

Morality, mobility and citizenship: legitimising mobile subjectivities in a contested outdoors

Abstract

In this article, we examine articulations of mobile citizenship produced through the discursive practices of state agencies, drawing in particular on a study of the contested reconfiguration of outdoor citizenship in Norway. Whilst increased participation and diversity in outdoor activities is highly valued and encouraged because of its social benefits, moral landscapes of the outdoors may be part of settling and reinforcing social differences and existing power relations. The article identifies three discursive normativities through which state officials negotiate mobility and outdoor citizenship; Knowledge, skills and socialisation; Engaging (with) nature; Deserving (in) the outdoors. These normativities serve as a basis for a critical discussion of different aspects of outdoor movement, and how social identities interact with the citizen responsibilities assigned to different forms of mobility, such as mountain biking, skiing and walking. The article demonstrates how and why certain outdoor practices, spaces and boundaries of citizenship are both fluid and critically negotiated by the state officials. By bringing together theories of moral landscapes, mobility and citizenship, the article contributes to understandings of the politics of mobility, and particularly the theorisation of how morality works in relation to different dimensions of mobility. It also highlights how the contestation of mobile citizenship is an issue in rural as well as urban realms.

Keywords: citizenship, mobility, moral landscapes, discourse, nature, outdoors, state agency, *friluftsliv*, Norway

1. Introduction

Dogfight in the ski tracks. Dog owners and dog haters crash in the ski tracks. Ski poles become weapons in the war over ruined tracks and dog poo (Dagens Næringsliv, 2011).

In this newspaper report a rather unpleasant picture is painted of outdoor encounters between people at 'war' in the ski tracks in Oslo. The current article addresses contested and changing notions of citizenship underpinning such tensions in the outdoors where participation is just as much morally as legally controlled and regulated. We wish to explore this in terms of mobile citizenship since

increasingly diverse mobile subjectivities seeking to access the outdoors punctuate these contemporary struggles for legitimacy. While mobile subjectivity often is studied through an empirical focus on the performed bodily practices of those doing the moving, we rather look at how subjectivity is discursively mobilised by state actors who play an important part in stabilizing, reinforcing or challenging various normativities of the right way to move in particular spaces. In that respect, the article will shed light on how corporeal mobility is enacted beyond the spaces of the moving body, by examining how the changing role and priorities of the State interface with the unsettling of taken-for-granted imaginaries of the Norwegian outdoors. In short, the article investigates how one group of powerful actors bestows legitimate citizenship upon moving subjects in an increasingly contested outdoors. To understand these reconfigurations of outdoor citizenship, and hence the normativities through which different actors are associated with particular modes of moving, we bring together theories of moral landscapes, mobility and citizenship. This enables us to identify how morality works in spatialised ways, shaping who can move where, and how they are expected to do it.

Norwegian outdoor life culture, or *friluftsliv*, is legally backed in *Friluftsloven*, the Act Relating to Outdoor Recreation, first passed in 1957. *Allemannsretten*, the Public Right of Access, which is folded into *Friluftsloven*, grants all citizens the right to access most areas in the country whenever they wish to. However, the details of legitimate outdoor practices are entangled in extra-legal social and cultural processes, and in consequence, the idea of outdoor citizenship implies there are certain context-specific requirements that need to be fulfilled in order to 'rightfully' move – and indeed move in particular ways – in the Norwegian outdoors. We assert in this article that such extra-legal requirements challenge the understanding of the Norwegian outdoors as easily and equally accessed and open to all.

There are two key issues in current public debates pertaining to diversity, participation and outdoor citizenship in Norway, which we believe to be crucial for shedding light on such extra-legal processes. Firstly, latent demand for using the outdoors and how patterns of outdoor recreation participation do not reflect social diversity of society more broadly. This is generally considered unsatisfactory in the context of persistent problems of physical, mental and social health. There is thus a pronounced policy at present to encourage new groups of people, such as youth and immigrants, to participate in the outdoors (Ministry of the Environment, 2000-2001). This implies that certain groups of people need to cross boundaries and develop orientations to other social groups and cultures with different moral codings (Urry, 2000). Secondly, diversity amongst existing sets of users and how to manage an expanding range of outdoor practices and identities is disputed. We have for example

witnessed heated debates over current uses of the outdoors where tensions between user groups have hit the media; clashes in the ski tracks are only one example. Other reported clashes concern mountain bikers vs. hikers/walkers, motorized activities such as snowmobiling vs. activities based on calm and quietness, and activities like kiting and surfing vs. environmental protection concerns (e.g. related to disturbances of flora and fauna). Such clashes relate to how particular groups and their movements tend to be defined in relation to others, where production of and struggles over symbols, ideas and knowledges are important parts of the (re)configuration of cultural citizenship (Isin and Wood, 1999). In short, individuals and groups are struggling to become rightful citizens of the Norwegian outdoors, where cultural acceptance is the key to legal entitlement.

This leads us to the following critical questions: Does inclusion in the Norwegian outdoors mean that new groups of people should adopt an existing and established *friluftsliv* culture, or alternatively, that the perception of practices and subjectivities deemed legitimate in particular spaces needs to be reconsidered? What defines and should define contemporary Norwegian *friluftsliv*? These questions reflect an increasing pressure put on the State to reposition itself in terms of its role and priorities in relation to outdoor recreation. Broadly speaking, the State not only needs to accommodate the frugal and fit outdoor citizen, but importantly also rural development, commerce, nature protection and outdoor participation by an increasingly heterogeneous set of users (Sandström et al., 2008). This transition, which is linked to the current trends of liberalisation in the public sector (Mydske et al., 2007) as well as rural restructuring and commodification processes (Perkins, 2006), conditions our current exploration of the proposition that participation and diversity in the outdoors are hampered by processes acting to maintain prevailing outdoor values.

Empirically, we draw on nine in-depth, qualitative interviews with *friluftsliv* officials from the former Norwegian Directorate for Nature Management (DN)¹ along with a content analysis of strategically selected policy documents². Our main focus in the analysis is on the role of a key state agency, which is an executive and advisory body for the Ministry of the Environment³, and challenges staff are facing while facilitating inclusion and management of difference in the Norwegian outdoors. Folded into DN's responsibility for outdoor recreation, is managing the right of public access

¹ A merger of the Norwegian Directorate for Nature Management (DN) and the Norwegian Climate and Pollution Agency as of 1 July 2013 means that DN is now known as the Norwegian Environment Agency. In this article we will use the acronym DN because the interviews and the study as a whole were undertaken prior to the merger.

² The interview material was transcribed in full, coded according to the principle of cross-sectional indexing and the analysis was facilitated by the use of computer aided qualitative data analysis (CAQDAS).

³ As of 2013, The Ministry of Climate and Environment.

(*allemannsretten*). Hence, DN plays a crucial role in delineating 'right' from 'wrong' with respect to physical movement, representations and practices in the outdoors. Due to their power in ascribing legal and formal validation to rightful citizens, they are a key stakeholder group that needs to be considered. We acknowledge, of course, that DN is one of many stakeholder groups, such as NGOs, nature conservationists and the media, who also contribute to the shaping of normativities of outdoor citizenship. There is, however, a lack of knowledge about the role of State agencies in the legitimisation of claims to *friluftsliv*.

Analytically we bring to bear the three theoretical stands of moral landscapes, citizenship and mobility, to enhance our understanding of acceptable outdoor movement and interaction. We engage the growing body of literature on citizenship and mobile subjectivity in order to grasp in more detail how outdoor mobility becomes contested and culturally as well as legally contingent (e.g. Cresswell, 2006, 2010; Parker, 2007; Adey, 2010; Cresswell and Merriman, 2011a). Furthermore, we highlight what the concepts of moral landscapes (Setten and Brown, 2009) and mobile citizenship can offer each other in terms of how landscapes, moral judgements, and myriad dimension of movement and mobility, become entangled in struggles over appropriate spatial conduct, and specifically how this can help flesh out and refine Cresswell's 'constellations of mobility' (2010) theoretical framework.

2. Moral landscapes, mobility and citizenship

Citizenship generally refers to the status of being a citizen, i.e. to hold membership in a community and responding and committing to rights, entitlements and obligations which at any time are relevant for any particular community (Chouinard, 2009). Citizenship theory has in large measure moved away from being concerned with 'rights' granted from a state or a bureaucracy, to being increasingly concerned with a moral citizen project "generated through greater emphasis placed on individualization and the concomitant flexibilization of rights claims" (Parker, 2001, 381). This shift in focus to time and place specific social and cultural relationships has consequently become key in order to explain and understand "the practices of power" (Chouinard, 2009, 110) inherent in any citizen's belonging and participation within a community. However, necessary as it is to pay more scholarly attention to more informal assessments of belonging, we argue in this article that there is still a need to consider how State actors are shaping citizenship through their mundane discursive practices.

Citizenship, in the sense of belonging to nation states as well as to other types of spaces, entails management and negotiation of mobility (Adey, 2010; Hindess, 2002). Citizens have thus been defined just as much by the right to move as by the nations or cities to which they belong (Cresswell, 2010).

This analytical 'move' is now generally seen as a key characteristic of the 'mobility turn' within the social sciences, which, in our case, more specifically aids our analysis of a moral discursive landscape of managing and negotiating mobility. Of particular relevance is hence recent research on mobility, which has emphasized what exactly happens on the move, "how mobile time and space is filled with liveliness" (Cresswell and Merriman, 2011b, 4) and how mobility is inscribed with meaning (Cresswell, 2006; see also Sheller and Urry 2006; Urry, 2007).

Crucial for the 'mobility turn' has been the distinction between movement and mobility (Cresswell 2006). Adey (2010, 36) terms this basic separation "abstracted mobility", the simple movement from A to B versus "mobility in context", movement ascribed meaning in the course of "travelling over and through the complex terrain and topology of social spaces". Because movement in itself is not value-laden, nor has any pre-existing meaning, it is argued that mobility is *given* meaning dependent upon the spaces and contexts within which it takes place, and furthermore upon those who are in power to give significance to the different meanings (Cresswell and Merriman, 2011b). Those who have the power to control these spaces have also power over how citizenship entitlements to the same spaces are (re-)configured.

Outdoor activities are mobility in context and often conducted for their own sake. What actually happens on the move, and the meaning inscribed, is the very reason why this movement takes place. Although the basic differentiation between movement and mobility is useful, we need a more fine-grained tool in order to understand how exactly different facets of mobility in the outdoors lead it to become political and contested. Cresswell (2010, 19) provides useful clues here, when suggesting three entangled aspects of mobility: physical movement (getting from one place to another), representation (the shared meaning of movement) and practice (experienced and embodied movement). The politics – the social relations that produce and distribute power – of movement, representations and practice, Cresswell argues, vary historically, including the ways in which they are interrelated. Thus, what are considered as appropriate or morally 'right' mobilities in a given temporal and geographical context also vary. Cresswell conceptualises these changing interrelations as "constellations of mobility", and he argues that different constellations are continuously emerging, dominant and residual. Thinking in terms of constellations of mobility, then, "illustrates the continuation of the past in the present" and, importantly, "helps us avoid the historical amnesia when thinking about and with mobility" (Cresswell, 2010, 27-29). To further delineate the politics of mobility, Cresswell (2010) suggests breaking mobility down into six different aspects of moving, which are why persons or things move, the speed of the movement, the rhythm, what route it takes, the feeling one

gets from the movement and finally when and how it stops. Cresswell argues that each are important in constituting mobile hierarchies and mobile subject identities, and that breaking mobility down into these six aspects provides us analytical purchase on how mobility becomes political.

For the mobile subjects in the outdoors to become mobile outdoor *citizens*, and thereby claim the rights of outdoor access conferred by such citizenship, they depend on how their mobile practices and identities are considered and given meaning by others with reference to particular spaces. Thus, there are crucial links between mobility and citizenship, but the processes where the transition from mobile *subjects* to mobile *citizens* is negotiated are also morally entangled with the landscapes, both materially and metaphorically, in which mobility takes place. Geographers have over the last couple of decades explored the co-constitution of morality and different spaces, places and landscapes (Matless, 1998; Philo, 1991; Setten, 2004). Work on moral geographies and in particular moral landscapes, “draws attention to the way morality underpins the fundamental relationship people have with land; how they see it, how they engage with it, that is, how landscape is used to both prohibit and enable certain behaviour” (Setten and Brown, 2009, 192). Crucially, moral landscapes also point at the naturalisation, and often fixing of certain moral boundaries in and through physical spaces “in the interplay of their material and representational forms and related significations” (ibid., 191).

Against this background, it has been usefully demonstrated how the conduct of particular groups are linked to the ascribed character of particular places, and how assumptions about acceptable modes of conduct affect who can make claim to particular spaces (Cresswell, 1996, 2006; Matless, 1998, 2005). People’s normative practices can also shape places and landscapes (Setten 2004; Setten and Brown, 2009). Boundaries between what is acceptable or not, become particularly visible when transgressed, and hence, this work speaks to issues of diversity and social inclusion, i.e. which subjects and whose ways of moving and sensing are allowed to become associated or disassociated with the outdoors. As symbolic and material landscapes are mobilized, settled and unsettled in relation to people’s engagements with - and ascriptions of meaning to - nature, social differences can be reinforced as well as challenged (Mitchell, 2000; Panelli, 2010). Being in the position of ‘authoring’ landscapes requires legitimate access entitlements, and scholars have highlighted how property rights - such as access rights - can only be successfully enacted by particular individuals, groups or activities if there is moral as well as legal backing for their claim to particular landscapes (Blomley, 2004; Brown, 2007).

Literature on moral landscapes has focused on the moralities of ‘conduct’ in certain landscapes (e.g. Matless, 2005; Setten, 2004). Precisely what this conduct entails might, however, be better

elaborated with reference to emerging insights from the mobilities debate, especially in tracing the details of movement, meaning and experience that inform the practice and judgement of 'conduct', and how it is co-produced with landscapes, rather than just judged against them. Cresswell and Merriman (2011b, 7) note that spaces "have their own grammar which can direct or limit mobility", and that these spaces, or landscapes, produce necessary contexts for the practising of mobility. This underlines a point made by Cresswell (2006, 73), that "human mobility is simultaneously representational and practical" and that "movement of human bodies (...) is never separate from consciousness and representation". Therefore, it is important to understand how mobility is represented and discursively articulated, in order to account for the normativities that both inform and are the result of these processes. Taking this into consideration, alongside the apparent moral assumptions and meanings attached to Norwegian *friluftsliv*, it is important to consider how moral landscapes of the outdoors may work to unsettle and reinforce social differences and existing power relations, and thereby influence the legitimacy and inclusion of different mobile citizen subjects.

In this article, we draw upon insights from the mobilities literature to elaborate the moral landscapes through which mobile subjectivity and citizenship are constituted by Norwegian statutory agency staff. With these civil servants we are tracing one of the threads through which the past continues into the present in conditioning norms of mobility in the outdoors, and how historical *friluftsliv* ideologies relate to current understandings of legitimate outdoor mobilities. Hence we now turn to a short outline of the current role of historically constituted constellations of Norwegian outdoor mobility.

3. *Friluftsliv* the Norwegian way

Current outdoor policies in Norway lean on an understanding and definition of *friluftsliv* as "residency and physical activity in open air during leisure time with the aim of providing change of scenery and nature experiences" (Ministry of the Environment, 2000-2001). There is an outspoken aim to promote simple *friluftsliv* for everybody in their daily life and in harmony with nature. At the core of this aim are non-competitive, non-motorised activities, which take place in nature-like surroundings, emphasising activities that are environmentally friendly and promotes good health.

Legally, this understanding of *friluftsliv* is based in the Act Relating to Outdoor Recreation, which aims to

protect the natural basis for outdoor recreation and to safeguard the public right of access to

and passage through the countryside and the right to spend time there, etc. so that opportunities for outdoor recreation as a leisure activity that is healthy, environmentally sound and gives a sense of well-being are maintained and promoted.

This 'neutral' framing has for decades secured Norwegian citizens a general right and possibility to practice a wide variety of outdoor activities in all types of spaces and at any time.

Socio-culturally, Norwegian *friluftsliv* has been tied to the building of a Norwegian nation and a related national identity during the 18th and 19th centuries (Goksøyr, 1994; Christensen, 1998; Tordsson, 2007; Gurholt, 2008). Influenced by romantic ideas prevalent in Europe throughout the 1800s, nature and landscapes became important national symbols and arenas for physical activity (Ween and Abram, 2012). Polar explorers such as Roald Amundsen and Fridtjof Nansen confirmed Norway as a nation of people close to nature through toil and struggle. Coupled with a Protestant ethic, where work and hardship is more valued than fun and playfulness (Riese and Vorkinn, 2002), a distinct *friluftsliv* culture was shaped as ideal and image of the country.

Contained within this development of *friluftsliv*, two branches can be discerned; first, a branch developed from the rural population's necessary use and utilization of natural resources, and second, a counter-branch emanating from a need within the urban upper class to use nature as an arena for recreation. The latter managed to establish what, eventually, became a systematic national focus on nature protection and environmentalism (Breivik, 1978).

A fundamental trait of Norwegian *friluftsliv* is that it is expected to be 'simple', and it is presented as a 'tradition' that people are, or should be, socialised into. Socialisation, a core concept within social theory, has by several scholars been tied to movement culture and sport in general (e.g. Dietrich, 2002) and to Norwegian *friluftsliv* in particular (Odden, 2008). Socialisation defines processes in which individuals are developing membership in societies through inheriting and taking possession of particular norms, values and customs (Dietrich, 2002; Clausen, 1968). Setten (2004) has demonstrated how landscapes are materially and metaphorically produced through such 'moral memberships'. For *friluftsliv*, Odden (2008) has equally highlighted how socialisation and the transfer of knowledge, skills and values from one generation to the next is vital for the reproduction of established *friluftsliv* practices as well as social relations. The concept of socialisation has become significant in the general *friluftsliv* discourse, but as will be clear, notably more in relation to *friluftsliv* constituted as 'traditional' than new forms of outdoor mobility and subjectivity. Hence, competing moral landscapes are both spatially and temporally produced and struggled over. Furthermore, the

expectations of *friluftsliv* as 'simple' is ideologically founded on a close and character-building relation with nature, and reflected in the official definition of *friluftsliv*. It is equally reflected in the Nordic welfare state's ideal of the 'healthy mind, healthy body' and the related connections between nature, social conditions, working life and health (Alvsvåg et al., 1997). Coupled with a democratic public right of access, we are, however, now faced with critical questions as to whether such democratic legal rights are challenged by rather exclusive normative rights founded in the ideologically based 'simple' *friluftsliv*.

At present, and echoing the two key issues in current *friluftsliv* debates presented in the introduction, the view of *friluftsliv* as 'simple' and 'traditional' is challenged (Flemsæter et al., 2011). Firstly, the dynamics within different outdoor activities, often impelled by younger generations, is changing. New types of activities emerge and old activities find new forms, meeting a demand for other types of experiences, hence contesting the idea of uniformity in outdoor citizenship. Typical examples are rafting, mountain biking, kiting, freeride and sports climbing, which in various ways challenge established constellations and combinations of practices, spaces and subjectivities in the outdoors. Secondly, current goals and measures in public outdoor policies focusing on increased participation, especially among particular, and to a certain degree marginalized, groups such as immigrants, children/youths, and impaired persons. The documented positive effects on health and well-being are the main arguments for focusing on the recruitment of these groups into *friluftsliv* (Ministry of the Environment, 2000-2001). Against this background we observe a pronounced focus from local authorities on facilitating *friluftsliv* in parks, greenbelts and forests in or very close to urban areas. This is a notable departure from the mountains and open country forming an influential part of established *friluftsliv* imaginaries. Both trends are linked to challenges relating to the previously mentioned observations, latent demand and diversity, and together they are key to the exposition in the next section of how *friluftsliv* is conceptualised and negotiated by DN staff and in policy documents.

4. Three normativities of the Norwegian outdoors

In the interviews with DN staff, we have identified three interlinked normativities, which illustrate key tensions emerging with regard to the moral landscapes of the Norwegian outdoors. While being interlinked, they are also competing as part of struggles over what *friluftsliv* is or ought to be.

4.1 Knowledge, skills and socialisation

One of the main messages of the interviewees is that participants in the outdoors do not need to *know*

anything in order to do *friluftsliv*. This reflects principles of inclusion and democracy, while also reflecting that any requirements to bodily enskilment and mastery appear to be taken out of *friluftsliv*:

You have to do it as simple as possible so that most people have the money and possibilities to get out, you can't require certain skills and so on in order to do things. Hence we have lately focused our use of policy instruments at local environments. Accommodate activities close to people's homes.

Such inclusion is generally seen as good, while importantly also being a threat to traditional *friluftsliv*:

You now have a generation of adults who's not grown up with friluftsliv. And their children (...). I: But how do you define friluftsliv (...)? What is it that they have not been brought up with? With walking ... OK. (Laughter). (...) they might, of course, have grown up with friluftsliv in the park, right, when you walk from home. But if they haven't been in the woods or the mountains ... You need more skills to move around there. So it's wrong to say that they haven't grown up with friluftsliv.

Knowledge, skills and socialisation, and the lamented 'loss' or writing out of these requirements, are particularly pertinent when related to the issue of safety in the outdoors:

People make these stupid appointments about phoning home. And then they don't, and you think they're dead. And you let them loose in the middle of the forest, and they're not even able to find their way home. (...) You could say that if you've grown up with outdoor life in the city, you should actually continue to stay there [in the city]. If you then wish to expand your outdoor life, you need somehow to accept that you need to start from scratch.

It is evident that due to sometimes taken-for-granted perceptions of pre-requisite knowledge and skills, moral boundings of citizen entitlement might become limited to particular spaces, which means that some subjectivities are not actually entitled to access all outdoor spaces after all, even though that is legally scripted and valorised in the Norwegian *friluftsliv* culture.

Interviewees argue that socialisation into *friluftsliv*, which used to be achieved through transfer of knowledge through practice from one generation to another, now needs to be taken care

of by for example schools, kindergartens and NGOs. This has implications for how DN works to stimulate *friluftsliv*, i.e. DN is forced to reflect on which NGOs they ought to support in order to promote a certain type of socialisation; it seems they feel only able to support socialisation into a 'traditional' model of *friluftsliv*. In fact, few interviewees mentioned entrances into *friluftsliv* through school, kindergarten, friends or media without us asking specifically about them. On a question about "new" forms of *friluftsliv* and that young people might prefer activities other than the more established ones, an interviewee suggested that these are "often exclusive activities" that require both particular skills and resources, hence such activities become counter-activities to those seen as more democratic and to a lesser extent dependent on financial means. Furthermore, we also see how 'mastery' is mobilised in both positive and negative ways according to what activities are addressed. Mastery is used in rather negative terms related to egocentrism and self-fulfilment when addressing "new forms of outdoor activities" like mountain biking, kiting and sports climbing often "preferred by young people". Mastery is given positive connotations when referring to 'traditional' activities like hiking and fishing in the mountains.

Importantly, then, skills are not only an issue relating to participation in *friluftsliv* itself, but have become crucial to *friluftsliv* management. Being an active *friluftsliv* participant as well as a manager influences both positions: "Today's focus on local environments or peri-urban areas changes which competence is needed in the management sector" and that "real inclusion demands that different activities are acknowledged [by the management]". This illustrates that different understandings and definitions of *friluftsliv* are polarised, i.e. which skills, knowledges or socialisation processes are required or seen as 'right', 'important', 'valuable' or 'appropriate', are context-specific. Stating that "all [activities] have their own areas", further reveals that there is also interplay between what is demanded of different outdoor spaces and what is deemed appropriate mobile citizenship to be performed in them:

This is perhaps about liking or not liking each other's activities. And then it is a discussion of whether we [DN] should, for example in a National Park, say that one user has priority over the other, when the effects on the natural environment are the same. This is difficult.... The number of conflicts between users seems to increase, but I think the social wear-and-tear comes before the wear-and-tear on the terrain.

The DN interviewees seem to maintain that to become an appropriate mobile citizen it is required to

be knowledgeable *enough* in order to enact the landscape in acceptable ways (e.g. as a birdwatching place or a mountain biking place). If certain outdoor subjectivities 'fail' to do so, there are three options: (1) teach skills in alignment with the original vision; (2) disallow particular subjectivities in those spaces; or (3) allow landscapes to be reproduced differently from previously. The valuations of these three options are fundamental in the processes of negotiating claims to the outdoors, and importantly, *which* outdoors.

4.2 Engaging with nature

A second, and related, normativity concerns how people engage with nature through *friluftsliv*. *Friluftsliv* is generally expected to be carried out close to nature, entailing cognitive experiences gained by just being in nature combined with an element of physical activity. What counts as 'nature' is, however, increasingly contested, and there is a huge difference between the understandings of nature in the cultural practices construed as 'traditional' *friluftsliv* and how it is understood, or at least described, in current official policy documents. There is a general broadening in the understanding of 'nature' from remote wilderness to places such as urban parks. This is evident in the Ministry's phrase 'nature-like' (Ministry of the Environment, 2000-2001). A double challenge hence surfaces: *friluftsliv* participants as well as managers are stretching *what* actually counts as nature, as well as *how* people ought to engage with this nature. This quote illustrates especially the first point:

The definition of friluftsliv includes outdoor life in parks. It's [White paper on friluftsliv] just referring to nature-like surroundings. It just takes a few trees, right. You can still experience nature, if a bird passes. It takes very little, really, if you scrutinize the definition. And it's the definition that guides us, right, official definitions and official politics. (...) Lots of people think that outdoor life takes place in the wild. So there's a challenge in relation to making people understand that you're also doing friluftsliv while walking in the park.

Several of the interviewees emphasized that each of us, participants and managers, have our own subjective frame of reference regarding *friluftsliv*, which is challenged when DN is stretching the content of established notions in order to encourage more people to participate and be physically active. Consequently, by stretching *how* and *where* *friluftsliv* can and should take place, the idea of *who* can do it is also stretched. Consequently, who is seen as legitimate mobile subjects in the outdoors becomes a matter of contestation. Most encounters between different outdoor identities and

practices unfold without issue, but as we saw conveyed in the quote at the outset, some *friluftsliv* participants are willing to go to extremes in demonstrating what they do not find to be legitimate behaviour. This is also observed among DN staff:

In the peri-urban areas in Trondheim, where some participants act like the police, chasing and yelling and waving their ski poles, I don't get it.

It seems that previously taken-for-granted norms of behaviour now require more active enforcement by fellow citizens: an increased scope for disagreement on who is an 'acceptable citizen' and who is a 'deviant' is observed. A good illustration of this is a boundary drawn between *friluftsliv* and sports, even though this boundary is also blurred as new activities and types of experiences emerge: "It was *friluftsliv* when you focused on experiencing nature. If you ran too quickly or didn't notice what was going on around you, then it was sport", according to one interviewee. This also illustrates how *friluftsliv* managers take different sensory engagements with nature up for moral evaluation, as here with different ways of prioritising visual and kinaesthetic ways of sensing landscapes. It is often said in public documents and media, as well as by our interviewees, that it is first and foremost youth who engage with nature through new or less traditional activities and experiences (Ministry of the Environment, 2000-2001). This is interesting given that 'new', often represented as adrenalin-seeking activities are frequently seen to represent a threat to 'traditional' engagement with nature.

A closely related issue concerning alleged (dis)engagements with nature is the contested issue of human and wildlife disturbance. While some disturbances are tangible and measurable, others are more elusive and based on emotional and indeed moral valuations of what belongs or not. This quote illustrates very nicely how (dis)engagements in the outdoors produce conflicting and morally charged ideas about what it means to be an outdoor citizen:

Maybe not so much on a bike, but certainly kiting and that stuff, that you move so quick that you might risk... The risk of frightening both humans and animals is real. So there are reasons for saying no to that. (...) And you can philosophize yourself into the thing about disturbing [someone]. If I experience that that cyclist is disturbing my (...) friluftsliv (...) I don't think he should be there. These things should be taken seriously. (...) Should that be key to deciding new ways of using nature? (...) It's certainly something to bear in mind when relating to new activities and management of areas.... You shouldn't ridicule people's experiences (...) You are

confronted with difficult decisions, right. How much attention you should pay to these attitudes about how life should be.

What actually counts as nature in this context becomes basically a matter of definition. This raises issues of how subjects are expected to relate to nature across different outdoor spaces, and likewise the challenge of how appropriate citizen performances can relate seamlessly across them. If some outdoor natures are deemed more 'proper' or 'real' than others, this has implications for *who* can perform appropriate outdoor citizenship where. What counts as 'nature', and thus appropriate ways of moving within it, is deeply related to landscape and morality, and it seems that new subjectivities of outdoor recreation have challenged and expanded the definitions of the outdoors as well as nature: "You can still experience nature, if a bird passes... it takes very little, really", to paraphrase an interviewee. These are complicated notions of ideal and acceptable mobile citizenship, which brings us to the third normativity.

4.3 Deserving (in) the outdoors

There is strong evidence in the empirical material that notions of the individual hiker or cross country skier out in the forests or mountains are deeply rooted in the Norwegian *friluftsliv* culture. A fundamental aspect incorporated into these notions is the idea of sweating and striving to reach and deserve what we aim for: "... going out, sweating and reaching a summit to demonstrate that you have the skill ..." (interviewee). But the necessity of sweating to gain outdoor experiences might be about to change along with wider societal changes: "I think many people are happy with going to town, walking around. ... Not everybody today is made for sweating every day".

How to "deserve" the outdoors is to a large extent expressed through what kinds of materialities and technologies are accepted as parts of outdoor activities. Interviewees tend to think that some materialities and technologies make it 'too easy'. Many activities and their related materialities and technologies are therefore assessed through the interviewees' moral lenses in terms of what tools are acceptable or not when moving in the outdoors. Motorized vehicles and mountain bikes are some of the most contested technologies in the Norwegian outdoors, although motorized mobility in the outdoors, such as using snowmobile or ATV, is simply taken out of the official definition of *friluftsliv*. We do, however, also encounter contradictions, for example when one of the interviewees states that "there is room for everybody", followed by counter-reflections over the discrepancies between the 'official version' of *friluftsliv* and personal moral assessments of

appropriate and inappropriate movement in the outdoors:

Of course I think the hiker belongs there [in the mountains] rather than the cyclist. [Laughing]. It's related to what you're used to. In the mountains you walk, and you're quiet and careful. (...) Motorised traffic ... you use noise as an argument, right. And that's fair enough. But what if the snowmobile was quiet? I will argue that it's still disturbing my outdoor life. But then it's the fact that I don't think it belongs there. I don't think it should be that easy to get there [to the mountains]. There shouldn't be that many people there. Those who are there should walk. [Laughing].

These reflections are followed up in this way:

By driving fast they [snowmobiles] also make more noise. But they also come across as something different. They come across as an unnecessary toy. (...) The only reason why I'm forced to listen to them is because they [people driving] are allowed to play. I have a different attitude towards somebody bringing firewood to their cabin on a snowmobile. (...) Play is allowed, but there is something about the degree to which you bother other people whilst playing.

When people are doing *friluftsliv* they most often, in one way or another, also disturb nature in terms of leaving traces resulting from their activities. In the first quote below it is demonstrated which traces, materialities and technologies are more acceptable than others, whilst the second quote demonstrates that there might not be such a big difference:

*Why is it so much more terrible that a path is made by bikes than by feet? You can philosophise over that. But then the conservative attitude surfaces again. That everybody ... who's slightly older and have been doing *friluftsliv* for a long time, we think that people ought to walk. 'Is it really necessary to cycle'?*

I don't really see the danger of seeing traces after wheels, because some people do think that that is much worse than seeing traces after feet, and I can't really see the difference.

In sum, there appears to be normativities pertaining to which subjectivities 'deserve' to use and experience the landscapes of the Norwegian outdoors, and that these valuations are partly based on notions of what is more or less 'worthy' ways of moving through these landscapes and what are appropriate and inappropriate technologies to employ.

5. The (de-)legitimation of different mobile subjectivities – becoming an outdoor citizen

The empirical material demonstrates, to borrow Cresswell's (2006, 71) words, that "forms of 'correct' and 'appropriate' movement are produced in relation to 'inappropriate' forms of movement through a complicated representational process". We will now address in more detail the possible implications of the three normativities identified by paying more detailed attention to dimensions of mobility and to the landscapes in which mobility takes place. Cresswell's (2010) previously mentioned six aspects of moving – why a person or a thing *start* to move; the *speed* in which a person or a thing move; in what *rhythm* a person or a thing move; what *route* it takes; the *feeling* of movement; and when and how movement *stops* – will frame our discussion as we look deeper into how different aspects of mobility pertaining to acceptable conduct in the outdoors are brought forward and morally assessed by the DN staff.

The reconfiguration of outdoor citizenship is shown to depend on how the *purposes* for movement in the outdoors are negotiated as appropriate or inappropriate, and therefore legitimate. This resonates with Cresswell's (2010) identification of motive force as important to the politics of mobility. This was exemplified most clearly by the contingency of the disruption of a *friluftsliv* experience by the noise of a snowmobile on whether the purpose associated with that snowmobile's movement was perceived as for pleasure or subsistence. But there were also other ways in which past constellations of mobility (e.g. slow, simple, pedestrian, physical hardship) were heavily influencing understandings and practices of changing purposes at present, e.g. the increasingly technologized, fast and too comfortable ways of moving.

Crucial for these past constellations of outdoor mobility and the experience of it, were peace, quiet and contemplation, which some people feel is threatened by the speed with which outdoor recreation movement takes place. The meaning ascribed to mobility is thus influenced by velocity, and it is therefore relevant to consider how moral judgements are made relating to the speed of things. *Friluftsliv* is traditionally constituted as activities taking place at slow speed. Technologies such as bikes, kites or snowmobiles, which speed up movement, tend to be associated with negatively loaded terms such as exclusivity and noise, including disengagement with nature. There appears to be a limit, both

physically and symbolically, related to how fast it is acceptable to move in order to experience nature, including the disruption of other people's *friluftsliv*. That said, it is clearly stated in documents as well as in the interviews, that outdoor activities should have an element of physical exercise – you should sweat a bit – so there is also a possibility of moving too slow, as might be the case e.g. in urban parks.

As regards the normativity we termed 'engaging (with) nature', speed also seems to be deeply entangled with the moralities of what 'counts' as an appropriate way to engage the senses in/with nature. 'Slow' engagements through contemplation and gazing at the landscape from viewpoints are often seen to stand in opposition to 'fast' kinaesthetic engagements through interactions with nature on a surfboard or a mountain bike. Crucial too is the spatiality of these normativities, i.e. moralities of speed are reflected in the outdoor landscapes. Interviewees convey that while slow speed is related to the ideal of struggling to 'deserve nature', high speed is related to play and fun. This echoes Brown's (2012) findings from a study in the Scottish outdoors, which also demonstrates that there appears to be a morality connected to encounters between fast and slow moving subjects in shared spaces, most often regulated through informal norms. This relates directly to a point already made by a DN interviewee, that the speed of movement is key to tensions between bikers and walkers. Even though DN recognizes the importance of regulating for this tension, it is rather The Norwegian mountain biking organisation⁴ which has proactively formulated so-called *stivettregler*, i.e. normative rules of conduct for mountain bikers, calling on fast moving mountain bikers to give way for slow moving walkers.

Implementing such normative rules can be seen as an attempt to synchronise movement along the routes it takes place, as different speeds of mobility on the same route can disrupt the rhythms produced by the different activities. The importance of rhythm to everyday mobility is highlighted both by Cresswell (2010) and Lefebvre (2013), and the key issue here pertaining to the politics and moralities of the outdoors is which, and therefore whose, rhythms are deemed most appropriate in particular spaces. Different activities have their own rhythms or repetitive movements that become an embodied part of the *friluftsliv* experience, directly like in walking, cycling and canoeing and indirectly in terms of how different activities systematically interact with the surroundings where for example the sounds, views, smells and weather conditions are part of the experience. If different rhythms are taken into account when choreographing encounter in the outdoors (cf. Brown, 2012), the rhythms can be synchronised in a pattern of movement embracing different activities and different rhythms. Alternatively, activities with different speeds or other rhythms might be separated into designated routes or areas. The discussion about sharing space versus zoning it between different modes of

⁴ *Norsk Organisasjon for Terrengsykling* - NOTS

mobility is paramount to the moral politics of outdoor citizenship. Zoning of activities has by some been held as vital in order to eliminate problematic encounters between different groups of users (e.g. Manning, 2011). However, DN staff argue that zoning might threaten the principle of the public right of access, *allemannsretten*, and undermine the responsibility for taking other users and competing interests into account, which is the main principle upon which *allemannsretten* rests.

Rhythm is, however, not only a basic aspect of the different outdoor activities and in the encounters between them, *friluftsliv* in itself might also be argued to have its own 'beat'. And to play along you have to learn that beat – "*there are certain skills you need*", according to some of the interviewees, which together make up a model or pattern that is repeatable and thereby makes it possible to recreate the *friluftsliv* experience. The first normativity identified in the material (knowledge, skills and socialisation) demonstrated issues pertaining to speed and rhythm well in terms of the apparent requirements of being knowledgeable enough to use the outdoors in acceptable ways.

In the wake of the recent and growing tendency for more and more mountain bikers and hikers to use the same trails, we are also confronted by debates about which activities leaves the most damaging traces and how they affect both nature and the experiences of other participants (Setten and Brown 2013). Most recreationists in Norway move along existing routes such as roads, tracks and trails (Strand et al., 2011), and these often designated routes have their own norms of conduct producing 'correct' mobilities. However, what kinds of disturbances or traces are acceptable is clearly contested (Brown, forthcoming). Trails and paths made by, or prepared for, hikers or cross-country skiers are obvious examples of what is commonly looked upon as acceptable traces from a positive and healthy activity. The challenging of such norms regarding engagements with nature is demonstrated several places in the empirical material, for example through arguments dealing with conflicts between different outdoor users in the peri-urban forests: in winter when walking in or next to the ski tracks without skis or with dogs may, according to some, ruin the tracks. Similarly in summer, when cycling along tracks "made for walking" might ruin the trails or disturb others' experiences. Sharing the same route, or spaces, across mobile difference is hence challenging. Some interviewees assert, however, that the conflicts are to a large extent mental constructs rather than based on actual encounters in the field, and that it is not necessarily the actual damage on the trails that is the root of the problem. It is rather the anticipation of encounters with mobile subjects not felt to be moving 'correctly'. So, "It's the feelings about things which cause conflicts. It's no more scientific than that", as one interviewee stated. Either way, the patterns of use and user groups, and the facilitation of co-existence within them, seem to be a key management issue for DN. This has implications for the

material spaces, for example how trails, tracks and access points of *friluftsliv* landscapes are prepared and maintained, as well as the configuration of citizenship to these spaces, for example by excluding activities typically practiced by certain social groups, such as youths, from the management of these landscapes.

A crucial aspect of *friluftsliv* is thus the experiences of it, or the *feeling* (Cresswell, 2010). Experiences come across strongly in the negotiations over what it takes to be a legitimate outdoor citizen, which highlights the key role of normative boundaries in the outdoors (cf. Brown, 2012). Echoing literature on Norwegian *friluftsliv* history, the interviewees demonstrated that outdoor recreation in Norway centres around experiential aspects, actualising notions of 'right' and 'wrong' feelings. These are often expressed through dichotomies such as slow-fast, quiet-noise, hard-easy, play-seriousness and pleasure-pain, where it is argued that one is somewhat morally superior to the other. This reflects the literature on the geographies of morality and mobility (e.g. Matless, 2005; Cresswell and Merriman, 2011a). For example when noisy snowmobiles spoil someone's contemplative experiences dependent on peace and quiet, but also when the same snowmobiles are looked at as an "unnecessary toy" which makes movement in the outdoors "fun" and too "easy". The same arguments are used towards mountain bikers who "don't belong" or disturb other people's experiences by moving "too fast" or leaving unacceptable marks on the trails. Again, we recognize a contested 'naturalisation' of moral boundaries that trouble established *friluftsliv* imaginaries through which such boundaries are enacted, and part of the contestation is about who shall be given "the cultural authority" to define the nature of certain landscapes (Matless, 2005, 142) .

We have already mentioned how *friluftsliv* spaces and routes have their own morality pertaining to acceptable ways of moving and possibilities of sharing spaces and routes between activities and identities. The morality of routes also demonstrates how the three normativities are interconnected. Through the normativities of both how to engage with nature and how to deserve nature, the empirical material addresses the question of which are acceptable routes to be part of *friluftsliv* spaces. Routes are hence moral landscapes, both materially and symbolically: While walking trails in the mountains or forests are taken for granted as integrated parts of *friluftsliv* culture, other routes are more contested. Interviewees highlighted urban parks, green-belts and paved trails between neighbourhoods as part of the all-embracing *friluftsliv* definition, whilst also struggling to incorporate these routes of movement when talking about *friluftsliv* knowledge, skills and socialisation as well as nature engagements.

The emerging theme of 'deserving' in the outdoors can be understood as a moral bounding in

relation to the 'friction' dimension of mobility highlighted by Cresswell (2010) – in that worthy forms of recreation according to established constellations of mobility have to overcome a certain degree of friction, in this case hardship and hard work, in order to deserve their citizen entitlement. However, it clearly has to be the 'right' kind of friction, e.g. the sweat of walking up a big hill rather than mountain biking up it. Some of the frictions in traditional *friluftsliv*, such as too difficult terrain for a bicycle, are met by new technologies and activities, while other frictions, by some looked at as negative factors for *friluftsliv*, such as heavy winds and wild river streams, are by others utilized as vital elements of 'new' activities such as kiting and river rafting. 'New' activities, then, force a re-consideration of the politics of frictions, including a reevaluation of the different forms of mastery and skill needed.

Summing up this section, the on-going reconfigurations of outdoor citizenship are, firstly, entangled in morality in terms of the valorisations of different practices. Yet, and secondly, the assessments of 'right' and 'wrong' practices are strongly influenced by the landscapes with which the practices are associated (and whether urban or rural, park, forest or mountain all equally count as the 'nature' *friluftsliv* sets out to engage). Notions of acceptable and appropriate mobile citizenship are fundamental to whether these spaces becomes constituted as sharable, and thus efforts are made to find ways of harmonising different ways of moving and experiencing movement. Landscape becomes a tool for those who are in power to give significance to different meanings of mobile citizenship. This complies with points scholars have made about the co-constitution of spaces and moralities (Matless, 1998, 2005; Philo, 1991; Setten, 2004). Moreover, by bringing more detailed dimensions of mobility to bear and breaking down mobility into different aspects of movement as highlighted by Cresswell (2010), we improve our understanding of how moral landscapes are contested and transformed, and arrive at a critical understanding of the negotiations of Norwegian outdoor citizenship as established constellations of mobility come increasingly under strain.

6. Morality, mobility and citizenship in the Norwegian outdoors

We find evidence of an unsettling of established moral landscapes of mobile citizenship in Norwegian outdoor recreation. This reconfiguration of outdoor citizenship is negotiated by DN as a State actor. Emerging from their discursive practices are three key interconnected normativities important to the accomplishment of mobile citizenship belonging and entitlement: knowledges and skills, and how people are socialised into these; engaging with nature, and crucially which natures; and, which ways of moving count as deserving (in) the outdoors. Intersecting with these, the analysis underlines how examinations of moral landscapes can fruitfully include interrogations of the six

detailed dimensions of the politics of mobility identified by Cresswell (2010). This includes highlighting important factors further situating and cross-cutting these such as purpose (from subsistence to frivolity), physicality, hardship, simplicity, seriousness, technological enrolments, traces left behind in the landscape, and sensory hierarchies (in both register and content, e.g. that one prioritises the sense of hearing AND what one hears). Crucially, these aspects of mobility did normative work according to how they were discursively situated by the DN staff in relation to particular people and landscapes. Since some outdoor natures and some outdoor activities, are valorised over others, this also matter for *who* in turn are considered to have the most legitimate claims to the outdoors, and hence to outdoor citizenship.

The extra-legal regulation of outdoor recreation thus seems to be in tension with an understanding of the Norwegian outdoors as easily and equally accessed and open to all. DN has the challenge of how to manage the evolving diversity of mobile subjects, whilst encouraging further social and cultural diversity in participation. This includes taking a position (wittingly or otherwise) on whether inclusion in the Norwegian outdoors means that new groups of people should adopt an existing and established *friluftsliv* culture and spatiality, or whether interweaving notions of the mobilities, subjectivities and natures deemed a legitimate part of *friluftsliv* need to be reworked. DN is hence faced with the challenge of accommodating competing 'moral memberships', spatially as well we temporally.

As we have seen, DN helps managing the co-existence of subjects moving with different purposes, speeds, rhythms and sensory hierarchies, where users sometimes seek similar routes even if the experience of them they seek diverges significantly. By analysing and making connections between the different aspects of mobility DN staff identify as important in bounding appropriate conduct in Norwegian *friluftsliv*, we have elaborated some of the moral contours struggled over in delineating who can rightfully stake a claim to the various outdoors. Although contemporary citizenship scholarship is moving away from understandings of citizen regulation as formally delineated by State rights and responsibilities and towards normative contours of belonging (Isin and Wood, 1999; Parker 2006, 2007; Chouinard, 2009), there is still a need to consider State actors as exerting power through such normative contours.

By connecting theories of moral landscapes (Setten and Brown, 2009), mobility (e.g. Cresswell, 2006, 2010; Adey, 2010; Cresswell and Merriman, 2011b) and citizenship (e.g. Isin and Wood, 1999; Parker, 2001, 2006; Chouinard, 2009), we are better able to understand the contested moralities of (outdoor) mobility, and by implication, the negotiations of mobile (outdoor) citizenship. Work on moral

landscapes has theorised how notions of 'conduct' and 'practice' become entangled in moral assessments of 'good'/'bad', 'im/proper', and so on (e.g. Philo, 1991; Matless, 1998, 2005; Setten, 2004). We assert that drawing on insights developed in mobilities scholarship can enrich such consideration of conduct and practice. So, by demonstrating the co-production of conduct and landscape, i.e. not only judging conduct *against* landscapes, we are able to move the notion of moral landscapes forward. We do this in the present article by bringing to bear insights from Cresswell's (2010) work on the politics of mobility, and examining more specific dimensions of movement and mobility and the role these play in mobilising particular notions of the rightful citizen subject.

Much of the current citizenship debate, as well as the mobilities debate, focus on the urban realm. This article demonstrates that these issues are no less relevant to discussions of nature and to the rural domain, and might be enriched if paying attention also to spatial aspects beyond the urban. Theorising subjects as citizens of nature or landscapes rather than merely of the streets and cities where the majority of them live, is crucial for the reimagining of the citizen required to realise the societal objective of expanding participation in outdoor activities beyond its current limited scope. In this way, we can envision citizens as the rightful inhabitants of all the spaces they are legally entitled to, not just those they are currently restricted to by moral norms.

Future research on the politics of *friluftsliv* mobility should explicitly account for the tensions between actual lived and embodied outdoor mobility and abstracted and ordered mobility of state agencies who discursively endeavour to structure mobile practices, and make them "knowable" (Cresswell 2006, 71). In the socio-legal struggle for contemporary notions of the rightful mobile citizen, we can detect a risk that exclusionary relations and processes might, unwittingly, be promoted even when greater inclusion is the stated official goal. For that reason, it is not straightforward to will greater diversity and participation, as stated in official policies. It will rather take active and sensitive management to accommodate the greater varieties of imaginaries and norms in the Norwegian outdoors, and more attention needs to focus on this challenge and how it is currently held in tension with established mobilisations of *friluftsliv*.

References

- Adey, P., 2010. *Mobility*. Routledge, London.
- Alvsvåg, H., Gjengedal, E., Råheim, M., Anderssen, N., 1997. *Kunnskap, kropp og kultur: helsefaglige grunnlagsproblemer*. Ad notam Gyldendal, Oslo.

Authors' Accepted Manuscript of Flemsæter, F., G. Setten, and K. M. Brown. 2015. Morality, mobility and citizenship: Legitimising mobile subjectivities in a contested outdoors. *Geoforum* 64:342-350.
Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2014.06.017>

© 2015 This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

- Blomley, N., 2004. *Unsettling the City. Urban Land and the Politics of Property*. Routledge, New York.
- Breivik, G., 1978. To tradisjoner i norsk friluftsliv, in: Breivik, G., Løvmo, H. (Eds.), *Friluftsliv. Fra Fridtjof Nansen til våre dager*. Universitetsforlaget, Oslo, pp. 7-16.
- Brown, K.M., 2007. Understanding the materialities and moralities of property: reworking collective claims to land. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 32 (4), 507-522.
- Brown, K.M., 2012. Sharing public space across difference: attunement and the contested burdens of choreographing encounter. *Social & Cultural Geography* 13 (7), 801-820.
- Brown, K.M., forthcoming. Appropriating space through movement and materiality: the contested inscription of surfaces in outdoor recreation. *Cultural Geographies*.
- Chouinard, V., 2009. Citizenship, in: Kitchin, R., Thrift, N. (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*. Elsevier, Oxford, pp. 107-112.
- Christensen, O., 1998. A national identity is formed, in: Sørensen, Ø. (Ed.), *The search for the Norwegian*. Ad Notam Gyldendal, Oslo, pp. 51-73.
- Clausen, J.A., 1968. *Socialization and society*. Little, Brown and Co., Boston.
- Cresswell, T., 1996. In *Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, Mn.
- Cresswell, T., 2006. 'You cannot shake that shimie here': producing mobility on the dance floor. *Cultural Geographies* 13 (1), 55-77.
- Cresswell, T., 2010. Towards a politics of mobility. *Environment and Planning D-Society and Space* 28 (1), 17-31.
- Cresswell, T., Merriman, P., 2011a. *Geographies of Mobilities: Practices, Spaces, Subjects*. Ashgate, Farnham.
- Cresswell, T., Merriman, P., 2011b. Introduction: *Geographies of Mobilities: Practices, Spaces, Subjects*, in: Cresswell, T., Merriman, P. (Eds.), *Geographies of Mobilities: Practices, Spaces, Subjects*. Ashgate, Farnham, pp. 1-18.
- Dagens Næringsliv, 2011, Bikkjekamp om skisporet, <http://www.dn.no/dnaktiv/article2059240.ece>
- Dietrich, K., 2002. *Socialisation and the Social Change in Movement Culture and Sport*. Institute of Exercise and Sport Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen.
- Flemsæter, F., Brown, K.M., Holm, F.E., 2011. Friluftslivets moralske landskap - trender og tradisjoner, in: Stræte, E.P., Haugen, M. (Eds.), *Rurale brytninger*. Tapir, Trondheim, pp. 234-251.
- Goksøyr, M., 1994. Nasjonal identitetsbygging gjennom idrett og friluftsliv, *Nytt norsk tidsskrift*, 11 (2), 182-193.

- Gurholt, K.P., 2008. Norwegian *friluftsliv* and ideals of becoming an 'educated man'. *Journal of Adventure Education & Outdoor Learning* 8 (1), 55 - 70.
- Hindess, B., 2002. Neo-liberal Citizenship. *Citizenship Studies* 6 (2), 127-143.
- Isin, E. F., Wood, P. K., 1999. *Citizenship and Identity*. Sage, London.
- Lefebvre, H., 2013. *Rhythmanalysis : Space, Time and Everyday Life*. Bloomsbury, London.
- Macpherson, C.B., 1978. The meaning of property, in: Macpherson, C.B. (Ed.), *Property. Mainstream and Critical Positions*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto, pp. 1-13.
- Manning, R., 2011. *Studies in Outdoor Recreation: Search and Research for Satisfaction*, 3rd edition. Oregon State University Press, Corvallis.
- Matless, D., 1998. *Landscape and Englishness*. Reaktion Books, London.
- Matless, D., 2005. Sonic geography in a nature region. *Social & Cultural Geography* 6 (5), 745-766.
- Ministry of the Environment, 2000-2001. St.meld. nr. 39, *Friluftsliv - Ein veg til høgare livskvalitet*. Miljøverndepartementet - Ministry of the Environment, Oslo.
- Mitchell, D., 2000. *Cultural Geography. A Critical Introduction*. Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.
- Mydske, P.K., Claes, D.H., Lie, A., 2007. *Nyliberalisme: ideer og politisk virkelighet*. Universitetsforlaget, Oslo.
- Odden, A., 2008. *Hva skjer med norsk friluftsliv?: en studie av utviklingstrekk i norsk friluftsliv 1970-2004*. Doctoral thesis, NTNU, Trondheim
- Panelli, R., 2010. More-than-human social geographies: posthuman and other possibilities. *Progress in Human Geography* 34 (1), 79-87.
- Parker, G., 2001. Land, rights and the gift: the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000 and the negotiation of citizenship. *Sociologia Ruralis* 41 (4), 381-398.
- Parker, G., 2006. The Country Code and the ordering of countryside citizenship. *Journal of Rural Studies* 22, 1-16.
- Parker, G., 2007. The negotiation of leisure citizenship: leisure constraints, moral regulation and the mediation of rural place. *Leisure Studies* 26 (1), 1-22.
- Perkins, H.C., 2006. Commodification: re-resourcing rural areas, in: Cloke, P., Marsden, T., Mooney, P.H. (Eds.), *Handbook of Rural Studies*. Sage, London, pp. 243-257.
- Philo, C., 1991. *New Words, New Worlds: Reconceptualising Social and Cultural Geography*. Department of Geography, St David's University College, Lampeter.
- Riese, H., Vorkinn, M., 2002. The production of meaning in outdoor recreation: A study of Norwegian practice. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift-Norwegian Journal of Geography* 56 (3), 199 - 206.

Authors' Accepted Manuscript of Flemsæter, F., G. Setten, and K. M. Brown. 2015. Morality, mobility and citizenship: Legitimising mobile subjectivities in a contested outdoors. *Geoforum* 64:342-350.
Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2014.06.017>

© 2015 This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

- Sandström, C., Hovik, S., Falleth, E., 2008. Omstridd natur: trender & utmaningar i nordisk naturförvaltning. Boréa Bokförlag, Umeå.
- Setten, G., 2004. The habitus, the rule and the moral landscape. *Cultural Geographies* 11 (4), 389-415.
- Setten, G., Brown, K.M., 2009. Moral Landscapes, in: Kitchin, R., Thrift, N. (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*. Elsevier, Oxford, pp. 191-195.
- Setten, G., Brown, K.M. 2013. Landscape and social justice, in: Howard, P., Thompson, I. & Waterton, E. (Eds.) *Routledge Companion to Landscape Studies*. Routledge, Oxford, pp. 243-252.
- Sheller, M., Urry, J., 2006. The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning A* 38 (2), 207-226.
- Strand, O., Gundersen, V., Panzacchi, M., Andersen, O., Falldorf, T., Andersen, R., van Moorter, B., Jordhøy, P., Fangel, K., 2011. Ferdsel i villreinens leveområder, NINA-Rapport 551. Norsk Institutt for Naturforskning, Trondheim.
- Tordsson, B., 2007. What is friluftsliv good for? Norwegian friluftsliv in a historical perspective, in: Henderson, B., Vikander, N. (Eds.), *Nature First: Outdoor Life the Friluftsliv Way*. Natural Heritage Books, Toronto, pp. 62-74.
- Urry, J., 2000. *Sociology Beyond Societies: Mobilities for the twenty-first century*. Routledge, London.
- Urry, J., 2007. *Mobilities*. Polity, Cambridge.
- Ween, G., Abram, S., 2012. The Norwegian Trekking Association: trekking as constituting the nation. *Landscape Research* 37 (2), 155-171.