



Adventure and Sustainability

- 11.1 The Ecological Price Tag of Adventure – 176
- 11.2 The Human Costs of Adventure – 182
- 11.3 In Search of Authentic Adventure in the Twenty-First Century – 185
- Key Readings – 188

© The Author(s) 2019

S. Beames et al., *Adventure and Society*, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-96062-3_11

Chapter Aims

After reading this chapter, you will be able to:

- Describe the environmental costs that come from adventure equipment manufacture and air travel
- Outline the key labour rights issues associated with the manufacture of outdoor clothing and equipment
- Critically consider the ethical imperatives for adventures that come with a deeper understanding of the ecological and human rights costs inherent in them
- Understand how the notion of seeking ‘authentic’ and ‘sustainable’ adventures within broader contexts of capitalism, technology, and social media is highly problematic

Three central issues persist as we explore notions of adventure and leisure in the twenty-first century. The first issue revolves around the environmental costs associated with outdoor equipment manufacture and air travel. All of our adventures come with ecological price tags and, as such, demand ethical consideration. The second issue considers the humanitarian side of adventure practices—in particular, the degree to which dominant concepts of adventure (fostered by the Global North) can offer something to all humans, without excessive harm to any kind of ‘other’. The third and final issue is more philosophical and identity-oriented, as it ponders to what extent it is possible to find sustainable ‘authentic adventures’—or ‘purist’ type adventures—that are unfettered by the larger structures and belief systems of greater society. The chapter (and book) closes by highlighting how the world of adventure is remarkably complex and must be examined simultaneously through interrelated analytical lenses, such as identity, capitalism, and sustainability, in order to work towards social and environmental justice.

11

11.1 The Ecological Price Tag of Adventure

All of our actions have ripple effects that influence ecosystems and communities throughout the world. Some of these influences may be very obvious, such as cutting down a section of hedge to build a mountain bike ramp, and others may be hard to perceive, such as the influence of buying an iPhone on miners in the Congo (see Merchant, 2017). Scientist and deep ecologist, Fritjof Capra (1997), outlined what he called a ‘holistic worldview’ and explained how all phenomena in our world are fundamentally interdependent. Humans, he argued, needed to see ‘the world as an integrated whole rather than a dissociated collection of parts’ (p. 6). This notion of the interdependence between everything is central to understanding how adventuring and sustainability influence each other.

As with most topics that we have covered in this book, there are lots of different ways to understand ‘sustainability’—depending on your theoretical perspective and cultural background. As global society has become increasingly aware of the impacts of human behaviour on the planet in the last 60 years, sustainability has become a concept that influences people’s behaviours to greater or lesser degrees across a wide range of contexts. Attempting to distil the core elements of the term, Thiele (2016) explains that, ‘[s]ustainability is the practice of satisfying current needs without sacrificing future wellbeing by preserving core values and relationships while managing the scale and speed of change’ (p. 4). At its simplest, this means not using more of a resource than a system can support. For example, taking water from a well at a rate faster than it naturally refills is not sustainable, nor is using modes of transport that depend on the extraction of ancient fossil fuels and lead to the emission of greenhouse gases that the planet’s natural systems cannot process fast enough. Historically, sustainable solutions have been framed in terms of social, environmental, and economic elements, but Thiele urges us to also consider *cultural creativity* as a fourth pillar, as this helps to ensure that sustainable solutions respond to people and place.

Given this broad range of views on what should be valued most highly and the different ways of working towards sustainability, an equally wide spectrum of approaches has emerged. *Sustainable development* is one such approach and comprises principles and practices that can be marshalled to address issues of sustainability in many spheres of life across the globe. For example, the United Nation’s most recent Agenda for Sustainable Development (UN, 2015a) sets out 17 goals to be met by 2030 and includes such big picture, transformational aims as ‘ensure sustainable consumption and production patterns’ and ‘take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts’ (p. 14). The UN Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) highlights that sustainable development is about ‘the will to improve everyone’s quality of life, including that of future generations, by reconciling economic growth, social development and environmental protection’ (2014, p. 3). The growing field of Education for Sustainability is a movement overseen by UNESCO (2014) that, through education, has the principal aims of ‘reconciling economic growth, social development and environmental protection’ (p. 2). Thus, we can see that if it is to be effective, sustainable development needs to be integrated into all forms of public and private citizenship.

Living in sustainable ways has arguably become a human imperative, and is seen by many as one that needs to be actively practised and constantly improved upon (Thiele, 2016). Figuring out how to live sustainably can be very challenging for adventurers and non-adventurers alike, because so many of the sustainability

issues in our lives comprise multiple, interwoven, highly complex, interdisciplinary, and even ‘wicked’ problems (Rittel & Webber, 1973), where trying to fix one aspect may have unpredictable knock-on effects on others. Consider the complexity surrounding buying a new fleece sweater. Should you buy the cheapest one, the one that is from recycled material, the one made in your own country, the one manufactured in a factory with strict labour laws, or the one from the company that only uses factories with low CO₂ emissions? Maybe we should not buy synthetic fleece at all!

As we can see, even the most basic example of trying to live sustainably requires higher-order reflection and critical thinking skills, which enable us to deeply consider the various arguments surrounding the consumer activity that is an inescapable part of our adventure practices.

Dennis Soron (2010) argues that our consumer habits are deeply intertwined with our identities (see more in ► Chap. 8). He cites Alan Durning, who in 1992, claimed that consumption had become a ‘primary means of self-definition’ (p. 8). Soron explains how the ‘quest for sustainability’ (p. 173) is hugely limited by people of relative privilege who are unwilling to let go of their patterns of consumption. Ultimately, dominant consumer identities lie in opposition to ecological identities (Elgin, 1981). This shift in thinking (and buying!) from one to the other is so wrapped up in non-rational values, emotions, and socio-cultural influences, that individual behaviour change towards environmentally friendly practices can be very difficult to effect and sustain (Soron, 2010).

The sustainability and consumption discussion takes on another level of complexity when we consider ‘green consumption’. Green consumption refers to acts of buying ‘conscience soothing goods’, which can include everything from free range eggs to electric cars, and is generally associated with affluence (Soron, 2010). Affluent people have the ability to make choices about what they buy, which, of course, makes them targets for profit-making companies who want to sell them their green products. This arrangement is further complicated by the inestimable costs associated with the disposal of old products and the manufacture of new ones.

For example, most of us now know that the microplastics from our fleeces and the poly-fluorocarbons (PFCs) in our waterproofs are bad for the environment. However, even though some people can afford to replace them with organically farmed wool layers or PFC-free garments, the chemicals, plastics, and associated carbon would still exist in the ecosystem, and they are hard to recycle. This raises the crucial question of whether it is more ecologically harmful to purchase new products, even if they are more environmentally friendly, or make do with what we have until we really need to replace them. There is a danger of green consumerism becoming the unwitting driver of the production of endless

amounts of ‘eco-junk’ (Monbiot, 2007). Indeed, it is strongly argued that human beings’ rampant consumerism (green or otherwise) will effectively ‘kill the planet’ (Leonard, 2010, p. xiv). The answer to living more sustainably lies not only in consuming greener products but also in consuming fewer products, as has been highlighted in the UN’s Sustainable Development Goal 12 (UN, 2015b).

Our consumption patterns are much more involved, far-reaching, and multi-stepped than many of us realize. In broad terms, first, there is the extraction of resources from the land; second, there is the manufacture of the product; third, is the packaging; fourth, is the transport and distribution of the finished goods from the sites of production to the seller; fifth, is the actual buying of the product; and sixth, is the eventual disposal of the product.

? Discussion Question

Consider a material good that is part of your ‘adventure world’ which you have bought in the last three months. On a rough scale of 1 to 10 score, how ecologically harmful you think the following stages of its life were (and will be)? (10 would be the most harmful).

- Extraction
- Production
- Packaging
- Transportation (before, during, and after manufacture)
- Disposal

In the last decade, the world of adventure recreation has been criticized for its relatively narrow view of sustainability. Many adventurers love ‘gear’, and this love has changed adventure and wilderness recreation into a global industry that ‘extends from alpine summits to urban retail outlets, open ocean shipping lanes, factory floors in developing nations, and oil fields around the world’ (Simon & Alagona, 2009, p. 19). The authors explain how, since the 1970s, many of the products ‘required’ by the burgeoning adventure market have been synthetic materials that are derived from petroleum. This includes everything from waterproof breathable jackets to Vibram rubber soles to wetsuits and from plastic canoes to nylon tents. As noted in ► Chap. 5 on capitalism, the gear we buy for our adventures is not only designed for certain adventurous pursuits, but is created to sell as many units as possible through marketing tactics that ‘evoke sentiments and arouse desires’ (p. 20).

This creates something of a paradox: superficially, outdoor adventure activities are environmentally wholesome, but responsible action in one area of your life does not necessarily transfer to other (perhaps more dominant) areas. Simon and Alagona (2009) discuss this in relation to the Leave No Trace (LNT) movement,

which they state has ‘become widely accepted as a popular, common sense, and uncontroversial environmental ethic’ (p. 18), and which represents an officially sanctioned way of acting in the wilderness. The authors argue that the seven LNT guidelines allow many adventurers to demonstrate exemplary low-impact camping practices while in the backcountry, but do this without effectively reducing the high levels of consumption of fossil fuels and electronics, for example, in their home lives. They highlight, in the title of their 2012 paper, that ‘Leave no trace starts at home’. In this view, adventurers are at risk of ‘divorcing themselves from their actions as consumers outside wilderness’ areas (Turner, 2002, p. 479), despite the fact that the ‘outdoor recreation industry that helped to create the LNT program, also participates in global circuits of capital’ (Simon & Alagona, 2009, p. 25).¹ The contexts in which many campaigning groups and non-governmental organizations operate are complex and often tied up with consumption and corporate social responsibility (see Thorpe & Rinehart, 2013, and ► Chap. 5 in this book).

While acknowledging these grassroots/corporate relationships and the inherent contradictions present in unsustainable consumption associated with participating in some adventures, it is important not to downplay the power of membership organizations and issue-driven campaigns, which can often embody the mantra ‘think global, act local’. Shared experiences, or even the mere *idea* of cherished environments that are important to adventure communities, can bring people together. Surfers Against Sewage (SAS), for example, has grown from a local campaigning group of a dozen surfers fed up with the pollution of their local breaks into one of the more influential environmental charities in the UK (Hines, 2015). It has played a role in improving water quality and beach cleanliness around the country since 1990 (SAS, 2015). The SAS members’ aims are not just trying to enhance their own surfing experience; Wheaton’s (2007) consideration of SAS suggests that environmental campaigning linked to adventure sports can extend beyond self-interest and play a role in developing wider political engagement, as well as facilitating the increasingly complex identities discussed throughout this book. As local communities around the world become increasingly aware of threats to environments that they care about and more easily mobilized through social media, we are likely to see more of this type of voluntary campaigning. Hines (2015) suggests that surfers, climbers, and other adventure practitioners who ‘interact with the natural environment in its raw state’ (p. 248) are uniquely

1 It is worth noting that Simon and Alagona’s paper has generated much fascinating debate, and some of this has been captured through position papers in the journal *Ethics, Policy and Environment*.

positioned and motivated to act for positive social and environmental change.

The final topic that we consider in this section on the ecological cost of adventure shines the spotlight on air travel. Trans-continental cyclist and environmental philosopher Kate Rawles is a campaigner for low-carbon adventures. Rawles (2013) summarizes the environmental condition as follows:

- » We have taken carbon, formed from long-dead plants and stored for millions of years under the surface of the earth in the form of oil, coal and gas, and burned it. This has given us a vast new source of energy and the many, undeniable, life-transforming benefits of industrialization. It has also released immense amounts of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, where it and other 'greenhouse gases' trap heat from the sun. At the same time, we have destroyed millions of acres of forest that would otherwise act as a carbon sink; this adds up to an appalling double-whammy. (p. 151)

Drawing on work from the World Bank Group (2012) and George Monbiot (2006), Rawles (2013) explains how we need to limit individual carbon footprints to under two tonnes per year. What does this mean? Well, the average American has a carbon footprint of 13 tons (Carbon Brief, n.d.). It stands to reason that all humans—adventurers and non-adventurers alike—need to find ways to significantly reduce their carbon footprints. Long-haul air travel is a major 'carbon culprit', and Rawles (2013) implores adventurers to ask themselves whether the aims of their adventures can be achieved without it. She challenges the ethical positions of adventures that involve high amounts of air travel and minimal public or ecological benefit, such as climbing the highest peak on all seven continents. Such a position suggests that some adventures are inherently incompatible with sustainability. Unsurprisingly, Rawles advocates either choosing closer to home adventures or finding ways to travel to your adventure site in a carbon light way (which, in itself, could be adventurous!).

Working to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions, which carbon footprints help to measure, is important, especially as the global community attempts to minimize the extent to which global temperatures might rise in the coming years. The most recent agreement of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), ratified in Paris in 2015, aims to keep the rise in global temperature 'well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels' (UN, 2015b, p. 3) and work towards 1.5 °C. This is an immense challenge for the world, but even 0.5 °C difference in global temperature increases will have a significant impact on what life looks like in the coming century, especially for developing countries (Schleussner et al., 2016).

While the international policy focus is thus, rightly, on global climate change, alternative measures of environmental sustainability have been put forward, which may be useful to our discussions around the multifaceted nature of sustainability issues in adventure. One such tool is the Ecological Footprint, which ‘measures human demand on nature, expressed as a single, easy-to-understand number that’s scalable from an individual to a global level’ (Global Footprint Network, 2018, para. 3). This measure has been developed from the early work of Mathis Wackernagel and William Rees (1996). It starts from the standpoint that ecosystems provide services (e.g. forests simultaneously sequester carbon dioxide and provide sources of timber) and uses the economic concepts of *deficit* (when demand outstrips supply) and *reserve* (when supply exceeds demand). Using these factors, ecological footprints allow us to calculate whether a person, country, or region is existing within the capability of the earth’s systems. At present, our global ecological footprint is equivalent to 1.7 Earths (Global Footprint Network, 2018), meaning that we are using more of the Earth’s resources than can be naturally regenerated. It follows that, in order to ‘balance the books’ and establish a truly sustainable way of life (which only requires one earth), we need to reduce consumption and restore or enhance natural systems. You can measure your own Ecological Footprint at ► www.footprintcalculator.org.

What is implicit from the above critical perspectives is the ethical imperative for all adventurers to consider ‘How much stuff do we really need to adventure?’ (Rawles, 2013, p. 154), and where does that stuff come from? The climate change context demands that all of us examine the far-reaching costs of our adventures in relation to the personal, educational, or social benefits.

11

11.2 The Human Costs of Adventure

While the first section of this chapter focused on the ecological costs of adventure practices, the second section looks at the unintended and, too often, unnoticed human costs of adventure. Our discussion places a specific focus on ‘global others’ who lead marginalized lives, yet manage to indirectly support and subsidize adventure practices in the Global North.

We have all heard of the manufacturing ‘sweat shops’ that exist in Southeast Asia and Central and South America (among other places). These shops, which are characterized predominantly by long working hours and low pay, often feature in the manufacture of adventure sports clothing (O’Connor, 2015).² Perhaps unsur-

2 Adventure sports technical equipment (e.g. ropes and carabiners) is most often made in the Global North, where quality standards are easier to monitor.

prisingly, much of the extraction and manufacture of many of the goods we consume is performed by people who are forced by financial hardship to work for low pay, in appalling conditions. Seen this way, the ‘dark side’ of having ‘nice things’ relies on dominant patterns of consumption which may be harming people and places on the other side of the world from us. This is also discussed in ► Chap. 5 on capitalism.

In 2015, *Outside Online* published a story that examined the manufacture of adventure garments from a labour rights perspective (O’Connor, 2015). While critics have been examining the rights of garment workers for years (see, e.g., Ross, 1997), this interrogation of the outdoor sports clothing industry specifically has been relatively recent. O’Connor spoke to Verite, an organization that advocates for workers’ rights, and learned that almost 21 million workers around the world are victims of forced labour—most of whom are in the textiles, agriculture, and fishing industries.

The vast majority of these workers are migrants, as they have moved from their homes in order to find work. In the *Outside* article, Verite CEO Dan Viederman explained, for example, how ‘Taiwanese factories tend to bring in Filipino, Thai, Vietnamese, and sometimes Indonesian workers’ and ‘Malaysian factories tend to bring workers in from Burma, Nepal, and Indonesia’ (para. 13). Some migrants find work through ‘brokers’, but many of the brokers are malicious and offer desperate workers high interest loans that are impossible to pay off. These people effectively become prisoners who are unable to leave, in what is called ‘debt bondage’ (Hepburn & Simon, 2013).

The more we ‘peel back’ the outer layers of adventure practices to what goes on behind the thrilling video of the skiers cruising the couloir or the climbers hanging off the giant icicle, the more the ethical argument grows to critically examine the arrangements that make our adventures possible. To ‘cherry pick’ words from Simon and Alagona (2009), too many adventure-related organizations, corporations, and individuals fail to respond to the ‘exploitative labor conditions in less developed nations’ and the landfills and chemical pollution that are by-products of the ‘manufacturing process’ (pp.19–20).

Viederman, from Verite, urges consumers to do their own research by visiting their favourite brands’ websites and investigating whether or not the ‘labour rights risks’ in every step of their supply chain is disclosed. He finishes by stating that ‘if you aren’t confident the product you’re buying has been made ethically, chances are it hasn’t been’ (O’Connor, 2015, p. 38).

In ► Chap. 5, we highlighted the discrepancy between the ‘haves’ and ‘have nots’ in the increasingly capitalistic adventure world, where a disproportionately large number of vulnerable and disadvantaged (usually from the Global South) are effectively

supporting adventure-based existences for privileged others. It may be that in our quest to have the next ‘cool’ or ‘required’ piece of equipment, clothing or Instagram-able adventure experience, we fail to consider the environmental and humanitarian impacts of our lifestyle choices.

This distinction is closer to the surface in some adventure contexts than others, and may be a factor in how certain industries or sports respond to sustainability and human rights issues. For example, surf tourism in the Global South has existed since the 1960s, but increasing numbers of surfers travelling in search of the four-featured ‘surfing Nirvana’ of perfect waves, uncrowded conditions, and pristine tropical environment (see Ponting, 2009) have led to unsustainable development and the exploitation of local communities and resources. However, as can be seen in many of the cases presented by Borne and Ponting (2015) in ‘Sustainable Stoke: Transitions to Sustainability in the Surfing World’, the international surf community has increasingly had to face up to ecological damages and human oppression and is now working to develop creative solutions that involve a more diverse range of stakeholders. This surfing example highlights ways in which financially powerful individuals and organizations must work hard to increase cross-cultural understandings and engagement with those from adventure destination communities (O’Brien & Ponting, 2013).

11

Case Study: Alastair Humphreys’ Microadventures

Following a run of international, physically demanding adventures that included a four-year bike ride around the world, rowing across the Atlantic, and walking across India, Alastair Humphreys turned his attention to more localized activities that could be conducted by everyday practitioners and integrated into family and work life. The result was a new buzzword and social media-fuelled push for new forms of adventure.

In 2011, Humphreys set out to explore his home country in a year of ‘microadventures’, starting off with a 120-mile circumnavigation of the M25, the motorway which encircles London, to show that even the most apparently mundane, close to home landscapes could

be settings for extraordinary experiences. According to Humphreys, a microadventure is ‘an adventure that is short, simple, local, cheap – yet still fun, exciting, challenging, refreshing and rewarding’ (n.d., para. 1). When surrounded by strong support systems and cultures, which, for example, ensure equitable responsibility for childcare and a healthy work/life balance, these can potentially serve to tackle some of the constraints to participation in adventurous activities that we have discussed elsewhere in the book.

Over time, and with the support of a strong social media following, this concept has been distilled to encompass everything from multi-day trips through lesser known areas of

your home region to ‘5–9’ overnights, which squeeze as much adventure into the time between finishing work in the evening and starting work the following morning. This could be something as comfortable as walking to a nearby beach or hill with family or friends to spend the night in a tent, or more intense, like Chris Mackie’s recent mid-summer mountain bike ride with a friend that was structured to fit around looking after young families: leave after the kids are in bed, ride until it gets as dark, sleep in a bivvy bag near a mountain stream for three hours, then get up and ride home in time for breakfast and a day of looking after the kids starting from 7 a.m.! As Humphreys states in a short video summary,

microadventures are not about 'diluting' adventure but coming up with 'a concentrated form, distilled, like a shot of espresso' (Humphreys, 2016, 04:10).

For adventurers like Humphreys, simple acts of

low-impact adventure like this also offer a space to challenge some of the dominant values held by our consumption and work-driven culture: what do we value most if we aim to come into work more tired and

uninspired on the Monday than when we left on the Friday? Is it so radical for families to value time spent together in natural environments with few financial transactions, over other, more consumption-driven pursuits?

11.3 In Search of Authentic Adventure in the Twenty-First Century

While the first two sections of this chapter featured some rather challenging (and perhaps concerning) material on the ecological and human elements of adventure and sustainability, the following section is more philosophical and identity-oriented in nature. In recent years, a significant amount of attention has been paid to notions of participant authenticity in a range of adventure domains (see, e.g. Beal & Weidman, 2003; Fletcher, 2008; Poulson, 2016; Telford & Beames, 2016). Something to consider is whether—given our extensive discussions on the influences of capitalism and transnational corporations (► Chap. 5); technology and social media (► Chap. 6); multiple, fluid, and social-driven identities (► Chap. 8); and contradictory ways that sustainability has been invoked and practised by adventurers (this chapter)—we might come to a consensus regarding what it means to undertake adventures that are 'authentic'. Furthermore, to what degree do our 'authentic' adventures reflect or come into conflict with key principles of sustainability?

On one hand, philosopher Charles Taylor (1991) explains that every human has a particular 'way of being' (p. 28) and that authenticity is about 'following a voice of nature within us' (p. 27). This harkens back to our earlier idea from ► Chap. 8 regarding a highly personal or 'core' sense of self. Within this notion is an assumption that people can attempt to live authentically when 'they make decisions about their lives that are not overly shaped by external influences' (Beames & Brown, 2016, p. 51). This may seem reasonable enough, but how can we follow our own way of being in the face of the barrage of social, corporate, and technological influences? These latter influences, according to many social scholars and philosophers, cannot help (at some level) but determine what we think and what we do. In ► Chap. 8, for example, we referred to the structural arguments put forth by philosophers such as Antonio Gramsci and Michel Foucault, who both suggested that societal forces greatly impacted our identities, belief systems, and life practices.

These discussions of authentic contemporary adventures become further complicated as we consider the increasing reach of new online and virtual applications into our worlds of adventure. Following discussions in ► Chap. 6 on technology and social media, to what degree do we consider drone flying and other ‘adventure by proxy’ practices authentic representations of adventure sports?

We authors are fascinated by the proliferating notions of what it means to be an authentic adventurer, and what features these authentic adventures comprise (see the virtual adventure section in ► Chap. 6). Although, as noted three paragraphs earlier, authenticity has been a key feature in much adventure scholarship, there are now so many evolving, changing, and even contradictory ways that participants attempt to claim and experience ‘authenticity’ in adventure. We suggest that it is our responsibility to ponder how these emerging identities and practices may or may not be commensurate with what can be seen as a global ethical imperative to live more sustainably; perhaps the ways in which we negotiate what constitutes a personally authentic adventure need to sit more firmly within discourses of what is not only in our best interests but also in the best interests of ‘global others’ and the planet that sustains us.

? Discussion Question

It will be interesting to see if there is a move away from high-carbon adventures in faraway places that have no public benefit, towards low-carbon, self-funded, local, microadventures. Is one more authentic than the other?

11

Conclusions

If we look back to key elements of the material covered in this book, several of them seem to rise above the others as being central to any consideration of adventurous practices in the twenty-first century. These key elements are capitalism, technology, identity, equalities and sustainability (i.e. ► Chaps. 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11). We can now reveal one of this book’s shortcomings that we have identified (you may have others!): it is almost impossible to examine adventure practices through only one theoretical lens at a time. This kind of approach tends to render sociological analyses of all kinds into reductionist, oversimplified, and narrow academic exercises.

Because of the high degree of overlap between the different forces at play, a more fruitful, but much more demanding, approach to examining adventure is to consider how multiple features interact with each other. This ‘systems’ view is well articulated by the Centre for Eco-Literacy (2012):

- » A system is a set of interrelated elements that make a unified whole. Individual things—like plants, people, schools, watersheds, or economies—are themselves systems and at the same time cannot be fully understood apart from the larger systems in which they exist. (para. 3)
- » Systems thinking is an essential part of schooling for sustainability. A systems approach helps young people understand the complexity of the world around them and encourages them to think in terms of relationships, connectedness, and context. (para. 4)

In a similar way, this systems view is also helpful as we seek to gain a 'big picture' view of adventure. For example, it is very limiting to discuss identity without also considering the influences of social structures, such as global capitalism and social media, upon it.

The principal focus of this chapter has been to help you understand general conceptions of sustainability, critically interrogate the ecological and human costs of our adventure practices, and to provoke creative thinking about how we can have morally excellent adventures. It is important to note that we are not making a blanket statement that adventure harms the environment and other people, but we are definitely saying that some consumption practices do.

If we have a rallying cry, it is for adventurers around the world to deeply examine their adventure practices and consider how they might adversely affect people and places, especially on the other side of the world. This involves using our unique understandings of people and place in order to help affect meaningful and enduring social change.

» **When we look at the sustainability of adventure, we must do so deeply and broadly enough to reveal the social, cultural, economic, and environmental conditions and consequences that permit our adventures. Ultimately, the big questions we must answer are:**

1. *Who in society are advantaged and disadvantaged by changing adventure practices that are being driven by an increasingly globalised world?*
2. *How are we going to address these unjust social arrangements?*

We believe that adventure can be re-positioned as a societal asset, which can be used as a tool to create more

equitable communities and healthier ecosystems. Adventurous experiences do not just offer opportunities for ‘respite’ or ‘escape’ from the pressures of late modern society, but instead can be spaces which allow for experimentation and encounters that might be harder to achieve in other social contexts. This might involve, for example, using adventure to welcome migrants from war-torn countries, or to extend invitations to those who might normally be excluded from activities that seem ‘boundaried’ by class, sex, race, sexual orientation, and ability. From this perspective, communities of adventurers can become shining examples of what a caring, inclusive, and environmentally conscious group of people can bring to society.

Key Readings

- Humphreys, A. (2014). *Microadventures: Local discoveries for great escapes*. London: William Collins.
- Rawles, K. (2013). Adventure in a carbon-light era. In E. Pike & S. Beames (Eds.), *Outdoor adventure and social theory* (pp. 147–159). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

References

- Beal, B., & Weidman, L. (2003). Authenticity in the skateboarding world. In R. Rinehart & S. Sydnor (Eds.), *To the extreme: Alternative sports inside and out* (pp. 337–352). New York: SUNY Press.
- Beames, S., & Brown, M. (2016). *Adventurous learning: A pedagogy for a changing world*. New York: Routledge.
- Borne, G., & Ponting, J. (2015). *Sustainable stoke: Transitions to sustainability in the surfing world*. Plymouth: University of Plymouth Press.
- Capra, F. (1997). *The web of life: A new synthesis of mind and matter*. London: Flamingo.
- Carbon Brief. (n.d.). *Five facts about Europe’s carbon emissions*. Retrieved from <https://www.carbonbrief.org/5-facts-about-europes-carbon-emissions>
- Centre for Eco-Literacy. (2012). *Systems thinking*. Retrieved from <https://www.ecoliteracy.org/article/systems-thinking>
- Durning, A. (1992). *How much is enough? The consumer society and the future of the earth*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Elgin, D. (1981). *Voluntary simplicity: Towards a way of life that is outwardly simple, inwardly*. New York: Morrow.
- Fletcher, R. (2008). Living on the edge: The appeal of risk sports for the professional middle class. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 25(3), 1–23.
- Global Footprint Network. (2018). *Our work*. Retrieved from <https://www.footprintnetwork.org/our-work/ecological-footprint/>
- Hepburn, S., & Simon, R. (2013). *Human trafficking around the world: Hidden in plain sight*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hines, C. (2015). Surfing can change the world. In G. Borne & J. Ponting (Eds.), *Sustainable stoke: Transitions to sustainability in the surfing world* (pp. 248–259). Plymouth: University of Plymouth Press.
- Humphreys, A. (n.d.). *Microadventures inspiration*. Retrieved from <http://www.alastairhumphreys.com/microadventure-inspiration/>

- Humphreys, A. (2014). *Microadventures: Local discoveries for great escapes*. London: William Collins.
- Humphreys, A. (2016). *Microadventures*. Retrieved from <https://vimeo.com/136917267>
- Leonard, A. (2010). *The story of stuff: How our obsession with stuff is trashing the planet, our communities, and our health -- and a vision for change*. London: Constable.
- Merchant, B. (2017). *Were the raw materials in your iPhone mined by children in inhumane conditions?* Retrieved from <http://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-merchant-iphone-supplychain-20170723-story.html>
- Monbiot, G. (2006). *Heat: How to stop the planet burning*. London: Allen Lane.
- Monbiot, G. (2007). Ethical shopping is just another way of showing how rich you are. *The Guardian*, p. 27.
- O'Brien, D., & Ponting, J. (2013). Sustainable surf tourism: A community centred approach in Papua New Guinea. *Journal of Sport Management*, 27(2), 158–172.
- O'Connor, M. (2015). The dirty secret hiding in our outerwear. *Outside Online*. Retrieved from <https://www.outsideonline.com/1999281/dirty-secret-hiding-our-outerwear>
- Ponting, J. (2009). *Consuming nirvana: The social construction of surfing tourist space*. Saarbrücken, Germany: VDM Verlag.
- Poulson, S. (2016). *Why would anyone do that?: Lifestyle sport in the twenty-first century*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Rawles, K. (2013). Adventure in a carbon-light era. In E. Pike & S. Beames (Eds.), *Outdoor adventure and social theory* (pp. 147–159). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Rittel, H., & Webber, M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, 4, 155–169.
- Ross, A. (1997). *No sweat: Fashion, free trade and the rights of garment workers*. London: Verso.
- Schleussner, C., Lissner, T., Fischer, E., Wohland, J., Perrette, M., Golly, A., et al. (2016). Differential climate impacts for policy-relevant limits to global warming. *Earth System Dynamics*, 7(2), 327–351.
- Simon, G., & Alagona, P. (2009). Leave no trace starts at home: A response to critics and vision for the future. *Ethics, Policy & Environment*, 15(1), 119–124.
- Soron, D. (2010). Sustainability, self-identity and the sociology of consumption. *Sustainable Development*, 18, 172–181.
- Surfers Against Sewage. (2015). *Making waves since 1990: 25 years of cleaner oceans*. Retrieved from: <https://www.sas.org.uk/news/campaigns/making-waves-since-1990-25-years-of-cleaner-oceans/>
- Taylor, C. (1991). *The ethics of authenticity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Telford, J., & Beames, S. (2016). Bourdieu and alpine mountaineering: The distinction of high peaks, clean lines, and pure style. In B. Humberstone, H. Prince, & K. Henderson (Eds.), *Routledge international handbook of outdoor studies* (pp. 482–490). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- The World Bank Group. (2012). CO₂ emissions (metric tons per capita). Retrieved from <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EN.ATM.CO2E.PC>
- Thiele, L. (2016). *Sustainability*. London: Polity Press.
- Thorpe, H., & Rinehart, R. (2013). Action sport NGOs in a neo-liberal context: The cases of Skateistan and surf aid international. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 37(2), 115–141.
- Turner, J. (2002). From woodcraft to 'leave no trace': Wilderness, consumerism, and environmentalism in twentieth century America. *Environmental History*, 7(3), 462–484.

- United Nations (2015a). *Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. Retrieved from http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/70/1&Lang=E
- United Nations (2015b). *The Paris agreement*. Retrieved from https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/english_paris_agreement.pdf
- UNESCO. (2014). *The DESD at a Glance*. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001416/141629e.pdf>
- Wackernagel, M., & Rees, W. (1996). *Our ecological footprint: Reducing human impact on the earth*. Gabriola Island, Canada: New Society.
- Wheaton, B. (2007). Identity, politics, and the beach: Environmental activism in surfers against sewage. *Leisure Studies*, 26(3), 279–302.

Supplementary Information

Index – 193

© The Author(s) 2019

S. Beames et al., *Adventure and Society*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-96062-3>