

Sustainable urbanisation? Norwegian cabin culture in transition

Thomas Berker, Helen Jøsok Gansmo

2009

Published as: Berker, Thomas and Gansmo, Helen Jøsok(2010) 'Sustainable urbanisation? Norwegian cabin culture in transition', *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 8: 3, 172 — 182

Abstract

In this article, we explore a cultural change which has made the desire to live close to nature from a core tenet of Norwegian culture to an unsustainable threat to nature. During the last two decades, Norwegian cabin tourism has moved from 'hard' forms (few, prolonged stays, strong identification with the site) of ecotourism to 'softer' ones (shorter, more frequent stays, commercialisation of the site). These changes, we argue, have led to a situation in which the image of an ideal cabin which echoes hard ecotourism is perpetuated within new, softer practices. Unfortunately, this new kind of nature tourism, which is characterised by many short stays of many uncoordinated visitors spread over preferably 'pristine' nature, is inherently unsustainable. As an alternative, we propose more cautious transitions to more coordinated and 'denser' forms of tourism, which are exemplified in two cases.

Introduction

The City of New York houses almost two times the population of the country of Norway which is more than 300 times larger (385,252 km²). Norway is a country of stunning natural beauty, its fjords and mountains attract millions of tourists every year. New York, attracting millions of guests as well, is one of the icons of the modern urban form, its fascination and perils. It is difficult to imagine an image which better expresses the difference between the natural and the artificial, than comparing New York City with one of the many mountain ranges in Norway surrounding a crystal clear fjord.

Yet, the statistics produced by those registering the harm done by humans to the climate speak a completely different language. A report commissioned by the mayor of New York City concluded that an average New Yorker produces 7.1 tons CO₂ per year (2006; ‘Mayor’s Office of Long-Term Planning and Sustainability’, 2007), whereas analyses for Norway estimate around 8.7 tons CO₂ per capita (2003; ‘US Energy Information Administration’, 2008). Leaving aside interfering variables (climate, demographics) and above all the ample insecurities hidden within such highly aggregated numbers, these findings do not surprise the student of sustainability. Low population density, leaving nature seemingly untouched, can lead to severe dangers to the environment when combined with other conditions such as high standards of living and high degrees of mobility. These conditions are more than fulfilled in Norway.

In this context, contemporary Norwegian cabin life inhabits a special place. While most Norwegians would agree that cabin life is about enjoying leisure in pristine nature, statisticians register ever shorter stays, more frequent visits and improved standards at Norwegian cabins (Arnesen & Skjeggedal, 2003) – trends which all contribute to increasing CO₂ emissions in this sector. In this text, our goal is to show how nature tourism in Norway can react to these trends in a sustainable way. We claim that those looking for a sustainable future are better informed by density and coordination which is taken to the extreme in New York City’s urban form than by the yearning for a mythical past in which Norwegian farmers and fishers were living ‘close to nature’.

Before we return to the more general question of nature tourism, in the next section, we describe in depth how the lack of density and coordination has become a problem for the sustainability of Norwegian cabin tourism. Then we review the literature which describes life at the cabin as romantic, striving for an alternative from modern urban life. We confront these accounts with descriptions of cabins as just as embedded in modern everyday life as any other leisure activity. Then we present two concepts, which seek to increase coordination and density of leisure cabins in order to provide a more sustainable alternative to current development patterns: sustainable cabin villages and green mountain resorts. These cases are different in their strategies, sizes and ambitions. We are not presenting them as best practice or as cautionary tales, instead we find them notable for marking more or less cautious departures from the idea of the good life at the cabin as being the opposite of the stress and artificialities of cities. As such they are part of current tendencies which increase coordination and density while seeking to accommodate existing desires and expectations to find untouched nature at the cabin. In the concluding section, we discuss similarities and differences between the cases arguing that findings from the Norwegian case can be generalised to those forms of tourism which seek to provide nature as an experience of radical alterity to modern urban everyday life.

Norwegian cabins between soft and hard ecotourism

Life at Norwegian cabins ('hytte', pl. 'hytter') is closely related to most Norwegians' personal and familial experiences, be it through fond childhood memories, the dream of owning the perfect cabin, or frequent stays whenever possible. Almost 400,000 of these cabins exist and it was estimated that nearly half of the Norwegians have regular access to a cabin.¹ Cabins come in various sizes and forms; they are often located within driving distance from population centres and are mostly used for leisure purposes. With unequalled economic growth based on a relatively evenly distributed income from oil and gas, Norwegian cabins have become more numerous and are rapidly closing the gap on the average Norwegian home both in terms of size and fixtures. This has led to a steady rise of energy consumption in this sector, making this area the most dynamic in the Norwegian energy statistics.² Contemporary cabin tourists who visit their cabin more often while staying for shorter time periods cause more emissions through travel and are less likely to develop a close relation to their holiday home and its ecosystem. Furthermore, cabins with improved standards put a strain on local ecosystems because they demand the extension of grid infrastructures.

In the terms suggested by Weaver (2005), one way of describing this trend is as a shift from harder to softer forms of cabin tourism. In hard ecotourism, smaller numbers of visitors pay for prolonged visits because of a strong commitment to the destination's unique traits, whereas soft ecotourism is characterised by more tourists who stay for shorter visits. Tourism of the latter sort does not have to be unsustainable (Weaver, 2005). However, if it corresponds to a simple intensification of tourism, which is not accompanied by careful coordination and increased density, it can put considerable demand pressures on local communities and ecosystems and exceed their carrying capacity (Vail & Hultkrantz, 2000, p. 240). Unfortunately, this is exactly what has happened in much of the recent cabin development in Norway: shorter and more frequent visits by more people to upgraded cabins which are still as uncoordinated and dispersed in nature as they were in times of their 'hard' usage. In this situation, careful coordination and increased density of cabins deserves a closer look. Ecoresorts, for instance, are able to address a broad spectrum of issues (transport, buildings, activities, etc.) and contain the tourists' effect on the surrounding nature (Ayala, 1995; Weaver, 2005). This, however, presupposes a carefully designed 'master plan' which uses scale effects to make efficient use of sustainable technologies, environmental sponsorship, and eco-packaging (Ayala, 1995, p. 358). In its ideal form, such a 'place product' would include both self-contained resource use and a sustainable exchange with the ecosystem within which it resides:

An ecoresort project will fully subscribe to the strategy of developing a self sustainable property as a closed system, in which 'closed' implies re-use and recycling as well as minimized demand on the destination's non-renewable or

scarce resources. However, the same ecoresort project as the catalyst of a quality ecotourism experience will strive to achieve the greatest possible ‘openness’ between the resort-owned and ‘borrowed’ components of the setting, and to stimulate interaction between the visitor and this setting. (Ayala, 1995, p. 361)

This sustainability within the resort and in the interplay of resort and surroundings has to be understood ‘as a transition, journey or path, rather than an end point or an achievable goal’ (Farrell & Twining-Ward, 2004, p. 275). This includes ‘adaptive management’ both internally and in relation to the outside (Farrell & Twining-Ward, 2004, p. 285).

A more contained, denser, socially more coordinated, less intrusive life at the cabin, which resembles more the image of villages or towns than the individual cabin in the forest, promises to be a more sustainable reaction to recent trends in cabin tourism. The implementation of this new way of experiencing nature for leisure in Norway, however, has to acknowledge cultural and social practices, dynamics, and ideas, which are connected to Norwegian life at the leisure cabin and which expect untouched nature to begin just behind the cottage’s door. It is exactly this tension between the touristic appreciation of pristine nature and ecotourism as a more abstract form of ‘earth-friendliness’ which will interest us in the remainder of this article.

Cabin life as moral narrative and material practice

Research on Norwegian cabin life has generally taken two points of departure: moral narratives of alterity and the embedded nature of cabins in modern life. Moral narratives focus primarily on the ‘escape’ element of a search for alterity from modern everyday life. At the same time, cabin life is embedded in the very same modern everyday life and as such fundamentally shaped by it. The challenge to an understanding of contemporary Norwegian cabin life, thus, is to understand alterity and embedment and how they interact dynamically.

Moral narratives of alterity

Abram (2007, p. 4) noted that Norwegians often assume a strong moralistic authority when talking about what cabins are and what they should or should not be. This moral narrative, which is often reproduced in research on cabins, describes cabins as simple, family-owned wooden cabins without connection to public utilities and with very basic equipment (Abram, 2007, p. 4, 10). The interiors are aesthetic according to Abram (2007) (here she is taking over the narrator role from ‘the Norwegians’) and can be ‘astonishingly similar’ in their ‘charming rusticity’ (p. 4; see also Grimstad & Lyngø, 1993, p. 52). Accounts reproducing the moral narrative often note that a special set of activities is

to be carried out at this imaginary cabin. Here practices dominate which in earlier times were necessary to survive in Norwegian nature, such as hiking, skiing, berry and mushroom collecting, and in some cases hunting (Abram, 2007, pp. 8–9; Grimstad & Lyngø, 1993, p. 53).

A similar description of a fairly homogeneous Norwegian cabin life can be found in Ling, Julsrud, and Krogh's (1997) analysis of mobile phone use in Norwegian cabins. In strong contrast to the 'intruding' mobile communication, they present an image of an ideal life at the cabin, in which nature is 'something in which one physically immerses oneself', in some cases even reaching a 'communion with nature' (Ling et al., 1997, p. 4).

A common way of summarising the moral narrative about the ideal Norwegian cabin is as somehow residing outside modernity. Kaltenborn, for instance, states that

while the welfare and material well-being of everyday life (home > and work) increases, a large part of the population increasingly seeks simpler life forms through recreation home use in natural surroundings. (1998, p. 121)

In this sense, holidays at the cabin are seen as a 'vacation from modernity' (Kaltenborn, 1998, p. 124).

This moral narrative is located within the idea of a unique Norwegian national character which is reproduced at the cottage. The return to an imagined pre-modern state with its close relation to nature and the respective set-off activities (hunting, gathering, etc.) binds the elements of the moral narrative loosely together.

However, in the same way, as Norwegian cottage tourists are clearly part of a globalised economy and culture, contemporary cabin life obviously is 'as much a product of daily life and normative domesticity as it is a product of its escape' (Garvey, 2008, 218). Kaltenborn (1998, p. 133) also acknowledges this when he observes that increased mobility – a result of modernisation processes – enables more frequent visits and thus changes what it means to be at the cabin.

Cabins as embedded in modern everyday life

The embedment of cabin life in modern everyday life instead of alterity is taken as the point of departure in Arnesen and Skjeggedal's (2003) discussion of recent changes in Norwegian cabin tourism. They see the establishment of a new 'leisure-structure', which they conceive parallel to the better-known material and geographic structures of work. According to them, these new structures within which Norwegian leisure time is spent are characterised by an extension of the cabins' user base better standards, and new ambitions concerning identity construction via leisure activities. This perspective treats cabin life as just another leisure activity, which is subject to the same overarching trends as

any other form of leisure travel, such as increasingly volatile and globalised labour markets, the escalated ageing of developed societies, changing national and regional identities, and new values regarding life and work (Williams & Michael Hall, 2000).

According to the literature discussed so far two themes seem to play an important role in these dynamics: nature and leisure.

Nature

In his study of cabins on a Norwegian island, Krogh (1995) distinguishes three kinds of ‘landscaping’, a term he uses to describe the process in which the ‘landscape’ is constructed out of nature, both materially and imaginarily (p. 2). In ethnologies of pre-modern societies he finds ‘close contact with the natural environment’ (p. 11, our translation). In modern societies, according to his reading of Giddens, people are freed from close bonds to nature, leading to a ‘multi-local multi-identity’ (p. 19, our translation). In the postmodern landscape, the landscape is based on Urry’s ‘tourist gaze’: a disengaged and relativistic play with signs is added as a mode of landscaping (Krogh, 1995, pp. 21–22). Cabins in this scheme are located in pockets of the pre-modern engagement with nature within a modern or post-modern world. Krogh (1995), in line with Garvey (2008) and Kaltenborn et al. (2005), finds in his interviews with cabin owners and locals a description of life in nature, which is in sharp contrast to other sites where they work or live (p. 17). This alterity of a life closer to and in practical engagement with nature is a reoccurring theme in descriptions of imaginations connected to Norwegian cabins.

Carrier (2003) in a critique of dualistic approaches polarising between proximity and distance to nature rightly points out that practical interaction and distanced gaze, these two extremes, are an artificial construction. There is no reason why life at the cabin should not show traits of practical engagement with nature, modern disentanglement from nature, and post-modern gaze at nature at the same time. On the level of the moral narrative, however, practical immersion in nature is imperative for every cabin tourist.

Leisure

The theme of alterity is present as well when cabins are seen as a place of leisure. While leisure may be thought of as the opposite of work, the sphere in one does what one wants, it is clear that work and leisure are in a close mutual relationship (Carrington, 2008). Lefebvre’s (1991) classical interpretation of leisure as the critique of everyday life comes closest to how activities at the cabin are presented in the meta-narrative of cabins as ‘vacation from modernity’. Lefebvre describes this critique of everyday life as intrinsic to capitalism. According to him, an ‘ideology, and a technicity, and a technocracy of relaxation’ (quoted by

Highmore, 2002, p. 229) emerges, which reacts on everything which makes work unpleasant: anxiety, worry, and preoccupation. In their quantitative study of cabin life, Kaltenborn et al. (2005) base their exploration of ‘feelings when you are at your cabin’ on the concept of ‘mental restoration’ in direct opposition to work. And indeed, when asked directly to compare cabin life and work life, respondents state that cabin life is easier, cozier, less challenging, funnier, less dramatic, and more relaxing than life at work (Kaltenborn et al., 2005, p. 26). Whether these respondents reproduce the moral narrative and how far these judgements reflect their actual cabin holidays must remain open.

Several observers (e.g. Kaltenborn, 1998) note that Norwegian life at the cabin is filled with renovating, extending, and redecorating the cabin, as an infinite activity. In this way, cabin life is remarkably similar to how Chaplin (1999) describes the activities of British second-home owners in France. In her words, they enjoy an ‘almost pre-industrial relationship between production and consumption, in which the divisions between work and leisure are blurred’ (Chaplin, 1999, p. 53). This supports that there can be pleasures of escaping modern life searching refuge in ‘almost pre-industrial’ relationships. But she also observed the self-conscious and ‘staged’ character of these activities (1999, p. 45). After all, the subjects interviewed by her were not French farmers, and they were very clear about this. Thus, and in analogy to what was said with respect to cabins’ significance for relations to nature, there is no reason why Norwegians should not mix different forms of activities in their cabins: chopping wood in the morning, collecting berries in the afternoon, and checking emails in the evening. The moral narrative, however, is clearly opposed to activities which remind the tourist too much of life outside the cabin.

Negotiation and conflict

Both with respect to nature and leisure, we have encountered moral narratives which presuppose a pure life at the Norwegian cabin which is defined as ‘the other’ of (post-)modern urban life. We have argued that extreme positions are constructions and that mixing and staging different forms of life are more likely to be encountered. In fact, in her study of energy consumption at Norwegian leisure cabins, Johnsen (2009) has shown how these sometimes strange mixes are a result of debates within families. Moral narratives about the pure Norwegian cabin often play a role within these negotiations, but Johnsen found also other imperatives, such as cleanliness, convenience and comfort, which are well known from studies on energy consumption in domestic settings (Shove, 2003).

Sustainability was not a primary concern for the families who were studied by Johnson and the other cabin researchers quoted here. However, moral narratives, the embedment in everyday life and the families’ negotiations of nature and leisure play an important role within the creation of a sustainable reaction to recent changes in Norwegian cabin tourism. Above all, increased coordina-

tion and density, both a precondition for softer forms of sustainable tourism, are diametrically opposed to the content of moral narratives about leisure and nature at the cabin. Concepts promoting sustainability of the new cabin tourism will have to tie into the families' discussions and negotiations if they want to succeed. How this can be done is an empirical question, which we pose in the next section.

Negotiating sustainable cabin tourism in contemporary Norway: two cases

Softer forms of cabin tourism are already well established in Norway. These developments in the form of cabin villages (Hyttefelt) and mountain resorts (Fjellandsby), however, were not at all driven by the desire to achieve sustainability. Instead, they were promoted by private investors hoping to see large profits and local municipalities which find larger pools of cabins easier to administer. More recently, however, municipalities and developers alike have discovered the green potential of coordinated and denser forms of cabin development. In the following sections, we present two such cases, in which the aim to reduce CO2 emissions during the use of the cottages figured prominently. Sustainable cottage development is still a rather uncommon phenomenon in Norway, and both projects were not in use during the time of the case study. Their presentation is therefore intended to give an impression of how increased density and coordination are pursued within the context of moral narratives which prescribe loneliness in Norwegian wilderness. We base the following on interviews with central actors within the projects⁴ and extensive document study, including the coverage of local newspapers, official documents, and similar sources.

Cabin villages

Mimicking a traditional village, the cabin village Fjellsnaret, some 200 km northwest of Oslo, did succeed in realising an alternative innovative energy strategy for cabins. Its story began in 1992 – around the same time when large cabin villages first appeared around Lillehammer – with four local landowners, who decided to combine their land in a common pool. This meant that possible profits or losses of land development would be shared equally. This move enabled them to act as a strong actor both in relation to the municipality and to business partners. Additionally, it gave the municipality one contact address, which streamlined their routines and which usually is one reason why large private contractors are preferred. Today 10 landowners are organised in the development of the cabin village Fjellsnaret.

The four original owners decided to profile the area as environmentally friendly. The flagship of this engagement was a district heating system (fjernvarmeanlegg)

which is based on heat provided by a local biomass plant fed by locally harvested firewood and which supplies 40 cottages with space and water heating. Additionally, one is using an experimental geothermal energy facility. These technical innovations are accompanied by unusual owner requirements such as a financial obligation of the individual cabin owner to support community investments, such as commonly used cross-country ski tracks.

When the idea was born, the owners started to calculate whether the investment would pay off. They hired a consultant engineer, who concluded that it would not. Nevertheless, the owners decided to pursue their plan further. And so far it seems to have worked out well. Even though the profitability of the system in the long-term routine operation is not yet proved, the investment did pay off very well for the owners who had no problems attracting buyers. The municipality played an important role by supporting the development with long-term credits at good conditions. Additionally, the Norwegian crown prince couple decided to support the green profile of the cabin village by buying one of the cabins.

The success of the project led the owners to extend gradually the environmental focus. In what is dubbed ‘area 2’ (some 70 additional cabins), geothermal energy and heat pumps will be implemented.

At Fjellsnaret, the owners deliberately chose a slow and gradual development of the area. One corner stone of this strategy was their focus on local networks. Local and national suppliers were preferred where possible and the prevalence of close familial and personal links between involved parties is highly visible. Thus, the resulting concentration and coordination of cabins is based on a strategy based on strong local links.

In this case, private owners acted as careful developers relying on strong links including a supportive and patient municipality. The mimicking of traditional village growth allows for energy saving and the use of renewables. For the moment, we therefore conclude that soft cabin tourism with increased density, centralised solutions, and connectedness to grids fares well in all dimensions of sustainability when it borrows elements from traditional villages than from a market-driven urbanisation.

Mountain resorts

As opposed to other countries, mountain resorts are a new trend for developers of leisure cabins in Norway. Like cabin villages, resorts allow for higher degrees of coordination and density and have therefore the same potential for energy savings and other environmental benefits.

A development project which even aims at becoming carbon neutral is located close to Geilo, a little town located 250 km from Oslo and 260 km from Bergen. Geilo’s history as a tourism destination is closely connected to the railway between Bergen and Oslo which was opened already in 1909. Its location close to

the high mountains (reaching 2000 m) attracted high standard mountain hotels from early on. Today it is best known as the ski resort, which attracts mainly visitors who own a cabin there, who stay at one of the local hotels, or who rent apartments and cabins. The tourist infrastructure is already well developed with around 5000 beds, which is roughly double the number of permanent residents.

In 2003, the Geilo mountain resort was built; by the time of our interview 2 years later, the resort had produced exceptional profits for the owners, a local entrepreneur, and two investors from Bergen. At the time of our interview, a large extension project was planned with an ambition to build the first CO₂ neutral mountain resort. The project covered more than 3000 acres with privately owned apartments and cabins, as well as large dwellings with apartments for letting.

The concept which was chosen for the development is called geotourism, which was originally developed by the National Geographic Society. Geotourism is defined as ‘tourism that sustains or enhances the geographical character of a place – its environment, culture, aesthetics, heritage, and the well-being of its residents.’⁵ In a TV interview which was conducted in 2008,⁶ a spokesperson of the Geilo mountain resort presented geotourism as being prominently about the preservation of cultural heritage.

The developers considered several options such as thermal heat, but since the municipality already hosted a pellets factory, pellets were chosen. In 2008, the local newspapers reported that the developers had established cooperation with local energy and renovation enterprises like Hallingdal kraftnett, Hallingdal renovasjon, and Ystekveikja energi in order to contribute to the pellets production. In the same year, the mountain resort founded an energy company, which produces both heat and power based on pellets. The production is planned to be located in the centre of the mountain resort and provide heat for 55,000–60,000 m². Ski lifts will also be driven by electricity generated at this facility. The plans additionally include a cable car which reaches from the main ski area down to the old village’s centre, which would reduce traffic dramatically.

Additional benefits planned for the population of Geilo include a conference centre which can be used as town hall and provide a public swimming pool.

Later in 2009 alluding to the economic downturn, local newspapers⁷ reported that the project work had slowed down and will have to wait for the markets to recover. At this stage, we can therefore only assess the ambitions for the mountain resort, not their realisation or even chance for realisation.

Compared with the cabin village case, several similarities and differences exist. The mountain resort – if realised – will be able to house many more tourists than even the most far-reaching plans for the cabin villages presented above ever were planning to accommodate. Fjellsnaret and Geilo use the same renewable energy source, but a larger scale at the mountain resort makes a profitable operation more likely. On the other hand, the slow, evolutionary development of the

cabin village appears more adequate in terms of adaptive management of the village. Both cases, finally, plan to provide elements which go beyond relaxation and excitement and may entail learning: the focus on cultural specificity within geotourism and the social commitment expected from cabin owners at the cabin village provide impulses in this respect.

Conclusion

It is clear that Norwegian leisure cabins inhabit a special place in the Norwegian soul. Earlier we have described how Norwegianness is preformed in an imagined life close to pristine nature residing outside modernity. With changes in how cabin holidays are actually practiced, however, this version of Norwegian cabin life has become unsustainable in abstract terms of energy consumption and CO2 emissions. This tension between a direct appreciation of nature and a more mediated concern for the environment is by no means exclusive to the Norwegian case. Moral narratives about a better, simpler life closer to untouched nature as they were described for the ideal Norwegian cabin, have accompanied industrialisation since its beginnings wherever it took hold (Morton, 2007).

We have opened this text claiming that Norwegian cabin tourism can learn from coordination and density which is emblematically represented by the urban jungle of New York City. But what if a New Yorker longs for a holiday, simple refuge in preferably untouched nature? How can coordination and density be provided to an increasing number of tourists without destroying the alterity which characterises destinations which provide elements of a ‘vacation from modernity’?

We have presented two cases in which coordination and density were increased in order to accommodate a softer form of ecotourism. Both projects used their ecological profile actively to avert the impression that coordinated cabin development is preventing the tourists from experiencing pristine nature. In the case of the mountain resort, a holistic concept of sustainable tourism (geotourism) was imported (from National Geographic) to build up green credibility. Representing a harder approach (fewer beds, fewer tourists), the cabin village Fjellsnaret was not forced to produce as much external proof for its ecological commitment. It relied on a home-grown version of green tourism, which was slowly and gradually developed resembling more closely the ‘adaptive management’ described by Farrell and Twining-Ward (2004).

This first difference – holistic concept versus local development – forms the first finding of the present study: In the case study, the holistic, more abstract, and more formalised approach to environmental preservation was connected to a destination development which is more intrusive in terms of actual destruction of nature. Whether this is a necessary relation in the sense that ‘harder’ evidence for greenness is needed in softer ecotourism appears plausible but would have

to be subject to further study.

Despite this difference, both projects left their future users large degrees of unfettered individuality. But they also introduced elements which increased coordination. This was particularly obvious in the way infrastructure was handled. Again, the cabin village took a slightly different approach by distributing costs for common infrastructure between all owners. This coordination is part of the more general impression of the cabin village mimicking a traditional village which would handle common infrastructures in a similar way. The concept of the mountain resort went some steps further. Especially in the case when cabins will be rented out, the demand for coordination will become even stronger and is more likely to be taken care of by specialists. Thus, the resort is taking an approach in which the coordination and densification is increased up to a degree which may indicate a complete departure from the idea of a Norwegian cottage holiday. Compared with this, the village seems to occupy the middle ground, but is only permitting a certain degree of density and coordination.

In both examples, we saw a shift from the ideal typical wilderness cabin to more coordinated and denser forms of cabin tourism. Between the extremes of the isolated Norwegian cabin and the mountain resort as a CO₂ neutral tourist destination which in principle could be built everywhere, the cabin village seemed to negotiate wilderness and environment in a more original way. Introducing organic growth and cautious community organisation may provide answers to the question of how to provide a more sustainable cabin experience which allows for more and shorter stays while remaining true to the traditional cabin ideal.

Acknowledgement

This paper is based on research funded by the Research Council of Norway as part of the FRIMUF programme.

References

- Abram, S. (2007, August 29–31). Movement and nature: Holiday practices and Norwegian ‘Hytter’. In Performing nature workshop 1 (Unpublished paper). Department of Social Anthropology, University of Oslo, Oslo.
- Arnesen, T., & Skjeggedal, T. (2003). Rekreasjon og fritidshus. Spekulasjoner om a ° bo, utmark og urbanitet. PLAN, 2, 10–15.
- Ayala, H. (1995). Ecoresort: A ‘green’ masterplan for the international resort industry. International Journal of Hospitality Management, 14, 351–374.

- Carrier, J.G. (2003). Mind, gaze and engagement: Understanding the environment. *Journal of Material Culture*, 8, 5–23.
- Carrington, B. (2008). Introduction: Rethinking labour and leisure. *Leisure Studies*, 27, 369–374. Chaplin, D. (1999). Consuming work/productive leisure: The consumption patterns of second home environments. *Leisure Studies*, 18, 41–55.
- Farrell, B.H., & Twining-Ward, L. (2004). Reconceptualizing tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31, 274–295.
- Garvey, P. (2008). The Norwegian country cabin and functionalism: A tale of two modernities. *Social Anthropology*, 16, 203–220.
- Grimstad, I., & Lyngø, J. (1993). The pleasure of the holiday cabin. *Ethnologia Scandinavica*, 23, 45–57.
- Highmore, B. (2002). *The everyday life reader*. London: Routledge.
- Johnsen, T. (2009). *Hytteliv og energi. Mellom trivsel, tradisjon og teknologi* (Master thesis). Faculty of History and Philosophy, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim.
- Kaltenborn, B.P. (1998). The alternate home—motives of recreation home use. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift-Norwegian Journal of Geography*, 52, 121–134.
- Kaltenborn, B.P., Bjerke, T., Thrane, C., Andersen, O., Nellemann, C., & Eide, N.E. (2005). *Holdninger til hytteliv og utvikling av hytteområder*. Lillehammer: NINA.
- Krog, E. (1995). *Landskapets fenomenologi* (PhD thesis). Institutt for økonomi og samfunnsfag, Norges landbrukshøgskole Ås.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *Critique of everyday life*. London: Verso.
- Ling, R., Julsrud, T., & Krogh, E. (1997). The Goretex principle: The Hytte and mobile telephones in Norway. In L. Haddon (Ed.), *Communications on the move: The experience of mobile telephony in the 1990s* (COST248 Report, pp. 97–120). Farsta: Telia.
- Mayor's Office of Long-Term Planning and Sustainability. (2007 April). Inventory of New York City greenhouse gas emissions. Retrieved February 11, 2009, from http://www.nyc.gov/html/om/pdf/ccp_report041007.pdf
- Morton, T. (2007). *Ecology without nature: Rethinking environmental aesthetics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Shove, E. (2003). *Comfort, cleanliness and convenience: The social organization of normality*. Oxford: Berg.
- US Energy Information Administration. (2008). *Country analysis Briefs, Norway*. Retrieved September 9, 2010, from <http://www.eia.doe.gov/cabs/Norway/Profile.html>

Vail, D., & Hultkrantz, L. (2000). Property rights and sustainable nature tourism: Adaptation and mal-adaptation in Dalarna (Sweden) and Maine (USA). *Ecological Economics*, 35, 223–242.

Weaver, D.B. (2005). Comprehensive and minimalist dimensions of ecotourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32, 439–455.

Williams, A., & Michael Hall, C. (2000). Tourism and migration: New relationships between production and consumption. *Tourism Geographies*, 2, 5–27.