you are interested in more involvement and leadership training you can apply for Officers School. This is what I did. If you pass the first year of training and schooling, you get the chance to work one year as a Drill Sergeant. The first seven months of training were in boot camp. We were out and about non-stop. Some clearly disliked the experiences they had while being out on exercises, but I remember talking to comrades about the enjoyment I got out of it. Not all agreed, but some of us really enjoyed it. We were pushed hard, but it was not linked with warfare for me, I saw it as different types of challenges and a setting for personal development. Through outdoor lectures and exercises we were taught a variety of skills on how to take care of ourselves and the squad. We were out in the wild forests and mountains on exercises from one to four weeks throughout the first seven months. This created a strong feeling of coping with nature. This motivated me to gain more outdoor skills, and when I worked as a Drill Sergeant I attended two separate guide programmes through civilian outdoor pursuit centres; first a rafting guide course then a glacier guide course. Both were weeklong exposures to different settings with the elements, focusing on experiencing and respecting the elements and learning how to engage with them. This led to a series of avalanche safety courses and formal mountain search and rescue training.

After two years in the army I searched for a different experience and went to the Caribbean and worked as an activities leader on a cruise ship. During this time I picked up surfing. This opened my eyes for new dimensions of challenges in nature. Based on the experience I had from both competitive swimming and rafting I became very eager to learn a new combination of skills. Once again the skills had to be developed while being immersed in the elements. Most of the surfing I did during these six months was with other people from the ship, but every now and then I would go adventuring on my own. I was getting more aware of the intrinsic value outdoor experiences had to me and how rewarding I found it to cope with the challenges.
After saving up some money while working and surfing in the Caribbean, I got the chance to join some friends who were planning to spend a ski-season in Chamonix, France. This was the first time I felt like I truly was following my passion for the outdoors. I experienced more of the feelings I had started to become aware of while surfing: the intrinsic value of attaining skills in relation to an outdoor adventurous activity. This was enhanced when I started working as a rafting and glacier guide when I returned to Norway. In this setting I was part of the production of commercial outdoor adventurous experiences. Suddenly there was a difference between the outdoor experiences I was engaged in. When working, the main focus was on producing experiences for others, and when engaging in outdoor adventures when not working, the main focus was on the enjoyment and pleasure I got from it myself.

In many ways the last 10 years have revolved around developing skills related to some core activities in the outdoors. While getting my Bachelors degree from 2002 till 2004, my time was divided between studies, work and play. More precisely, work and studies were organised to maximise play. I am critical to how I spend my leisure time, to enhance both the quality and duration of it. This tends to be in relation to surfing, mountain biking and skiing. I have learned that this is defined as ‘serious leisure’ (Stebbins, 1982). This construct is easiest grasped if contrasted with ‘casual’ or ‘unserious leisure’ which can be exemplified by an activity like walking where progression is not clearly identifiable through stages of achievement. A significant characteristic with serious leisure is the unique culture that exists with the activity, often with its own norms, values and behaviours (Green & Jones, 2005). I identify with a leisure pursuit through adventurous activities in the outdoors, where I need a diverse set of skills to master it. I find it intrinsically rewarding to encounter special contingencies and variations where I go through stages of achievement and involvement. The dimension that brings me closer to nature is the involvement with the elements, and the awareness and respect this requires.

With this insight it is obvious to me that my behaviour in the last decade has been increasingly influenced by serious leisure. My focus on some activities has gradually effected my lifestyle choices when it comes to the work and travel I have done. It has
been combined with the urge to stay at a destination for a longer period of time. I have spent three months skiing in Chamonix, France; several month long periods in New Zealand surfing, skiing or mountain biking; and four and a half months surfing and free-diving while sailing in the South Pacific. I stay as long as possible to develop skills in an activity, and enjoy becoming a part of a community and establishing relationships with both people and places.

I link this with what can be defined as a pursuit of optimal experiences. Csikszentmihalyi and LeFevre (1989, p 816) called this active state for ‘flow’; “when a person perceives that the environment contains high enough opportunities for action (or challenges), which are matched with the person’s own capacities to act (or skills)”. This concept from psychology is complex and the different dimensions are contested. I relate my outdoor adventures to a search for intrinsic flow that enhances the perception of performance and in some cases the performance itself. Being challenged by the elements and pushing my own limits and coping with the challenges gives me great joy and enthusiasm. This is an autotelic personality trait defined by Csikszentmihalyi and LeFevre as “the tendency to experience challenging situations as rewarding” (1989, p 820) which they claim means less need for material possessions and less need for comfort, power or fame because so much of what a person does is already intrinsically fulfilling. This fits well with the basic principles of friluftsliv as described in Part Three. The autotelic personality trait also makes the individual more involved with everything around them because they are “fully immersed in the current of life” (Csikszentmihalyi & LeFevre, 1989, p 820). I feel that this is a good representation of how I have developed, but again the dimension related to understanding and mastering the elements, which I believe has brought me closer to nature, has intensified these notions.

Reflection on what Davidson (2001) defines as adventure learning can add to the understanding of how my ecological self has developed. Adventure learning is understood as an accumulation of experiences that help to shift perceptions and change previous behaviours and assumptions (Davidson, 2001, p 19). This is similar to the process of transformative learning, but Davidson’s construct is based on a more
defined setting. “[L]earning through adventure is potentially valuable as a holistic and life-long form of activity that enhances the capacity to enjoy and engage in living” (Davidson, 2001, p 11). Looking back at the adventures and significant experiences I have had in nature, I feel that Davidson’s reflection on the gathering of outdoor adventure experiences is representative of its central importance and intrinsic value to me.

I have used an understanding of my adventurous self to look into my relationship with nature. I have focused on significant adventure experiences that form the foundation for my adventurous self. In the last 10 years I have had experiences that have supported this foundation, but in the last two years my everyday focus and behaviour has changed. This change in focus and behaviour has come with my research journey, the process I associate with transformative learning. I have become aware of how I see the world around me, how I interact with it and in turn relate to mainstream Westernised culture. This awareness is coupled with an understanding of ecological perspectives. Reading Jakobsen’s (2009) concept of transformative ecological learning helped me see Naess in a new light. I could relate it to what I was personally experiencing. Being able to explore this through my Masters work, through a qualitative narrative that emphasises the process, has helped integrate the concept of ecological self with my real world experience of my ecological self. This is my empirical understanding of an ecological self. The following section is based on this understanding. To make it tangible I will use excerpts from my ecological-diary, from when I sailed from Panama to Tahiti. This was done while working with the theories and concepts that changed my way of thinking and my behaviour.
**Nature-friendly living**

While working on my Masters project from New Zealand I was offered the chance to sail with my brother in the South Pacific in a five-berth catamaran. I saw this as a great chance to adventure sustainably and spend quality-time with my brother. It was a nature-friendly way to travel and see a remote part of the world, and there would be great opportunities to engage with nature and the elements through surfing and free-diving. I did not want to let the opportunity pass, so I deferred my masters while committing to crew on my brothers boat for four and a half months. This would take me from the Caribbean side of Panama, through the Panama Canal to Tahiti, via Galapagos and the French Polynesian islands of The Marquesas and The Tuamotus.

When preparing for the voyage I had a meeting with the supervisory panel where we explored the opportunities the sailing trip could bring. We came to the conclusion that my thoughts, while sailing, could bring an interesting dimension to my personal narrative. With this mind-set I wrote a diary that reported on how I experienced and related to *my ecological self: an ecological diary (eco-diary)*. The following section is a discussion of my notes from sailing 17 weeks in the South Pacific during the first half of 2010. The ecological diary builds on the autoethnographic approach of Ellis (2002) where the researcher invites the reader into their lives to communicate how the themes of the study are experienced by the researcher. Ellis sees the purpose of this as creating insight and understanding that “makes the reader want to do as well as understand” (2002, p 404). Social movements are thereby connected to individual stories and emotionality, and narrative allows us to tie abstract theory to lived experiences (Kling, 1995).
The ecological diary

The eco-diary has functioned as a tool to reveal and manifest *transformative learning*. I have articulated thoughts and experiences that show a shift in how I relate to the world. This shift is expressed through my feelings that surface and the actions I carry out. By shift I mean a change in the way I relate to the world around me, from the time when I was developing *my adventurous self*. The shift is from being ‘a friend of nature’ to living ‘nature-friendly’. I see being ‘a friend of nature’ as just appreciating different dimensions of nature, but living ‘nature-friendly’ as taking the consequence of an ecocentric worldview and actually redressing the imbalance created by anthropocentrism (Mosquin, 2009).

Excerpts from my eco-diary

These first diary excerpts are from Panama in Central America where the sailing trip started. The first month I did not get to read much because of all the work in relation to preparing the boat. Part of the preparation was maintenance and repairs; another area was the sailing plan and dealing with the bureaucratic processes related to some of the islands we were planning on visiting; the rest was planning, organising and sorting out the provisions. The excerpts create an understanding of the setting and my thoughts around it. I feel that they show how I have internalised the ideas of nature-friendly thinking and living.

The excerpts are quoted verbatim and where I have added or taken something out this is marked with square brackets. Most of what I wrote was in English but if I use sections that were originally written in Norwegian, the excerpts are translated into English and this is clarified in square brackets.
Day 35 – 9th April 2010 – Las Perlas, Panama

[We have spent] A month in Panama. Maintenance, repairs and preparations for sailing into the Pacific. I find it hard to be a friend of nature. I want to, but when daily choices and decisions are to be taken the good alternatives are not there. Nature-friendly priorities/decisions/actions require knowledge and determination. For me every purchase is voicing my opinion. When the purchase at hand is for me, it is easy to argue my values. I will not purchase anything if I feel that it supports the culture of consumerism. A cheap mass-produced object or article that most likely is of poor quality (and that is not suited for repair) basically means buying trash. More correctly, paying to produce trash. On the other hand, buying trash (second hand items or recycled) is the way to go. Products that actively reuse materials and recycle through their production is the way forward. Some articles [presented as green] have a tad too much gimmick attached to them – not holistically embracing ‘reduce, reuse, recycle’. But still, it creates awareness – in other words leading in the right direction. The concept of purchase directed by [a person’s] values is fairly easy for the individual, it just requires knowledge and determination [as well as clarification of value orientation]. Values-directed purchasing for a group is challenging because different values are dominant for each individual. This became apparent when preparing the boat for the crossing: food and supplies – general approach [on organising and setting up the onboard community] and specific purchases [challenges because of communal economy for the five crew and price being more important than ecological or ethical considerations]. [...] 

Drinking water is another challenge. The most common approach [on long haul sailing vessels] is bottled water [when stocking up for longer passages]. After some discussions we went for water tanks and filters (purifiers). Less trash, good water quality, and NOT supporting [the] bottled water industry (or the concept). Pleased with that. [...] 

On the boat we are a mini community. An isolated entity - or unit. We need to reduce, reuse and recycle. We have limited space so initially we reduce what we bring onboard and we reuse what we have onboard. We reduce what we consume in general. We are conscious. [...] Energy is semi-renewable. Solar panels and the wind generator are the friendly ones. [We could generate power by running the engines, but we had limited diesel.] To have a varied diet and as much non-processed food as possible we have a fridge and a freezer. They draw a lot of power. Combined with navigation instruments and the autopilot we need to conserve as much power as possible. [...]
Trash is a challenge; both physically and mentally. Physically we have brought as little potential trash onboard as possible – very little packaging. This also to reduce the chance of rodents and insects [coming onboard with it]. Roaches is one of the big threats. The mental challenge is the trash we throw over board [when at sea]. These are things we believe will break down. Some things are obviously OK, others are more challenging because it [the break down] will take time. How long is uncertain because of lack of knowledge, therefore it feels wrong. Cans are cut open to sink. In general we try to help the composting or process of breaking things down by cutting things into smaller pieces [both organic and non-organic]. Anyway, some of this feels wrong.\footnote{The feeling of this being wrong (the last sentence in the excerpt) refers to throwing things over-board and not having knowledge of the impact of this compared to disposing of it in a landfill.}

My reflection is centred on the consequences of the individuals’ decisions and how the individual is part of a community. This implicates value-orientation and a fundamental self-understanding as a part of a greater whole \cite{StetindDeclaration}. These excerpts reflect on important aspects of \textit{The Stetind Declaration}.

The \textit{Council for Eco-philosophy} addresses these concepts directly when explaining \textit{The Stetind Declaration}:

The seriousness of the situation requires that every human being challenge her- or himself to think critically and deeply reconsider personal values in relation to nature. Each responsible person must commit to trying to understand the long-term consequences of the current, dominant way of living and the problems it poses, in particular for future generations, the poorest parts of the populations, and Indigenous peoples \cite{StetindDeclaration, NatureFriendliness}. The values that are expressed in my diary through the decisions that are made, shows how I am acting based on having internalised ecological principles. Being on the boat makes it tangible for me to relate to an ecological perspective on both a community level and processes in a closed system. This is relevant for an understanding of ecological community living \cite{ecologicalCommunityLiving} but also seeing the community as a part of a greater whole –connecting with the ecosphere \cite{ecosphere}.

\footnote{The feeling of this being wrong (the last sentence in the excerpt) refers to throwing things over-board and not having knowledge of the impact of this compared to disposing of it in a landfill.}
When we left mainland Panama I got the chance to revisit a book I had read about six months earlier while skiing on the glaciers of the Southern Alps, New Zealand: *Ishmael* by Daniel Quinn (1992). The book was very inspiring when I read it the first time, and it organised concepts related to *Deep Ecology* in a digestible and entertaining format. While reading *Ishmael* in the daytime, I listened to an audio book of Arne Naess’ *Life’s Philosophy* during night shifts. The synergy of these two books gave a very holistic perspective on adopting eco-philosophical perspectives and inspiring to live nature-friendly. The following excerpts are from key elements in the discussion in *Ishmael*. I noted them because the quotations exemplify concepts related to the *instrumental dimension* of *‘The Joy of Living Nature-friendly’*. The excerpts here show what fuelled the development of my *ecological self*.

**Day 41 – 15th April, 2010 – At Sea: en route Las Perlas-Galapagos**

Thoughts on, and sections from *Ishmael* that have a wording, a concept or something specific… or in general of interest…

The fundamental hinder for change: “Captives of a civilization system that more or less compels you to go on destroying the world in order to live” (Quinn, 1992, p 25).

The concept: The impression of being captive. To escape, one has to be able to find the bars of the cage. “If you can’t discover what’s keeping you in, the will to get out soon becomes confused and ineffectual” (Quinn, 1992, p 25).

About the pressure existing in our culture to take part – to continue to enact the culture: “One must learn to discover the voice of mother culture – telling her story again and again. Engraving it in our mind set. This creates a wall for those who question how things are. Very often an enormous wall not possible to get through” (Quinn, 1992, p 37).

[...] Can this be one key that can open for change?

The short annotations from *Ishmael* that I did in my diary bring out the essence in sections of the book. They served as concepts that I later based my understanding of *ecological self* on, and that exemplified the concept of identification through a broadening and deepening of the self (Naess, 1989).
The following excerpts are key to deep ecology and support the deep questioning model that Naess developed to work through a rationale for the deep ecology movement (Drengson, 1999). The following excerpts addresses a fundamental understanding of a revised worldview that deep ecology and ‘The Joy of Living Nature-friendly’ is centred on.

**Day 41 – 15th April, 2010 – At Sea: en route Las Perlas-Galapagos**

“Man’s destiny is to be the first to learn that creatures like man have a choice: The world doesn’t need to belong to man, but it needs man to belong to it.” (Quinn, 1992, p 243).

“People need a vision of the world and themselves that inspires them”. (Quinn, 1992, p 244).

To change the way people behave towards the world, it is essential to change the way people think about the world – the way people think about divine interventions, the way people think about the destiny of man. This for it to be deeply rooted and actually support the momentum needed for change, real change –change of any scope and depth. This can’t be done by changing laws. You must change people’s minds. People need something that is meaningful, something that makes sense. “[Y]ou can’t just root out a harmful complex of ideas and leave a void behind; you have to give people something that is as meaningful as what they’ve lost – something that makes better sense than the old horror of Man Supreme, wiping out everything on this planet that doesn’t serve his needs directly or indirectly.” (Quinn, 1992, p 249).

These annotations and quotations inspired me to take more direct action in relation to my Masters work. Focusing on what I see as the foundation for changing people’s minds, their vision about the world, led to an approach on the conference paper that used the deep questioning model to address peoples ultimate premises (Drengson, 1999). The deadline for submitting a paper was when we were planning on being at sea in the middle of the South Pacific, en route to the Marquesas Islands. This meant that I needed to submit it while I had internet connection on Galapagos. Having worked my way through Ishmael, and combining the ecocentric articulations there with Naess’ reflections in ‘Life’s Philosophy’, I focused my paper on the conference topic: ‘nature-friendly living’. Preparing for the presentation I took these notes in my diary.
Day 42 – 16th April 2010 – At Sea: en route Las Perlas-Galapagos

[Translated from Norwegian] Blue ocean as far as the eye can see [...] The ocean is a deliciously blue. A deep and inviting kind of blue. The water seems very clear. Crystal clear. I hope my thoughts clear up in tune with the water –that my thoughts and ideas crystallises. [...] The senses are enjoying the impressions. We are dancing along in 7-8 knots right now. The wind is around 12-14 knots from South East. We are about 250 nautical miles from Galapagos. I have to look at my conference contribution. I’m actually happy with that. All dimensions of it. Where I am physically. What I am going to process mentally. With Arne Naess in the background (literally speaking [...] since I have been listening to his Life’s Philosophy the last couple of night-shifts. Excellent). Ishamel is with me as well. Great companions. Motivating and inspiring. All in!

With this as the physical and mental frame, I defined the focus of my conference presentation:

Day 42 – 16th April 2010 – At Sea: en route Las Perlas-Galapagos

1 - Who am I? Short on where I’m from, and ‘where I’m coming from’ [with the presentation]. My concern: environmental ambassadors [the starting point], my approach/my masters.
3 – The need for a shift in the way we think about the world. A solid shift based on the deep questioning model. Solid meaning deep grasping and fundamental for the self/the reflective and thinking individual.

With a shift in the way we think about the world –or at least ‘consciousness’ about how we think about the world (ultimate premise ...or even ‘divine interventions’ or ‘the destiny of man’) people can make their way through the levels of deep questioning. [...] The 'Stetind Declaration' is a helpful tool in this process, as platform principles.

The conference paper I submitted49, and the presentation I had at ‘The Spirit of Place’, were based on these notes and my case study of ‘The Joy of Living Nature-friendly’. The paper was entitled: ‘Fostering nature-friendly ways of living: alternative approaches’ and used the deep questioning model that I explained in Part Three, to show how the

49 In the Appendix E.
JLN can be used in a rational system to address how we think and live our lives. Working my way through the rationale and structure behind the deep ecology movement and the JLN, and using this structure to propose alternative approaches to nature-friendly living, triggered an urge to exemplify and realise these principles for myself. The following excerpts show how this surfaces.

Day 64 – 8th May 2010 – At sea: en route Galapagos-Marquesas

[Translated from Norwegian] We are close to 1/3 of the distance now [between Galapagos and Fatu Hiva in the Marquesas, French Polynesia]. It’s all working fine. Have been on our way [at sea] a week now. Between two and three weeks left. We have good routines onboard – the shift system works fine. Shifts overlapping like a zipper with six-hours shift in the day time and four-hours at night. We have daylight precisely half of the day - from 6am to 6pm. Dinner like in the old days between 1 or 2 pm. I read a lot, and ponder even more. Good wind for sailing means not running the engines so we don’t have power for the different technical devices. In other words little music and audio-books these days, but instead greater focus on pondering. Thumbs up. I contemplate a lot on how I’m going to turn nature-friendly thinking into nature-friendly living. Ishmael, Story of B50 and Life’s Philosophy is a highly potent mix that I find extremely meaningful and motivating. I will turn my thoughts into action. There is no way around that now. The way of thinking is adopted. What I find fascinating is that this approach is meaningful. Yes, MEANINGFUL. To be conscious of your part of a greater whole is meaningful. It gives direction for thought and action. Keel and rudder! The keel is the fundamental norms. Perhaps the fundamental one. I need to explore this more. I need to have examples at hand. I need to have my own ecosophy to proclaim. [...] A deeper and wider identification with all living – all that has vitality or the energy of life. A feeling of belonging in the great house, the ecos – oikos – the community of all living53 [etymologically oikos means household, here the broader meaning as ‘earth household’ (Naess, 1989, p 38). When Naess describes identification as a wider and deeper understanding of the self he strikes the core of the process I have gone through. A matured understanding of the self.

In this excerpt I express a matured understanding of the self. This is based on a notion that I see my self as part of a greater whole through a wider identification with more

---

50 Quinn, 1992
51 Quinn, 1996
52 Naess, 2002
53 Etymologically ‘oikos’ means household, here the broader meaning as ‘Earth household’ (Naess, 1989, p 38).
than just humans, as well as a deepened identification with other humans. A wider identification implies a broad perspective where more than just other human beings are included in the self. This means other living beings and places; all that make up the ecosphere (Mosquin, 2009). A deepened identification with other humans implies seeing your self in all human beings, and perceiving this in the metaphysical self. According to Naess this is a matured perspective on the self: the ecological self that understands man as being from and of nature from the very beginning (Naess, 1989). To manifest this notion I express the urge to define my own ecosophy. Building on the writing of Naess, an ecosophy is a position, or point of view on eco-philosophy. Eco-philosophy is then seen a field of study that concentrates on relations to nature (Naess, 1989, p 37).

Naess emphasises that it is “the responsibility of any integrated person to work out his or her reaction to contemporary environmental problems on the basis of a total view” (Naess, 1989, p 163). Through defining an ‘ecosophy’ one verbalises basic attitudes so that they become easier to relate to, navigate after, communicate and discuss (Naess, 1989, p 35). Naess’s idea that people are to define their own ecosophies, is from his work on deep ecology as a movement. The philosophical side of eco-philosophy investigates the particular methods of viewing the world that lead different individuals to something like the platform principles of the deep ecology movement. An ecosophy is a system for reasoning that leads to a platform, an Ecosophy. Naess defined ‘Ecosophy T’. The ‘T’ is said to represent both his mountain hut Tverrgastein (’cross the stones) and the Norwegian word for interpretation [tolkning], but it is its personal nature that is most important (Naess, 1989). It opens for individual approaches in the form of ecosophy A, B, C and so on, that each of us can develop. While being individual, different ecosophies are meant to agree with the platform of the Deep Ecology Movement. It is important that the same conclusions are reached, relating actions to similar platform principles. To internalise this it needs to be done through ways of feeling and reasoning familiar to the individual, rather than accepting all of Naess’s particular steps and defences of his reasoning. The motive behind Ecosophy T is to teach people to develop their own system and empower them to do it in their own way. Personal ecosophies might be incomplete, or perhaps just a framework of
principles related to the *deep ecology movement*, but they are necessary for individuals to reach real and grounded conclusions. This is the process of internalising the concepts (Rothenberg, 1989; Naess, 1989).

So, how does the process of defining an ecosophy go? In the introduction to Naess’ ‘Ecology, community and lifestyle’, Rothenberg points out that Naess’s system starts with an immediate reconsideration of ‘what there is’, how we perceive things around us. But to do this, there needs to be awareness of the starting point. And as Rothenberg emphasises, defining an ecosophy “cannot begin at once because it must be studied, considered, and perhaps internalised. Only then can we use it in a spontaneous matter” (Rothenberg, 1989, p 2).

Having studied *the deep ecology movement* and Naess’s *Ecosophy T*, and having read Daniel Quinn’s *Ishmael* and *The Story of B*, I was inspired to materialise my own ecosophy. This coincided with arriving in the Marquesas Islands. Here I learned about the local traditions and art of tattooing. Their culture uses the act of getting tattooed as a symbol of the passage from childhood to adulthood. In other words it spoke of a matured understanding of the self, and the world. The traditional tattoos were mosaics of different motifs that were to express the identity of the bearer. In the Marquesas each motif had a specific meaning for the bearer, but they also had a general interpretation that expressed belonging to a group and served as a protective barrier against evil influences. In dialogue with a tattoo artist in Nuku Hiva, Marquesas I discussed motifs that represented my way of thinking and what I wanted to be identified with. My matured self-understanding materialised through a mosaic of motifs. The following excerpts portray the mosaic that makes up the tattoo I got on the 8th June 2010.
Day 99 – 12th June 2010 – At sea: en route Marquesas-Tuamotus

The idea was to define my keel and rudder, or at least start the process with defining my value-orientation and the norms that can guide my actions. Hard to get started with this. For my tattoo to be a manifestation of my keel and rudder I need to be explicit about the symbolism of it.

8th June 2010 tattoo artist Brice on Nuku Hiva tattooed a manta ray on my right shoulder and over-arm. The shape is a manta ray, but it consists of different smaller motifs. Most of them are traditional Marquesian motifs/symbols that represent different concepts. The motifs can be interpreted different ways, but the motifs Brice used represent specific concepts and meanings for me.

The manta ray (the shape of the tattoo): It symbolises curiosity and grace. For me this is a species in the ocean I identify strongly with and I can relate to. The symbolism of it enhances the relation. [...] Water is the element that gives me the most joy. [...] I am fascinated by manta rays. They fly through water and play graciously. [When free-diving] I visualise that I do the same – gracious play.

The motifs: generally speaking traditional Marquesian motifs. The simplistic style – the most traditional.

The main motifs represent respect for the ocean, and respect for the mountains. These motifs follow the back [centre] of the manta. I want this to express respect and identification with nature. In the middle of the ocean- and mountain-motifs is the one representing man, and also family, friends and society in general. Man with nature is the backbone – the core. This leads to a symbol representing a Maori carving of a koru with a fishhook. The motif represents a carving that was a gift from friends when I left New Zealand: a whalebone carving of a koru and a fishhook. Traditionally the koru signifies personal growth, new beginnings, positive change and awakening, while the fishhook ‘catches’ good luck, health, and positive energy and represents strength and determination. Being carved in whalebone this symbolises wisdom and longevity, an affinity to nature – especially the sea. This embodies my time in New Zealand. The awareness of the people around me, the community and the joy we had with the ocean and the mountains – the fellowship this led to. For me it also incorporates a revised value-orientation [the process]. Becoming conscious through insights into eco-philosophy. The realisation of a revised value-orientation: the declaration of dependence. Nature and man as dependent on each other.
The Tiki: traditionally it represents the original human and protects the bearer. For me it represents the original human, this way it binds the manta ray and me. It represents the original force of life, the natural rhythms of free nature and man developing based on this understanding [before the relation to nature was influenced by totalitarian agriculture and the cultures that grew out of this]. It is to remind me of the value of and joy of identifying with all humans, other forms of life and the vitality in free nature.

The Mata Haoa: the symbol of the eyes that are looking into the future. Represents the future – the future’s presence in the now. I see this as an active part of my ecosophy: decisions are made and action is taken considering the past as well as the future.

Homo Ludens: “the playful human being”. Represented by a tiki figure surfing, and another skiing. These are not traditional motifs but adapted for the specific meaning. They represent how the ecosophy is to be lived out. Human life is to be considered as extremely serious, but one should constantly be in search of, and find opportunities for play. This is a principle adopted from Arne Naess’s Life’s Philosophy (2002, p 178). As Naess sees it ‘play’ takes place for its own sake and through this reveals the meaning of life.

The placement of the tattoo: the main part of the manta ray is on the back part of my shoulder and on top of it, with the tail going down on the back side of my over arm. It is on its way over my shoulder. It is curious. It’s playing. The manta is looking over my right shoulder. The shape works anatomically so that it moves as a ray when I move. By looking over my shoulder [being visible for me] I get a reminder of what it represents. I meet what I want to stand for eye to eye.

These are the fundamental principles of my personal ecosophy: Ecosophy M. The shape of the tattoo is a manta ray, but I see it as a mosaic of motifs that serve as a visual mantra. The understanding of mantra is a here based on the origin of the word from the late 18th century in Sanskrit, meaning ‘instrument of thought’, from ‘think’ the ancient meaning of the word ‘man’ (Apple Dictionary, 2009). Mantras in the traditional form as a sound, syllable, word or group of words are meant to create transformation. The tattoo, The Mantra Ray, is created to manifest transformation. As a part of the hermeneutical process, The Mantra Ray - my instrument of thought, is the materialisation of a journey of transformative ecological learning.
Ecosophy M

Based on the underlying concepts expressed through *The Mantra Ray* I can be explicit about my personal *ecosophy*. Naess documented the outline of *Ecosophy T* so that others could work with their own articulation of an ecosophy. “Do not take it at face value but use it as a guide to formulate you own” are Naess’s words (Reed & Rothenberg, 1993, p 100). He acknowledges that certain people already have ways of acting and attitudes such that they will feel at home in *Ecosophy T*, but they might not be able to articulate them. I find that *Ecosophy T* confirms many of my exciting attitudes and behaviour, and it has made me understand more of myself. This way my personal narrative has functioned as “an avenue to understand ‘the other’ as well as ‘the self’” (Ellis, 2002, p 401). For this reason I base my articulation of *Ecosophy M* on his total view, but to truly internalise this I need to base it on my understanding of the immediate, what my starting point is. And as Rothenberg emphasised in his introduction to *Ecosophy T* in 1986, (having translated and edited the original book from 1976) “the change must begin at once” (1989, p 5). Therefore *Ecosophy M* is intended to be a lived philosophy that is adapted to the real world. It is a rough outline and a starting point for a total view – for the purpose of getting started on a personal ecosophy. This sheds light on another important aspect of an ecosophy, it is supposed to be an organic philosophy that becomes evolutionary through the deep questioning approach. An ecosophy changes with natural conditions and adapts to different situations, places and cultures. To follow my own reasoning I will show this through the deep questioning model as explained by Drengson (1999).
My starting point is the declaration of dependence as articulated by The Joy of Living Nature-friendly. My platform principles can be condensed to:

- **nature and humankind constitute a whole**
  -> nature is the home of culture

- **life is like a woven fabric of relations**
  -> to live is to be dependent

- **the value of nature and human dignity are intrinsically linked**
  -> what we do to nature, we do to our selves

- **concern for nature implies a concern for greater justice**
  -> our way of life affects in particular the poorest among us, indigenous people, and future generations

These principles, like the platform principles of the Deep Ecology Movement, unite people with the long-range vision to protect the integrity of the earth’s ecological communities and their inherent value (Drengson, 1999). The platform principles on Level II in the deep questioning model lead to Level I, my ultimate premise ‘Relational Empathy!’ is the act of building empathy through experiential relations to people, living beings and places. Inspired by Naess, the exclamation mark emphasises the active condition of ‘relational empathy’. It is the experience of the act itself. Relations to ‘the other’ becomes meaningful in itself and leads to the platform principles. My premise is derived from my intuition of ‘Relational Empathy!’.

My empirical understanding is that an active presence in relations to the other enhances empathy and the willingness to act on behalf of the greater Self. The greater Self is based on Naess’s interpretation of Spinoza’s Self, with a capital ’S’. But along with the identification this is based on, I emphasise the value of relating to more than
what is traditionally seen as living. Other humans are a given, but identifying with all living beings is part of the Self. I extend the relation to the other to include the natural elements that support the vitality of the ecosphere. This acknowledges our interdependence with all ecosystems that make up the ecosphere – The Earth Being (Rowe, 1987). The felt empathy is rooted in my active involvement with the elements when being with nature. This is my renewed understanding of what it means to be human and deep empathy thrives through active relations.

Supporting Naess, the definition of the premise should not be pinned down too precisely; it should be open to ‘tasting’. The premise is intended to be inspiring for my personal ecosophy, and, using Neassee’s own words: “being more precise does not necessarily create something that is more inspiring” (Rothenberg, 1989, p 8). My experience is that an active presence in relations, create deep empathy that supports the platform principles.

Moving through the platform principles, based on Relational Empathy!, I now have direction for how to live my life. It can be visualised as a keel and rudder for thoughts and actions (Faarlund, 2008). My platform principles and my ultimate premises make up the keel, this keeps me on course. The norms that I base my actions on are derived from the general course I set for my life. The norms therefore make up the rudder, which I navigate with to keep me on course. The course I am on, and how I choose to navigate through life makes up my lifestyle. Generally speaking, this means a nature-friendly lifestyle. This is level III in the deep questioning model and is derived from level II. Examples of lifestyle choices is specific behaviour, this is level IV: supporting ecological products, fair-trade and embracing anti-consumerism through the actions of ‘reduce, reuse and recycle’; methods of transport: biking, public transport, ride-sharing, and sailing; line of work: getting involved with youth and a program for developing ecological consciousness through experiences with nature; and leisure time activities: active involvement with nature, both its elements and as a whole, based on the traditions of friluftsLiv. In sum the deep questioning model leads to a nature-friendly lifestyle and being aware of and present in everyday actions. This is what I consider a lived ecological consciousness.
Summing up

Part Four has made the complex influences on my development visible through an autoethnographic representation of the change process. I have gone into discoveries in this process and interpretations of them. This encompasses reflections on increased self-awareness, how I have been affected by the research journey, and last how I have integrated the concept of ecological self. I made this tangible through a discussion of my understanding of adventurous self, the approach on my conference paper and how concepts from my ecological diary developed and materialised. This is built around my understanding of the case study, and through the research journey applying a method that brings the JLN to fruition as my change-agent. This means in practice that my personal narrative has been an avenue to address ‘the other’, but through this understanding ‘the self’ (Ellis, 2002).

As explained when introducing the eco-diary, I believe that it conceptualises transformative learning (Jakobsen, 2009). This expresses my experience with realising an ecological worldview. The process of ‘self referential learning’ can be linked with different elements of the diary. Describing the physical setting and actively engaging with the literature can be seen as the ‘conceptualising effect’. It creates an awareness of different worldviews and how different cultures are enacted. The direct reflection around this is the ‘emancipating effect’. Through this reflection I take a step back and distance myself from the concepts. When working with the conference paper and presentation I could build on the other steps of the self referential learning process (Jakobsen, 2009). Through having conceptualised worldviews and how cultures are enacted I could relate to the approach of the deep ecology movement and build an alternative approach that brought in different concepts in a creative solution. I understand this as the ‘imaginative component’. This materialised in my personal philosophy: Ecosophy M. The hermeneutical process is ongoing, but the premises for Ecosophy M are defined.
Part Five

Integration

~ Relating the parts to the whole

“Man’s place is to be the first without being the last.”

*Ishmael concluding an educational journey
(Quinn, 1993, p 243)

Outro

My intention with this narrative has been to inspire and lead towards a deep structural shift in the way we think about the world. My narrative, containing the case study of The Stetind Project and The Joy of Living Nature-friendly, has functioned as a vehicle for change. This is not change based on a check list or a program, but deep grasping change in how I envision and relate to the world. The introductory quote from Quinn is from an educational journey that presents a different vision on what it means to be human. It fascinates me that my perspective on this has been revolutionised. I aim to inspire others to explore what it means to be human and hopefully they will engage with their own perspective.

Summing up

The change process that has become tangible through this research narrative, and my take on Ecosophy M will continue to develop, but the narrative needs to be summed up. This means relating the parts to the whole, and the whole to the parts. Within my methodology this can be seen as the final stage of this hermeneutic process. The whole that I can relate the different parts of the narrative to, is the development of an ecological consciousness. The whole relates to me personally, but also others in the
sense that I intend to guide others towards integrated ecocentric worldviews. I have experienced, studied and understood the effect of deep joy as an impetus for change (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2009). This is therefore the backdrop for my personal ecosophy and this is derived from and developed through my research journey. The parts that have contributed to the whole is first and foremost the main themes in my narrative: ecological self and the approach of The Joy of Living Nature-friendly. These themes have been explored through the actual research approach, as well as through the different levels of my research journey.

**My research approach**

An emerging design has made the discoveries and interpretations possible. The outcome of the process is related to my initial research interest, but the approach that developed and the methods used, have emerged with the research. This is linked with the interconnected development of research and researcher (Strong, Pyle, DeVries, Johnston & Foskett, 2008). The qualitative case study led to an in-depth understanding of the concepts at play (Stake, 2005). My personal experiences with key concepts in the research context bridged theory and practice. An insider’s perspective on friluftsliv and the Ash-Lad mentality helped me grasp the different layers of Deep Ecology. This understanding triggered personal reflection beyond the scope of a case study. To incorporate this reflection in the academic work with my Masters, the process surrounding the case study was included in my study. To do this, autoethnography was adopted to a personal narrative. I developed a reflexive account of my relationship with nature and how this developed. An understanding of the development from my adventurous self to a focus on my ecological Self exemplified the change process from being a friend of nature to becoming nature-friendly.

A personal narrative with autoethnography has been used actively as a tool to inspire and lead social change. Through this I could keep my focus on my research interest and tie social activism to the development of my Self (Ellis, 2002; Ellis, 2009; Ellis & Bochner, 2000; Schostak & Schostak, 2008). The intention is to show the process I
have gone through, both as an example of the change *The Joy of Living Nature-friendly* has been a catalyst for, but also to guide the thought-process of others.

**My journey**

My journey has been multidimensional. It started with my physical journey to New Zealand for postgraduate studies. This opened for the educational journey of my Masters study. Relating both journeys to *transformative learning* and *self referential learning* created an awareness and presence in the process (Jakobsen, 2009). My Masters study went into a new phase when I intentionally combined the mental and the physical journeys while sailing across the South Pacific (Ellis, 2002; Ellis, 2009; Ellis & Bochner, 2000). Inspired by an in-depth understanding of *eco-philosophy*, and refining this understanding through the conference paper and presentation I worked on while sailing, I developed and reflected upon my own fundamental way of thinking and being (Drengson, 1999). I developed my ecological consciousness through the combined journeys.

The concept of a *declaration of dependence* has been a clear contribution to the formation of an ecological consciousness for me. Through a matured self-understanding, everyday decisions are seen in a greater perspective (Naess, 1989). The outcome of lifestyle choices becomes meaningful in light of a holistic understanding of impacts (Drengson, 1999; Jakobsen, 2009; Naess, 1989; Naess, 2002). Being present in my relationship to different parts of nature, as well as an interrelated understanding of the ecosphere, has been the impetus for my change (Drengson, 1999; Mosquin, 2009; Naess, 1989; Naess, 2002; Rowe, 1987). This is grounded in my personal *ecosophy* as *Relational Empathy*!
Looking ahead

With the understanding that has been constructed through this narrative, it is necessary to reflect upon the future of the knowledge created. The impacts of this study will depend on an indefinable number of variables. For me personally the most important aspect will be the integration of Ecosophy M. This will depend on how reason and feeling is balanced, and my ability to adapt to changes within my self, as well as my surroundings.

If the approach and the process described through my narrative is to generate any tangible outcomes beyond Ecosophy M, it would be that individuals and communities engage with the declaration of dependence and are inspired to start the process with their own ecosophies. The Joy of Living Nature-friendly as understood through the case study is an appropriate framework to do this. With The Stetind Declaration as a platform for deep questioning, there can be a plurality of philosophies and broader worldviews that foster policies and actions. In the process of applying personal ecosophies, one can move through the principles of The Stetind Declaration and develop specific policies and practical actions. This is an organic process, where all levels of the deep questioning model are relevant in different situations and visited at different occasions. This keeps one’s understanding and practices in line with a changing world. The deep questioning approach then becomes evolutionary, changing with natural conditions and adapting to different situations, places and cultures (Drengson, 1999). This opens for alternative approaches on fostering nature-friendly ways of living.

The greatest challenge with the approach of The Joy of Living Nature-friendly (JLN) is to create an atmosphere that actually stimulates, so that the experiences and reflections needed trigger "profound changes in mode of living" (Faarlund, 2008, p 17). The building blocks that are defined in relation to the JLN and the mountain Stetind have great potential to achieve its combined purpose. The direct involvement of the
specific Council for Eco-philosophy and all they bring to the project combined with the cultural and historical context is essential.

To create local approaches on the JLN, the building blocks of the project need to be adapted to the context. As an example, if a local approach was to be established at the mountain village Finse in southern Norway, it would not be necessary to do any fundamental changes. A simplified description of the process would be that a local council would be created, a place of nature would be decided on, and the declaration would be adopted much as it is. The synergy of the concepts would be intact but it exists in a slightly different historical and cultural context. I define what I just described, based on the approach of the JLN, as the original approach. Roughly the same building blocks are used but they are adapted to a slightly different context. The parallels to the approach at Stetind are obvious, but for the same reason the people that are attracted to a place of nature at Finse are much the same as a place of nature at Stetind. To create an alternative approach it should be in a very different context, and hence reach different people than what the original approach does.

I believe that most of us in the western world as well as developing societies need to go through the basic value orientation that we base thought and action on. We need to commit to a revised view of ourselves as part of the greater whole. The synergy of the JLN can have the impact needed, but the original approach will mainly reach and affect individuals who are already focusing on appreciating nature. For this reason the people who will visit ‘the place of nature’ by Stetind, or similar places of nature will already be open to the values expressed. The challenge is to get the people who would not normally stop by ‘a place of nature’ to experience what the Council for Eco-philosophy describes as “the deep joy of identification with free nature” (2008, p 17). I believe that the same method as the JLN uses; a council, a place of nature, and a declaration can be adapted to other cultural contexts where completely different people can get involved. The deep questioning model can be a good starting point to conceptualise how this could be done. If a council is established with participants from a different cultural or sub-cultural context, they can develop a declaration of dependence that is adapted to their culture but still embraces the same principles as
the original. This will serve as the platform principles on Level II in the deep questioning model. The key thing with the platform principles derived from the JLN is that they unite people who can generally agree on the interdependency of all life on earth -and therefore also the inherent value of all life. With a declaration of dependence that expresses this, the Level I premises or worldviews can be different for each individual. Based on a worldview that supports the platform principles (Level II, in this example a declaration of dependence adapted and defined by a sub-culture) it is possible to develop policies or lifestyles (Level III) that guide concrete actions (Level IV). This model supports great diversity in general approaches to life, as well as specific practical actions.

If we define city dwellers as a sub-culture, it is safe to say that the urban jungle is more familiar than free nature. For many people it does not appeal to spend time in a place of nature, as it is conceptualised in the original approach (the one by Stetind). An alternative approach should therefore be in a context where other people are more likely to get involved. Generally this can be city centres or places where people go for both work and recreation. Examples can be: a central square in a town, a railway station, a cultural centre or any other location where people go. The building blocks of the JLN can be adopted and adapted to any setting.

When a council is established and a declaration is adapted, the same needs to be done with the place of nature. The main challenge for an alternative concept is adapting it to an environment where free nature cannot be experienced. To do this it is necessary to focus on something that appeals within the culture. A place for nature enjoyment still needs to stimulate the senses. The place needs to have or create an experience of nature. It can be in the shape or form of anything from a natural history film to an artistic instillation. The key is that it needs to create an emotional response similar to experiencing free nature, as this is more likely to trigger deep reflection which can lead towards a change in perception for the individual (Bulbeck, 2005; Tarrant & Green, 1999). Expressions through different forms of art can do this, and design and architecture has great potential to encompass this function. Technology such as 3D and IMAX films can be combined with other elements that activate the senses. Film as
an experience is a strategically choreographed and mediated sequence of audio-visual stimulus intended to have specific effects on the viewer (editing techniques). The resulting stream of images creates an experience that transcends recording reality in a linear fashion (Champoux, 1999). Smell and touch combined with visual impressions can enhance this as well.

Related to activating the senses is the concept of urban ‘re-wilding’, where small pockets of nature are brought into a city environment. Examples range from occupying central city parking spots with indigenous vegetation, to more permanent approaches like the Rhizome Collective who turned an old warehouse in the middle of an industrial area in Austin, Texas into a vibrant sustainable community. The building houses a group of people that co-exist with permaculture54 tools such as constructed wetlands, a bicycle wind turbine, rainwater collection tanks, gardens, fish ponds, solar ovens, fruit trees and chickens (Kellogg & Pettigrew, 2008). This shows that it possible to take an alternative approach a step further. Perhaps in a totally different direction, through inviting even more diverse and radical concepts. The key thing is that it must be adapted to the community or culture it is intended to engage with, and the synergy of the building blocks of the JLN must be facilitated to gain benefits from the instrumental dimension of the approach.

A question that remains unanswered here is if an alternative experience of nature can create the deep joy that experiencing free nature can? To what degree is the message formed by the medium? Does it grasp you the same way and can it trigger the profound changes in our mode of living that are sought after? These questions bring me back to the opening quote in Part One. In a discussion related to The Deep Ecology Movement and the methods that are suitable to create change, Naess expressed the following:

Reform or Revolution? I envisage a change of revolutionary depth and size by means of many smaller steps in a radically new direction. [...]The direction is revolution, the steps are reformatory (Witoszek, 1997, p 65).

54 Permaculture is a multi-disciplinary practice used to design long lasting human communities (Kellogg & Pettigrew, 2008)
Alternative approaches and different concepts of the JLN can be a step towards reconnecting a greater variety of people with nature. Experiencing an alternative place for nature enjoyment might not lead directly to a radically new direction in life, but it can lead towards reflection on one's value-orientation, and it can bring a variety of people closer to free nature, and lead them towards more nature-friendly lifestyles. These steps are part of the social movement bringing us towards the revolution needed.
Closing remarks

*Relational Empathy!* as a fundamental norm in *deep questioning* makes it possible to grasp our place both as individuals in our own communities, but also as a global community in the development of the planet. If you as the reader accept that we as human beings have developed from *Homo erectus* to *Homo sapiens* that think and have meaning-making ability, then you will be inclined to except that other species can evolve and go through similar development. Following this train of thought I see a greater purpose with developing our *ecological Selves* that goes beyond the initial ecocentric effects. Caring for the different elements that make up the vitality of the ecosphere, based on *Relational Empathy!*, can actually lead to a level of relations that go far beyond what I initially envisioned.

The phrase ‘positive feedback loops’ comes to mind. In recent times it is frequently used by climate scientists to illustrate processes that function as self-enhancing catalysts. The processes they denote have adverse effects on the ecosphere, but associated with *Relational Empathy!* the concept of a positive feedback loop can have the opposite outcome. An active involvement in the relations to ‘the other’ can thereby be auspicious. The positive feedback loops that are created through active involvement in relationships, strengthens the processes that are derived from the platform principles.

I want to bring in *Ishmael* by Daniel Quinn, who helped me understand and fully contextualise these links. He writes that “Man’s place is to be the first without being the last” (p 243). This is expanded on more explicitly: “Man’s place is to figure out how it’s possible to do that –and then to make some room for all the rest who are capable of becoming what he’s become” (Quinn, 1992, p 243). When contrasting this revolutionary perspective with standardised reformatory actions, the vision becomes clear: “Stopping pollution is not inspiring. Sorting your trash is not inspiring. Cutting down on fluorocarbons is not inspiring. But this… thinking of ourselves in a new way,
thinking of the world in a new way... This is!” (Quinn, 1992, p 244). In other words this is a vision that changes the focus from the narrow perspective of the individual, to the deeper and wider perspective of nature and humankind as a whole. This is a vision based on ecological consciousness.

In an attempt to summarise the later phases of my research journey, the words of Albert Einstein holds the greater meaning:

No path of logic leads to the secrets of nature,  
-we can only get there through experiences based on empathy, interpreted with intuition (Faarlund, 2010, p 251).

With an open, but active end to my narrative I hope that my journey can help others towards thinking differently about the world. Based on experiencing nature, and focusing on the relationship with the natural world, the perspective on the world as a whole will evolve. By realising this perspective as an ecosophy using the deep questioning model, the perspective becomes integrated with the Self. Empathy and intuition can therefore create a meaningful and joyful response to the greatest challenge of our time: what it means to be human.
References


Appendix A – Proposal for Masters of Tourism

Proposal, Masters of Tourism  
Twelve Month Research Master, Thesis Only

Student name: Martin Julseth  
Student # 9677583

Topic:  
Commercial outdoor and environmental education in Norway and New Zealand:  
A comparative analysis of the environmental philosophies that shape the pedagogical  
approach that nature based skills courses use, and the impacts it leads to for the  
participants

Summary:  
The main objective is to (a) investigate the environmental philosophies and how they  
shape the pedagogical approach used, and (b) what impact it has on the participants.  
More precisely, does the approach influences the positive outcomes for the participants:  
does it influence respect, appreciation and spiritual connection with nature and does it  
lead to commitment to conservation and stewardship of the environment?

A study that explores similarities and differences between philosophical approaches  
and what outcomes this leads to for the participants, could answer key questions that  
can refine both the approach and the outcomes in both cultures.

I) Introduction
The intention with this proposal is to define my options so that there is a starting point  
for discussion. Even if my defined alternatives are not realistic, they still serve as a  
starting point for defining approaches or more realistic options. With this open  
approach it is easier for me to build on my interest and enthusiasm for the topic.  
Hopefully it is concrete enough so that it is useful to give me feedback and further  
direction.

II) The Research Context
My starting point is that we need to acknowledge the environmental problems and  
challenges we both are generating and encountering the effects of. When this is done it  
is time to move on and focus on the solutions and create motivation for change. Outdoor  
educators are striving to refine the positive outcomes from facilitating human-nature  
interaction. An interaction aiming to develop a deeper human-nature relationship and  
harvest the outcomes of this (Martin, 2004).

With my combined background from tourism and outdoor education, I see a niche  
where the two merge. Based on the research I have studied from both academic  
perspectives related to how experiences in the outdoors affect participants, I want to  
investigate the environmental philosophies and pedagogical approach used by the  
outdoor educator and the outcomes it leads to. Outdoor and environmental education is
closely related to ecotourism, but encompasses a process that has proven to have profound impact on the participants and benefits from the programs reach beyond the participants (Burridge, 2004; Kellert, 1998; Ward & Yoshino, 2007).

This has been researched both in the context of tourism and ecotourism (Bulbeck, 2005; Powell & Ham, 2008), as well as a wide variety of outdoor education programs (Kellert, 1998; Martin, 2004; Ward & Yoshino, 2007). My interest is in the shorter programs that can be defined as on the border-line between ecotourism and outdoor and environmental education. There is a grey zone where the two merge which can be described as edutainment, when education is combined with entertainment. Ecotourism operators often combine the two in products related to wildlife watching or interaction with, as well as different approaches on being in the natural landscape. Operators with good tour design and targeted interpretation can lead to attitudes and intentions related to pro-conservation behaviours for participants (Bulbeck, 2005; Powell & Ham, 2008).

I wish to concentrate on commercial outdoor education programs that focus on the development of outdoor skills. This kind of shorter outdoors skills courses, or similar outdoor experiences, have proven to have an impact on the participants’ environmental stewardship or important aspects related respect, appreciation and spiritual connection with nature (Brooks, Wallace, & Williams, 2005; de Wet & Robertson, 2007; Pruneau, Chouinard, Arsenault, & Breau, 1999; Ward & Yoshino, 2007). Because of the short length of this kind of skills courses the little time and money needed to partake makes it viable for the general public. It is therefore seen as an important arena to influence values, attitudes and behaviour towards the environment. With increased skills these courses often lead to further engagement in the outdoors for the participants and therefore also continue to influence the participants’ mindset (Ward & Yoshino, 2007).

With the socio-cultural development that has taken place in Norway, in light of the countries history, there is a solid foundation for a unique and authentic approach on outdoor and environmental education (Faarlund, 1993; Reed & Rothenberg, 1993; Schroll, 2007; Setreng, 2005). This raises the question why the existing program by the Norwegian pioneer in outdoor and environmental education, the Norwegian High-Mountain School ([Norges Høgfjellsskole | NHS], is currently being considered shut down.
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This raises some initial questions:
1. Norway (with NHS as the defined case study) seems to have a unique history and a solid philosophical foundation for outdoor and environmental education, but does this affect the approach and the outcomes?
2. Can NHS be compared to Outward Bound (OB) New Zealand, or is the National Outdoor Leadership School (NOLS) in New Zealand a better program to base a comparative study on?
3. Is the philosophical approach, and how this is mediated by the instructors or guides, an appropriate level of comparison with the outcomes this leads to for the participants?
4. Are the demographics of New Zealand and Norway appropriate for a comparative analysis?
5. Does the environmental philosophy of a nature based courses in New Zealand have an impact on the participants?
6. Does the environmental philosophy of nature based courses in Norway have an impact on the participants?

The answers to these questions create a backdrop for a comparative analysis of nature based programs in Norway and New Zealand.

**III) Aims, Goals and Objectives**

The main objective is to (a) investigate the environmental philosophies and how they shape the pedagogical approach used, and (b) what impact it has on the participants. More precisely, does the approach influences the positive outcomes for the participants: does it influence respect, appreciation and spiritual connection with nature and does it lead to commitment to conservation and stewardship of the environment?

A study that explores similarities and difference between philosophical approaches and what outcomes this leads to for the participants, could answer key questions that can refine both the approach and the outcomes in both cultures.

Important aspects are:

i. What & who :: General demographics of countries and participants of programs
ii. How :: The outdoor education and environmental philosophies that the programs have adopted and the pedagogical approach used to mediate them
iii. Why :: The outcomes the approach leads to for the participants

Other elements that are relevant as a backdrop for the comparison of the two nature based programs:

iv. Business/management structure
v. History and development - programs and products
vi. Reflection on trends and future development

Main focus on i, ii and iii.
IV) Method
A holistic method is ideal, but this is not realistic or suitable to encompass in a one year Masters thesis. I will still describe what elements I see as relevant for the study, and then we can discuss what is appropriate to investigate through the Masters thesis.

A mixed qualitative method is seen as most appropriate to investigate the different aspects of the phenomenon. The data collected will range from documents (such as review of research literature and content analysis of relevant studies of the programs selected) to empirical research based on observations and interviews. It is desired to primarily focus on a naturalistic inquiry, where qualitative methods are used to collect data in the natural setting of the phenomena being studied. Burridge (2004) emphasises the importance of studying elements of outdoor education in the setting where the phenomena occurs, due to the complex nature of the experience. To gain further understanding of the pedagogical approach it is therefore seen as effective for the researcher to be a participating observer in the programs.

The researcher doing the investigations is the primary instrument, but the main focus of the research will be on the phenomenon studied, and not the anthropologic aspect of the investigations themselves. This will be utilised as a foundation for reflection on the literature reviewed and create a solid background for semi-structured interviews with key personnel within the organisations studied, as well as interviews of participants.

To gain insights of the effect the pedagogical approach has on the participants, photo elicit interviews seems like a good method to centre the focus on relevant aspects of the experience (Loeffler, 2004a, 2004b), where the participant interprets their own experiences. When this technique is employed, after the researcher has been a participating observer, the outcome (the impact it has on the participant) can be reflected upon in light of the approach used by the instructor.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE QUALITATIVE RESEARCH APPROACH THAT IS PROPOSED
Focus: the philosophical foundation and how this is expressed in the pedagogical approach on outdoor and environmental education and the impact this has on the participants

• Philosophical roots: phenomenology
• Goals of investigation: understanding, description, discovery
• Design characteristics: flexible, evolving, emerging
• Setting: natural, familiar, real life,
• Sample: small, non-random, theoretical
• Data collection: researcher as primary instrument
• Mode of analysis: inductive (perspectives by researcher)
• Findings: comprehensive, holistic, expansive, perspectives

V) Supervision
Initially it seems ideal to have joint supervision between Department of Tourism and Physical Education (Outdoor Education). Since the research can be defined as in the grey zone between the departments, and aspects are mutually related, it would be beneficial for the research to have direct links to both academic arenas. To develop and execute the proposed fieldwork, the experience and network that the department of Outdoor Education encompasses would be of great support.
VI) Auxiliary
Conference: to get momentum early in the research process it is of great interest to attend the ‘The Fourth International Outdoor Education Research Conference’ which will be hosted by the ‘Centre for Excellence in Outdoor and Environmental Education’ at La Trobe University in Australia in April 2009. The conference seeks to “...promote and foster an international community of researchers whose work critically examines outdoor education theory and practice.” (Centre for Excellence in Outdoor and Environmental Education, 2008)

My proposed research is of great relevance to the conference which explicitly states that “…work that examines the social and cultural dimensions of outdoor education is particularly encouraged” (Centre for Excellence in Outdoor and Environmental Education, 2008). In spite of late entry to the conference (and still early in the research project), it would be ideal to present the research in progress there to get feedback from international academics that are linked to the topic.
VII) References


Appendix B – Ethical Approval

APPLICATION TO THE UNIVERSITY OF OTAGO
HUMAN ETHICS COMMITTEE FOR ETHICAL APPROVAL OF
RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN PARTICIPANTS

PLEASE read carefully the important notes on the last page of this form. Provide a response to each question; failure to do so may delay the consideration of your application.

University of Otago staff member responsible for project:

(surname) (first name) (title)
Higham James Professor

Department: Tourism

Contact details of staff member responsible:

E-mail to Professor James Higham: james.higham@otago.ac.nz

Phone: 03 479 8500 (Direct on-campus line: 8500)

Title of project:

The International Transferability of the Stetind Project

5. Brief description in lay terms of the purpose of the project:

This Masters project will focus on the transferability of the Stetind Project (SP) to a setting outside of Norway. In my study the SP will be approached as a framework that is facilitating the adoption of eco-philosophy (specifically nature friendly ways of thinking and living) for individuals. By identifying what constructs the SP is made up of, it is possible to reflect upon the transferability of the approach used to an international setting in a way that maintains the defined purpose of the SP.
Indicate type of project and names of other investigators and students:

Staff Research

Yes

Student Research

X

Yes

Martin Julseth

Multi-Centre trial

Yes

7. Is this a repeated class teaching activity?

Yes

No

If applying to continue a previously approved repeated class teaching activity, please provide Reference Number:

Intended start date of project:

25th May 2009

Projected end date of project:

December 2009

Funding of project.

Is the project to be funded:

Internally

Externally

Please specify who is funding the project:

(If externally funded, will there be any commercial use made of the data and will potential participants be made aware of the external funding before they agree to participate? If not, please explain)

The student is funding the project but is supported by the Norwegian State Educational Loan Fund.

10. Aim and description of project: (Clearly specify aims)

The aim is to deconstruct the Stetind Project (SP) into themes, so that the themes can be treated as separate but entwined building blocks. The building blocks are the intrinsic elements that are directly related to the context and the specific approach used by the SP. By deconstructing it, the aim is to identify the elements that are critical to obtaining the instrumental dimensions. The instrumental dimensions are those that are not inherent in the project, but instead the purpose and the defined goals that the project is aiming at. The deconstruction and identification of themes will be based on literature review; identification
through facilitated focus groups and; through conversations and semi structured interviews with the initiators of the project and other key informants.
With a case study approach the building blocks of the SP can be reflected upon to gain insights of how they relate to the instrumental dimensions. The SP is designed specifically to create a renewed understanding and a commitment to living and thinking in a nature friendly way (based on eco-philosophy), and aims at “finding the great joy of” this way of living and thinking. My research project is aiming at identifying the transferability of the intrinsic and instrumental elements of the SP to a setting outside Norway.

11. **Researcher or instructor experience and qualifications in this research area:**
   The researcher has experience in performing semi-structured interviews as data collection for his dissertation in 2004 at the Norwegian School of Hotel Management. The researcher has also worked with a consultant company in Norway 2003-2004 where he facilitated focus groups.

**Participants**
(*Participants means any person whose behaviour, actions, condition, state of health the researcher proposes to study; or whose personal information the researcher proposes to collect or use*)

12(a) **Population from which participants are drawn:** *(in particular, please specify whether any of the following might participate: minors, prisoners, hospital patients, or anyone whose capacity to give informed consent is compromised in any way)*
The interviews and focus groups will only include a targeted sample of individuals who have the capacity to give uncompromised informed consent to partake.
The sample will be individuals representing the initiators of the Stetind Project (SP) (also known as the Council for Eco-philosophy) and representatives from the local community of Tysfjord, local businesses, the municipality, regional and national government in Norway (these individuals represent the context of the project).

12(b) **Specify inclusion and exclusion criteria:**
The interviews and focus groups will include individuals who have specific knowledge of, or resources related to the Stetind Project (SP). This is the initiators of the SP (also known as the Council for Eco-philosophy), and representatives from the local community of Tysfjord, local businesses, the Tysfjord municipality, regional and national government in Norway (this is the context of the project). This will give a sample that is informed about the project and has valuable insights from different perspectives.

12(c) **Number of participants:** *(where a sample size calculation is appropriate i.e., for quantitative research, it should be provided)*
The number of participants cannot be determined at this point because participation in the focus groups is voluntary. They will be open for the participants at the Stetind Seminar 28\textsuperscript{th}-30\textsuperscript{th} June 2009, but will be limited to 8 participants per facilitator. Number of facilitators will depend on how many potential participants there are at the Stetind Seminar. The researcher will give the facilitators the necessary training and guidance, and the focus session will be led and supervised by the researcher. Participants will be informed that they can choose to not partake at any time. Based on the data collected through the focus sessions, key informants will be identified and semi structured interviews will be arranged.
There will be no more than 10 key informants, but the specific number depends on the usability/quality of the data that is collected.

12(d) Age range of participants:  
Selection criteria requires a minimum age of 18. There is no upper limit of age range.

12(e) Method of recruitment:  
At a seminar that is specific to the Stetind Project (the Stetind Seminar 28.-30. June 2009), the researcher will inform and invite to focus groups at an invited presentation that he will deliver on the topic “the international transferability of the SP”. Based on the focus groups and conversations with the initiators of the SP, key informants will be identified and approached to partake in semi structured interviews.

12(f) Please specify any payment or reward to be offered:  
Acknowledgement in the introduction of the thesis, and key informants will be given the option to receive a summary report of the findings.

13. Methods and Procedures: Describe the design of the study, the nature of the task required of participants and how the results will be analysed. The various precautionary measures to be taken to avoid harm or discomfort should be described (up to two pages; any questionnaire or survey form to be used must be attached). [If using body fluids or tissues please describe the ultimate fate of the sample; please note these samples must not be used outside of this research]

The focus groups will be facilitated in Norwegian as that is the language of the seminar. There will be allocated time to specific themes. The data will be collected by a) the facilitator who will take notes and b) the participants who will be encouraged to write down key words and phrases (on post-it notes). At the end of each theme the facilitator will summarize the theme and get the group to agree on a consensus related to the theme. The facilitator will transcribe the data related to each theme from each focus group. The researcher will debrief the facilitators to summarize the focus group session. The researcher will transcribe and analyze all notes related to the specific themes to identify elements in the project that have the necessary characteristics to either assist or hinder transferability of the SP. The participants of the focus groups will remain anonymous and will not be linked with the information given.

The interviews will be semi structured and will be related to the themes used in the focus groups. The interviews will be conducted in Norwegian and will be voice recorded. The researcher will produce summaries of the interviews in English. Every possible measure will be taken to preserve the participant’s anonymity.

14. Compliance with The Privacy Act 1993 and the Health Information Privacy Code 1994 imposes strict requirements concerning the collection, use and disclosure of personal information. These questions allow the Committee to assess compliance.

14(a) Are you collecting personal information directly from the individual concerned?  
YES. It is assumed that participants will represent specific perspectives, based on personal background, experience, vocation and other such variables, and this is seen as relevant for the research project. Personal information that will be collected: gender, age, ethnicity, educational attainment, and vocation.
For the focus groups it is relevant for the research to register who the participants are representing, if they are there to represent a specific point of view. This can be in the function of representing the municipality, local businesses or the local community, as well as regional or national government. It is who they are representing, and not the identity of the individual that is relevant for the research. The participants’ identities will be kept anonymous, but connections between participant’s perspective and the information given will be included and reflected upon if relevant for the research.

The interviews will be approached the same way. It is not the person or the participant’s identity that is relevant, but the SP (the case study) and how perspectives on it are related to different standpoints.

If you are collecting the information **indirectly**, please explain why: N/A

14(b) **If you are collecting personal information directly from the individual concerned, specify the steps taken to make participants aware of the following points:**

You should make participants aware of these points in an Information Sheet for Participants; a suggested template is attached:

- **the fact that you are collecting the information:**
  
  All personal information will be given by the participants themselves, either as part of the focus group session or as part of the interview.

  Participants will be invited to partake in the focus groups and will be given an information sheet and consent form before the session starts.

  Interviewees will be invited to partake in the study as key informants and they will be given an information sheet and a consent form before the interview is conducted.

- **the purpose for which you are collecting the information and the uses you propose to make of it:**

  The purpose and intentions of both interviews and focus groups will be explicitly expressed in the information sheet. The information will be specific about this for both the focus groups and the interviews.

  From the Information sheet for Participants of focus groups:

  “The main purpose of the focus groups is to identify different perspectives of the context and the specific approach used by the Stetind Project to achieve its defined purpose. Key words and phrases will be registered together with the facilitator’s notes.”

  From the Information sheet for Participants (Interview):

  “The main purpose of the interviews is to identify different perspectives on the context and the specific approach used by the Stetind Project to achieve its defined purpose. The interview will be voice recorded and the interviewer will register key words and phrases.”

  - **who will receive the information:**
    
    The information collected will only be used in the study described.

  - **the consequences, if any, of not supplying the information:**
    
    None.

  - **the individual's rights of access to and correction of personal information:**

    Participants will be asked to verify that the personal information given is correct during the focus session or the interview.

14(c) **If you are not making participants aware of any of the points in (b), please explain why:**

Are making participants aware of points in 14 (b).
14(d)  Does the research or teaching project involve any form of deception?
NO

If yes, please explain all debriefing procedures:
N/A

14(e)  Please outline your storage and security procedures to guard against unauthorised access, use or disclosure and how long you propose to keep personal information:  (The University requires original data of published material to be archived for five years after publication for possible future scrutiny. The University is responsible for providing data storage space, data relating to projects should be kept in secure storage within the University Department concerned [rather than at the home of the researcher] unless a case based on special circumstances is submitted and approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee. At the end of the Project any specific identifying personal information must be destroyed by the Principal Investigator [as specified in question 1] or relevant Head of Department).

Storage and security procedures will comply with University of Otago requirements. I will use the storage facilities for original data that is provided by the Department of Tourism, University of Otago. Data will be transcribed from post-it notes and facilitators’ notes, and stored securely on a password protected personal computer. Pack-ups will be stored on a password protected server. At the end of the project any personal information will be destroyed immediately except that, as required by the University’s research policy, any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which it will be destroyed. Reasonable precautions will be taken to protect and destroy data gathered by email. However, the security of electronically transmitted information cannot be guaranteed.

14(f)  Please explain how you will ensure that the personal information you collect is accurate, up to date, complete, relevant and not misleading:

All personal information will be given by the participants themselves, either as part of the focus group session or as part of the interview. Participants will be asked to verify that the information given is correct during the focus session or the interview.

14(g)  Who will have access to personal information, under what conditions, and subject to what safeguards against unauthorised disclosure?  (Personal information includes video tapes, audio tapes, transcripts of interviews etc. Although individuals do not need to be named, the positions of those with access to the data and their relationship to the research need to be listed. Will participants be given access to the data in its raw format? If not, this needs to be made clear to participants before they consent. Will the results of the research be provided or be made available to participants when the project is completed? This should also be made clear to participants before they consent to the project)

Only the researcher and supervisor will have access to data in its raw format. Key informants and the initiators of the SP can be invited to comment on and validate the findings, dependent on the relevance of this and the nature of the findings. A summary of the results will be provided to the participants who are interested.
14(h) Do you intend to publish any personal information and in what form do you intend to do this?
Every effort will be made to ensure that participant responses are kept anonymous. No personal information will be published or presented in writing in connection to responses provided during data collection.

14(i) Do you propose to collect information on ethnicity?
(If the collection of information on ethnicity will be used for drawing comparisons or conclusions between Māori and other ethnic groups or the project has clear implications of direct interest to Māori, consultation should be undertaken in accordance with the University’s Policy for Research Consultation with Māori (Please see http://www.otago.ac.nz/research/maoriconsultation/index.html). If this process has already been undertaken please attach a copy of your completed Research Consultation with Māori Form with this application.)
Yes. Ethnicity will be collected under personal information. This will allow insights into how ethnicity relates to participant perspectives on the SP. No comparison of responses based on ethnicity will be performed.

15. Potential problems: Explain whether there will be harm or discomfort to participants, medical or legal problems, or problems of community relations or controversy, or whether any conflicts of interest might arise (Researchers also have an obligation to be available after participants have participated in the project, should any stress, harm, or related concerns arise. If it is anticipated that professional services are appropriate, these services for the participants should be clarified as well as risks, limitations and obligations. Participants normally should have the opportunity to obtain information relating to the outcome of the project if they wish.)
There must be an awareness of the dynamics of the local community and the individuals that are involved when collecting and analysing the data. If sensitive issues surface or arise, they will be handled objectively and only included in the study if relevant for it. Everything possible will be done to preserve the anonymity of the participants. Participants will be given contact information on the researcher through the information sheet and will be invited to address any concerns.

16. Informed consent
Please attach the information sheet and the consent form to this application. The information sheet and consent form must be separate.
At a minimum the Information Sheet must describe in lay terms:
• the nature and purpose of the research;
• the procedure and how long it will take;
• any risk or discomfort involved;
• who will have access and under what conditions to any personal information;
• the eventual disposal of data collected;
• the name and contact details of the staff member responsible for the project and an invitation to contact that person over any matter associated with the project;
• details of remuneration offered for participation and compensation payable in the event of harm;
• Exclusion criteria for the project if applicable including Health Concerns. (If exclusion include a clear statement to the effect that: “People who meet one or more of the exclusion criteria set out above may not participate in this
project, because in the opinion of the researchers and the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee, it involves unacceptable risk to them.

• and any other relevant matters

The Information Sheet must conclude with the statement: "The University of Otago Human Ethics Committee has reviewed and approved this project."

The Consent Form must make it clear that a participant:
• understands the nature of the proposal;
• has had all questions satisfactorily answered;
• is aware of what will become of the data (including video or audio tapes and data held electronically) at the conclusion of the project;
• knows that he or she is free to withdraw from the project at any time without disadvantage;
• is aware of risks, remuneration and compensation;
• is aware that the data may be published;
• is aware that a third party (i.e. transcriber) may have access to the data;
• is aware that every effort will be made to preserve the anonymity of the participant unless the participant gives an express waiver, which must be in addition to and separate from this consent form.

(Applicants should use the pro forma Information Sheet and Consent Form provided by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee, with appropriate adaptation, unless a case is made and approved that these formats would be inappropriate for the specific project; Research or teaching involving children or young persons require written consent from both the child or young person AND the parent/guardian unless an adequate justification is provided).

Fast-Track procedure (In exceptional and unexpected circumstances, and where the research needs to commence before the next monthly meeting of the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee, a researcher may request that the application be considered under the fast-track provisions).

Do you request fast-track consideration? (See Important Notes to Applicants attached)

NO

(Please note that this involves the application being sent around members of the Committee by correspondence and can be expected to take 10 to 14 days)

If yes, please state specific reasons:-

18. Other committees

If any other ethics committee has considered or will consider the proposal which is the subject of this application, please give details:

19. Applicant's Signature: 

Date: 8 May 2009

Please ensure that the person signing the application is the applicant (the staff member responsible for the research) rather than the student researcher.
20. **Departmental approval**: I have read this application and believe it to be scientifically and ethically sound. I approve the research design. The Research proposed in this application is compatible with the University of Otago policies and I give my consent for the application to be forwarded to the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee with my recommendation that it be approved.

**Signature of *Head of Department*: .................................................................

**Date**: ........................................

*(In cases where the Head of Department is also the principal researcher then the appropriate Dean or Pro-Vice-Chancellor must sign)*

Please attach copies of the Information Sheet and Consent Form
Appendix C – The Stetind Project, translation of selected extracts: project description

The Stetind-project
The Joy of Living Nature-friendly

Stetind (the National Mountain of Norway):
the place where philosophy and ecology was joined

as an international symbol of a nature friendly way of thinking and living

The following is a translation of the Stetind-project as described by the Council for Eco-philosophy, who are the initiators of the project. Martin Julseth, 2009.
Background

The approach on the Stetind-project (SP) is a result of the themes and the reactions from the participants at the international conference “Being in nature” in the Gisna-valley, Norway in 2007. The themes were “how humans relate to nature” and “different pedagogical approaches when working with ‘friluftsliv’ ['friluftsliv' generally speaking; being the culturally significant approach on being in the outdoors in Scandinavian countries. These approaches have variations between the countries, but are all ‘friluftsliv’]. The participants expressed strong aspiration to continue this international work.

During the winter of 2008 amanuensis Børge Dahle from The Norwegian School of Sport Sciences (NIH) started his work with “Nature friendly friluftsliv- seen in a global environment and educational perspective”. Through this project it became clear that Stetind [The National Mountain of Norway, in the Tusfjord Municipality in Northern Norway] was the place where philosophy and ecology was merged.

This happened during a climbing trip in 1966, when Nils Faarlund and friends from the Alpine Club at the Norwegian Technical Collage (NTH) had invited the experienced Stetind climber Arne Næss and his Masters student Sigmund Kvaløy Setreng. Inspired by the philosophers Peter Wessel Zapfe, Baruch Spinoza and Mahtma Gobhi, they thoroughly questioned ‘why’ they did mountaineering. Setreng and Faarlund was eager to put the philosophies into action and approached this through the science of ecology. While the rain was pouring down on their tents they came to a consensus of an outline of an ecological philosophy that later has become known as deep ecology (specifically eco-philosophy and ecosophy).

In June 2008 Børge Dahle contacted Tysfjord municipality, in northern Norway to explore the possibility of arranging to host an international conference. This area was chosen because Stetind is located there and also where deep ecology and ecosophy was coined. Tysfjord municipality was positive to the initiative and supported it with great enthusiasm. A co-operation with the municipality was established. Two meetings have been held in Tysfjord municipality to develop and include the project in the municipality’s plans for the development of Stetind as the ‘national mountain’ of Norway.

Tysfjord municipality has since 2002 (when Stetind was chosen/nominated to be the national mountain of Norway) worked towards enhancing Stetind as an attraction, associating it with the mountain and fjord landscape in the region. Together with the efforts to develop general business and tourism activity in Tysfjord municipality, a consulting company (Transportutvikling AS) was engaged in 2007 to do an analysis of the possibilities in the Stetind region (pilot study Stetind). The pilot study identified numerous possible approaches, but it is lacking of a unifying theme or concept, which is seen as critical to creating international and national awareness.

In August 2008 amanuensis Dahle took initiative to a new seminar in the Gisna-valley. The main task of this seminar was to draft the “joy of living nature-friendly” developing concepts from “Being in nature”. They also developed a first draft to the “Stetind-declaration”.

Purpose

There are several different perspectives on consumerism and egocentric ways of living and these have negative and unknown consequences for nature and humankind and obviously the relationship between them. The purpose of the project- the joy of living nature friendly. In light of acknowledgment to question this way of living, to produce an agenda to question this way of living. Help and create an interest of creating a more nature friendly way of thinking and living. Through the project the initiators aim to create interest nationally and internationally. The initiators wish to set up a place for nature enjoyment. Support ‘local places of nature’ (places for reflection with protocol for Stetind declaration).

In relation to this Stetind will be able to develop as a special destination for groups of people that wish to work to take responsibility to develop more nature friendly ways of living. Also, develop ways of thinking that contribute to create harmony between nature and humans.
Tasks
The project tasks:

Part One
The responsibility of the initiators (the Council for Eco-philosophy): Børge Dahle (NIH), Øystein Dahle, Nils Faarlund, Aage Jensen (HINT), Eirik Myrhaug, Siri Nøss and Finn Wagle.

• Develop the Stetind Declaration.
• Develop a formal ‘celebration of nature’, comprised of artwork, poetry, photographs, writing, drawings etc from professionals and amateurs, young and old, representing Norwegians and people in general. Presented as a book.
• Develop ideas for different ‘places of nature’. A place for reflection and afterthought.
• Host Stetind seminar 28th-30th June 2009
  During the seminar the ideas and thoughts behind the project ‘the joy of living nature-friendly’ will be presented. The project will be developed during the seminar in dialogue with local community and businesses, Tysfjord municipality, and government at regional and national levels.
• Prepare an international conference ‘Stetind-conference 30th July -3rd August 2010, together with Tysfjord municipality. To hold the conference it is necessary to establish ‘a place of nature’ by Stetind.
• Develop plans to expand the project nationally and internationally.

Part Two
The responsibility of Tysfjord municipality.

• Establish solid underpinnings to plan and realise ‘a place of nature’ in the vicinity of Stetind with the necessary infrastructure.
• Develop plans to host the Stetind week.
• Build a strategy that supports the development of Stetind as a symbol for nature friendly ways of thinking and living.
• To develop Stetind as a symbol for “nature friendly ways of thinking and living” means establishing Stetind as a destination for nature friendly travel and experiences (as pilgrimage). Based on this Tysfjord can develop as a attractive destination with added meaning through facilitation of knowledge building and meaningful experiences (experiential learning) related to eco-philosophy (nature friendly ways of thinking and living).
The context

The Council for Eco-philosophy and the initiators of ‘the joy of living nature friendly’:

Boerge Dahle, Assistant Professor, from The Norwegian School of Sport Sciences (NIH), presently working on ‘Nature friendly “friluftsliv” in a global environment and educational perspective’. The initiator of the Stetind Project.

Siri Naess, widow after Arne Naess (founder of deep ecology), was present at the first Stetind-seminar in 1966, sociologist and psychologist who has studied quality of life, living conditions and welfare systems

Eirik Myrhaug, Sami Shaman, has worked with ecological economies and eco-municipality projects in northern Norway

Oyestein Dahle, leader of the board of the Worldwatch Institute, honourable member of the Norwegian Outdoor and Trekking Association

Finn Wagle, former Bishop in Nidaros, deeply engaged in nature friendly ways of thinking and living

Aage Jensen, Dr, engaged in the project through his academic studies and work at the North Troendelag College

Nils Faarlund, Nature philosopher, was present at the first Stetind-seminar in 1966 and has since then worked with and for nature friendly ways of thinking and living as head of the Norwegian High-Mountain School

Who is the project aimed at:

People who are interested in giving attention to, working for and seeking understanding of their responsibility and the importance of learning to live in a more nature friendly way.

About the area

Tysfjord Municipality’s distinguishing characteristics is the long deep fjords, and the steep tall mountains. The contrasts are enormous in the pristine landscape: from mountains around 1500 m high, fjords as deep as 900 m surrounded by glaciers, steep valleys, deep gorges and waterfalls. The municipality has two protected areas, where one of them is the first one in Norway. The municipality has just above 2 000 inhabitants centred around three main towns, where Kjoepsvik is the largest. Tysfjord has two different types of Sami, the Sea Sami and the Mountain Sami, along with Norwegians. Tysfjord is a great example of different cultures living alongside with nature. In this area the cultures have a unify aim to take care of nature and live in a nature friendly way.

The characteristics of the landscape is the main attraction of the area, but orcas that come to feed spawning herring has become a great tourist attraction as well. There is also a steady stream of climbers and mountaineers from all over the world that come to reach the summit of the Stetind. Besides this the steepest cave system in Northern Europe and the biggest gorge is in the municipality. To add to the heritage dimensions of the area there are also 10 000 year old stone carvings.

Stetind

The mountain Stetind was nominated by the Norwegian public to be Norway’s National Mountain in 2002 (during the international year of the mountains). The mountain itself has an interesting history related to first ascents, as well as several Sami Myths about it. The south face is a climbers dream with almost 1000 vertical meters and has given the Tower of the Arctic its reputation.
**Project description**

As a project, ‘the joy of living nature-friendly’ is aiming internationally at becoming an important part of an international movement for a nature friendly way of thinking and living. For Tysfjord Municipality this is mostly a rural development project related to the Stetind, but the project will have a positive effect on the development of the entire “Northland” region. The project will need thorough planning, organising and networking.

**The “Place of Nature” by Stetind**

The ‘place of nature’ should be close to Stetind. There should be some kind of structure that is inspired by Sami ways of living and it should open up towards nature and it inspire to contemplate and reflect. The structure should have low impact and be locally produced.

- Primarily a place to go to reflect upon and sign the Stetind Declaration
- A place where groups are brought to hear about Sami culture and understanding of nature
- A place where groups are brought to discuss nature friendly ways of living and quality of life
- A place where groups are brought to hear about mountaineers, the Stetind and the development of an eco-philosophical way of thinking
- A place where ceremonies can take place
- A place where special cultural events can take place
- A place where businesses and organisations can meet to discuss issues of valueorientation
- A place where nature can be experienced next to a very significant mountain

**Access to the ‘place of nature’**

It will be within a short walking distance, on a path, from the closest road. It should also be possible to arrive via Storelva [the Big River] by boat. There must be signs with information about the area and the ‘place of nature’.

The process of changing the regulation of the specific area was undertaken January 2009, and will be finished during the summer 2009.

**The Stetind Declaration**

The Stetind Declaration is created by the board (of trustees). The declaration must be presented in a format that gives it distinction, and it has to be beautiful to look at. The Stetind Declaration itself approaches the individual to adapt a nature-friendly way of thinking and living.
Appendix D – United Nations International Year of Mountains

2002 Tokyo Declaration
for the International Year of Mountains

We, the participants in the UNU International Symposium on the Conservation of Mountain Ecosystems, held in Tokyo (Japan) on 1 February 2002,

1. Acknowledging with gratitude the United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/RES/53/24 to declare the year 2002 as the International Year of Mountains, thus drawing the world’s attention to the need to foster sustainable mountain development;

2. Recognizing that mountains are fragile ecosystems with unique natural and human resources as stipulated in Agenda 21, Chapter 13;

3. Noting with concern that human pressure on mountain resources from extraction of mineral resources, soil erosion, touristic exploitation, etc., continues to affect the mountain environment adversely, particularly with regard to endemic, rare and endangered species of wild fauna and flora in mountains and also depletes mineral resources;

4. Noting further with concern, that climate change can seriously affect water regimes in highlands as well as lowlands, which can pose problems with the quality and quantity of available freshwater resources for human consumption and agriculture and increase competition between different interest groups in which mountain dwellers are usually the disadvantaged members, leading to an increase in the potential vulnerability of mountain people;

5. Noting also that ca. 500 million people in mountains live below the poverty line (80% of the world’s mountain population);

6. Recognizing that environmental management of mountains needs to take holistic approaches in conserving the environment, while at the same time providing sustainable incomes for mountain dwellers, including appropriate compensation for their services;

7. Affirming that scientific studies on mountain systems, management of natural resources and
monitoring of mountain environments are essential for fostering sustainable development in line with conservation and development objectives;

8. Conscious that mountain dwellers, especially women, are the main stakeholders and often the true managers who ensure the sustainable development of mountain environments and participate in the utilization and management of mountain resources;

9. Conscious also that mountain dwellers safeguard important cultural diversity that needs to be maintained and allowed to evolve further in a world moving towards globalization;

10. Aware that there is a considerable gap in knowledge and perception of mountains between academia and the general public, for whom the mass media serve as the main source of information regarding mountains;

11. Aware also that mountains and areas under the influence of mountains accommodate and provide a livelihood not only for poor communities, as often perceived, but also for a significant proportion of the urban population of the world, whose resource consumption has a heavy impact on utilization and management of mountain resources; and

12. Realizing that mountains, including the human inhabitants and the natural environments in mountain areas, especially in developing countries, are highly susceptible to serious and increasing physical violence and destruction, for example from armed conflicts, due to their particular geographical features;

Declare that:

13. UNU should continue its work with mountain populations to appraise their situations, to identify gaps in knowledge, needs and constraints, and to help them work towards more sustainable development;

14. Every effort should be made to support mountain research and monitoring in the field of environmental conservation and sustainable mountain resource use;

15. Capacity-building and education targeted at all levels and segments of mountain populations and minorities traditionally dependent on mountain resources must be further strengthened so as to counteract the looming marginalization of mountain dwellers;

16. Cultural diversity in mountains needs to be maintained and developed, as it can be a powerful means for counterracting social, economic and environmental degradation in mountains;

17. Holistic and trans-disciplinary management schemes for environmental conservation and sustainable development be applied in mountain regions (as is the case in biosphere reserves);

18. More efforts should be made to disseminate proper and correct information to the public by working with the mass media as well as by improving the coordination of activities between
researchers and practitioners;

19. Greater attention should be given to the urban aspect of mountains, through additional research and monitoring of highland-lowland interactions;

20. Empowerment of poor local communities, especially of women, should be supported in order to facilitate sustainable development of mountains in a self-supporting manner;

21. The issue of conflicts and resulting destruction of mountain ecosystems and livelihoods should receive more serious consideration from academia and policy-makers; and

22. The possibility of new approaches to mountain issues should be explored, for instance, by identifying hotspots and creating and discovering successful approaches applicable to different problems and contexts of sustainable mountain development.

We therefore call upon UNU, UNESCO, FAO, UNEP, UNDP and other concerned international and national organizations and NGOs to facilitate mountain research, monitoring, capacity-building, sustainable development, conservation of mountain ecosystems, and maintenance of cultural diversity in mountains so as to create linkages and synergies among mountain scientists, mountain communities, policy / decision-makers, practitioners and the general public.
Appendix E – Conference paper

**Fostering nature-friendly ways of living:**
*Alternative approaches*


**Abstract**

With the Stetind Declaration as a platform for deep questioning, there can be plurality of philosophies and broader worldviews that foster policies and actions. In the process of applying fundamental philosophies and worldviews one can move through the principles of the Stetind Declaration and develop specific policies and practical actions. This is an organic process, where all levels of the deep questioning model are relevant in different situations and visited at different occasions. This keeps one’s understanding and practices in line with a changing world. The deep questioning approach then becomes evolutionary, changing with natural conditions and adapting to different situations, places and cultures (Drengson, 1999). This opens for alternative approaches on fostering nature-friendly ways of living.

**Introduction**

This paper is based on a case study of the Stetind Project. I will focus on the sub-project I define as ‘The Joy of Living Nature-friendly’. I see this as the cornerstone of the Stetind Project. With an understanding of this sub-project it is possible to adopt elements of the approach to alternative settings.

In its simplest form I understand The Joy of Living Nature-friendly (JLN) as a way of connecting humans with nature. It can be argued that it is about reconnecting us with nature, as we are from and of nature, but we have developed societies with cultures that separate humans from nature (Naess & Rothenberg, 1989). The JLN is infused with a holistic way of thinking. A founding principle for the project is that there is no specific way leading to nature-friendliness, but being nature-friendly is the way (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008: 2009: 2010). This emphasises the importance of the process – or in many ways that the process is the purpose. For the JLN this means that the purpose of the project is inherent in its’ different parts: fostering nature-friendly ways of thinking and living.

The following argument is based on the notion that we, in what is generally understood as the civilised world, need a shift in the way we think about the planet and its inhabitants. Due to the environmental crises we need to reconsider the development of cultures and therefore where our societies are headed. Faarlund
(2008) addresses this with the analogy of "the keel and rudder for thought and action" (p 17). The keel is the philosophy, or way of thinking that keeps us on course. The rudder is the norms that guide our actions, or how we navigate according to our way of thinking (Reed & Rothenberg, 1993).

A challenge with the approach of the JLN is that it primarily reaches people who choose to be in and with nature. For the project to reach the ones that are more alienated from nature a different approach must be used. I will tie the structure of the JLN to the deep questioning model presented by Naess in relation to the deep ecology movement (Drengson, 1999). I use this as a starting point for addressing alternative approaches on reconnecting people with nature.

I have gained my understanding of the JLN through a qualitative case study. Stake (2005) defines a case study that addresses both the particular and the general aspects of the case as having a "combined purpose" (p 445). For my study of the JLN, this means enquiring into the specific actions - or building blocks - of the project, and the purpose and effect of these building blocks. After describing my understanding of the JLN, the building blocks of the project will be presented so that alternative approaches can be developed based on them. I will build further understanding of the project by relating it to Arnes Naess's deep questioning model. He used it to explain how the philosophy of Deep Ecology can be related to ones world view and also turned into practical actions (Drengson, 1999). This will lead to how an understanding of JLN can facilitate alternative approaches on fostering nature-friendly ways of living.
The Joy of Living Nature-friendly

JLN has been created to support and generate interest and understanding for nature-friendly ways of thinking and living. The managing committee is aiming to create national and international attention to what can be described as the umbrella project: *The Stetind Project*. The managing committee for the Stetind Project is also known as the “Council for Eco-philosophy”. This is meant as an example for *local councils* that can guide similar projects other places, not just in Norway, but internationally as well. For this reason they define themselves as just *Council for Eco-philosophy*, instead of 'the' council (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008).

JLN combines the experience of being in nature with reflecting upon nature-friendly ways of thinking and living. This reflection will be facilitated through a document defined as “*The Stetind Declaration*” (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008, p 6). This document is a *declaration of dependence* between humans and nature, and therefore the interdependence of all life on Earth. *Council for Eco-philosophy* describes the purpose of the declaration as:

“[...] to unify international efforts promoting nature-friendly endeavors and to call attention to the need for joyful and hopeful responses to the environmental crisis. We believe that the impending challenges we face need to be addressed individually and collectively. We believe that the challenges are not merely economic and technological, but rather, that they implicate our values and our fundamental self-understanding as human beings. Our aim with this declaration is for each person who signs it to visualise his or her own values orientation.”

(Council for Eco-philosophy, 2009)

The intention with the declaration is that this reflection is done in a setting where the individual can experience nature. For this reason *Council for Eco-philosophy* are developing a concept that is a place for enjoying nature, “*a Place of Nature*” (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008, p 6), meaning a place that facilitates closeness with nature. This experience is to be combined with reflection based on the *declaration of dependence*.

Stake (2005) stresses the importance of specific perimeters that define the subject that is being studied. The JLN is the unique and bounded system I have studied. To understand the complexity of the case, and to accommodate the combined purpose of studying the JLN, I will relate the study to what I see as the *intrinsic elements* and the *instrumental dimension*. I see the *intrinsic elements* as the *Council for Eco-philosophy, The Stetind Declaration*, and *The Place of Nature* by Stetind. The *instrumental dimension* is what the synergy of these elements are working towards: fostering nature-friendly ways of thinking and living. The study requires thorough attention to the approach used by the managing committee on the components of the project.

The Stetind Project, being the umbrella-project, is part of a regional development plan and a result of an identified potential in relation to the national mountain of Norway (Stetind) (Aasheim, 2008). This has merged with a confluence of academic, political,
and cultural events. In sum it is a multi faceted project anchored in eco-philosophy. It has several dimensions working for the ultimate goal of creating a renewed understanding of ourselves, our culture and their relationships with nature.

**Relating the whole to the part and the part to the whole**

The case study of JLN has been a hermeneutic inquiry. The insights created are my interpretations of texts, presentations, discussions and conversations related to the project and participating at the Stetind Seminar in Kjoepsvik, July 2009. The central principle of hermeneutics is that it is only possible to grasp the meaning by relating the information at hand to the whole discourse or world view from which it originates. The 'hermeneutic circle' relates the whole to the part and the part to the whole. As a qualitative method the hermeneutic circle involves relating the qualitative material at hand to the greater understanding of it, and then relating the holistic understanding back to the specific information (Willis, 2007). With this as the backdrop I will now present the building blocks of the JLN so that alternative approaches can be developed based on this understanding.

**Council for Eco-philosophy**

This council consist of some of the participants from the *Stetind Seminars of 1966*, as well as personas that strengthen the council. The *Stetind Seminars of 1966* were when central ecological and philosophical concepts were joined. This is the philosophical understanding known as eco-philosophy (Faarlund, 2008). In summary the members of the council embody a broad spectrum of backgrounds, both culturally and spiritually. They are recognised and influential individuals that have come together for a defined purpose. Table I presents the members of the council and relevant information on role and background.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Name</strong></th>
<th><strong>Relevant background</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Boerge Dahle</strong></td>
<td>Assistant Professor, teaches friluftsliv at The Norwegian School of Sport Sciences (NIH) in Oslo, working with 'Nature friendly friluftsliv in a global environment and educational perspective'. Author of children’s books on friluftsliv. The initiator of the Stetind Project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Siri Naess</strong></td>
<td>Sociologist and psychologist, has studied quality of life, living conditions and welfare systems. Was present at the Stetind Seminars in 1966.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eirik Myrhaug</strong></td>
<td>Sami Shaman and Healer, has worked with ecological economies and eco-projects for municipalities in Northern Norway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sigmund K. Setreng</strong></td>
<td>Eco-philosopher, environmentalist and supporter of the deep ecology movement. A spokesperson against global 'unidimensionality' in favour of regional multidimensionality since the 1960's. Was present at the Stetind Seminars in 1966.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oeystein Dahle</strong></td>
<td>Former leader of the board of the World Watch Institute and honourable member of the Norwegian Outdoor and Trekking Association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Finn Wagle</strong></td>
<td>Former Bishop of Nidaros in the Church of Norway, deeply engaged in nature-friendly ways of thinking and living.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aage Jensen</strong></td>
<td>Teaches pedagogy for friluftsliv students at Nord-T floendelag University College. Has written about the concept of 'conwaying' and 'friluftsliv' in books for students of friluftsliv at all levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nils Faarlund</strong></td>
<td>Nature philosopher, was present at the Stetind Seminars in 1966 and has since then worked with and for nature-friendly ways of thinking and living as head of the Norwegian High-Mountain School. Established friluftsliv as a course of study at The Norwegian School of Sport Sciences (NIH) in 1972. Described as a foundational figure to the evolution and meaning of traditional Norwegian friluftsliv. Received the 'The Royal Norwegian Order of St. Olav' for his efforts for the alpine search &amp; rescue service.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 'Place of Nature' by Stetind

The purpose of a Place of Nature is to experience nature. This specific Place of Nature should be close to the mountain Stetind so that it can be linked with the spirit of the place based on its history and cultural significance. The idea is that there should be some kind of structure that is inspired by local traditions and ways of living, including Sami perspectives. The structure must have low impact on the environment and be based on local building techniques and materials. The intention is that a Place of Nature should open up towards nature and inspire to contemplate and reflect with protocol in a declaration of dependence (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008).

Description of intended use of The Place of Nature by Stetind is listed in Table II.

**Table II: Intended use of The Place of Nature by Stetind**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Format</th>
<th>Description of use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual or group</strong></td>
<td>Primarily a place to go to reflect upon and sign the Stetind Declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A place where nature can be experienced next to a significant mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
<td>Information/education about Sami culture and their understanding of nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A place where ceremonies can take place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitate discussions on nature-friendly ways of living and quality of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information/education about mountaineers, the Stetind and the development of an eco-philosophical way of thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitate special cultural events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A place where businesses and organisations can meet to discuss issues of value orientation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II: From the project description, Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008.
The intention with *the Place of Nature* by Stetind is that it should be within a short walking distance, on a path, from the closest road where the main access point to Stetind is. It should also be possible to arrive by boat (via Storelva). The area must be developed so that the cultural and historical significance of the place is recognised. An important aspect is the Stetind Seminars of 1966 and the development of eco-philosophy. The *Place of Nature* by Stetind is conceptualised to facilitate reflection with protocol in *The Stetind Declaration*. There must be signs and information that create an understanding of the area and this specific *Place of Nature*.

*The Stetind Declaration*

*The Stetind Declaration* is created by *Council for Eco-philosophy* to generate awareness of individual and communal value orientation. A commitment to a renewed understanding of the relationship between nature and humankind is to be realised through signing the declaration. This declaration is an example of a *declaration of dependence* – a manifestation of the interdependence of all life on Earth (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2009, Location: Sign Up!). *The Stetind Declaration* is the most explicit element of the JLN and The Stetind Project as a whole. The Stetind Declaration is presented in Figure I.
Figure I: The Stetind Declaration as presented online by Council for Eco-philosophy

THE STETIND DECLARATION

We have gradually come to realize:

Our way of life has fatal consequences for nature and humankind, and therefore all life on Earth. The challenges that we face, as individuals and community, are not merely of economic and technological nature. They concern our basic values and our fundamental conception of what it means to be human.

We acknowledge:

- Nature and humankind constitute a whole and share a common destiny.
- Nature is the home of culture.
- Life is like a woven fabric of relations. To live is to be dependent.
- The value of nature and human dignity are intrinsically linked.
- What we do to nature, we do to ourselves.
- All life is vulnerable and therefore under threat.
- Concern for nature implies a concern for greater justice: Our way of life affects in particular the poorest among us, indigenous peoples, and future generations.

We will:

- Work to promote a renewed understanding of the relationship between nature and humankind.
- Strive to base our choices, both as individuals and as a community, on this understanding.
- Discover the joy of living in harmony with nature: There is no path to harmony with nature. Harmony with nature is the path.

Humankind possesses great capacity to both create and destroy. At this crucial point in time we will take responsibility and commit ourselves to thinking and living in a way that promotes life.

I/we will work to fulfil The Stetind Declaration:

[Signed by:]
Siri Naess, Aage Jensen, Oeystein Dahle, Finn Wagle, Boerge Dahle, Nils Faarlund, Sigmund Kvaløy Setreng

Figure I: Format from Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008; content from Council for Eco-philosophy, 2009 Location: Sign Up!

At the Place of Nature by Stetind the declaration is intended to be presented in a format that displays and communicates its distinction, and it is essential that individuals and groups visiting can express their support by signing it.
Relating the parts back to the whole

The overall aim for the Stetind Project is to turn Stetind into an international icon for nature-friendly ways of thinking and living (Council for Ecophilosophy, 2008). Council for Eco-philosophy has developed the project ‘The joy of living in a nature-friendly way’ “as a hope to be able to unite organisations and individuals, to support politicians who want to develop a nature-friendly society” (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2010, web: main page). The ultimate goal is to inspire local approaches nationally and internationally and build a social movement.

Thinking of the intrinsic elements separately from the instrumental dimension is beneficial for an understanding of the dynamics of the project. I see the project as greater than the sum of its parts because of the depth of the concepts and the resonance this creates within the holistic approach. The synergy of the concepts at play is the instrumental dimension.

The JLN can function as a framework for adaptation to local approaches. Council for Eco-philosophy is an example of a local council, The Stetind Declaration is an example of a declaration of dependence, and the place of nature by Stetind is an example of a place of nature. In sum they are meant to trigger a social movement with a revised value orientation. Faarlund (2008) expresses this as a need for “profound changes in mode of living” (p 17). He continues that this “can not be triggered by theorising and abstract persuasion [but instead] experiential learning with reflection is needed” (p 17). This is fully recognised and has shaped the project and its approach.

Theoretical underpinnings

The theoretical underpinnings for the JLN has evolved from the topics that were focused on at the international conference ‘Being in nature’ in the Gisna-valley [Gisnadalen], Norway in 2007. The JLN is a amalgamation of the conference topics and how the participants engaged with them, and the later collaborations and ideas that were sparked based on this (Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008).
The themes from *Being in Nature* 2007 can be linked directly with the building blocks of the JLN. The themes that are of particular significance for JLN are friluftsliv; identity; nature conservation, education and politics; aesthetics; and quality of life. The themes and their relevance are presented in Table III.

**Table III:** Significant themes from *Being in Nature* 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Significance for JLN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friluftsliv</strong></td>
<td>Gives a backdrop for the context and the mind-set that the approach on JLN has developed from. A combination of: the traditions of friluftsliv; contemporary understandings of friluftsliv; and international perspectives on friluftsliv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time and space</strong></td>
<td>Awareness of ‘being’ and ‘individual values’ which are seminal to the reflections JLN is endeavouring to trigger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity</strong></td>
<td>Gives insights into experiential learning and how personal experiences can be used to reflect critically on identity and lifestyles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature conservation, education and politics</strong></td>
<td>Clarifies educational benefits of nature as the classroom; the significance of experiencing nature combined with reflection (experiential learning); modes of learning in and with nature and; development of general awareness of surroundings as well as maturity of the self and self awareness. All vital to the JLN.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aesthetics</strong></td>
<td>Conceptualises the visual and artistic dimensions of being in nature – the outcome of ‘lively encounter with one’s self’ is recognised as the feeling of ‘being’ and ‘liveliness’. Important in the process towards a renewed understanding of one’s value orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality of life</strong></td>
<td>The positive influences and outcomes of being in nature, and friluftsliv as a specific approach that shifts the focus to quality of life (instead of standard of living), and to self-realisation (instead of materialistic-relaisation).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Awareness of the themes from Being in nature 2007 is crucial for an understanding of the context that the JLN came to be in. Norwegian friluftsliv with its culturally specific traits and its development creates a greater understanding of this context. Deep Ecology and the Deep Ecology Movement encompasses these contextual elements in a rational system which are mirrored in the specifics of JLN. With this understanding the declaration of dependence can function as a platform where unity is created – similar to the platform principles of the Deep Ecology Movement, while local councils combined with places of nature feature as diversity in approaches. The next section will lead to alternative approaches on fostering nature-friendly ways of thinking through an understanding of the deep questioning model.

Deep questioning guiding alternative approaches

To be able to work with individual value orientation and issues related to world view, it is of great help to have some guidance. Naess's deep questioning model can facilitate this. Naess introduced the term ‘deep ecology’ at the Third World Future Research Conference held in Bucharest in 1972 and published it the year after in the seminal paper entitled “The Shallow and Deep, Long Range Ecology Movement: A Summary” (Drengson, 1999). Reed and Rothenberg (1993) describes deep ecology in a simple and broad sense as “the belief that today’s environmental problems are symptomatic of deeper problems in our society, and that this belief requires an effort to solve these fundamental problems, not just retrofitting our current practices to be in line with environmentally correct mores.” (1993, p. 1). Hence ‘deep’ partly refers to level of questioning of our purposes and values when arguing in environmental conflicts (Drengson, 1999).

Deep ecology must be understood as both a philosophy and a movement. Naess defines ‘philosophy’ with two meanings: “1) a field of study, [as] an approach to knowledge; 2) one’s own personal code of values and a view of the world which guides one’s own decisions (insofar as one does full heartedly feel and think they are the right decisions)” (Naess & Rothenberg, 1989, p 36). When the second meaning is applied to “questions involving ourselves and nature” Naess defines this as “an eco-philosophy” (Naess & Rothenberg, 1989, p 36). As an overriding umbrella term, Naess defines eco-philosophy as “[t]he recognition of the problem and its subsequent study using philosophical methods [...]. More precisely, it is the utilisation of basic concepts from the science of ecology – such as complexity, diversity, and symbiosis – to clarify the place of our species within nature through the process of working out a total view” (Naess & Rothenberg, 1989, p 3). Eco-philosophy is therefore seen as the study of approaches, but when considering practical situations involving ourselves, the aim is to develop individual ecosophies.

The philosophy of deep ecology is expressed by Naess as a question of ontology that opens for “a re-examination of how we perceive and construct our world” (Naess & Rothenberg, 1989, p 19). Deep ecology encompasses two inescapable components: “valuation and emotion in thinking and experience of reality, and how they lead to the
ability to mature, integrated human personality to act on the basis of a total view. “The strategy and tactics of the deep ecology movement depend upon drawing the consequences of these necessities” (Naess & Rothenberg, 1989, p 32). The philosophy of deep ecology can therefore be an inspiration and source of support for the deep ecology movement. In relation to this, Naess defines a social movement as “not scientific – [for the philosophy to be applicable to the movement] its articulation must be permeated throughout with declarations of value and value priorities” (Naess & Rothenberg, 1989, p 32).

When Naess originally characterised the Deep Ecology Movement (DEM), it was an attempt to outline the main points of deep ecology as a practical philosophy. This was later refined by Naess and Sessions in 1984 to the eight points that make up the platform principles of the DEM (Drengson, 1999). The platform principles are presented in Table IV.
### Table IV: The eight platform principles of the Deep Ecology Movement

#### The eight platform principles of the Deep Ecology Movement

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td><em>The well-being and flourishing of human and nonhuman Life on Earth have value in themselves (synonyms: intrinsic value, inherent value). These values are independent of the usefulness of the nonhuman world for narrow human purposes.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td><em>Richness and diversity of life forms contribute to the realisations of these values and are also values in themselves.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td><em>Humans have no right to reduce this richness and diversity except to satisfy vital human needs.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td><em>The flourishing of human life and cultures is compatible with a substantial decrease of human population. The flourishing of nonhuman life requires such a decrease.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td><em>Present human interference with the nonhuman world is excessive, and the situation is rapidly worsening.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><em>Policies must therefore be changed. These policies affect basic economic, technological, and ideological structures. The resulting state of affairs will be deeply different from the present.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td><em>The ideological change is mainly that of appreciating life quality (dwelling in situations of inherent value) rather than adhering to an increasingly higher standard of living. There will be a profound awareness of the difference between big and great.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td><em>Those who subscribe to the foregoing points have an obligation directly or indirectly to partake in the attempt to implement the necessary changes.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV: Adapted from Drengson, 1999; Reed & Rothenberg, 1993, p 76; Naess & Rothenberg, 1989, p 29; Devall & Sessions, 1985, p 70.

Anyone who endorses these eight principles is seen as a supporter of the *Deep Ecology Movement*, not a ‘deep ecologist’. Naess does not see deep ecologist as an appropriate term as he finds it too immodest, and it would be confrontational in relation to the opposite: a *shallow ecologist* – which is unkind language. *Supporter* is in line with the general Gandhian approach of the philosophy and leaves more room for interpretation (Drengson, 1999).

For deep questioning, Naess uses a four-level system where the platform principles in Table IV make up *Level II*. At this level there is meant to be general agreement and the principles need to be flexible and integrative. Much cross cultural work is done with regards to platform principles, especially related to grass-root social movements. A grass-root movement is when their principles emerge from the bottom up, instead of through a hierarchic structure from the top down. The *Deep Ecology Movement* is
developed based on Naess’s experience from the world peace and social justice movements, and his commitment to the way of non-violence taught by Gandhi. As a philosopher of science and logic who has done innovative work on language and communication, his studies and travels have given him deep cross-cultural knowledge and perspectives (Drengson, 1999). Therefore, the platform is not meant to be in the direction of a rigid set of doctrinaire statements, but rather a set of discussion points, open to modification by people who broadly accept them. The idea is that the platform principles unite the group in terms of shared projects, aims and values. *Level II* is meant to function as a filter for deep questioning, leading to *Level I* (Drengson, 1999). Table V shows the different levels of questioning and their articulation.
Table V: Levels of questioning and articulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The four levels of questioning and articulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level I</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level II</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level III</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level IV</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*Level I* holds the ultimate premises, or ultimate norms. These are diverse and can be religious views or refined personal philosophies (or ecosophies as Naess defines them). What unites them in the DEM is a long-range vision to protect the integrity of the Earth’s ecological communities and their inherent value (Drengson, 1999). The function of the platform principles at *Level II* is to categorise what it is that binds supporters of the DEM together— they unite. From the *Level II* principles a great diversity of policies and recommendations can be articulated—they are the *Level III*. From the *Level III* policies comes practical actions. The *Level IV* actions are even more diverse than the *level III* policies (Drengson, 1999).

Through these four levels the DEM manifests both plurality and unity: unity at *Level II* and plurality at all other levels. From the platform principles, deep questioning leads to diverse ultimate norms or premises. In the process of applying these norms one moves through the platform principles and develops policies and practical actions. This is an organic process, where all levels are relevant in different situations and visited at different occasions. This keeps one’s understanding and practices in line with a changing world. The deep questioning approach then becomes evolutionary, changing with natural conditions and adapting to different situations, places and cultures (Drengson, 1999).
Relating this to the JLN, Council for Eco-philosophy functions as a local philosophical approach on working with the platform principals, similar to Level III (policies or programs) in the deep questioning model. The place of nature by Stetind is an approach which relates to Level IV in the model – it is a way of putting the theories and philosophies in concrete terms – it is practical actions based on deeper questioning.

Alternative approaches

The greatest challenge with the JLN is to create an atmosphere that actually stimulates so the experience and reflection that is needed triggers "profound changes in mode of living" (Faarlund, 2008, p 17). The building blocks that are defined in relation to the JLN and the mountain Stetind have great potential to achieve its combined purpose. This because of the direct involvement of this specific Council for Eco-philosophy and all they bring to the project combined with the cultural and historical context.

To create local approaches on the JLN the building blocks of the project need to be adapted to the context. As an example, if a local approach was to be established at the mountain village Finse in southern Norway, it would not be necessary to do fundamental changes. A simplified description of the process would be that a local council would be created, a place of nature would be chosen and the declaration would be adapted much as it is. The synergy of the concepts would be intact but it exists in a different historical and cultural context. I define this as the original approach. The parallels to the concept by Stetind are obvious, but for the same reason the people experiencing it are similar to the ones affected by the original. To create an alternative approach it should be in a very different context, and hence reach different people than what the original does.

I believe most of us in the civilised world need to go through our value orientation and commit to a revised view of ourselves as part of the greater whole. The synergy of the JLN can have the impact needed, but the original approach will mainly reach and affect individuals who are already open to eco-philosophy. For this reason the people who will visit the place of nature by Stetind, or similar places of nature will already be open to the values expressed.

The challenge is to get the ones that do not stop by 'a place of nature' to experience what Council for Eco-philosophy describes as “the deep joy of identification with free nature” (2008). I believe that the same method as the JLN uses; a council, a place of nature, and a declaration can be adapted to other cultural contexts where completely different people can get involved. The deep questioning model can be a good starting point to conceptualise how this could be done. If a council is established with participants from a different cultural or sub-cultural context, they can develop a declaration of dependence that is adapted to their culture but still embraces the same principals. This will serve as the platform principals on Level II in the deep questioning model. The key thing with the platform principals derived from JLN is that they unite people who can generally agree on the interdependency of all life on earth -and therefore also the inherent value of all life. With a declaration of dependence that
expresses this, the Level I premises or world views can be different for each individual. Based on a world view that supports the platform principals (Level II, in this example a declaration of dependence adapted and defined by a sub-culture) it is possible to develop policies or norms (Level III) that guide concrete actions (Level IV). This model supports great diversity in general approach on life as well as specific practical actions.

If we define city dwellers as a sub-culture, it is safe to say that the urban jungle is more familiar than free nature. For many people it does not appeal to spend time at a place of nature, as it is conceptualised in the original approach (the one by Stetind or like Finse). An alternative approach should therefore be in a context where they are more likely to get involved. General examples can be city centres where people go for both work and recreation. A central square in a town can be a good setting, at a large mall or any location where people are. The intrinsic elements of the JLN can be adapted to any setting.

When a council is established and a declaration is adapted, the same needs to be done with the place of nature. Adapting it to an environment where free nature cannot be experienced is the main challenge for an alternative concept. To do this it is necessary to focus on something that appeals within the culture. A place for nature enjoyment still needs to stimulate the senses. A minimum is an audio and visual experience through some installation. It needs to create an emotional response similar to experiencing nature, as this will help trigger deep reflection and can lead towards profound changes for the individual (Bulbeck, 2005; Tarrant & Green, 1999). Expressions through different forms of art can do this, and design and architecture has great potential to encompass this function. Technology as 3D and IMAX films can be combined with other elements that activate the senses. Film as experience is a strategically choreographed and mediated sequence of audio-visual stimulus intended to have specific effects on the viewer (editing techniques). The resulting stream of images creates an experience that transcends simply recording reality (Champoux, 1999). Smell and touch can enhance this as well. Related to this is the concept of urban ‘rewilding’, where small pockets of nature are brought into a city environment. An example is occupying central city parking spots with indigenous vegetation. It is possible to take the alternative approach a step further, or perhaps in a totally different direction, and invite even more diverse concepts. The key thing is that it must be adapted to the community or culture it is intended to engage with.
A question that remains unanswered here is if an alternative experience of nature can open for the deep joy that experiencing free nature can? Does it grasp you the same way and can it trigger the profound changes in our mode of living that are sought after? In a discussion related to the Deep Ecology Movement and different solutions as reformatory or revolutionary, Naess expressed the following: “Reform or Revolution? I envisage a change of revolutionary depth and size by means of many smaller steps in a radically new direction. [...] The direction is revolution, the steps are reformatory” (Witoszek, 1997, p 65).

Alternative approaches and different concepts of the JLN can be a step towards reconnecting a greater variety of people with nature. Experiencing an alternative place for nature enjoyment might not lead directly to a radically new direction in life, but it can lead towards reflection on ones value orientation, and it can bring a variety of people closer to free nature. These steps are part of the social movement bringing us towards the revolution needed.
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