Leonardas Rinkevičius

Shaping of the public policy culture in Lithuania: sociological exploration of change in environmental policy and public participation

(Viešosios politikos kultūros formavimasis Lietuvoje: aplinkosaugos politikos ir visuomenės dalyvavimo sociologinė eksploracija)

Abstract. *This paper aims at diagnosing change in policy culture in Central and Eastern Europe, particularly Lithuania, focusing on the field of environmental policy. The article analyzes public participation in the Soviet period, the years of break down of the Soviet system, and contrasts it with social change during the years of transition to a market economy and democratization of society. Based on interviews with relevant actors, secondary data analysis, and discourse analysis, this paper illuminates the shift of public involvement in environmental S&T policy to a different mode. This shift, or dialectics of policy culture, is epitomized by a changing mode of citizen participation – from latent forms and "double faced" culture in the Soviet times towards euphoria about civic democratic governance and direct participation during the years of "Singing revolution", and towards another round of colonization of public policy by the bureaucratic domain and the private sector during the 1990s.*

Introduction

The concept of policy culture (e.g. Jamison 1997) has been not too often applied in the analysis of changing Eastern European post-socialist societies (Rinkevicius 2000). The changing forms and style of public policy-making in Lithuania and other CEE countries are calling for novel research approaches in examining the character of those changes and developing adequate conceptual vocabulary. Therefore, this paper is aimed at applying the concept of policy culture in the case of Lithuanian society undergoing important structural transformations. The policy culture change is examined by exploring a shift in the mode of public participation in environmental science and technology (S&T) policy.

The issue of public participation is approached by analyzing the fields of tensions between different policy domains – bureaucratic, economic, academic, and civic (Jamison, 1997; Rinkevicius 2000).

The subsequent research questions are formulated and explored in this article:

- Which domains of society have prevailed in shaping the policy culture in Lithuania in the Soviet times?
- How did the civic environmental activism was manifest in Lithuania in different periods?
- How has the mode of public participation and policy culture change during the last decade of transition to a market economy and democratic governance?

Different research methods – interviews with relevant actors, documents, secondary data analysis, and discourse analysis – have been used in exploring the research questions outlined above.

The article is structured as follows. First, taking a historical detour back to the Soviet era, paper shows how, in the system of state-dominated public policy culture, specific latent forms of civic activism have emerged and were manifest. The second period that is traced looking at the important features of Lithuanian society is a period of awakening and mobilization of civil society that led to a break down of the Soviet system in the late 1980s and early 1990s. This period is characterized by an explicitly manifest faith in radical good-bye to the bureaucratic top-down mode of central planning and decision-making that was prevalent in

the Soviet state socialist regime and spreading euphoria about a quick democratization of society with an entirely new mode of public participation and expansion of the civic domain. The third part of this paper discusses the change of participatory mode in the course of the 1990s. This shift, or dialectics of policy culture, is epitomized by a changing mode of civic activism – from its latent and "double faced" culture in the Soviet times towards euphoria about civic democratic governance and direct participation during the years of "Singing revolution", and towards another round of colonization of public policy by the bureaucratic domain and the private sector during the 1990s.

The Soviet era: state domination and the monopoly of public policy-making

This section aims at providing historical outlook and background for analysis of current change in public-policy interface in Lithuania. As was discussed in my earlier paper (Rinkevicius 1997), the Soviet era in Lithuania can be characterized as a period of colonization of other spheres of society by the bureaucratic domain. This pattern is identifiable in most social structures, although prevailing ideology emphasized development of collective, democratic rule by working people.

The social doctrine which existed in the Soviet times was collective, however, people had to look for the ways to survive individually, to find their own place in this

pseudo-collective society. Any kind of collective action would not be possible, because all collective ideas were prescribed and controlled "from the top". One of the most serious problems of post-Soviet countries has evolved from this – society is short of real, creative individualism […] which would enrich, educate an active citizen who is responsible for his (her) decisions and thinking about the entire society[1].

Thus, political culture of Lithuanian society might be characterized as having facade and latent side (see Palidauskaite 1996). The institutionalized "double-faced" culture (Rinkevicius 1998) for many years inhibited emergence of a democratic public-policy interface. Lithuania of the 1970-80s can be portrayed as a country with "practically totally demolished civic society" (Vardys 1993). Social alienation and usurpation of public-policy interface by the bureaucratic domain created particular monopoly of information and authoritarian modes of communication which had important implications for environmental S&T policy. An example of monopolized information and communication is one of the important public policy documents, namely the Lithuania's *Complex Nature Protection Scheme till the Year 2000* published in 1986. On the one hand, it was a unique comprehensive "eco-modernist" policy document developed in the former Soviet Union. Similarly as the development of nature protection legislation and institutions in the late 1950s (Rinkevicius 1997), Lit-

huania took the lead among the former Soviet republics to develop a comprehensive state policy document environmentally assessing Lithuania's long-term needs and trends of economic, technological and territorial development. This so-called *Scheme* provided a plan of environmental S&T measures to be implemented in order to meet requirements of Lithuania's sustained growth. From the public participation point of view, however, the most important feature of this document is that it was marked with a "traditional" (in the Soviet system) label *For Official Use Only*. A special code number was put on every copy of the *Complex Scheme for 2000*, dissemination of information contained in it (as in many other policy documents) was strictly forbidden.

This case epitomizes the "secret" or colonized type of public policy culture that has been shaped by the elite decision makers in the bureaucratic hierarchy of soviet state authorities and selected representatives of academia involved by the state authorities to develop this policy document. There was no public scrutiny whatsoever or broader societal discussion of this important environmental S&T policy document. Only in 1995 was this *Scheme* remembered in the course of drafting a new Lithuanian National Environmental Strategy. This is just one illustration of public policy in Lithuania locked into the bureaucratic domain. It differs significantly in terms of policy culture and institutional set-up as compared, for

---

[1] Interview with the Polish professor A. Smolar (*Kauno Diena* 1997 02 27)

instance, with the development of the Dutch Environmental Policy Plan or Danish cleaner technology program which were based on a dialogue between various actors ("stakeholders") rooted in different societal domains (cf. Hajer 1995; Wallace 1995).

Alienation, individualization and command-type rule inhibited civic activism and public engagement in the policy-making process for long decades. One can hardly characterize Lithuanian society of the Soviet times as reflecting principles and ethos of civic culture, namely democracy, public scrutiny and participation. The bureaucratic culture and usurpation of public-policy interface is, however, only one side of a "double-faced" policy culture.

Looking deeper, one might notice some important indications of latent social community and public-policy communication channels whereby governmental decision-makers received feed-back from what might be termed "the public". The newly-emerged Lithuanian bureaucracy under the Soviets was still embedded in a society which did not loose the Gemeinschaft-type community. This community in relations among people and man-nature relations characteristic of pre-war Lithuanian society can be compared to what Worster (1977) calls the Arcadian tradition. In the Soviet era this tradition was mixed-up with dominant technocratic ideology and bureaucratic organization of society. However, new bureaucrats kept some Arcadian attitudes and close relations with (mostly rural) communities which they once belonged to. Their education and socialization often took place in the pre-war Gemeinschaft type communities which formed a nucleus of Lithuanian society. Those latent communication channels and information exchange among new party or bureaucratic elite and fellow-community members have resulted in a peculiar Lithuanian style of policy-making. On the facade side, it followed directives set top-down by central authorities in Moscow. On the latent side, it adjusted the course of industrialization, development of important sectors with respect to local social and natural circumstances.

Because of such "double-faced" policy culture, Lithuania avoided significant natural and social bifurcation which is visible in other former Soviet republics, for example, Belarus, the Ukraine, and even neighboring Latvia. For instance, Lithuania avoided concentration of all major industries in one or two biggest towns. Instead, many new industrial enterprises have emerged in local or regional towns enabling to employ former peasants from surrounding villages. In this way, disturbances of social community, people's alienation from former social and natural environment were less painful. This also prevented rapid 'russification' of the country, thus avoiding the destiny of other Soviet republics or particular urban areas. Riga and Daugavpils in Latvia can be presented as examples of the latter. The only significant exception in Lithuania is the development of Visaginas' town inhabited by the employees and families of Ignalina nuclear power plant who have immigrated Lithuania from all around the former USSR in the late 1970s.

There were strong charismatic personalities who took a lead in reshaping S&T decisions in an environmentally friendly way[2], and this has led to "moderate" modernization of Lithuania with prevailing not heavy industry, and few exceptions of large chemical and electronics plants. Adjustment of industrialization and S&T-related policies to local natural and social conditions, on the other hand, is not only a result of *latent* policy culture characterized by *informal* information and communication as well as remaining rudiments of Arcadian world views among new bureaucratic elite. There were official communist party and governmental documents which reflect existence of preventive approach and precaution with respect to environmental S&T policy.

One example is the Decree Nr. 303 by the Central Committee of the Lithuanian Communist Party and the Council of Ministers on the *Limitation of Industrial Construction in Large Cities* issued in 1981 (the era of deepest stagnation). This and related documents officially communicate a policy aimed at stopping industrial construction in Vilnius and Kaunas, reducing it significantly in Klaipeda, Kedainiai, Mazeikiai, giving priority for industrial development in Alytus, Telsiai, Taurage, Ukmerge, Plunge. It was expected that this policy will help to avoid merging of industrial cities into agglomerations. Similarly as most policy documents and decisions, this decree was not accessible to the general public, common citizens, and there was no public discussions or scrutiny. However, the contents of this decree as well as other documents indicates that those who developed such policies had their own ways for exchange of information with rural communities, for learning about local social and natural circumstances, and taking them into account. Thereby industrial and S&T decisions allowed to not completely disturb existing communities, not to cut people's social roots and relationship with social and natural environment.

These are just few aspects of a complex process of Lithuania's modernization, "balancing" between prevailing technocratic ideology, bureaucratic "command-and-control" information and decision-making style vis-ą-vis deliberate, precautionary policy, taking into account local social values and environmental conditions.

Awakening of the civic society in Lithuania: towards a new mode of public participation

Although the civic domain in Lithuanian society was traditionally weak and institutionally peripheral with regard to environmental S&T policy[3], it began to gain strength, and change the existing public-policy interface in the mid-1980s. Best known is the contribution by a group of intelligentsia' representatives who were the first pub-

---

[2] See Rinkevicius (1997).
[3] The same can be said about other sectors for policy-making – industry, energy, etc.

lic tribunes to disseminate in society signals of the risk from irresponsible short-sighted S&T decisions. In the fall of 1986 which was a time of early spring of *Perestroika* and *Glasnost*, a protest letter was published in the *Literaturnaya Gazyeta* in Moscow signed by some 20 outstanding Lithuanian and Russian writers, poets, actors, painters, composers, architects who warned about the threats of the plans of top-bureaucracy in Moscow to start extraction of oil nearby Curronian peninsula, a Lithuanian pearl on the Baltic coast. A few weeks later this protest letter was re-printed in the major Lithuanian culture newspaper, *Literatura ir Menas*[4].

It was the first such a publicly visible attempt to initiate societal debate and to influence environmental S&T decisions which were otherwise likely to be made in a traditional way – without any public assessment or scrutiny. It was the first time when mass media were deployed by actors rooted in the civic domain to disseminate important message which induced social environmental anxiety. Therefore this case can be regarded as a gate to the new mode of public environmentally-concerned communication induced by actors outside the bureaucratic domain.

The discourse which developed with the publishing of the protest letter involved different types of language – symbols, emblems, types of arguments used. Some arguments were based on the lexicon characteristic of Arcadian tradition – historical, cultural, mythological, poetic, moral, deeply-emotional. The ways in which the policy of oil extraction on the Baltic coast developed was interpreted as a symbol of deepening social alienation, institutionalization of doubt. The entire letter was penetrated by some intrinsic feeling of risk similar to that accentuated by the "risk society" theory emphasizing inherent threats in S&T development which are not susceptible to precautionary, preventative public scrutiny and control. It should be also noted that this letter was publicized about half a year after the Chernobyl catastrophe, and it added significantly to growing public anxiety and mistrust of the S&T advancement in the former Soviet Union.

Besides Arcadian type of language, this coalition of intellectuals tried to phrase their arguments in the informative language that actors in the bureaucratic and economic domain were familiar with: rational, quantitative, based on weighting economic and environmental costs and benefits.

> "[…] when 5 thousand tons of crude oil will spill off at once, the damage as follows shall be made for the state: 1) fines for pollution will amount to 155 million rubles 2) the fisheries will suffer from some 40 mln. rubles damage 3) damage for recreational coastal zone will amount to 38 mln. rubles 4) clean-up of the polluted territory will cost 49 mln. rubles. […] All together such a spill-off would cost for the state about 284 mln. rubles." [5]

---

[4] Kiek gali kainuoti vieno munduro garbė? (How much could the honor cost?)// Literatūra ir Menas (1986 11 15).

[5] Ibid.

In Lithuania it was probably the first time that the environmental concern was expressed not only in cultural and emotional terms prevailing in the 1960s and 1970s: "it will flood meadows and the Nemunas river", or "it will pollute the Baltic Sea". By contrast, information strategy was based on very concrete facts which were spelled out in a language that one would nowadays call the language of ecological modernization. One peculiar aspect of this letter is the fact that among all the intellectuals who signed this letter there was only one scientist. In order to argue about environmental damage in cost-benefit terms (based on the positivist faith that such assessment is viable) it was obviously necessary to involve some expert scientists, especially those who have access to important information which was privatized by the central bureaucracy. This leads again to hypothesis about existence of informal communication channels laid among environmentally concerned actors covering various societal domains – bureaucratic, economic, civic, and academic.

The protest letter also contained rather sharp statements of mistrust of the command-and-control system based upon directives from Moscow. The quest for de-centralization echoes an ideology promulgated by environmentalists in the Western countries during the 1970s. The call for decentralization and deliberation in environmental S&T decision-making is characterized by certain civic unconformity which was necessary even for a coalition of outstanding intellectuals to communicate publicly the words as follows:

> "We thought such *foolishness* and *open crime* against nature is impossible in the *Republic of Lithuania* [my italics – L.R.]. First of all because deep, nature respecting customs blossom here for many years, and Lithuanian nation is especially unanimous and concorded implementing elementary unwritten laws of nature protection, however, in the given case everything depends not on the republic".[6]

Thus, not only the call for precaution and deliberation in environmental S&T policy was communicated to the public, but also the need to increase national sovereignty was expressed in this letter and communicated publicly. This quotation reflects growing controversy in relations between the "center and republic" as it was called in those times. However, the call for sovereignty was spelled out in a rational (although sharp) language: emphasizing relevance of de-centralization for saving natural resources and avoiding environmental disasters.

This was probably the first case when environmentally concerned public information and communication was used for transmitting politically significant message. As later events have shown, this led to civic awakening , formation of environmental as well as national revival movement. Since the date of publishing this protest letter, a mix of environmental concern and ideas of na-

---

[6] *Literatūra ir menas*, 1986 11 15.

tional sovereignty have remained as a significant component of communication and information strategies deployed by movement organizations. In 1986, the public feed-back was expressed in collecting signatures against oil drilling on the Baltic coast. The increase of civic activism was a very gradual process. There still existed strong totalitarian boundaries which kept policy-making closed from democratic public scrutiny. Those boundaries were socially spanned only about two years later.

The raise of environmentalism and development of a democratic public-policy interface

In 1988-89, the re-awakening of civic society and steps towards re-constitution of the national sovereignty of Lithuania was closely inter-related with the awakening and mobilization of the Lithuanian Green movement. With regard to environmental S&T policy, it might be argued that 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 country's economic and technological development in new environmentally sound ways based on community, shared responsibility and wisdom of "Arcadian" tradition. At the same time, some of the movement's actions rai-

sed public concern and mistrust of laymen intervention in S&T decisions.

Similarly as in the West of the 1970s, the environmental movement in Lithuania initially propagated an ideology of "alternative technologies and alternative life styles" (Gudavicius 1988). However, the term "alternative" had not exactly the same meaning: the common denominator for "alternative" in Western world was a disillusion in dominant values, norms and institutions prevailing in industrial societies, whereas in Lithuania it meant as well a protest against the Soviet totalitarian regime with its "imperialist" ideology (both in environmental as well as political sense). Therefore, in 1988-89 the "alternativism" of Lithuanian environmental movement was shared by much broader circles of society compared to certain Western environmental movements in the 1970s. This shared environmental concern, expressed through various remarkable actions of public protest, strongly affected particular science and technology decisions. The most significant was notably the stoppage of the construction of the 3^d bloc of the Ignalina nuclear power plant[7] as well as suspending of the construction at Kruonis hydro-accumulation power plant, suspending of the development of oil import terminal on the Baltic coast of Lithuania[8].

It has been argued that in the Western countries during the up-swing of environmentalism in the 1970s, "alternative" aims

---

[7] Which is a technological mirror of the Chernobyl, but even more powerful.
[8] Those cases were briefly illuminated in my earlier paper in Pesto Series I (1997).

and efforts of the greens were focused not (just) upon possible ways to influence particular environmental S&T options and reshape them into what was called small-scale, appropriate, soft technology paths. Instead efforts of environmentalists were geared towards self-expression, maintaining distinct self-identity among other members of society (Hajer, 1995). A similar pattern is noticeable in Lithuania as well. Communicative strategies and self-expression of the Lithuanian greens was often tailored not simply at environmentally questionable S&T policy options, but rather at propagating and preserving self-identity of a coalition of people with a higher degree of ecological awareness, maturity and responsibility. The self-distinction of the greens among other members of society in terms of "alternative" world views and ethics can be illustrated by the following citation:

> In general, I also see the agency of the Greens as a controlling one – controlling not only the Government or particular organizations, but nature protection in general. […] the Greens will cooperate but also control the situation as no other "public" controlling committee[9] has ever done before. (Balbierius, 1990)

Such statements by the leaders and ideologists of the Lithuanian green movement well reflect the direction of change of public-policy interface that this social movement was promulgating in the early period of its development. The research into the ways in which the greens shaped public environmental discourse allows making the following hypothesis. Before coming of the phase when environmentalism was "appropriated by the movement's opponents" (Eder, 1996:203), there first was a period when environmentalists themselves aimed to appropriate and control the sphere of nature protection. Citation above highlights this tendency.

Indications of peculiar mix of antagonism and cooperation, say, between the greens and industrialists are visible in various episodes. For example, the first General assembly of the Lithuanian green movement in 1988 took place in the premises of Kedainiai' chemical plant – one of the few industrial companies in Lithuania which was very actively attacked by the greens. Industrialists showed hospitality to the same environmentalists who were publicly communicating negative image of the plant. Another example is provision of financial assistance and means of transport, etc. by *Azotas* fertilizers plant in Jonava for the Ecological Protest march in 1988. Paradoxically, during this Ecological protest march the greens organized rather aggressive protest actions against this plant, they actively disseminated information on serious negative environmental impact on humans and nature caused by *Azotas*. In 1989, the greens organized a hunger strike until the authori-

---

[9] The term "public controlling" committee is referring to a particular social institution within the Soviet command-and-control system that has performed the role of public inspection in various public spheres.

ties of Kaunas region will select site for construction of the city' waste water treatment plant.

These and other examples indicate that industrialists as well as national and local public authorities not simply phased pressure by the greens regarding particular environmental S&T issues, but certain public opinion has spread that environmentally responsible and sound S&T decisions are impossible without intervention by environmentalists. Pressure by the greens (emulating the civic domain) was often conflicting, antagonistic with regard to actors rooted in the bureaucratic and economic domain[10]. This might be one of the reasons why there evolved relatively negative attitudes of various actors and groups to public (laymen) participation in environmental S&T policy.

Later this stream of euphoria, self-confidence among environmentalists and seek for rapid radical changes slowed down. By that time Lithuanian greens have created a temporary public space for communicating in the society important message of environmental concern and deliberation which shaped people' s attitudes in general, and S&T policy options in particular. Later, similarly as in the West, environmentalism in Lithuania has been gradually "appropriated by the movement's opponents" (Eder 1996:203). Ideas and concern of the greens have been taken over to a certain extent by policy-makers, academics and industrialists.

Public environmental anxiety and participation of environmental movement in shaping particular S&T policies and decisions is rather controversial in Lithuania in the "laymen versus experts" perspective. Different actors – statesmen, industrialists, academics – quite early started blaming the greens for their incompetence and destructive contribution to environmental S&T policy. Although environmentally-informed deliberation was welcome, some of the pressures by environmentalists were criticized as economically and technically and even environmentally ungrounded, suggestions for S&T policy – incompetent. The case of Kruonis' hydro-accumulation power plant is one example repeatedly reminded of by various authors writing on public engagement in the environmental S&T policy in Lithuania. Environmentalists have questioned the economic and environmental relevance of this plant for Lithuania, and through physical blocking of construction works (transportation of turbines) caused costly suspending of this industrial development project. This case is often referred to as an illustration of incompetence of the greens, and of public (laymen) in general, and is regarded in Lithuania as a serious lesson for the further development of policy culture and types of public-policy interface.

"Environmental movement in Lithuania has been one of the most energetic and co-

---

[10] In Lithuania this pattern is characterized by numerous cases, particularly the stoppage of construction at Kruonis Hydroaccumulation power plant and boycott of agricultural and food processing industry.

lorful components of the political revival. Environmental movement has substantially radicalized the political movement, however, fast, not thorough, thoughtless, sometimes dilettante steps caused significant economic damage […] The latter is most often recalled in the present discussions about the greens. Their positive achievements are undeservedly forgotten." (Stoskus 1996)

These lessons had serious implications for the attitudes of various actors in Lithuania towards the ways in which public can participate in environmental science and technology policy-making. This is evident, for example, from the surveys that we have conducted regarding different types of public-policy interface. They will be presented later in the paper. The next section indicates a recent tendency by the bureaucratic domain (connected to industrial-financial elite) to privatize information and communication, a certain revival of technocratic approach to environmental S&T decision-making which creates illusion of public participation, but in fact often neglects societal concern. This tendency can be also seen as a continuing domination of "experts over laymen".

Another round of privatization of policy-making: the case of Butinge oil terminal

The tendency of centralization (and appropriation) of environmentally questionable S&T decisions is very well illustrated by the case of a new oil terminal development on the Baltic coast. It reveals emerging discourse coalitions with different attitudes, world views, vocabularies and communication strategies. One group might be referred to as a romantic, very much reminding of an Arcadian tradition, respecting moral values, social togetherness and respect to nature without utilitarian calculus (cf. Worster 1977): It bases its argument on poetic language, historical and cultural meaning of the Baltic Sea for the Lithuanian people.

The sea shore is not the same for us as for the Dutch or even the Latvians. It is so small and so valuable for the entire historical and even ontological feeling of Lithuania that construction of an oil terminal on the Baltic coast would mean almost the same for us as building it in the Rasu cemetery[11]. (Daunys 1992)

The other group (composed of several, often conflicting, parties) might be entitled "imperialist", because those actors base their arguments on the ideology of rational use of natural resources, on scientifically grounded "objective" information, on cost-benefit calculations. Their approach is to support construction of oil terminal based on assessment of its environmental, social and economic issues. This grouping is rather heterogeneous: dividing lines can be drawn along political parties (e.g. Christian-democrats vs leftist Democratic Labor party) as well as along ministries (e.g. the Mi-

---

[11] Graves of the prominent people of Lithuania are in the Rasų cemetery in Vilnius.

nistry of Energy vs Ministry of Government Reforms) or along industrial-financial alliances to which one or another political grouping is closest[12]. It is rather difficult to accurately detect or document the latter alliances, because they tend to avoid public transparency. Nevertheless, basic support of oil terminal and belief in experts' objective knowledge, capability to make scientifically-grounded decisions is what unites this discourse coalition ideologically.

Although information and communication strategy of actors from this discourse coalition is grounded on the "objectivist" scientific type of technology assessment, conclusions of different groups within this coalition lead to divergent S&T options of oil terminal, and hence, different environmental and social implications.[13]

Disagreement within the latter group is furthered by the tensions with actors who share the above mentioned romantic, Arcadian approach to human-nature relations and thereby make distinctive discourse coalition. The core of tensions is reflected in the following paragraph:

> […] 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 are taught of the right livelihood not only by science and parties, but also by stars in the sky, folk songs, Ciur-

lionis' paintings, and eyes of the child. (Karalius 1990 16)

The case of oil terminal also discloses the ways in which environmental movement can be misinterpreted and misused by the (economic and bureaucratic) parties that have vested interests (see Rinkevicius 1997). It also shows how public debates between various actors and groups are after all simply neglected by other parties.

Most importantly, it signifies a tendency of illusion that environmental S&T policy in Lithuania takes seriously into account the public concern and scrutiny.

Under the public pressure, numerous environmental, technical, economic and social assessments of oil terminal development were carried out by local and international specialists (natural and social scientists, oil business and engineering experts, etc.) since 1990 till about 1995. Nevertheless, there are not one but already two oil terminals developed on the Lithuanian part of the Baltic coast, instead of constructing one oil terminal adopted to the local needs and circumstances, or developing a fruitful partnership between Lithuania which has a modern oil refinery and neighboring Latvia which is already developing a modern oil terminal. Both terminals in Lithuania are likely to serve commercial ends of local and international economic actors rather than fulfilling local needs, e.g., to have an independent channel of oil supplies as it was

---

[12] See *Terminalas ant Baltijos kelio*, 1993.

[13] Ibid.

planned during the blockade of Lithuania by Russia in 1990. This neglect of objective environmental and social concerns again indicates appropriation of the ways in which S&T decisions are made. There is an illusion of openness to the public scrutiny. But in fact economic and technological decisions are more guided by the interests of particular actors in economic and bureaucratic domain (even shade economy), whereas scientists are employed to defend the relevance and viability of development projects promulgated by parties with vested interests.

In general, the cases described above indicate that emergence of new types of public communication and participation is to be seen as a process of learning-by-doing, because participatory traditions are lacking in Lithuania's political culture. On the other hand, public interest in "civic mode" of participation in policy-making is be slowing down compared to social movement of the late 1980s – early 1990s. Exceptional cases are those which involve large-scale environmentally controversial activities which have certain symbolic or "emblematic" significance, for example, Butinge oil terminal, incineration of obsolete pesticides, Ignalina nuclear power plant. Those cases still attract wide interest and anxiety of society at large, especially after some disastrous events, e.g. continuous oil spill-offs that took place in Butinge oil terminal in 2000-2001. A certain tendency can be observed of decreasing interest in collective ways of public participation and shifting to individual modes for common people to contribute to environmental S&T decisions, and greening of industry in parti-

cular. But this is a research question for another paper to follow.

Conclusions

Our research results might be in general interpreted as reflecting several tendencies of change in Lithuanian society regarding public policy culture and participation in environmental S&T policy. This shift, or dialectics of policy culture, is epitomized by a changing mode of civic activism. Three phases of this process can be traced:

1) latent and "double faced" culture in the Soviet times;
2) shift from latent and "double faced" culture in the Soviet times towards euphoria about civic democratic governance and direct participation during the years of "Singing revolution";
3) another round of colonization of public policy by the bureaucratic domain and the private sector during the 1990s.

The latter period and subsequent process of social change are indicating several important tendencies which call for the follow-up research concerning numerous aspects:

* growing individualization and social alienation;
* appropriation of environmental S&T decision-making by actors rooted in the bureaucratic domain, while creating illusion of public scrutiny;
* disappointment/ disillusionment of the general public as well as environmental authorities in the democratic public participation.

REFERENCES

Balbierius A. 1989. „Lietuvos Žalieji: tabu išvarymas“, *Mokslas ir gyvenimas* 1.

Beck U. 1992 *Risk Society. Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage Publications.

Daunys V. 1992. „Terminalas ant Baltijos kelio“, *Lietuvos rytas*. 1992 07 24.

Eder K. 1996. "The Institutionalisation of Environmentalism: Ecological Discourse and the Second Transformation of the Public Sphere", Lash S., Szerszynski B. and Wynne B. (eds) *Risk, Environment and Modernity: Towards a New Ecology*. London: Sage Publications.

Hajer M. 1995. *The Politics of Environmental Discourse. Ecological Modernization and the Policy Process*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Jamison A. 1997. "Introduction" in Jamison A. and Ostby P. (eds.) *Public Participation and Sustainable Development: Comparing European Experiences. Pesto Papers 1.* Aalborg Universitetsforlag.

Karalius A. 1990. ”Žalioji ideologija: kodėl žalieji žali?”, *Kūlgrinda*. Vilnius: Alternatyva.

Kavolis V. 1996. *Kultūros dirbtuvė*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.

Mol A. P. J. 1995. *The Refinement of Production. Ecological modernization theory and the Chemical Industry*. Utrecht: Van Arkel.

Palidauskaitė J. 1996. *Lietuvos politines kulturos raida valstybingumo atkurimo ir itvirtinimo laikotarpiu*. Daktaro disertacija. Kaunas: Kauno technologijos universitetas.

Rinkevicius L. 1997. ”Lithuania: Environmental Awareness and National Independence”,

Jamison A. and Ostby P. (eds.) *Public Participation and Sustainable Development: Comparing European Experiences. Pesto Papers 1.* Aalborg: Aalborg Universitetsforlag.

Rinkevičius L. 1998. "Ecological modernization and its perspectives in Lithuania: attitudes, expectations, actions". Doctoral dissertation. Kaunas University of Technology.

Rinkevicius L. 2000a. "Ecological Modernisation as Cultural Politics: Transformations of the Civic Environmental Activism in Lithuania", *Environmental Politics* 9 (1). New York: Frank Cass.

Rinkevicius L. 2000b. "Ideology of Ecological Modernization in 'Double-Risk' Societies. A Case Study of Lithuanian Environmental Policy" in Spaargaren G., Mol. A.P.J. and Buttel F. (eds.) *Environment and Global Modernity*. London: Sage.

Spaargaren G. 1997. *The Ecological Modernization of Production and Consumption. Essays in Environmental Sociology*. Wageningen: Landbouw Universiteit.

Stoškus K. ”Kada Lietuvoje gali atsirasti ir ekologine politika?”, *Lietuvos rytas*. 1996 06 31.

Terminalas ant Baltijos kelio. 1993.Vilnius: Žalioji Lietuva.

Vardys V. 1993. *Lietuvos politinė kultūra ir laiko reikalavimai*. Kaunas: „Į laisvę“ fondo Lietuvos filialas.

Worster D. 1977. *Nature's Economy: A History of Ecological Ideas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

SANTRAUKA

VIEŠOSIOS POLITIKOS KULTŪROS FORMAVIMASIS LIETUVOJE: APLINKOSAUGOS POLITIKOS IR VISUOMENĖS DALYVAVIMO SOCIOLOGINĖ EKSPLORACIJA

Straipsnyje siekiama atskleisti politinės kultūros pokyčius Vidurio ir Rytų Europos šalyse, sutelkiant dėmesį į aplinkosaugos politikos raidą Lietuvoje. Analizuojamas piliečių dalyvavimas ir įtaka aplinkosaugos politikos formavimui tarybiniu laikotarpiu, tautinio atgimimo laikotarpiu ir pereinamuoju į naują santvarką laikotarpiu. Remiantis interviu, do-

kumentų ir antrinių šaltinių tyrimais bei diskurso analize, straipsnyje parodomi du lūžiai Lietuvos politikos formavimo kultūroje. Pirma, posūkis nuo "dviveidžio" (oficialaus ir latentinio) politinės kultūros tipo prie euforiško tikėjimo piliečių tiesioginiu dalyvavimu ir demokratiniu šalies valdymu, pasireiškusiu "dainuojančios revoliucijos" laikotarpiu. Antra, perėjimas (arba grįžimas) prie aplinkosaugos ir ūkio politikos formavimo kultūros, kuriai būdingas valdžios struktūrų ir privataus sektoriaus dominavimas.

Department of Sociology,
Kaunas University of Technology
Donelaičio 20, LT-3000,
Kaunas, Lithuania.
E-mail: leonardas.rinkevicius@ktu.lt