

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 I: Council for Eco-philosophy

Name	Relevant background
Boerge Dahle	<i>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.</i>
Siri Naess	<i>Sociologist and psychologist, has studied quality of life, living conditions and welfare systems. Was present at the Stetind Seminars in 1966.</i>
Eirik Myrhaug	<i>Sami Shaman and Healer, has worked with ecological economies and eco-projects for municipalities in Northern Norway.</i>
Sigmund K. Setreng	<i>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.</i>
Oeystein Dahle	<i>Former leader of the board of the World Watch Institute and honourable member of the Norwegian Outdoor and Trekking Association.</i>
Finn Wagle	<i>Former Bishop of Nidaros in the Church of Norway, deeply engaged in nature-friendly ways of thinking and living.</i>
Aage Jensen	<i>Teaches pedagogy for friluftsliv students at Nord-Troendelag University College. Has written about the concept of 'conwaying' and 'friluftsliv' in books for students of friluftsliv at all levels.</i>
Nils Faarlund	<i>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 & rescue service.</i>

Table I: Based on information from Henderson & Vikander, 2007, pp 308-315; Council for Eco-philosophy, 2008, p 7.

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

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

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 Kvaløey 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*

Theme	Significance for JLN
<i>Friluftsliv</i>	<i>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.</i>
<i>Time and space</i>	<i>Awareness of 'being' and 'individual values' which are seminal to the reflections JLN is endeavouring to trigger.</i>
<i>Identity</i>	<i>Gives insights into experiential learning and how personal experiences can be used to reflect critically on identity and lifestyles.</i>
<i>Nature conservation, education and politics</i>	<i>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.</i>
<i>Aesthetics</i>	<i>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.</i>
<i>Quality of life</i>	<i>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).</i>

Table III: My interpretation of the themes from *Being in Nature 2007* and their significance for JLN. From the conference report: *Being in Nature: Experiential Learning and Teaching* (Dahle & Jensen, 2009).

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 *ecosophy*" (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

1.	<i>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.</i>
2.	<i>Richness and diversity of life forms contribute to the realisations of these values and are also values in themselves.</i>
3.	<i>Humans have no right to reduce this richness and diversity except to satisfy vital human needs.</i>
4.	<i>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.</i>
5.	<i>Present human interference with the nonhuman world is excessive, and the situation is rapidly worsening.</i>
6.	<i>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.</i>
7.	<i>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.</i>
8.	<i>Those who subscribe to the foregoing points have an obligation directly or indirectly to partake in the attempt to implement the necessary changes.</i>

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

The four levels of questioning and articulation		
<i>Level I</i>	Ultimate Premises	<i>The fundamental way of thinking: Taoism, Christianity, Buddhism, Ecosophy (T)/ individual philosophies, etc.</i>
<i>Level II</i>	Platform Principles	<i>The level that unites, high level of agreement: Peace Movement, Deep Ecology Movement, Social Justice Movement, etc.</i>
<i>Level III</i>	Policies & Programs	<i>General consequences derived from the platform principles: Lifestyles, general policies or structure for actions, etc.</i>
<i>Level IV</i>	Practical Actions	<i>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.</i>

Table V: Adapted from Drengson, 1999. Based on Naess's Apron Diagram in Drengson & Inoue, 1995, pp 10-12 and Naess, 1985, p 226.

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.

References

- Bulbeck, C. (2005) *Facing the Wild: Ecotourism, Conservation and Animal Encounters*. London: Earthscan.
- Champoux, J. E. (1999) Film as a Teaching Resource. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 8(2), 240-251.
- Council for Eco-philosophy (2008) Project description: 'The Joy of Living Nature-friendly' [Prosjektbeskrivelse: 'Gleden ved aa leve naturvennlig']. Unpublished document. Personal communication with Nils Faarlund.
- Council for Eco-philosophy (2009) The website for *The Stetind Declaration*. Retrieved 2nd January 2010 from:
<http://www.stetinddeclaration.com/wips/433183020/>
- Council for Eco-philosophy (2010) The website for *Council for Eco-philosophy*. Retrieved 5th February 2010 from:
<http://www.councilforecophilosophy.com/wips/1081659245/>
- Dahle, B. & Jensen, Aa. (2009) *Being in Nature: Experiential Learning and Teaching*. Conference Report from the Gisna velly conference 11th -13th August 2007, Norway. Retrieved 28th January 2010 from:
<http://www.councilforecophilosophy.com/wips/779539958/>
- Devall, B. (1980) The Deep Ecology Movement. *Natural Resources Journal*, 20, 299-322.
- Devall, B. & Sessions, G. (1985) *Deep Ecology: Living as if nature Mattered*. Salt Lake City, Utah: Peregrine Smith Books.
- Drengson, A. (1999) *Ecophilosophy, Ecosophy and the Deep Ecology Movement: An Overview*. [An earlier version of this article appeared in *The Trumpeter: Journal of Ecosophy*, 14 (3), 1997, p 110-111.] Retrieved 3rd February 2010 from:
www.ecospherics.net/pages/DrengEcophil.html
- Faarlund, N. (2008) *The Origin of eco-philosophy/eco-politics* [Translated from Norwegian: Om tilblivelsen av oeko-filosofi/oeko-politikk]. Appendix in Council for Eco-philosophy (2008) *Project description: 'The Joy of Living Nature-friendly'*.
- Naess, A. & Rothenberg, D. (1989) *Ecology, community and lifestyle*. Translated and edited by David Rothenberg [based on fifth edition of original work in Norwegian by Arne Naess 'Oekologi, samfunn og livsstil', 1976]. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Naess, A. (1985) Ecosophy T. In B. Devall and G. Sessions, *Deep Ecology: Living as if Nature Mattered*, Appendix (pp 225-228). Salt Lake City, Utah: Peregrine Smith Books.

Reed, P., & Rothenberg, D. (1993). *Wisdom in the open air: the Norwegian roots of deep ecology*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Stake, R. E. (2005) Qualitative case studies. In N. K. Denzin and Y.S Lincoln (eds), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed), 443-466. London, United Kingdom: SAGE

Tarrant, M. A., & Green, G. T. (1999) Outdoor recreation and the predictive validity of environmental attitudes. *Leisure Sciences*, 21, 17-30.

Willis, J. W. (2007) *Foundations of Qualitative Research: Interpretive and critical approaches*. London: SAGE.

Witoszek, N. (1997) Arne Naess and the Norwegian Nature Tradition. *World Views: Environment, Culture, Religion*, 1(1), 57-73.

Aasheim, S. P. (2008) Mulighetsstudie Stetind, Tyssfjord kommune. Sammendrag Sluttrapport [Contingency Study Stetind, Tyssfjord Municipality. Summary Final Report]. Retrieved 4th February 2010 from:
<https://www.tysfjord.kommune.no/stetind.96827.no.html>