
Attitudes and Values of the Lithuanian Green Movement in the Period of Transition

Leonardas Rinkevičius

Kaunas University of Technology,

Department of Sociology,

K. Donelaičio 20,

LT-3000 Kaunas, Lithuania,

E-mail:

<leonardas.rinkevicius@smf.ktu.lt>

This article theoretically and empirically explores attitudes and value orientations of the Lithuanian Green movement in the period since 1988 till present. By exploring changes of social movement in a transitional society, this paper aims to test an observation of ecological modernization theory that in of Western environmental movements some important changes have taken place. The main tendency is a shift from non-conformist, radical, self-distinctive and antagonist orientation of the greens in the period of movement's mobilization calling for a radical change of dominant values, life styles and institutions towards more balanced, dialogue and consensus orientated attitudes in the later stages of movement's development. The article finds that both types of attitudes and value orientations were present in Lithuanian environmental movement throughout the time studied. It suggests that the critical, grassroots, nonconformist character of Lithuanian Greens is continuously intertwined with the professional component and dialogue-orientation with regard to other actors and institutions, particularly the state bureaucracy, industrialists, and the political-economic élite.

Key words: environmental movement, attitudes, values, social change, Lithuanian society

INTRODUCTION

There is a lack of agreement among analysts of Western environmentalism regarding the social antagonism of those movements. Some ecological modernization theorists [7; 12; 19] note the 'alternativist' or, in other words, antagonist character of Western environmentalism at its early phase of development. This is expressed in attempts by environmental movements and their activists to search for a rapid change of the dominant values and institutions, calls for alternative lifestyles and technologies, and the radical ways in which environmentalists expressed their identity among other members of Western societies. This self-distinction and antagonism is most notable in the attitudes of environmentalists with regard to industrialists, the political-economic élite and state bureaucracy [3; 6]. By contrast, there are other, quite different views and interpretations of Western environmentalism in the 1970s, for instance, seeing the movement, its intellectuals and their influential writings as articulating 'a positive program of social ecology, rather than a depiction of doom and crisis' [8: 229].

This diversity of theoretical accounts and interpretations suggests the theme for this article, its objectives and research questions. At the core of this article are two main questions:

- How critical, radical, nonconformist value orientations of Lithuanian Greens are manifest at different stages of the development of this movement?
- How such value orientations are confronted or enriched by professional and dialogue-orientation with regard to other actors and institutions, particularly the state bureaucracy, industrialists, and the political-economic élite?

Aiming to explore aforementioned research questions, this article is composed of a number of sections that are analyzing empirical data such as documents, interviews, secondary sources reflecting different stages of the development of Lithuanian Green Movement during the period of transition in 1988–2000. The article is concluded by a number of general findings and interpretations pointing that the critical, grassroots, nonconformist character of Lithuanian Greens is continuously intertwined with

professionalism and dialogue-orientation with regard to other actors and institutions.

Value Orientations of the Lithuanian Green Movement in the Phase of Mobilization

At its early stage of development in 1988–89, the environmental movement in Lithuania propagated an ideology of ‘alternative technologies and alternative life styles’. However, the term ‘alternative’ did not have the same meaning as in the West in the 1970s: the common denominator for ‘alternative’ in Western environmentalism was a disillusion in dominant values and institutions prevailing in industrial societies. By contrast, in Lithuania radical environmentalist critique was directed against the Soviet totalitarian regime’s ‘imperialist’ ideology, both in the environmental and political sense. In 1988–89, the discourse of the Lithuanian environmental movement was therefore shared by much broader circles of society compared to Western environmental movements in the 1970s.

In Lithuania, environmental activism of this period was most often geared towards the protest against, and critique of, the Soviet totalitarian system, although critique was wrapped into discourse about particular social, economic, ecological issues. Therefore, certain antagonism has always been present in this civic activism. However, it was a different antagonism than that of Western environmentalists who were criticizing the material affluence and capitalist industrialization and addressed their critique to political élite and industrialists. In Lithuania, material welfare and the capitalist mode of production have not formed an ideological platform on which environmental activism would be based. Shortages of material goods were so common that the critique against affluent society which was so important in Western environmentalism in the 1970s [11] was irrelevant in the Soviet Union.

Regarding worldviews and cosmology, the following statement illustrates the ‘alternative’ character of Lithuanian greens. Written by one of the movement’s intellectuals, Alvydas Karalius, it expresses an Arcadian approach to human–nature relations and frames a distinctive discourse coalition:

“Rational logical cognition is to be complemented by intuitive-meditative way of grasping the essence. According to dogmatic scientists, the Greens are getting here into an ocean of mysticism, but in fact they just span the boundaries of categorical thinking... We learn about the right livelihood not only from science and parties, but also from stars in the sky, folk songs, Čiurlionis’ paintings, and the eyes of a child” [10: 16].

The self-distinctive identity and ‘alternative’ worldviews of the Lithuanian greens were also coupled with the self-distinctive, reactive agency with regard to other social actors and institutions that this social movement was promulgating in the early period of its development in the late 1980s.

“In general, I see the agency of the Greens as a controlling one – controlling not only the Government or particular organizations, but also nature protection in general. /.../ The Greens will co-operate but also control the situation as no other ‘public’ controlling committee has ever done before” [1: 4].

Such statements by Alis Balbierius as well as other leaders and ideologists of the Lithuanian green movement reflect the self-distinctive and antagonist character in relations between greens and actors rooted in other domains, especially in the state and economic sphere. This strong radical imperative among the greens and shared environmental concern was expressed through various remarkable actions of public protest and strongly affected policy-making.

In the summer of 1988, the first big rallies organized by the greens attracted a large number of people from various circles of society. Those rallies raised curiosity, cognitive interest and environmental awareness in society at large. It is important to note that radical, non-conformistic environmental activism also raised awareness and strengthened the belief that public critique against the system is feasible, and the repressive structures are no longer as threatening as they used to be. Public manifestations organized by the greens spontaneously evolved into protest actions against the Soviet regime. Environmental critiques provided a very widely shared set of metaphors and cases pointing to the shortcomings of the state socialism and setting a strategy for a radical change. The broad circles of Lithuanian society shared this idea, because it fulfilled people’s long-sought but latent aspirations of national liberty and democracy.

The radical critique of a system and its particular spheres and issues, however, was not like a one-way traffic, but rather it manifested a blend of radical antagonism as well as cooperation and dialogue among greens and other actors, *e.g.* in the economic sphere. An example of a mixed co-operation–confrontation, pressure–dialogue between the greens and industrialists was the financial assistance (10 000 roubles), transportation (coaches and trucks), and other support provided by the Jonava Azotas fertilizers plant to the ecological protest March in 1988.

Paradoxically, during this march and at some later occasions the greens organized quite radical protest demonstrations against this plant, they actively disseminated information on serious negative environmental impact caused by Azotas upon humans and nature.

Thus, the industrialists who were fiercely criticized by the greens in the first place were on the other hand providing material (and discursive) support for environmentalists. As interviews with the leaders of green movement¹ indicate, industrialists were stressing that they shared pro-environmental attitudes and had made some efforts to mitigate negative environmental impact of their productive activities. However, they admitted that their efforts were insufficient in the given Soviet political-economic system which was too cumbersome and ineffective. Industrialists, as a way to show their environmental awareness, helped the greens by various means, although they knew in advance that the environmental movement would criticize their companies.

The intertwined radical protest and constructive input by environmentalists regarding the problem of contaminated food can serve as another illustration of this complex profile of the greens: integrating radical critique and professional input. This critique by the greens was addressed against the public authorities and agri-business structures whose activities were aiming at fulfilling and exceeding the five-year plans by any means, and caused over fertilization and thereby contamination of vegetables and milk products:

“The greens of Lithuania are calling everybody [sic] to boycott milk products [...] Only unanimous action can shake the agri-industrial lions [...] Our two-week fast can make the leaders of agri-industrial monster descend down on earth from their thrones. Fast in the name of children!” [10: 25–26].

This quotation illuminates radical, non-conformist approach of the greens and the confronting ways in which this message was disseminated in society. The approach based on civic disobedience, namely, the boycotts and pickets, echoes the early New Environmentalism which emerged in Western countries in the 1970s [see McCormick 1989]. However, the above-mentioned ultimatum contained more than only radical nonconformist statements and slogans. The greens in the same letter also constructively proposed: ‘food products for sale should contain certificates about the concentration of hazardous substan-

ces’; ‘price differentiation depending on the environmental quality of products’, ‘production of high-quality fertilizers’, ‘application of agro-technical methods’².

Thus, besides the radical critique, the greens were generating and disseminating ideas that are now ascribed to the ecological modernization discourse. Its important aspects are the faith in individual ecological consciousness coupled with economic rationality; in the environmentally responsible behavior of consumers and actors in industry and public administration given sufficient information and economic motivation; belief in the need for, and feasibility of, a change in dominant technological and economic institutions.

In general, the new social-environmental movement that emerged in Lithuania in 1988–89 played an important role not only by carving out a temporary public space [cf. 8] and publicly communicating an important message, but also by consolidating the national liberation movement. Through an environmentalist critique, it expressed a genuine ecological concern as well as protest against the dominant Soviet regime. With regard to environmental policy, this movement opened up new avenues for changing, democratizing the public–policy interface. It disseminated signals promising the emergence of new types of dialogue, a belief in the constructive power of public participation, a promise of reshaping the country’s economic and technological development in new, environmentally sound ways that are based on community and shared responsibility.

The End of Euphoria: Antagonism and Dialogue in the First Years of Transition

Since 1990, civic environmental activists in Lithuania have continued to seek constructive dialogue with actors in bureaucratic and economic domains, even while maintaining radical, non-conformist pressures on the same. Environmental politics during this period have been affected by the ups and downs of economic and political transformation of Lithuania from a Soviet republic to an independent, market-oriented, democratic society. It has resulted in a professionalisation of environmentalism in Lithuania, new organizational forms for the environmental movement, ‘multiple identities’ and identity crises for some of the movement’s activists and leaders, and resurgence of new grassroots activism³.

The stream of euphoria, self-confidence and faith in public participation has gradually slowed down among common citizens as well as environmentalists. Radical actions by environmental activists became marginal; they did no longer mobilize a broad

spectrum of actors representing society at large. Environmental movement leaders have even explicitly stated that the movement would refrain from drastic impact upon various sectors of economy, primarily because of the transitional difficulties that Lithuanian society was facing [24: 11]. This position by the greens was especially strengthened when Moscow started an explicit economic and political blockade of Lithuania after it declared its independence on 11 of March 1990.

Public policy analysts, journalists, scientists and society at large did not forget, however, the radical actions inspired and led by the green activists during the 'Singing revolution', and associated those actions with the economic downswing in Lithuania during the first years of transitional period. Such 'bad memories' have especially activated during the difficult years between 1990–94 when society was facing shortage of heat, rapid growth of prices for electricity, food, shelter, and difficulties in fulfilling basic needs. There were voices blaming the greens for the negative impact of their actions upon the fragile Lithuanian economy and raising social anxiety. Rapidly growing difficulties in fulfilling basic needs made the greens one of the social groups that the rest of Lithuanian society in transition could blame on without deeply analyzing the real underlying causes of the worsening economy.

This might be one of the reasons why, among the broader publics, there have spread relatively negative attitudes towards public (lay) participation in environmental and economic policy. The positive impact of the environmental activists in mobilizing society and bringing to the public arena ideas of democracy and sustainable development were gradually forgotten [20]. Only the negative side was remembered, especially the greens' impact upon the Ignalina nuclear power plant, Kruonis hydro-accumulation power plant, Būtingė oil import terminal on the Baltic coast. The impact of environmentalists upon those and other environmentally sensitive policy issues was one of the main factors that increased people's negative attitudes towards environmental movement and general expectations regarding public participation in the public policy process [17].

Another lesson from Lithuanian environmentalism of this period is that massive civic activism, collective identity, large-scale social mobilization were significant only during the period of structural shift which was existentially important for society at large. Later this social phenomenon has become marginal, hardly visible, and this process of change was an inseparable part of a more general process of euphoria coming to the end in the period of social and economic bifurcation.

Professional Identity and Development of Lithuanian Environmental Movement

Since 1993-94, one can observe a tendency of institutional strengthening in the state environmental authorities, municipal authorities, industrial enterprises, academic institutions and newly emerging business enterprises. Various kinds of foreign aid programs were launched to support pollution prevention and cleaner production in Lithuanian industry; environmental authorities have developed and more actively enforced economic policy instruments, the National Environmental Strategy has been developed, other important policies adopted [16]. There are indications that in Lithuania, as in the West, the economic, bureaucratic, and academic domains have gradually overshadowed the civic domain of environmental activism.

The Lithuanian greens have professionalised in the process of environmental politics and policy-making, and this process resembles the trajectory towards greater professionalism among the Western environmental movement activists and organizations as described by Jamison [1996]. However, quite a high degree of professional competence and constructive input has been always present in the discourse and actions of the Lithuanian environmental movement from its onset in 1988. Since 1988–89 and into the 1990s, actors in the environmental movement have been not merely civic-oriented lay persons, but rather people with profound educational backgrounds encompassing a broad spectrum of disciplines in the technical, natural, and social sciences, even holding doctorates. In 1988–89, the Ignalina nuclear power plant became a key issue on the public agenda. At that time, the greens' discursive strategies and actions regarding this issue were formed by the leader such as Zigmantas Vaišvila, who holds a PhD in nuclear physics and had several years' experience of working at one of the top Soviet research institutes in this field, near Moscow. He and other activists who led the public debates in Lithuania about Ignalina in the late eighties were professional physicists, radiologists, energy specialists, mathematicians, biologists.

In 1990–2000, a similar combination of grassroots activism, radical critique and professional competence was observable. For instance, actions of the greens aimed at closing down the Ignalina nuclear power plant or opposing unreasonable plans of the Government to develop Būtingė oil terminal on the Baltic Sea coast were shaped by their close collaboration with academics, technology specialists and economic experts (see Rinkevicius, 2000a). There are indications that messages of the greens have been

taken seriously by policy-makers, academics and industrialists. For example, a warning of the greens concerning the urgent need to construct wastewater treatment plants in major cities gradually reached the bureaucratic domain and was incorporated by the latter. The Government of Lithuania declared construction of sewage treatment plants in five major cities – Vilnius, Kaunas, Klaipėda, Šiauliai and Palanga – to be a national priority. It became one of the key areas of the National Public Investment Program (PIP) adopted in 1994.

New Forms of Organization, Activity and Professional Identity

Organizational forms of environmentalism in Lithuania have changed since 1990, from the grassroots green clubs towards new professionalised institutions with an increased role for environmentalists as brokers between different social domains. For example, those who earlier formed a core of the Žemyna green club⁴ and the ecological center “Alternatyva” in Vilnius, e.g. Arturas Abromavičius and Aidas Vaišnoras, have established an environmental consulting firm. In the mid-1990s, this firm grew into a major environmental consulting and engineering company, the Baltic Consulting Group. It is a joint venture involving some of the strongest Nordic counterparts such as the Danish company, Kroeger; the Swedish firm, Rust; and the Nordic environmental financing consortium, NEFCO.

Through work in the Baltic Consulting Group, the former movement activists gradually became professionals designing sewage treatment plants and developing rehabilitation plans for contaminated former Soviet military sites⁵. Thus, those spheres that once were a major focus of the green critique and radical protest later became the areas where former members of the green movement found their new professional identity and employment.

Environmental action has been gradually changed by ecological, economic and technological innovation and ‘reflexive rationalization’, to use the term of Ulrich Beck and his colleagues [1994]. For instance, since 1994 the Lithuanian green movement together with the Lithuanian National Television channel, LTV, and the Ministries of the Environment and Urban Development, has conducted a contest among households called, ‘My House: Ecology, Economy, Conservation’. This popular competition is sponsored by various local and Western industries and commercial enterprises promoting, for example, heat isolation and insulation materials, environmentally friendlier products and technologies that enable more rational usage of natural resources by households.

Individualization and rationalization are gradually overweighing the idealism and mass participation in the protest actions. The ‘alternative’ and nonconformist ideology is gradually shifting towards an emphasis on daily energy and material saving. For instance, environmentalists in Kaunas, namely the green community, Atgaja, have established a special consulting center that is actively propagating energy conservation in households and bio-transportation, especially bicycling. Leaders of the greens, most often their vice-chairman Linas Vainius, are invited to the sessions of the Parliament committees, steering board of the Lithuanian Environmental Investment Fund, environmental strategy advisory board of the Ministry of the Environment, and other public as well as private organizations.

The greens in Klaipėda, members of Žvejonių club, are actively involved in academic activity and professional environmental research. Through various professional educational and research projects, e.g. preparing projects of ecological education for schoolchildren, they contribute to solving ecological problems on the coast of the Baltic Sea. This work is performed not in a traditional ‘alarmist’ way, but with some professional pedagogical skills and seeking funding for such projects in an innovative and entrepreneurial fashion which is a characteristic feature of ecological modernization. This entrepreneurship is expressed, for example, in the ways in which various ‘stakeholders’ are incorporated in the joint projects, e.g. the Coalition Clean Baltic.

A new local grassroots group has emerged in Klaipėda, radically opposing any option regarding the oil import terminal on the Baltic seacoast. At the same time, the council members of the Lithuanian green movement were trying not to simply oppose, but rather to find a constructive, ecologically, economically and technologically viable option for the terminal. Their proposal was to lay a pipeline between the Mažeikiai oil refinery in Lithuania and the already existing Ventspils harbor in Latvia. They expected that both the economic and ecological objectives could be thereby harmonized. Lithuanian public policy makers neglected this option and decided to construct a terminal in the Lithuanian territory [see also 18].

Albeit very fragmented, such examples demonstrate the gradual shift in the goals and forms of activity of the greens as a social movement towards increased professionalism. Those examples also illuminate new trends in its search for a new niche of green activism in the emerging ‘environmental marketplace’ which the movement had once created [4]. This change of the forms and kinds of environmental activism can also be interpreted as a more general tendency of ecological modernization.

New Grassroots Mobilization and Radical Activism

Yet, in the late 1990s important events have taken place in Lithuania, which support the claim that the radical, antagonist, grassroots green movement has not ceased to exist. There are reshaped and newly emerging groups that take a radical stance regarding particular policies and decisions by public authorities.

An illustrative case of new grassroots mobilization was a big public rally held in Vilnius in 1997. The radical critique was tailored against intensive deterioration of timber resources after lands and forests in Lithuania have been returned to the private ownership. This protest action was organized not by newly-emerged grassroots activists, but by the core of the existing green movement. This shows that professionalization does not preclude the radical, non-conformist character of the movement, and the two seemingly divergent traits of its character may coincide and enrich each other.

The greens and concerned citizens did not demand the prohibition of felling the forest. Rather, the stance taken by those people was conservationist, not preservationist. It was more rooted in the utilitarian paradigm of the 'rational use of natural resources' following Pinchot's tradition in the early 20th century [see 22]. However, some nostalgia of harmonious rural community, living and working in or together with nature was present in this discourse too. Therefore this kind of environmental discourse and activism can be seen as a cultural mix involving an eco-centric, nature-respecting attitude and value-orientation as well as conservationist, utilitarian, environmental management-like stream of environmentalism [cf. 13: 14].

Another series of newly emergent grassroots actions, guided by nature-respecting attitudes and value-orientations, have centered on the issue of expansion of the airport in the Curonian peninsula. A very small airport for emergency cases has been developed in this sacred nature spot in the Neringa town in Soviet times. In the mid-1990s, the economic-driven objectives to expand this airport for developing tourism industry have been pursued by the Lithuanian Government. The green movement has initiated multidisciplinary group of professional ecologists and economists to evaluate the potential impact of such an airport upon the fragile nature of Neringa.

The conclusions drawn by the scientists as well as a special commission launched by the Ministry of the Environment were recommending a suspension of the plans for developing the airport in Neringa.

In spite of all conclusions and recommendations, the Government has allocated significant resources to continue the project of expansion. This led the greens to organize a very drastic picket in front of the National Government building in May of 1999. The slogans used by the greens were as radical and non-conformist as in 1988–89. Some of the leaders of this rally were the same people, *e.g.* Saulius Pikšrys and Linas Vainius, who led the grassroots movement in the late 1980s. However, there were a lot of younger generation activists who joined the grassroots protest action perhaps for the first time in their life. It was not as numerous collective action as those big rallies in the late 1980s with some 50–70 thousand people involved. In this case, it was only some 20–30 people protesting. However, the greens' radical activity and public visibility as well as their impact on the policy-making process were significant.

The new grassroots groups tend to mobilize on a single-issue basis rather than joining the Green movement on the basis on general pro-environmental attitudes and post-materialist value orientations by this social group. In general, such empirical examples indicate that radical, antagonist environmental activism has not ceased to exist in Lithuania, that new social groupings and new forms of radical action can be expected to further emerge in Lithuania as they are expected in the Western countries [21: 8]. It is too early to predict whether this process will go in parallel with the mainstreaming of environmentalism, or rather if another 'alternativist' movement will emerge out of it. In both cases, the emergence of such new grassroots activism could be interpreted as part of the dialectics of ecological modernization (or ecological transformation) of contemporary society.

CONCLUSIONS

The Lithuanian environmental movement is a complex social phenomenon. On the one hand, it manifests critical, radical attitudes and protest against dominant social values (materialistic, individualistic) and social structures (centralization, bureaucracy, economic oligarchy and expert domination). At the same time, the movement brought modernist elements into ecological discourse such as cost-benefit analysis, scientific knowledge, public information and constructive dialogue with actors in the bureaucratic, economic and academic domains. The discursive and action strategies of the greens reflect a mixed type: composed of rational, techno-economic (eco-managerial) as well as romantic, idealistic (Arcadian) beliefs and values.

The Lithuanian environmental movement, besides radical public protest actions typical of traditional social movements, also relies on dialogue-oriented networks with industrialists, academics, and public authorities. The dialectics of such a mixed confronting–collaborating social structures and mixed value-orientations such as economic rationality and ecological idealism/romanticism is visible throughout the development of the Lithuanian green movement. The eco-centric attitudes are intertwined with techno-economic innovativeness in most of the movement’s activities. Although actors in the economic, bureaucratic and academic domains are increasingly active in environmental arena, the movement organizations and NGOs are by no means peripheral in the process of ecologization of Lithuanian society. Our research suggests that, in the period of transition, environmentalism ceased to exist as a large-scale social movement. However, new environmentalist social groups and new forms of radical action continue to emerge and can be expected to further emerge in Lithuania as they do in the Western countries. At the same time, non-governmental environmental organizations in Lithuania are likely to maintain their important role in society bridging the new collaborative networks among actors in different domains, and experimenting with the new forms of public participation in environmental, technological and economic policy.

Received

25 February 2001

References

- ¹ Interviews with key-actors of the Lithuanian Green movement, Saulius Pikšrys and Linas Vainius (May 1999).
 - ² For entire text, see Karalius and Lekevičius [1990].
 - ³ Some empirical examples are provided in my recent article “Ecological Modernisation as Cultural Politics: Transformations of the Civic Environmental Activism in Lithuania”. *Environmental Politics*. 2000. No. 9(1).
 - ⁴ It was famous as an intellectual center generating green ideology in Lithuania, mobilizing public to confront *inter alia* the construction of the 3rd bloc of the Ignalina nuclear power plant, etc.
 - ⁵ Interviews with Mr. Artūras Abromavičius, Director of the Baltic Consulting Group (May 1996), and Alvydas Karalius, Vilnius Municipality (October 1997), both of whom are the former leaders of the greens club Žemyna.
3. Cotgrove S. *Catastrophe or Cornucopia. The Environment, Politics and the Future*. Chichester: Wiley, 1982.
 4. Eder K. The Institutionalization of Environmentalism: Ecological Discourse and the Second Transformation of the Public Sphere. S. Lash, B. Szerszynski and B. Wynne (eds.). *Risk, Environment and Modernity: Towards a New Ecology*. London: Sage, 1996.
 5. Eyerman R., Jamison A. *Social Movements. A Cognitive Approach*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991.
 6. Hajer M. *The Politics of Environmental Discourse. Ecological Modernisation and the Policy Process*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
 7. Hajer M. A. Ecological Modernisation as Cultural Politics. S. Lash, B. Szerszynski, B. Wynne (eds.). *Environment, Risk and Modernity*. London: Sage, 1996.
 8. Jamison A. The Shaping of the Global Environmental Agenda: The Role of Non-Governmental Organizations. S. Lash, B. Szerszynski and B. Wynne (eds.). *Risk, Environment and Modernity: Towards a New Ecology*. London: Sage, 1996.
 9. Karalius A. Žalioji ideologija: kodėl žalieji žali? (Green Ideology: Why the Greens are Green?). *Kūlgrinda*. Vilnius: Alternatyva, 1990.
 10. Karalius A., Lekevičius E. *Lietuvos žaliųjų keliamų problemų apžvalga* (An Overview of the Issues Raised by the Lithuanian Greens). Vilnius: LII, 1990.
 11. McCormick J. *The Global Environmental Movement*. London: Belhaven Press, 1989.
 12. Mol A. P. J. *The Refinement of Production. Ecological Modernisation Theory and the Chemical Industry*. Utrecht: Van Arkel, 1995.
 13. O’Riordan T. *Environmentalism*. London: Pion, 1981.
 14. Pepper D. *The Roots of Modern Environmentalism*. London: Routledge, 1984.
 15. Rinkevičius L. Ecological Modernisation as Cultural Politics: Transformations of the Civic Environmental Activism in Lithuania. *Environmental Politics*. 2000. No. 9(1).
 16. Rinkevičius L. Ideology of Ecological Modernization in ‘Double-Risk’ Societies. A Case Study of Lithuanian Environmental Policy. Spaargaren G., Mol. A. P. J. and Buttel F. (eds.). *Environment and Global Modernity*. London: Sage, 2000.
 17. Rinkevičius L. *Ecological Modernisation and Its Perspectives in Lithuania: Attitudes, Expectations, Actions*. Ph. D. dissertation. Kaunas University of Technology, 1998.
 18. Rinkevičius L. Lithuania: Environmental Awareness and National Independence. Jamison A. and Ostby P. (eds). *Public Participation and Sustainable Development: Comparing European Experiences*. Aalborg: Aalborg University Press, 1997.
 19. Spaargaren G. *The Ecological Modernisation of Production and Consumption. Essays in Environmental Sociology*. Wageningen: Landbouw Universiteit, 1997.
 20. Stoškus K. Kada Lietuvoje gali atsirasti ir ekologinė politika? (When Could Environmental Policy Emerge in Lithuania?). *Lietuvos rytas*, 1996 06 31.
 21. Szerszynski B., Lash S., Wynne B. Introduction: Ecology, Realism, and the Social Sciences. S. Lash, B. Szerszynski and B. Wynne (eds.). *Risk, Environment and Modernity: Towards a New Ecology*. London: Sage, 1996.

References

1. Balbierius A. Lietuvos Žalieji: Tabu Išvaymas (Lithuanian Greens: the Expulsion of Taboo). *Mokslas ir gyvenimas*. 1989. Nr. 1.
2. Beck U., Giddens A., Lash S. *Reflexive Modernization. Politics, Tradition and Aesthetics in the Modern Social Order*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1994.

22. Worster D. *Nature's Economy: A History of Ecological Ideas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
23. Yearley S. Social Movements and Environmental Change. M. Redclift and T. Benton (eds.). *Social Theory and the Global Environment*. London and New York: Routledge, 1994.
24. Žemulis F. Žaliųjų vadas tvirtina, jog žalieji buvo, yra ir bus. (The leader of greens maintains that there were, are and will be the greens). *Lietuvos rytas*. 1995 05 21.

Leonardas Rinkevičius

**LIETUVOS ŽALIŪJŲ JUDĖJIMO POŽIŪRIAI IR
VERTYBĖS PEREINAMUOJU LAIKOTARPIU**

S a n t r a u k a

Straipsnyje teoriškai ir empiriškai nagrinėjama vieno spalvingiausių pastarojo dešimtmečio Lietuvos socialinių judėjimų – aplinkosauginio, arba Žaliųjų, judėjimo kaita.

Svarbiausi šios kaitos bruožai – požiūrių, vertybinių orientacijų, socialinės organizacijos bei santykių su įvairiais socialiniais veikėjais bei grupėmis pokyčiai. Lietuvos Žaliųjų judėjimo raidą nagrinėjama laikotarpiu, būtent nuo 1988 metų iki šių dienų, atspindinti empirinė medžiaga – dokumentai, interviu, atvejų tyrimai bei kt. – atskleidžia kompleksiską, daugialypį šio socialinio judėjimo pobūdį. Priešingai nei teigia kai kurios Vakarų ekologinės sociologijos teorijos, Lietuvos aplinkosauginio judėjimo dinamikoje sunku išvelgti vienareikšmę kaitą nuo radikalaus, nekonformistinio, antagonistiško kitų socialinių grupių atžvilgiu judėjimo link konstruktyvaus, profesionalaus, dialogu grįsto nevyriausybinų organizacijų sambūrio. Šio straipsnio analizė ir išvados byloja apie kitokią raidos dinamiką. Lietuvos Žaliųjų judėjime nuo jo užuomazgų bei mobilizacijos 1988-aisiais iki šių dienų susipynęs tiek radikalus, ekocentrisis požiūris bei postmaterialios vertybės, tiek techniniu ir ekonominiu racionalumu grįsti požiūriai bei veiksmai, santarvės, dialogo siekianti veika ir formalūs bei neformalūs ryšiai su ūkio ir valdžios institucijomis.