

Environmental Discourse in Lithuania in 1989-2005: Discourse Coalitions and Story-Lines

Audrone Telesiene

Kaunas University of Technology

K. Donelaicio str. 20, LT-44239 Kaunas, Lithuania

E-mail: audrone.telesiene@ktu.lt

Abstract

The content of the environmental discourse that took place in Lithuania from 1989 to 2005 is analyzed in this article. Discourse content is disclosed through identification and description of discourse coalitions and main story-lines that penetrate the discourse texts. The environmental discourse is not analyzed merely as a reflection of environmental worldviews, or as a reflection of socially acceptable norms of environment related behaviour, which dominate the collective consciousness of society. The article also analyzes the latent meanings embedded in the texts that signify social order expectations and social configurations of power defended by the discourse participants. The article is grounded on empirical results obtained as part of the author's doctoral research project. Data collected is pieces of texts from environmental periodicals.

Keywords: environmental discourse, discourse coalitions, environmental worldviews, discourse analysis.

Introduction

Recent ages of societal development saw industrialization, expansion of capitalism, dominance of individualistic as well as materialistic and post-materialistic philosophy, democratization and other social, cultural and political transformations. Growing levels of production and consumption together with specific societal environmental worldviews have resulted in qualitative and quantitative deterioration of environment. As a response, in the middle of the XXth century environmental movements were born and became overwhelmingly popular in western societies. By the end of the century environmental issues have become inseparable part of political agenda, too. Scientists, public authorities, environmental movement activists, industrialists have entered a public discussion, giving birth to worldwide environmental discourse. This environmental discourse, entailing philosophical discussions about ecological ethics as well as discussions about optimal forms for environmental activism, reports on state of the art of some issues, as well as discussions about environmentally most friendly social order contribute to cultural dispute (Douglas, 1970, 1982), which gives birth to new cultural categories that further structure individual

thinking and societal collective consciousness. Castells calls this newborn cultural identity a socio-biological identity: "environmentalists have induced the creation of new identity, a biological one, and the understanding of human culture as a constituting part of nature" (Castells, 2006, p. 185). It has also been admitted (Our Common Future, 1987; Douglas and Wildavsky, 1982), that environmental discourse is contextually embedded and socio-culturally determined and thus global environmental imperative acquires different shades in different cultures. The dialectics of socio-cultural contexts and ideas constructed within environmental discourse become a significant challenge for scientific research.

Environmental discourse, as remarked by many social scientists (Jamison, Eyerman, Cramer, Laesoe, 1990; Pepper, 1993; Hajer, 1995; Dryzek, 1997 and others), is usually tangled with various other social, political, economic discourses, as illustrated by close connection between environmental and antinuclear, pacifist, feminist movements: "Environmental movement is a very important movement of nowadays, because under the broad flag of environmental justice it embraces many social problems" (Castells, 2006, p. 190).

The rise of environmental movement in Lithuania in 1989 also went hand in hand with social and political transformations – environmental movement in its beginning was intertwined with processes of national rebirth and strove for restoration of independence from the USSR. Through green language, such as criticism of anti-environmental governmental decisions to extract oil in the Baltic Sea close to environmentally fragile Lithuanian seaside, environmental activists de-legitimized soviet system of decision making as well as the arrangement of the whole soviet political and economic system. People of all professions and occupations joined the Lithuanian environmental-political movement in hope for restoration of independence. The environmental discourse, which gained its momentum in the end of the 80's and contributed to radical political transformations in Lithuania, expe-

rienced changes over time but is still going on in Lithuania, arguing not solely for the need to solve environmental problems, but also for the need to solve many other problems and for the need to change current social order. This environmental discourse is not only influenced by, but influences itself the social reality and the development of Lithuanian society. The environmental discourse is a perfect mirror, where a scientist can see and research the social and cultural changes since 1989, as reflected by the participants of the discourse.

This article presents a part of the results of a scientific research conducted by the author of the article in 2005-2006 while implementing the doctoral research project (Telesiene, 2006).

The following questions define the scientific problem of this article: What environmental worldviews were being constructed in the discourse in Lithuania in 1989-2005? What discourse coalitions are being formed on the grounds of these worldviews? What main ideas penetrate the whole discourse and into what story-lines are they being organized? What social order is defended in the name of environment protection in Lithuania? Who are the actors of environmental discourse in Lithuania?

This article is retrospective – the 16 years period that is analysed in the article entails the early developmental period of a country with newly restored independence (period from 1989 to 2005). The data was obtained four years ago (in 2006), but this does not diminish the value of the findings. On the contrary – the scientific publication of the results becomes more and more relevant. New features, indicating the recent transformations of the environmental discourse, become apparent: discursive utterances gain access to wide public through channels of popular mass media, environmental issues gain more and more attention of the society. In order to explain these current developments one needs to know the historic, ideological and social contexts, grounded on empirical evidence. The results presented in this article serve as such an empirically grounded tool for better understanding and explanation of the recent developments in environmental discourse.

The object of the article: main actors, dominant worldviews and story-lines of the environmental discourse in Lithuania in 1989-2005. The aim of the article is to analyze and critically interpret the content of environmental discourse (as taking place within environmental periodicals) in Lithuania in 1989-2005. Main objectives are: 1) to define the main theoretical and methodological principles underlying the research with reference to methodological tradition of critical discourse analysis; 2) to reason the methods used in the empirical research (method of sam-

pling, data gathering and data analysis; 3) to identify main discourse coalitions and analyze characteristics of environmental worldviews articulated by them; 4) to analyze the main story-lines penetrating the discourse.

Sociological research on environmental discourse is relevant for better understanding and explanation of the formation of environmental worldviews in Lithuania, also of the influences made by contextual factors upon the content of discursive utterance on environmental issues, also relevant for better understanding of the main actors taking roles in the environmental discourse in Lithuania. Such a research is also relevant because it sheds light upon latent social order expectations and latent expectation of social power configurations that become manifest through the discursive utterances. Environmental social research in Lithuania is scarce and fragmented, thus the research on environmental discourse complements the existing empirical data and encourages further inquiries.

Theoretical and methodological basis of the research

The main theoretical assumption underlying the logics of the research is that *environmental worldview is a socio-culturally determined social construct, created and mediated through discourses*.

Theoretical principles of the research rely upon theory of discourse analysis, theories of environmental sociology analyzing structure and development of environmental worldviews and attitudes, theory of social constructivism, Douglas theory of socio-cultural determination, Durkheim notion of “collective representations” and Bauman concepts of “habitat” and “self-constitution”.

Relying upon analysis of Durkheim notion of social facts, social constructivist paradigm, Douglas theory of socio-cultural determination and Bauman notions of habitat and self-constitution, it is stated that environmental worldviews are collective representations that are socially constructed and socio-culturally determined as well as individually interpreted in the process of self-constitution and identity construction. Environmental worldviews are collective representations influenced by morphological and institutional societal factors. At the same time environmental worldviews are socially constructed through discourse. Contextual settings influence discourse tentatively. Environmental discourse content variation depends upon contextual settings and individual interpretations resulting from self-constitution processes.

Environmental worldviews themselves are described differently by various scientists. E.g. Worster

(1977) speaks of Arcadian and Imperialist traditions of societal views on living in/with nature, O’Riordan (1981) and Pepper (1984) distinguish between Eco-centric and Techno-centric modes of thinking about human-nature interaction, and Tellegen and Wolsink (1998) add an Anthropocentric dimension on society’s views of nature. Relying on critical analysis and synthesis of environmental sociological theories on environmental worldviews and paradigms (Worster, 1977; Dunlap & van Lierre, 1978, 1983; O’Riordan, 1981; Pepper, 1984; Eckersley, 1992; Tellegen & Wolsink, 1998; Castells, 2006) it is stated that environmental discourse content is cognizable through environmental worldviews contained therein and can be researched through such thematic criteria (operationalisation): perception of environment and man-nature relationship, prioritized environmental problems, associated problems of other spheres, explanation of causality of the problems, strategies for solving of the problems and vision of desired social order.

If environmental worldviews are socially constructed through discourse, as stated earlier in the text, a scientist needs to analyze the discourse in order to identify the worldviews. Relying upon analysis of “discourse” and “discourse analysis” concepts, as theoretically elaborated by Dijk (1985a, 1985 b), Foucault (1998), Kress (1985), Harre, Brockmeier, Muhlhausler (1999), Grimshaw (2003), Hajer (1995, 1996), Fairclough (1993a, 1993b, 1995), Wodak (1996, 1999) and others, the author of this article argues that discourse is a manifestation arena of social phenomena (e.g., environmental worldviews). In such a case, qualitative, hermeneutic methodology, critical discourse analysis and interpretive analysis of texts from environmental periodicals enable systematic and deep understanding and explanation of environmental discourse content in Lithuania in 1989-2005.

Main principles of critical discourse analysis (CDA) were adapted to the research aim and applied during the research process: attention to broadly understood context, conception of language as a means for manifestation of worldviews, interpretive and explanatory mode of analysis, openness and acceptance of possible change of research results.

Discourse analytical categories: discourse coalitions and story-lines

The content of environmental discourse is disclosed through description and analysis of environmental worldviews as characteristic to certain discourse coalitions, and through analysis and interpretation of story-lines penetrating the discourse.

While discussing the discourse analysis concept of Davies and Harre (1990), Hajer (1995) highlighted the concepts of *discourse coalition* and *dis-*

course story-line. Discourse coalitions usually are informal and unconscious unions of actors sharing similar positions with regard to discourse object. Every discourse coalition has a certain configuration of discourse actors. Discourse coalitions might not be equivalent in regard to their structure and configuration – some might be numerous and consisting of powerful governmental or private sector institutions, some might encounter single activists – though even the coalitions with different structures act in a discourse as partners or opponents. For better understanding of a discourse coalition, one first has to explain the notion of discourse story-line.

Hajer (1995, p. 56) explains story-lines as generative type stories or as collections of symbols and ideas that allow actors to use certain categories (immanent within these stories), by means of which physical and social realities are given meanings. Discourse story-lines are narratives about social reality. These narratives entail specific aspects of seeing and conceiving an issue. Narratives entail totality of symbolic signifiers that are constantly used by discourse actors. By referring to one of the symbolic signifiers, the whole story-line is evoked. Thus story-line can be understood as a metaphor. An example of a story line might be a widely recognized statement “Sustainable development is the best alternative of societal development”. Such a story-line entails narratives of necessary coordination of environmental, economic and social interests, entails symbols of environmental care and notions of environmentally and socially responsible business, sustainable urban development, sustainable consumption, etc. Such a story-line is understood and shared by different actors, such as environmental activists, policy-makers, scientists, journalists, etc. Story-lines serve as glue for discourse coalitions.

On the grounds of commonly accepted and used story-lines, *discourse coalitions* are being formed (Hajer, 1995). Different discourse coalitions have different definitions and interpretations of the same issues and might have different worldviews. Story-lines not only define the issues in a certain way, but also denote the necessary solutions, name different responsible actors, and even imply desirable ways for societal development. Story-line also describes those knowledge sources that must be trusted (e.g. science, technologies or religion and faith) and used for analysis of an issue.

Thus discourse coalitions unite actors that for different reasons declare same story-lines. Story-lines are nothing else than certain collections of (1) story-lines; (2) actors that share these story-lines; and (3) practices by which these story-lines are constructed and shared (Hajer, 1995, p. 65).

Discourse coalitions might share same story-lines but have slightly different interpretations of them. For example, both environmentalists and industrialists acknowledge the story-line of sustainable development, still environmentalists see sustainable development as implementation of environmental principles in all spheres of societal life, and industrialists see sustainable development as an opportunity for renewal of industrial practices towards more effective economic performance.

Different discourse coalitions interact in an environmental discourse, and argue among each other not that much about the actions necessary to undertake in order to solve one problem or another, but rather about what constitutes the essence of each problem and how to define it. Discourse coalitions compete in a discourse over the meanings and symbols that must be attributed to social or physical phenomena.

One has to stress here that discourse coalitions should not be understood in same way as political coalitions, which usually are defined as groups of actors coordinating their activities amongst each other in order to reach a certain aim (Bogelund, 2003, p. 79). First of all, discourse coalitions are united not by common interests of stakeholders, but by commonly used and shared story-lines and worldviews. Discourse coalition is much more about sharing common ideas and notions than about sharing common interests. Thus, such a coalition might be constituted of actors with very diverse backgrounds, e.g., members of environmental movement and members of parliament or single writers and single scientists. They can have different conceptions about the nature of an issue, but they might share common lines of argumentation. For example, they can follow the ecological modernisation line of argumentation. Thus different actors and institutions might enter a discourse and hand in hand with other subjects seek for societal changes without even a need for formal coordination of their practices or without a need for formal organization. Secondly, political coalitions are usually homogeneous in terms of background of the members. Discourse coalitions are diverse – a journalist can contribute to the (re-) production of a story-line in the same way as a scientist could do. Thus discourse coalitions have numerous communication forms and styles.

It should also be noted that analysis of the formation of discourse coalitions and analysis of their interactions do not eliminate necessity to look upon a single individual as an active player in the discourse production. Foucault (1998) argued that discourse actors enter discourse with their prior experiences and attitudes. The viewpoints of actors in any discourse coalition are not identical in the beginning, but might

become identical as the discourse proceeds. As the discourse goes on, individual attitudes lose their initial contents, new meanings appear and common group-specific approaches are born. In other words, in the beginning, each participant brings in his own worldview, determined by direct social contexts and specific cultural-intellectual capital. But during the discourse different attitudes converge and finally we see generalized abstract narratives. The new categories or meanings that are born during the discourse may change the way discourse participants see the problem, the aspects that they prioritize, etc.

Notions of discourse coalition and discourse story-line are both powerful tools for scientific inquiry into environmental discourse.

Methods of studying environmental discourse

The scientific research was conducted following the logics of qualitative social research methodology. Critical discourse analysis was the methodological strategy of the research. Methods of theoretical sampling, qualitative content analysis and thematic and grounded theory based data analysis, hermeneutic text deconstruction and interpretation, enabled deep and sensitive analysis of environmental discourse in Lithuania, allowed to focus on the variety of environmental worldviews manifested in environmental discourse, allowed to explain the object under study in the terms used by the ones who are researched.

Empirical basis for research: 608 texts sampled out of totality of texts published in three ecological periodicals “Green Lithuania”, “Green World”, and “Fatherland’s Nature” in the period from year 1989 to 2005.

The analysis of the sampled texts was based on environmental discourse content dimensions, as generated by the author by abduction. These dimensions entail (as listed earlier in the text): perception of environment and man-nature relationship, prioritized environmental problems, associated problems of other spheres, explanation of causality of the problems, strategies for solving the problems and vision of desired social order.

Pursuing the scientific quality of the research the author took into consideration the qualitative research quality criteria: openness and accessibility of the results, technique of including the reviews of the researched, the author also sought for clear and sufficient descriptions of the sampling and data analysis procedures.

Qualitative research is characterized by the fact that an investigator collects and analyzes great amount of empirical material. Usually pieces of the texts are given in the research reports as supportive il-

illustrations of the statements, arguments and interpretations made by authors. Thus the environmental discourse research report (on grounds of which the author of this paper defended her doctoral theses) entails a lot of textual illustrative material which is omitted in this article for the reason of space saving.

Worldview discourse coalitions constructed in the environmental discourse in Lithuania

Results of the text analyses show that in Lithuania in 1989-2005 two main discourse coalitions were being formed on the grounds of two different environmental worldviews: consciousness ecologisation and ecological modernization.

Consciousness ecologisation discourse coalition received its name because these texts focus on individual and collective consciousness, strive for ecologisation of culture and attention to ecologisation of science, technologies, industry or politics is only secondary.

Ecological modernisation discourse coalition's texts focus on ecologisation of industry and politics and give only secondary priorities to ecologisation of society's consciousness and culture.

Members of consciousness ecologisation discourse coalition conceive nature as holistic and self-sustaining, also see nature as the basis for human and nation existence. The value of natural environment is derived from the perception that human existence is based on nature. Man-nature relationship is perceived as a relationship of two equal partners (egalitarian view). Still a man is viewed as part of nature, a man has to conform to the laws of nature (and not to conquer and adapt to his own needs).

Ecological modernization discourse coalition is characterised by anthropocentrism; a man is seen as standing above the nature, as its master and manager. Proponents of this discourse coalition share concepts of a human as an active subject and nature/environment as a passive object. The value of natural environment is associated with resources that can be extracted, recreational functions and with supportive functions for economic systems (utilitarian position).

The problems articulated by both discourse coalitions range from global to national with an emphasis being on the latter. Collective and individual consciousness ecologisation and lifestyle changes are seen as the main problems and tasks in consciousness ecologisation discourse coalition. In ecological modernization texts the problems of environmental degradation are prioritized, e.g. water pollution, air pollution, soil erosion, deterioration of the living environment quality, irrational use of resources, deforestation and so on.

While talking about environmental problems discourse participants usually link them to the problems of other spheres (non-environmental). This tells much about the way actors see and interpret the issues. In the period of 1989-1990 both discourse coalitions while talking about environment also linked to political problems: economic and political dependence on the USSR, environmentally unfriendly USSR policies. Later, after Lithuania regained its independence in 1990, the range of associated problems expanded. Consciousness ecologisation discourse coalition started associating environmental problems with problems of awareness and cultural decline. Ecological modernization discourse coalition continued associating environmental problems with political issues and also started associating them with economic and legal problems. Ecological modernization texts also started speaking of science and technologies.

In the most common sense, ecological modernization discourse coalition conceptualizes environmental problems in such a way that these would require managed institutional changes and political-economic solutions, e.g. subsidizing of environmentally friendly technologies. In this way, power of environmental officials, industrialists, scientists and experts is being legitimized.

Meanwhile consciousness ecologisation discourse coalition perceived problems more as processes of structural change (e.g. morally irresponsible science, decline of culture and value systems), which are beyond the institutional capacity to intervene. This discourse legitimizes participative governance, community-based activism, morally responsible individual activism. Thus we see that specific definitions of the same problems also denote different necessary reforms and ways of societal change.

Texts from consciousness ecologisation discourse coalition express critical views towards irresponsible technological development (eco-centric attitude). Though texts from ecological modernization discourse coalition reveal their positive attitude towards technological development, trust in technological capacities, explicitly set out the need for environmentally friendly technologies, speak of low-waste and low energy consuming technologies, the need to change old resource-intensive technologies (techno-centric approach). Despite the overall positive attitude towards technologies, ecological modernization discourse coalition acknowledges that technologies account for a great part of environmental degradation. Thus this coalition articulates moderate technological optimism, avoids extreme cornucopian ideology. Ecological modernization discourse coalition also holds favourable attitudes towards development of science and its potential to solve environmental problems.

Consciousness ecologisation texts very clearly articulate the criticism of cultural trends and features of western civilization. The civilization is criticized for being inert and consumerist. Problems of culture and civilization also manifest as spiritual crisis and are closely linked to environmental problems.

Before restoration of Lithuania's independence and shortly after it, around 1991, the causes of environmental (and other) problems were explained as external ones – sovietisation conducted under occupation. After 1991 the explanation of environmental problems' causality expanded into several major groups.

Consciousness ecologisation texts mainly explain causality by abstractly referring to the decline of Western civilization. Some of the texts relate causes to more specific societal issues, such as lack of civil activism, lack of environmental education, lack of awareness, moral and cultural crisis, lack of knowledge about environmental problems, lack of political culture. Overall, the environmental problems in consciousness ecologisation discourse coalition are understood as being an integral part of other social problems. In this way, environmental problems are closely linked to the core issues of society, solution of which in a snowball principle would lead to the relative retreat of the environmental problems. These core issues are identified as lack of civic and community activism, lack of democratization, lack of personal responsibility and efficiency, depreciation of ethnic and cultural traditions.

Ecological modernization texts outline the following main causes of environmental problems: external – foreign occupation regime and the state planned economy (more often occur in texts before 1992), and internal – irresponsible development of production, lack of cooperation between environmentalists and industrialists, use of outdated and wasteful technologies, lack of involvement of scientists and scientific research, etc.

Another dimension of analysis is attribution of responsibility for the appearance of environmental problems and attribution of responsibility for solving these problems. This dimension for analysis of the content of worldviews characteristic to discourse coalitions also entails attitudes towards the best ways and means of solving the environmental problems.

Consciousness ecologisation texts often attribute responsibility to abstractly defined “society” or “every individual”. This discourse coalition has trails of individualistic worldview – every individual is held responsible for the appearance of environmental problems and consequently every individual is held responsible for and capable of solving these problems (e.g. through personal example of an alter-

native lifestyle). The problem-solving power consequently is attributed to the third sector – non-governmental organizations. Eco-educational activities are emphasized as the best ways of solving environmental problems. Consciousness ecologisation discourse coalition talks of the important role of politicians in the development of environmental legislative framework, also talks about the important role of scientists in spreading timely and comprehensive information about the current or imminent problems.

In the texts of ecological modernization the main actors responsible for the appearance of environmental problems are identified as follows: other state or union of states, industrialists / entrepreneurs, environmentalists, or the complaint includes the society as a whole.

In the consciousness ecologisation discourse coalition attitudes towards the best ways and means of solving the environmental problems are not homogeneous. There is only a general tendency to emphasize the need for changes in collective as well as individual lifestyles and way of thinking. Also, the cultural ecologisation and the role of education are emphasized. The decision-making power is attributed to NGO's, “every individual”, scientists and politicians.

Changes in economic practices, political decisions and scientific research are identified as the main means for the environmental problem-solving in the ecological modernization discourse coalition. The decision-making power is attributed firstly to industrialists and entrepreneurs. Public officials, environmentalists and policy-makers are also given an important role. Participation of scientists and experts in decision-making processes is seen as necessary. An active civil society and non-governmental organizations are attributed much less importance. Thus elitist preferences become clear – decision-making power is attributed to experts, officials, or wealthy industrialists.

Next dimension is analysis of the desired social order. The vision of a desirable social order in the consciousness ecologisation texts is captured in the expression: “Free, flourishing and green Lithuania”. The foundation of the desired vision of social development (and hence legitimizing of the activities) is sought in pantheist Lithuanian traditions, traditional culture, literary classics, and works of philosophers. Pantheist traditional values are set against the new values of consumerism and materialism; pantheist tradition of a human living in harmony with nature is contrasted to modern tradition of a man ruling over nature. In such a way the confrontation of Imperial and Arcadian traditions as discussed by Worster (1977) is revealed. The desired social order articulated by ecological modernization paradigm is enclosed in the state-

ment: “western-type society, beyond the threshold of material well-being”. Principles of sustainable development are immanent in this vision.

Consciousness ecologisation discourse coalition consists of several groups of actors: 1) Lithuanian Green Movement, 2) other more moderate non-governmental organisations, such as Association to beautify Lithuania, Atgaja and others, 3) young nature and forest friends, their teachers, foresters and environmentalists who assist them, 4) eco-educators, that is teachers working in various levels and profiles of education and higher education institutions, 5) members of the Romuva movement, 6) nature essayists and “green feathers” representatives, 7) scientists, intellectuals, and 8) promoters of healthy lifestyles, vegetarians.

Ecological modernization discourse coalition is highly homogeneous in their worldviews (while consciousness ecologisation discourse coalition has polarity and heterogeneity of views). The subjects acting in this coalition thus are not as diverse as in the consciousness ecologisation discourse coalition. Main groups of actors operating in this coalition are as follows: scientists (mainly representatives of physical sciences), public sector employees (not all civil servants in the field of environmental protection are eco-modernists), representatives of the Lithuanian Confederation of Industrialists, proponents of organic farming, a number of environmental NGOs. There is a tendency that most often the eco-modernist texts are written by scientists or public officials.

Main discourse story-lines

Three general story-lines have been identified as both being articulated by discourse coalitions and penetrating the whole environmental discourse in Lithuania: restoration of pantheist traditions, sensing of nature, ecological nationalism. Story-lines are systems of statements organized around a certain idea that repeatedly appear in the analyzed texts. These story-lines are characteristic to both discourse coalitions: consciousness ecologisation and ecological modernization.

The axis of *restoration of pantheist traditions* story-line is the revitalization of ancient Baltic moral culture and bringing back of pantheist traditions into contemporary life as a precondition for problem solving and harmonious life of Lithuanians with nature. It is argued, within this story-line, that modern reflective pro-Baltic position is necessary in order to solve current problems. Historical experience and modern expressions of ancient traditions are thought to be amongst the best measures in environmental problem solving. Close relationships of Lithuanian na-

tion and nature are derived from unique Baltic culture and viewed as a special feature characteristic to the Baltic nations only.

In the analyzed discourse it is also important to differentiate between notions of “sensing the nature” and “protecting the nature”. In the “protecting the nature” line of argumentation the most important ways for environmental problem solving are accumulation and dissemination of theoretical knowledge, awareness raising, and knowledge-based nature protection activities. “Nature protection” proponents argue that knowledge and awareness will help raise the environmental consciousness. “Sensing the nature” story-line argues that each individual has to experience and sense the nature directly through everyday practical activities (and not through gaining of theoretical knowledge), be they educational, recreational or conservational activities. Only the direct experience of nature would develop emotional relation to nature, personal responsibility and environmental consciousness. Religion, art or everyday experience are construed as better grounds for environmental problem solving than theoretical knowledge and bare information.

While conducting the research it has been noticed that environmental attitudes and environmental consciousness in the environmental discourse in Lithuania are closely interconnected with national identity, civil attitudes and even national patriotism. The line of argumentation where care for nation’s prosperity is closely interlinked with care for the environment is called a story-line of ecological nationalism. The term “nation” and not the terms “society” or “individual” is often used in textual contexts while speaking of nature-protection, sensing-the-nature, environmental responsibility or environmental consciousness. In this way the emphasis is not on abstract societal level of environmental consciousness, not on global convergence, but on specific national level of collective consciousness. This is about nation-nature relationship and not just about individual-nature, or society-nature relationship. Nature here is not so much individual’s, but more the whole nation’s source of vitality. Close relationship between nation and living environment (territory) is described using the terms “ethno-ecosystem”, “eco-patriot”, and “eco-genocide”. Around the middle of the last decade of the XXth century the frequent usage of words nation-nature disappears. Words “nature-individual”, “me and nature” become more frequent thus marking the decline of eco-collectivist ideology and rise of more individualistic approaches. At the same time, instead of talking about nationality, discourse actors start talking more about citizenship.

Conclusions and discussion

The content of environmental discourse in Lithuania is not homogeneous, several different environmental worldviews are being articulated by discourse actors, and several common story-lines penetrate the discourse. Two main discourse coalitions are identified as having formed in Lithuania in 1989-2005 on the grounds of two different environmental worldviews: consciousness ecologisation and ecological modernization. Proponents of consciousness ecologisation worldview focus on the ecologisation of culture, individual and collective consciousness, and pay secondary attention to ecologisation of science, technologies, industry or politics. Proponents of ecological modernization worldview focus on the ecologisation of technologies, industry or politics, and pay secondary attention to ecologisation of culture, individual and collective consciousness.

Three general story-lines have been identified as both being articulated by discourse coalitions and penetrating the whole environmental discourse in Lithuania: restoration of pantheist traditions, sensing the nature, ecological nationalism. The axis of restoration of pantheist traditions story-line is the revitalization of ancient Baltic moral culture and bringing back of pantheist traditions into contemporary life as a precondition for problem solving and harmonious life of Lithuanians with nature. In the story-line of sensing the nature it is argued that each individual has to experience and sense the nature directly through everyday practical activities (and not through gaining of theoretical knowledge), be they educational, recreational or conservational activities. The line of argumentation where care for nation's prosperity is closely interlinked with care for the environment is called a story-line of ecological nationalism.

Despite the fact that several public environmental periodicals are published in Lithuania (e.g. "Green Lithuania", "Green World", and "Fatherland's Nature") and there are plenty of specialized, thematic environmental periodicals, however, it can be stated that in Lithuania in general there is a certain vacuum of deep ecological worldviews. Publications reach only a small part of the population, environmental and ecological themes are not common in popular press or on television (Juraite, 2002). Shortage of environmental ideology, as observed in the period from 1989 to 2005, is a condition when only messages about environmental disasters or sensational articles about the commercial anti-environmental aims of businesses or industry reach the public through popular mass-media channels. This tendency is still present in nowadays environmental discourse in Lithuania and thus needs further research.

Yet another point for discussion is the fact that problem-oriented environmentalism and practical en-

vironmentalism dominate the environmental discourse in Lithuania (and not analytical discussions on environmental ethics or philosophy). Problem-oriented environmentalism is defined here as a tendency to concentrate attention on individual issues and separate environmental problems, e.g. deforestation and problems of improper maintenance of forests, decline in bird populations, etc. Discourse texts also often present information on so-called practical environmentalism – the nature protection activities that focus on direct practical activities aiming at any local or national problem, for example, planting of forests, cleaning of rivulets, registering birds or other animals of a specific area, etc. The above listed tendencies might be explained by referring to a specific feature of environmental consciousness in Lithuania – low global awareness and preoccupation mainly with national-level or local issues. Also this is influenced by sensing-the-nature story-line domination in the environmental discourse in Lithuania until 2005, which in turn is influenced by contextual factor – deep tradition or practical environmentalism as formed through sovietisation process.

References

1. Bøgelund, P. (2003). *Greening the area of car taxation: A Comparative Study of Environmental Policy Integration in Sweden and Denmark* (PhD dissertation, Department of Development and Planning, Aalborg University).
2. Castells, M. (2006). *Informacijos amžius: ekonomika, visuomenė ir kultūra. Tapatumo galia*. Vilnius: Poligrafija ir informatika, 2 t. Orig. published by Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2004.
3. Davies, B., Harré, R. (1990). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 20 (1), 44-63. Available online at <http://www.massey.ac.nz/~ALock/position/position.htm>.
4. Dijk, T. A. (1985a). Preface to the Four Volumes. In Teun, A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis: Dimensions of Discourse*, Vol. 2. London: Academic Press.
5. Dijk, T. A. (1985b). Introduction: The Role of Discourse Analysis in Society. In Teun, A. van Dijk (Ed.). *Handbook of Discourse Analysis: Discourse Analysis in Society*, Vol. 4. London: Academic Press.
6. Douglas, M. (1970). *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology*. New York: Pantheon Books.
7. Douglas, M., Wildavsky, A. (1982). *Risk and Culture: An Essay on the Selection of Technological and Environmental Dangers*. California: University of California Press.
8. Dryzek, J. S. (1997). *The Politics of the Earth: Environmental Discourses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
9. Dunlap, R. E., Liere, K. D. (1984). Commitment to the dominant social paradigm and concern for environ-

- mental quality. *Social Science Quarterly*, 65, 1013-1028.
10. Dunlap, R. E., Liere, K. D. (1978). The new environmental paradigm. *Journal of Environmental Education*, 9, 10-19.
 11. Eckersley, R. (1992). Environmentalism and political theory: Towards an eco-centric approach. London: UCL Press.
 12. Fairclough, N. (1993a). Critical Discourse Analysis and the Marketization of Public Discourse: the Universities. *Discourse & Society*, 4 (2), 133-168.
 13. Fairclough, N. (1993b). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
 14. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis. The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman.
 15. Foucault, M. (1998). *Diskurso tvarka*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos. Orig. išl.: Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1971.
 16. Grimshaw, A. D. (2003). Genres, Registers, and Contexts of Discourse. In Graesser, A. C., Gernsbacher, M. A. and Goldman, S. R. (Eds.), *Handbook of Discourse Processes*. Mahwah: New Jersey.
 17. Hajer, M. A. (1995). *The Politics of Environmental Discourse: Ecological Modernisation and the Policy Process*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
 18. Hajer, M. A. (1996). Ecological Modernisation as Cultural Politics. In Lash, S., Szerszynski, B., Wynne, B. (Eds.), *Risk, Environment and Modernity*. London: Sage Publications.
 19. Harré, R., Brockmeier, J., Mühlhäusler, P. (1999). *Greenspeak: A Study of Environmental Discourse*. London, New Delhi: SAGE Publications.
 20. Jamison, A., Eyerman, R., Cramer, J., Laessoe, J. (1990). *The Making of the New Environmental Consciousness*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
 21. Juraitė, K. (2002). *Ekologinė sąmonė ir masinė komunikacija: visuomenės nuomonės apie aplinkosaugą konstravimas žiniasklaidoje* (PhD dissertation, Universitas Vytauti Magni).
 22. Kress, G. (1985). Ideological Structures in Discourse. In Dijk, Teun A. van (Ed), *Handbook of Discourse Analysis: Discourse Analysis in Society*, 4, 27-42. London: Academic Press.
 23. O'Riordan, T. (1981). Environmentalism and Education. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 1 (12), 3-17.
 24. *Our common future* (1987). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 25. Pepper, D. (1984). *The Roots of Modern Environmentalism*. Beckenham: Croom Helm.
 26. Pepper, D. (1993). *Eco-socialism: from deep ecology to social justice*. London: Routledge.
 27. Telešienė, A. (2006). *Ekologinis diskursas Lietuvoje, 1989-2005 m.* (PhD dissertation, Kaunas University of Technology).
 28. Tellegen, E., Wolsink, M. (1998). *Society and Its Environment: An Introduction*. Amsterdam: OPA.
 29. Wodak, R. (1996). *Disorders of Discourse*. London: Longman.
 30. Wodak, R., Cillia, R., Reisigl, M., Liebhart, K. (1999). *The Discursive Construction of National Identity*. Transl. A. Hirsch and R. Mitten. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
 31. Worster, D. (1977). *Nature's Economy: a History of Ecological Ideas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Telešienė A.

Ekologinis diskursas Lietuvoje 1989–2005 metais: diskurso koalicijos ir siužetinės linijos

Santrauka

Šiame straipsnyje analizuojamas ir kritiškai interpretuojamas ekologinio diskurso, vykusio Lietuvoje 1989–2005 m., turinys. Diskurso turinys atskleidžiamas per diskurso tekstuose dominuojančių pasaulėžiūrinių diskurso koalicijų bei siužetinių linijų identifikavimą ir aprašymą. Ekologinio diskurso turinys analizuojamas ne vien kaip ekologinių pasaulėžiūrų ar ekologinės elgsenos normų, vyraujančių kolektyvinėje visuomenės sąmonėje, atspindys. Straipsnyje taip pat siekiama išanalizuoti latentiskai besireiškiančius norimos socialinės tvarkos lūkesčius, ekologinio diskurso dalyvių ginamas socialinės galios konfigūracijas.

Mokslinę problemą, nagrinėjamą šiame straipsnyje, atskleidžia šie klausimai: kokios ekologinės pasaulėžiūros konstruojamos ekologiniame diskurse Lietuvoje 1989–2005 m.? Kokio diskurso koalicijos formuojasi šių pasaulėžiūrų pagrindu? Kokios pagrindinės idėjos persmelkia šį ekologinį diskursą ir į kokias siužetines linijas jos

organizuojamos? Koks visuomeninio sambūvio modelis yra ginamas aplinkos apsaugos vardan? Kas yra šio ekologinio diskurso pagrindiniai veikėjai? Straipsnis yra retrospektyvinio pobūdžio: nagrinėjamas 16 metų laikotarpis apima ankstyvąjį naujai atkurtos nepriklausomybės raidos laikmetį. Straipsnio **objektas** – pasaulėžiūros, siužetinės linijos, atsiskleidžiančios ekologiniame diskurse Lietuvoje 1989–2005 m. **Tikslas** – išanalizuoti ir kritiškai įvertinti ekologiniuose periodiniuose leidiniuose vykstančio ekologinio diskurso turinį Lietuvoje 1989–2005 m. Siekiant užsibrėžto tikslo įgyvendinami tokie uždaviniai: 1) apibrėžti bendrusius teorinius ir metodologinius tyrimo principus, remiantis kokybine socialinių mokslų tyrimų prieiga bei kritiškosios diskurso analizės metodologine tradicija; 2) pagrįsti empirinio tyrimo metodiką (tyrimo vienetų atrankos, duomenų rinkimo ir analizės principų); 3) atskleisti pagrindines diskurso turinio pagrindus besiformuojančias diskurso koalicijas ir išanalizuoti jų reiškiamas ekologines

pasaulėžiūras; 4) išanalizuoti nagrinėjamo diskursui būdingiausias siužetines diskurso linijas.

Teoriniai atlikto tyrimo (kurio pagrindu parengta ši publikacija) principai remiasi diskurso analizės teorija, aplinkosaugos sociologijos teorijomis, analizuojančiomis ekologinių pasaulėžiūrų struktūrą, socialinio konstruktivizmo teorija, M. Douglas sociokultūrinės determinacijos teorija, E. Durkheimo „kolektyvinių reprezentacijų“ samprata, Z. Baumano „habitat“ ir „savikūros“ sąvokomis. Atliktas tyrimas rėmėsi kokybine sociologinių tyrimų prieiga. Tyrimo **metodologinė** strategija – kritiškoji diskurso analizė. Empiriniame tyrime naudoti **metodai**: teorinė, tikslinė tyrimo vienetų atranka; duomenų rinkimo metodai: kokybinė turinio analizė, giluminiai interviu; duomenų analizės metodai: tematinė ir **grounded** teorija, paremta kokybinės duomenų analizės strategija, hermeneutinis-kokybinis tekstų dekonstravimas ir interpretacija. Empirinis tyrimo pagrindai: 608 tekstai atrinkti iš generalinės tekstų visumos, kurią sudaro tekstai, publikuoti 1989–2005 m. trijuose ekologiniuose periodiniuose leidiniuose: „Žalioji Lietuva“, „SOS“ / „Žalioji Pasaulis“ ir „Tėviškės gamta“.

Pristatytų empirinio tyrimo rezultatų pagrindu daroma išvada, kad ekologinio diskurso Lietuvoje turinys nėra homogeniškas, jame reiškiasi skirtingos ekologinės pasaulėžiūros, artikuliuojamos įvairių diskurso subjektų, diskursui būdingos bendros siužetinės linijos. Ekologiniame diskurse Lietuvoje 1989–2005 m. išryškėja dvi pagrindinės diskurso koalicijos, besiformuojančios dviejų ekologinių pasaulėžiūrų pagrindu – sąmonės ekologizacijos ir ekologinės modernizacijos.

Sąmonės ekologizacijos pasaulėžiūriniam diskurse akcentuojama individualios ir visuomeninės sąmonės, kultūros ekologizacija, antraeilis dėmesys telkiamas į mokslo, technologijų, pramonės ar politikos ekologizacijos procesus. Sąmonės ekologizacijos pasaulėžiūroje žmogaus ir gamtos santykiai suvokiami kaip lygiaverčių partnerių santykiai; žmogus kartu suvokiamas kaip gamtos dalis, turintis prisiderinti prie gamtos dėsnių. Žmogaus–gamtos santykių problemos (o ne aplinkos degradacijos problemos), tokios kaip visuomenės bei kiekvieno individo sąmonės ekologizacija ir gyvenimo būdo pokyčiai, laikomos prioritetinėmis. Ekologinės problemos čia glaudžiai siejamos su individų sąmoningumu bei kultūros nuosmukio problemomis. Problemų sprendimo galia sąmonės ekologizacijos pasaulėžiūroje telkiama trečiojo sektoriaus – nevyriausybinių organizacijų ir pilietinės visuomenės – rankose. Požiūriai į problemų (ekologinių ir kt.) sprendimo būdus bei priemones sąmonės ekologizacijos pasaulėžiūroje yra nehomogeniški. Vyrauja tik bendra tendencija išryškinti individų mąstymo ir gyvenimo būdo keitimo būtinybę, kultūros ekologizaciją ir ekologinio švietimo svarbą. Sąmonės ekologizacijos diskurso koalicijos tekstuose reiškiamas norimas socialinės tvarkos vizija telpa į makroposakį „laisva, žydinti ir žalioji Lietuva“. Pamato norimai visuomenės raidos vizijai (kartu – ir legitimacijos veiklai) ieškoma panteistinėje lietuvių tautos praeityje, tradicinėje kultūroje, literatūros klasikų, filosofų darbuose. Pagrindiniai sąmonės ekologizacijos diskurso koalicijos subjektai: Lietuvos žaliųjų judė-

jimo ir kitų nevyriausybinių ekologinių, aplinkosauginių NVO nariai, mokiniai ir jų mokytojai, susijungę į „gamtos draugų“ ar „miško draugų“ klubus, aplinkosauginio švietimo aktyvistai, panteistinio religinio judėjimo „Romuva“ nariai, gamtos eseistai ir rašytojai, mokslininkai, sveikos gyvensenos ir vegetarizmo šalininkai.

Ekologinės modernizacijos pasaulėžiūrinės diskurso koalicijos subjektai akcentuoja technologijų, pramonės ir politikos ekologizaciją, antraeilę svarbą suteikdami visuomenės sąmonės ir kultūros ekologizacijai. Ekologinės modernizacijos diskurso koalicijos tekstų grupei būdingas antropocentrizmas, žmogus suprantamas kaip esantis aukščiau gamtos, yra jos valdytojas, tvarkytojas. Būdinga žmogaus kaip veikiančio subjekto ir gamtos / aplinkos kaip poveikio objekto samprata. Prioritetinės artikuliuojamos problemos yra tos, kurios nusako aplinkos degradaciją (o ne žmogaus–gamtos santykių problemos), pavyzdžiui, oro tarša, mechaninė dirvos degradacija, neracionalus išteklių naudojimas ir kt. Dažniausia su ekologinėmis problemomis asocijuojasi politinės arba ekonominės problemos. Problemų sprendimo ar išėjimo iš susidariusios situacijos priemonėmis ekologinės modernizacijos tekstuose dažniausia įvardijami ekonominės veiklos pokyčiai, politiniai sprendimai ir mokslinės veiklos plėtra. Sprendimų priėmimo galia priskiriama pramoninkams ir verslininkams, valstybės tarnautojams, aplinkosaugininkams, politikams. Ši pasaulėžiūrinė diskurso koalicija pasižymi dideliu reiškiamų požiūrių homogeniškumu, kuris gali būti aiškinamas kaip autorių institucinės priklausomybės pasekmė. Ekologinės modernizacijos pasaulėžiūrinės diskurso koalicijos subjektai – tai pramoninkai, verslininkai ar jų atstovai, mokslininkai ar mokslinių institucijų atstovai, valdžios institucijų atstovai, aplinkos politikos kūrėjai.

Analizuojant ekologinį diskursą ekologiniuose periodiniuose leidiniuose, išryškėjo keletas pagrindinių siužetinių linijų: panteistinių tradicijų atgaivinimas, gamtojauta, ekologinis nacionalizmas. Panteistinių tradicijų atgaivinimo siužetinės linijos ašis yra siekis atgaivinti senovės baltų moralinę kultūrą ir integruoti panteistines tradicijas į šiuolaikinį gyvenimą. Gamtojautos siužetinėje diskurso linijoje argumentuojama, jog kiekvienas individas turi pajauti gamtą tiesiogiai per kasdienę praktinę-pažintinę, aplinkosauginę, rekreacinę ar kitą veiklą (o ne per teorines žinias). Tik per kasdienę praktinę veiklą gamtoje išsiugdo emocinis santykis su gamta, atsiranda asmeninė atsakomybė ir vystosi ekologinė sąmonė. Religija / tikėjimas, menas, kasdienė žmonių patirtis konstruojami kaip geresnis pagrindas sprendžiant ekologines problemas nei teorinis žinojimas ir aplinkosauginė informacija. Ekologiniame diskurse Lietuvoje ekologinės nuostatos, požiūriai, ekologinis sąmoningumas glaudžiai siejami su tautiniu identitetu, pilietinėmis nuostatomis ir pažiūromis, tautiniu patriotizmu, taip formuojant ekologinio nacionalizmo diskursyvią siužetinę liniją.

Pagrindiniai žodžiai: ekologinis diskursas, diskurso koalicijos, ekologinės pasaulėžiūros, diskurso analizė

The article has been reviewed.

Received in May, 2010; accepted in December, 2010.