

Audrone TELESIENE, Kaunas Technical University, Lithuania*

A DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF ENVIRONMENTAL ATTITUDES IN LITHUNIA

Classification of environmental attitudes

Western scientists have a lot of ways of classifying environmental attitudes. D. Pepper [1984] analyzes the theory of T. O'Riordan [1981]. D. Pepper and T. O'Riordan discuss two main distinct modes of thought: ecocentrism and technocentrism. Ecocentrism and technocentrism are presented as the two distinct poles in a classification of environmental ideology. Every attitude towards the coexistence of man and the natural environment can be placed somewhere in between these two opposite poles.

An egalitarian interpretation of the intercourse of man and nature, a view of man as a part of a bigger world ecosystem, man dependent upon the laws of nature are the characteristic features of ecocentrism. Whereas technocentrism is characterized through the views of nature subordinate to man, a world where only mankind has rights to change the landscape, use the resources for the sake of economic growth. The main characteristics of ecocentrism, technocentrism and their trends are given in Table 1.

The ecocentric standpoint has no confidence in modern wide-range technologies, technocrats and bureaucrats, criticizes tendencies of centralization and materialism. Ecocentrism treats nature with respect, acknowledges nature's inner value, it's significance to the bodily and mental health of living creatures. Ecocentrism is divided into two slightly different trends: deep ecology and soft technologists. Deep ecology can be

* Audrone Telesiene is a PhD student of the Department of Sociology of Kaunas Technical University in Kaunas, Lithuania.

Table 1. Ecocentrism and Technocentrism

Environmentalism			
Ecocentrism		Technocentrism	
Deep ecologists	soft technologists	environmental managers	cornucopians
Intrinsic importance of nature for the humanity of man	Emphasis of smallness of scale and hence community identity in settlement, work and leisure	Belief that economic growth and resource exploitation can continue assuming: a) suitable economic adjustments to taxes, fees, etc. b) Improvements in the legal rights to a minimum level of environmental quality c) compensation arrangements satisfactory to those experience adverse environmental and/or social effects	Belief that man can always find a way out of any difficulties either political, scientific or technological
Ecological laws dictate human morality	Integration of concepts of work and leisure through a process of personal and communal improvement	Acceptance of new project appraisal techniques and decision review arrangements to allow for wider discussion or genuine search for consensus among representative groups of interested parties	Acceptance that pro-growth goals define the rationality of project appraisal and policy formulation
	Importance of participation in community affairs, and of guarantees of the rights of minority interests. Participation seen both as a continuous education and political function		Optimism about the ability of man to improve the lot of the world's people

Table 1. cont.

Environmentalism			
Ecocentrism		Technocentrism	
Deep ecologists	soft technologists	environmental managers	cornucopians
Lack of faith in modern large-scale technology and its associated demands on elitist expertise, central state authority and inherently anti-democratic institutions.			Faith that scientific and technological expertise provides the basic foundation for advice on matters pertaining to economic growth, public health and safety
Implications that materialism for its own sake is wrong and that economic growth can be geared to providing for the basic needs of those below subsistence levels			Suspicion of attempts to widen basis for participation and lengthy discussion in project appraisal and policy review
			Belief that all impediments can be overcome given a will, ingenuity and sufficient resources arising out of growth

Source: O'Riordan, quoted in D.Pepper, 1984.

defined as a radical trend of ecocentrism and soft technologism as a modest trend of ecocentrism. The former trend holds idealistic attitudes towards nature. The latter trend, soft technologism, is more liberal and admits the spread of environmentally friendly technologies. Soft technologism emphasizes the importance of environmental education, speaks for controlled economic growth.

Technocentrists believe, that it is possible to solve all environmental problems with the help of rational modern science and modern technology. Economic growth and use of natural resources are seen as necessary and the only means for sustaining human welfare. Technocentrists have confidence in the opinions of experts, who should rule our societies, there is distrust of civil engagement and the role of a centralized state is emphasized. Technocentrism is also (as ecocentrism) divided into two trends: the moderate trend of environmental management and the radical trend of cornucopia. The former admits the necessity to establish some limits to economic growth in order to maintain harmony in nature. The later trend, cornucopia, stands for an idea that natural resources are inexhaustible and can be used without any restricts.

Environmentalists, claiming one type of ideology or the other (ecocentric or technocentric), agree about the existence of environmental problems, but they differ in their priorities and perception of the scope and catastrophic nature of the problems, and offer different ways for solving the problems. Ecocentrists see every ecological disaster as a prophet of future catastrophe and claims that there is no time for discussions – humankind has to act quickly. Technocentrists pay attention only to those problems, which can be measured and evaluated by scientific methods and believe that humankind can solve them with the help of technology and a growing economy. The question is **why people tend to commit to one type of environmental attitudes and to reject others, and why people emphasize different problems and have different strategies for solving of those problems?** The cultural theory of risk perception that is presented in the book of M. Douglas and A. Wildavsky "Risk and Culture" [1984] gives an answer to the question posed above.

Determination of environmental attitudes

The study of M. Douglas and A. Wildavsky "Risk and Culture" [1984] is dedicated to an explanation of what determines individual's perception of risk. The authors talk about the factors, mainly of social origin, which influence the attitudes that an individual holds about any specific environmental problem. The main idea is that the type of social organi-

zation determines its members' knowledge about and attitudes towards natural or social facts that appear during individual's life.

Each individual lives in a community. All the members of the community share some common attitudes and thus direct a separate individual's life, in a sense that community provides individual with some guiding ideas. M. Douglas and A. Wildavsky say, that a community criticizes and rejects what does not correspond with its standards. If some knowledge threatens a community's existence or unity, it tends not to let the members have this knowledge. Thus each individual, being a member of some community, is deprived from a particular part of knowledge. This helps a community (or social organization) to survive. Having its existence under threat, a community also tends to emphasize some certain problems. Then all the members are busy with solving the problems they are exposed to, they never get interested in finding knowledge, which could be disastrous to the social organization. For example, an industrial factory has its interest in not letting its workers and politicians of the region know how harmful the polluted emissions from the factory's pipe are to the neighborhood forest. If it let the workers or the politicians of the region know this fact, it would be probably closed. It is only a rough example, the social reality is much more complex. Thus communities, or social organizations, are seen as huge machines that act so as to keep themselves alive by ignoring some facts and emphasizing others

M. Douglas and A. Wildavsky discussed three types of social organizations, each of them differently influencing individual's attitudes and behavior: hierarchy (bureaucratic organization), individualism (free market organizations), and sectarianism (sectarian type of organizations). The main characteristics of these types of organizations are given in the Table 2.

M. Douglas and A. Wildavsky claim that hierarchical and individualistic types of social organization are characteristic of the society's main body, or center, organizations. But the sectarian type is characteristic of border organizations. The borders of a society are those groups of individuals that are "remote from power and influence" [Douglas and Wildavsky, 1984, p. 102]. Douglas and Wildavsky argue that in Western culture center organizations are dominant and border organizations can only take the part of opposition. They describe the differences of the center and border views (Table 3). Table 3 also contains the description of risk portfolios that are characteristic to either center or border.

The very style of organization, the specific goals and interests, certain patterns of organizational behavior determine the selection of attitudes towards natural, social, or other risks. These attitudes, as described in the first part of this study, can be classified as ecocentric or technocentric.

Table 2. Types of social organizations and their main characteristics

Hierarchy (Bureaucracy)	Individualism (Free market)	Sectarianisms (Sects, minority groups)
Collectivism	Utilitarianism	Voluntarism, egalitarianism
Goals are multiple and vague	Goals are individual and clear-cut	Goals are collective and clear-cut, do not correspond with the main goals of the larger society
Action is possible through obedience to authorities. The individual is inactive	Action is possible through negotiation. The individual is the main actor	Strategy for action is supported with sacrifices and devotion to the goals. The individual is active
Plans are short-sighted. There is no hurry in solving problems	Plans are short-sighted. Always in a hurry to solve problems	Plans are long-sighted. Short of time to solve problems
Trust in traditions	Traditions have no value	Speak against traditions
Control is explicit	Control is indirect	Control must be repudiated
Sources of risk are foreign relations	Source of risk is economic collapse	Source of risk is technology

Source: Douglas and Wildavsky, 1984.

The attitudes that are found within every type of organization correspond with the types of environmental ideologies (ecocentrism and technocentrism). Precisely, centrist types of organization (hierarchy, individualism) hold a technocratic environmental ideology; and an ecocentric ideology is characteristic to sectarian types of social organization. In other words, the conclusion is that hierarchical and individualistic types of social organization determine the selection of technocentric environmental ideology and the sectarian type of social organization determines the selection of ecocentric views towards nature.

Having such a conclusion, it is clear that if one wishes to describe the environmental attitudes in any society, he/she has to separate the center views, that are little concerned with the natural environment, and the border views, that most likely are the adherents of environmental movement.

A comparative analysis of the common attitudes of the inhabitants of Kaunas in Lithuania and the ideology of Lithuania's Green Movement will be made in the further chapters of this survey, following the classification of environmental ideologies and the typology of social organization, also having in mind the conclusion that was made about how the type of social organization determines the environmental attitudes.

Table 3. The Differences of Center and Border Views

Center	Border
Imperialism	Smallness of scale
Membership is inclusive	Membership is exclusive and voluntary
Objectives are local in range	Objectives are global in range
Future is seen as extension of present	Expect discontinuity, future is seen as different from and worse than present
Optimistic	Pessimistic, foretells disaster
The individual is insignificant	Belief in every individual's inner goodness and possibility to act
Ignore long-term risks or low probability ones	Takes long-term or even low probability risks, have interest in any bad news
More worried not about the destruction of natural system, but of the social system under question	More worried about irreversible destruction of nature as reflection of people's immorality
Risk portfolio: Dangerous situations appear accidentally, no one is responsible for them. Only explicit short-term high-probability dangers are paid attention to. There is belief that long term or low-probability dangers will be solved in the future with the help of ever developing technologies. The control of dangerous situations is delegated to administrative issues. Most important are social, economic, political dangers, which can harm the social organization itself. Only environmental problems that can directly harm the functioning of the system (for example, depletion of resources) are emphasized.	Risk portfolio: Dangers stem from immorality, which is caused by the central social organizations. God or nature are seen as those who can punish bad behavior. All ecological disasters are seen as prophets of catastrophe. Pollution is emphasized as the symbol of moral defects. Environmental dangers are seen as having irreversible, disrupting nature. Each individual must take responsibility for coping with problems.

Source: Douglas and Wildawsky, 1984.

A description of the attitudes of the inhabitants of Kaunas

Lithuanians' attitudes towards the environment and its protection were described in the public opinion survey "Environmental Consciousness", which was conducted in Kaunas in 1998 by sociologists from Vytautas Magnus University.

First of all respondents were asked to evaluate how important environmental problems were 10 years ago, how important they are now, and how important they will be in 10 years. 56% of respondents claim that environmental problems were very important or important 10 years

ago, 92% claim that they are very important or important today, and 87% claim that they will be very important or important in 10 years. The conclusion can be made, that respondents are optimistic, because they think that problems in the future will be less important than today.

Respondents were asked how much they are interested in environmental problems. 68% of respondents answered that they are a bit interested, and 21% – that they are very interested in environmental issues. The rest (11%) of the respondents claimed that they are not interested at all.

The organizers of the survey also wanted to indicate how environmental issues are valued among other social, economic and political issues of Lithuania, such as: alcoholism, drug addiction, crime, AIDS, cancer cases, terrorism, possible accidents in nuclear power stations, car-crash accidents, etc. The respondents were asked to indicate which of the mentioned issues is the most important. Crime (38%), alcoholism (30%) and pollution of the environment (9%) were the three most often mentioned problems in present day Lithuania. As we can see, pollution is the third most important issue in Lithuania, but the percentage of respondents who indicated this issue as most important is three times lower than the percentages for the issues of crime and alcoholism. The organizers of the survey explain this by the socio-economic situation in Lithuania [Environmental consciousness research..., 1999, p. 12]. They say, that only, when people can meet their basic material needs, moreover – when they already have a satisfying economic basis and guarantee of safe life, they become more interested in such problems as environment degradation. This is true only for global environmental issues. But local, small-scale problems of the surrounding area are very important to those people who have a low standard of living. This idea is supported by some other data. The respondents were asked to evaluate what environmental problems are the most important in Lithuania: pollution of water, pollution of air, Ignalina nuclear power station, dangerous waste from households, the depletion of the ozone layer, acid rain, the global warming effect, overuse of fertilizers, and the building of an oil terminal in Butinge. The main environmental problems in Lithuania were seen as being water pollution (79%), air pollution (68%), and Ignalina nuclear power station (50%). These data support the idea, that the attitudes of respondents are more orientated towards local rather than global problems.

Beside the general interest in environmental issues, the attitudes towards solving these issues were described. The respondents were asked to rank the four levels of solution making: individual level (orientated towards changing people's lifestyles), local level orientated towards the action of local administration institutions, local level orientated towards the action of state government, and international level where problems

are solved through international projects. 45% of respondents think that first of all people should change their way of living. 36% of respondents think, that solutions first of all should be made in the local administrations institutions and at national state levels. And only about 19% of respondents think that solutions would be best made at an international level. These data are supported by another set of answers – the readiness of individuals to contribute to the solving of problems, which was described through such statements:

1. I would devote a certain part of my income to the solving of environmental problems, if I knew that they would be used properly;
2. I would agree with higher taxes, if that additional money were be devoted to the lowering of environmental pollution;
3. The state must take the responsibility of solving environmental problems, but I should not pay any additional money.

Having in mind the first statement, the data show, that 48% of the respondents would agree to devote a part of their income to solution of environmental problems. 37% agreed with higher taxes (Statement 2). But a high number of 67% of respondents agreed with the 3rd statement. The data are very controversial. On the one hand, most respondents think, that solutions first should be made at an individual level, but when they are asked about their real readiness to contribute, most of respondents start to claim that the state should be responsible for the solving of environmental problems.

Having all the data analyzed (not all of the data are presented in this article), it is interesting to notice, that a clear distinction can be made between those respondents who most probably are in favor of environmental ideas and those who most probably are not in favor, or who favor social, economic or other type of issues. The two groups of respondents carry different social-demographic characteristics. These characteristics are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Social-demographic characteristics that influence different attitudes towards environment protection

Individuals giving priorities to environmental issues	Individuals giving priorities to other type of issues
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - older than 25 years of age; - women rather than men; - individuals with a university diploma or those who started but did not finish university; - employed rather than unemployed; - individuals coming from rural areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 18–25 years of age; - men rather than women; - individuals with secondary or higher education; - unemployed rather than employed; - individuals coming from urban areas.

The two groups of individuals, either giving priorities to environmental or other issues, should be treated differently. The second group of individuals (those giving priorities to other types of issues) should be the target of policy-makers. Most of the projects devoted to developing environmental awareness should be addressed to youth, people with a lower of education and townspeople.

The results of the public opinion survey conducted in Kaunas in 1998, describe the common tendencies of attitudes that are present in people's minds. The conclusion can be made that, most probably, the average inhabitant of Kaunas city is of a moderate technocentric mode of thought (see Table 1). This is true because the average individual has confidence in experts (technocrats and bureaucrats), emphasizes the role of the state while solving problems, and has a relatively optimistic view of future. In order to get more arguments supporting the technocentric character of the inhabitants of Kaunas wider and deeper research is needed.

The results of the public opinion survey also prove that the society under study holds the center type of attitudes (Tables 2 and 3). Individuals are interested in environmental issues, but they think that the problems should be solved by authorities (either local or state); they are more interested in social problems (crime and alcoholism), as these are direct threats to the survival of the system itself; give priorities to local issues (water and air pollution, accidents in Ignalina nuclear power station). These features clearly indicate the centrist nature of common views in this society.

A description of the ideology of Lithuania's Green Movement

The study of the ideology of Lithuania's Green Movement (hereon denoted in the text "the Movement") was conducted as part of the bachelor's degree diploma at Vytautas Magnus University in Kaunas in the year 2000 by the author of this article. Secondary data analysis was made in order to describe the ideology of the Movement according to T. O'Riordan's and D. Pepper's [1984] classification of environmental ideology.

The results of the research showed that Lithuania's Green Movement is nonconformist, idealistic, favoring extreme forms of action [Lietuvos Žaliųjų judėjimas, 1995, p. 2]. In 1988 during the protest action "The Ring of Life", which was organized by the Movement, about 15,000 protesters girded Ignalina nuclear power station and expressed their hostility towards nuclear energy [Žalioji Lietuva, 1992]. Such radicalism is

characteristic of "deep ecology" trend of ecocentrism (see Table 1). The activists of Lithuania's Green Movement are aware not only of the environmental problems of the country – they also criticize the social and economic policy of the state, if it does not match with the principles of environment protection. For example, a campaign was organized against the law according to which compensation in the form of forests is given to those citizens whose property cannot be restored. The Green's Movement claims that this law enables the felling of forests for short-time profits [Žalioji Lietuva, March 1997].

Besides radical actions, the Movement also propagates environmental education, inter-organizational and international cooperation, cooperation with state authorities [Lietuvos Žaliųjų judėjimas, 1995]. For example, the Movement takes part in some common projects with the European Union: "Sustainable Europe" [Tolydi Europa, 1996], "Billions for sustainable development? The European Union's Regional Policy and Readiness for Membership." [Milijardai tolydžiai plėtrai, 1999].

Lithuania's Green Movement speaks out not only against environmental degradation, but also against the moral defects of society. In numerous articles of the newspaper "Žalioji Lietuva" [Žalioji Lietuva, 1989–1992, 1996–2000] criticism of inequality, materialism and consumerism is explicitly presented. One of the leaders of the Movement, Saulius Gričius, said once, that "if you consume – you are guilty". One of the aims of the Movement is to harmonize the relations of man and nature [Lietuvos Žaliųjų judėjimas, 1995], because man is perceived as a part of the world ecosystem.

Anti-materialism goes hand in hand with anti-urbanism. In the statute of the Movement [Lietuvos Žaliųjų judėjimas, 1995] it is written, that Lithuania's Greens' movement stands against the expansion of urban areas. The criticism of moral defects goes hand in hand with a negative attitude towards modern wide-range technologies. But it is believed that environmentally hostile technologies can be changed by environmentally friendly ones [Žalioji Lietuva, December 1989]. This standpoint is characteristic of soft technologists branch of ecocentrism.

Lithuania's Green Movement incorporates the sustainable development concept, which is the leading concept of the European Union's and many national states' Environmental Policy, in their ideology. It is paradoxical, because this concept, to the opinion of the author of this article, is typically technocentric. This technocentric idea is expressed in the joint publications of the Movement and the EU: "Sustainable Europe" [Tolydi Europa, 1996], "Billions for sustainable development? The European Union's Regional Policy and Readiness for Membership." [Milijardai tolydžiai plėtrai, 1999] mentioned earlier.

The overall conclusion can be made, that Lithuania's Green Movement ideology corresponds with characteristics of ecocentric mode of thought (see Table 1), because it covers idealism, radicalism, environmental education, a critique of modern moral defects and the promoting of environmentally friendly technology, as well as a holistic view of man and nature. It also admits the technocentric principle of sustainable development.

Lithuania's Green Movement criticizes the lifestyles of the majority, emphasizes smallness of scale, insists on equality, uses the symbol of pure nature to indicate the immorality of the modern way of life, pays attention to every smallest violation of the natural order. All these features are characteristic to border types of organizations.

Conclusions

- The majority of inhabitants of Kaunas hold central tendencies of technocentrism (this should also be true of the majority of Lithuania's citizens), which is the most popular form of environmentalism in western countries and the official policy of EU.
- Lithuania's Green Movement represent the main principles of ecocentrism;
- The coexistence of the two different modes of thought in one society can be explained by the cultural theory of M. Douglas and A. Wildavsky [1984]. The majority of inhabitants of Kaunas belong to central type of organizations (commercial firms, state owned enterprises, bureaucratic apparatus of the state and local governing, universities, schools, etc.), which are more suitable for the spread of technocratic type of attitudes towards the environment. Whereas Lithuania's Green Movement is a border type of organization, where ecocentric views are more common.

Literature

- Douglas M., Wildavsky A. *Risk and culture* - London: University of California Press, 1984.
- Pepper D. *The Roots of Modern Environmentalism.*- Beckenham.: Croom Helm, 1984.
- Environmental consciousness research report for the project of Local Agenda 2 - Kaunas - Kaunas: University of Vytautas Magnus, 1999.*
- Lietuvos Žaliųjų judėjimas: Programa. Įstatai.*- Vilnius.: Žalioji Lietuva, 1995.
- Milijardai tolydžiai plėtrai: Europos sfjungos Regioninė politika ir pasirengimas narystei.*-Vilnius: Lututė, 1999.
- Tolydi Europa.*- Kaunas: bendrija "Atgaja", 1996.
- Žalioji Lietuva.* Vilnius: Žalioji Lietuva, 1989-1992, 1996-2000.