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Abstract
The conventional interpretation of the Czech environmental movement in the political science literature contrasts its role as part of the revolution of 1989, seen as spontaneously local, with a period of westernisation in the 1990s. This paper argues, primarily on the basis of interviews with key movement intellectuals, that this interpretation neglects the earlier history of the movement, which gives it a distinctly Czech identity, albeit one that was compatible with many of the western influences brought to bear in the 1990s. The result is a movement based principally on the assumptions of ‘liberal environmentalism’ with limited development of more politically radical analyses and arguments.

Introduction

A number of scholars, especially political scientists, who have analysed the development of Central and East European (CEE) environmental movements in the post-1989 period, have identified a trend towards ‘westernisation’.

The environmental movement in CEE has undergone profound transformation: the movement has shifted from being a mobilising agent for populist protest against the totalitarian of the Communist regime and in its place has emerged pragmatic, goal-oriented professional organisations. Western aid agencies and environmental peer groups have had a strong influence on this transformation. The transformation has brought advantages to environmental NGOs. However, it has also resulted in a loss of the local perspective, with its distinct modus operandi and bottom-up input, and this has impoverished political discourse in the transition states [Jancar-Webster, 1998: 69; our emphasis in bold].
Similarly, Carmin and Hicks [2002: 317] conclude that in the 1990s ‘(t)he Czech and Polish environmental movements continued developing similar structures, with both more resembling Western and other transnationally-linked movements’. On the basis of manifest transformations of the organisational form and function of the movements, this literature also makes the assumption that western involvement led to equally far-reaching changes in the substantive knowledge of activists [Hicks and Carmin, 2000]. With few exceptions [e.g. Rinkevicius, 2000], the existing literature contains little insight into the worldviews, values, ideas and long-term goals of the environmental movement in CEE in the late 1990s.

A few authors [Tickle and Vavroušek, 1998; Jehlička, 2001] have attempted to put forward a more comprehensive history of the Czech environmental movement covering the period from the 1970s to the 1990s. Most of the recent accounts of the development of the Czech environmental movement focused on de-radicalization of the movement in the mid-1990s [Fagin and Jehlička, 1998] and international influences on the movement [Carmin and Hicks, 2002; Fagan and Jehlicka, 2003]. Conceptually, this literature is based, for the most part, on resource mobilisation theory and political opportunity structure approaches. But it says comparatively little about the underlying beliefs and worldvies of the Czech environmental movement. Our goal is to fill this lacuna. Our experience of events in CEE and our geographical understanding of the way that local differences have persisted, and should be conceptualised, under globalisation [Massey, 1999] suggested that such an enquiry would have to be guided by an approach with a broad sensitivity to cultural differences and ability to link values and beliefs to political strategy and tactics. Such an approach is identified in the next section, following which our survey and results are presented.

Knowledge Interests and Movement Intellectuals

In carrying out this research, we have been influenced by the approach mapped out over more than a decade by Jamison and his collaborators, since it combines a broad interdisciplinary perspective with clear conceptual and methodological development. Starting from dissatisfaction with the unhelpful divisions of environmental social science, both between disciplines and between US empiricism and European grand theory, these authors have built an approach which overcomes the early division of social movement studies between ‘resource mobilisation’ and ‘identity formation’ schools. The key proposal, elaborated in Eyerman and Jamison [1991] is that social movements should be studied in historical and comparative context and with a focus on ‘cognitive praxis’ – ideas as manifested in action as part of experimental or emergent counter cultures engaged with, and trying to change, dominant cultures.

Jamison et al. [1990b] identified three kinds of ‘knowledge interest’ – cosmological, technical and organisational – and used them to demonstrate that the environmental movement emerged very differently in Sweden, Denmark and the Netherlands. The cosmological dimension consists of worldview assumptions, attitudes to nature and society, and of their interrelationships. The technological dimension refers to specific technological issues around which the movement develops including the
articulation of specific concerns in their practical activity. The organisational dimension concerns the movement’s organisational paradigm, the modes of organising the production and dissemination of knowledge.

When we designed the research, we had some concern about applying an approach which had been developed to deal with the 1960s and 1970s to events in the 1990s, especially after a period which has been widely seen as one of globalisation. However, Jamison and Baark [1999] not only articulated the stages of development of the environmental movement towards ecological modernisation in the 1990s but also showed that the different geography, history, culture, institutions and political styles of Denmark and Sweden had resulted in ecological modernisation being played out in significantly different forms in the two countries. Jamison [2001] reiterated and extended that argument, adding the different experience in the US and pointing also to different processes in India. He focused on distinct national policy styles, cultural biases and movement legacies as constraints on, and resources for, environmental activists.

Within a particular national context, a social movement has to relate to these national styles even while it is engaged in trying to change them. In so doing, ‘movement intellectuals’ [Everman and Jamison, 1991: 98] articulate the knowledge interests and cognitive identity of the movement in ways which are designed to mobilise activists and appeal to wider publics. Movement intellectuals are distinguished from ‘established intellectuals’, who, while taking some part in the formation of the movement, are based in official institutions and hence tend to articulate more ‘establishment’ views [Jamison et al., 1990a]. Recently, west European environmentalism has been seen as characterised by a tendency towards ecological modernisation, supplemented by a radical countercurrent of more oppositional groups like the anti-roads protest movement [van der Heijden, 1999], and ecological modernisation itself is seen to vary from weak to strong, depending on the ability of the environmental movement to argue for more critical viewpoints [Christoff, 1996]. In such circumstances, a higher proportion of environmental experts are likely to be incorporated into business and the state, so the ‘movement intellectuals’ associated with NGOs face different challenges from those of their predecessors in earlier decades and in particular a dilemma between pursuit of greater incorporation and engagement with direct action [Rootes, 1999]. This was especially so in CEE, where the transition was influenced by strong international pressures to move towards sustainable development and the new international norm characterised by Bernstein [2000] as ‘liberal environmentalism’.
Investigating the Cognitive Praxis of the Czech Environmental Movement

Although many Czech environmental groups published their own periodicals at some point of their existence, these were often irregular, as they usually depended on the availability of grant funding. In the latter half of the 1990s, the withdrawal of grant funding not only terminated Děti Země’s (Children of the Earth) magazine Alternativy but also temporarily discontinued the publishing of Nika, a bimonthly of the Prague branch of Český svaz ochránců přírody (ČSOP; Czech Union of Nature Conservationists) that played a historic role in the late 1980s. The only periodical that systematically discussed and deliberately sought to shape knowledge interests, was Hnutí DUHA’s (Rainbow Movement) monthly Sedmá generace (The Seventh Generation). While our research was informed by this and other existing printed and electronic materials such as magazines Veronica and Hnutí Brontosaurus’s (Movement Brontosaurus) Ekolist, in our quest to identify contours of Czech environmental movement’s knowledge interest we had to rely primarily on interviews with movement intellectuals.

Twenty-one in-depth interviews with leading movement intellectuals were conducted in winter 1998/99. Although the main criterion for selecting respondents was their personal saliency within the movement we are also convinced that, with the possible exception of the Brno-based group NESEHNUTÍ, which represents a more radical current, the information and opinions provided by 21 respondents captures the breadth of the Czech environmental movement in the late 1990s. We spoke to people from a traditional conservation organisation, from campaigning groups that are the backbone of environmental movement at present, with people whose activity can be best described as consultancy, with a director of an organisation that serves as an intermediary between environmental groups and state central authorities as well as with a veteran activist whose work could now be characterised as applied ecology research but who at the same time was a presenter of a public TV environmental programme. Our research covered all important centres of Czech environmental activism. The interviews took place in Brno, České Budějovice, Liberec, Olomouc, Plzeň, Prague, and Ústí nad Labem. We interviewed people representing 13 different environmental groups.

Our contention that interviewing the Czech movement’s intellectuals about their knowledge interests would be a pioneering work was confirmed on a number of occasions by respondents themselves. Apart from four interviewees based in Prague, who complained about being approached with requests for an interview rather too often, the majority of our respondents living outside Prague had never been interviewed except by
local journalists on topical issues. After the interview, many respondents commented that this was the first time that somebody was interested in their worldviews, beliefs and past formative experiences.

Fourteen respondents were men, seven were women. Twelve respondents were full-time employees of their environmental organisations. The majority of interviewees turned out to be veterans who joined the movement in the pre-1989 period. The average age of the respondents was 33 and only three were below 25 at the time of the interview. Most respondents (15) were past members of at least one of the two conservationist groups that legally existed in the 1970s and 1980s – ČSOP (8) and Brontosaurus (9).

The importance of pre-1989 formative experience was suggested by the finding that nine out of our 21 respondents completed their full time education, including university education, prior to 1989. As Kundrata pointed out at the beginning of the 1990s, ‘one has to take into consideration the fact that since the 1950s, at least 90 per cent of university graduates received a highly specialised education not based on a holistic or global approach’ [Kundrata 1992: 32]. Moreover, during the Communist period the structure of university education was heavily biased in favour of technical and scientific disciplines. Graduates in these disciplines, if we count medicine as science, made up about 80 per cent of all university graduates. Out of 19 respondents to our survey who held a university degree or were currently studying for it, 7 had a background in scientific disciplines, including four who studied biology or ecology. Seven were graduates of polytechnics or agricultural universities, two respondents were lawyers, two studied linguistics, and one did sociology.

However, while the availability of social sciences, arts and humanities programmes was growing during the 1990s, only a tiny minority of students was enrolled in these programmes even in the second half of the decade (the proportion of students studying humanities and social sciences increased from 2.5 per cent in 1989 to 11.6 per cent in 1997). The 1990s brought little change to this educational experience of Czech environmental movement intellectuals. Only two respondents whose first degree was either in science or agricultural studies felt that they needed to extend their education beyond scientific ecological expertise and were completing a second degree in social and political sciences:

I felt that biology or ecology was not enough, that what was needed was to have a background in social science, to understand the political system for example, because an environmental activist is not only an expert - ecologist, but also a citizen, who needs to have a knowledge of law.....(INTERVIEW 12/2/99).
Czech Environmental Knowledge Interests in the Late 1990s: Summary of Research Findings

The Czech environmental movement’s knowledge interests as set out below are a collection of features shared by the majority of our respondents rather than an exhaustive list of elements to which all respondents would subscribe. We do not deny that, as everywhere else, a large variety of ideas and beliefs can be found in the Czech environmental movement. However, at the same time we believe that it makes sense to attempt to identify the dominant knowledge interests of the Czech environmental movement. On the basis of detailed scrutiny of transcripts of the in-depth interviews with the environmental movement’s intellectuals we strove to detect the fundamental beliefs and ideas with which the Czech environmental movement as a whole could be identified. Organising our findings in a similar way to Eyerman and Jamison’s [1991] approach, the following is how we interpret the Czech environmental movement’s environmental knowledge interests of the late 1990s:

Cosmological dimension: Environmental degradation is usually seen as arising from business activities that are supported by local or national politicians, but this almost never amounts to the identification of some structural features of liberal capitalism as causes of these problems. Nature is perceived in a clearly anthropocentric perspective, in which it is subordinated to humans’ well-being. One of the main reasons for the importance of fighting for better environmental protection is the potential of health risks to the current and future generations arising from industrial pollution or other types of environmental degradation.

The most important thing for us is that we want to make sure that the generation of our children and our grandchildren can live here (INTERVIEW 20/1/99).

Nature itself is seen as robust within limits, i.e. the environment will tolerate a certain degree of damage. Scientific evidence and expert knowledge are the main criteria according to which environmental disputes should be resolved. Liberal democracy and the market economy are the preconditions for effective solutions to environmental problems. Conversion at the individual level will trigger social change.

There is a coalition of teachers in this town who teach ecological education. I think that everything is in children. I don't think that one can have big goals in this. The only way forward is to disseminate doubts (INTERVIEW 17/2/99).

A striking feature of the Czech environmental movement’s cosmology is that it almost completely ignores social, political and economic structures more nuanced than state and market. Systemic change as a precondition for resolution of environmental problems is often explicitly rejected.

We do not see the solution in the change of the social system because other systems would also cause (environmental) problems (INTERVIEW 30/9/98).
Technological dimension: Czech environment movement intellectuals do not demonise technology, with the partial exception of nuclear power, but see it as a means that both creates and solves problems, so that it is up to people how they choose to use it. It can be a partial solution to current problems, along with the employment of market-based and flexible instruments of environmental policy. Small-scale technology is preferred. Technology can play a particularly positive role in the shift towards increased efficiency, through the use of renewables.

(C)ars consuming less petrol, better insulation of houses - it's not a solution in itself but it's a partial solution (INTERVIEW 29/3/99).

Organisational dimension: Apart from ‘civil society’ very few collective actors are recognised. The central components of civil society are activist groups such as the environmental ones. As to members of environmental groups, they are expected to create a community of friends who can trust each other.

We have had long debates about how to recruit new members. I am a sceptic by nature and hence I have always argued that when people who we do not know want to join us, we should be cautious. We do not know how they behaved during the previous regime and we cannot know what they would do as members of our group (INTERVIEW 20/1/99).

The desired role for environmental groups is that of a mediator between individual citizens, or, preferably, locally based informal groups of citizens, and the central state authorities. Environmental groups should be consulted by central authorities and treated as partners. Rational arguments and behaviour are preferred to emotionally motivated behaviour.

At the beginning we were those who stand somewhere with a protest banner and at the same time have a few arguments. There was a lot of enthusiasm in it then, but I think that over the years we have managed to change the image of our organisation in the eyes of the public, state officials and investors so that they are now accepting us as partners (INTERVIEW 17/2/99).

The main agents are human subjects. More specifically, the end-product of environmental groups’ activities at the local level is an individual who through a conscious value-based lifestyle change helps to create a more harmonious relationship between society and the environment.

The common denominator of all those things I am involved in is to try to help to formulate and disseminate different values and to identify how these values can influence our way of thinking (INTERVIEW 11/02/99).

In the long-term perspective, the solution is in ecological education leading to changed individuals’ consciousness (INTERVIEW 30/9/98).
According to the emphasis placed on the market economy and the individual, an important role is ascribed to green consumerism guided by self-interest.

We definitely aim to influence individuals. For instance by disseminating information about washing powder without phosphate. We enclose it to consumers magazines and newspaper supplements….Consumers should demand washing powder without phosphate (INTERVIEW 19/1/99).

Administrative regulation as well as infinite economic growth are stigmatised. The state has a part to play here too, however, as it should guarantee that individuals have a choice between environmentally harmful and environmentally friendly consumption, the latter seen as economically more beneficial.

Ecofriendly behaviour is also economically sound. It's been proved many times that people respond to economic stimuli very quickly (INTERVIEW 12/2/99).

Summary: Overall, the positive view of the market and the emphasis on individual behaviour fitted well with what Bernstein [2000] calls ‘liberal environmentalism’. In our view, Czech environmental movement intellectuals were less prone to radical critique of capitalist society than would be the case for west European environmentalists. There were a small number of individuals, associated with local protest or with more radical groups like Hnutí DUHA, who have more interests in changing social structures, but they seemed to us less radical than their western counterparts. Some of our respondents indicated that they had had these kinds of belief for decades. These influences persisting from a relatively distant past prompted us to look at the earlier experiences of our respondents.

Formative Experience of Environmental Movement Intellectuals

As shown above, the Czech environmental movement is still largely led by people who rose to prominence in the movement around 1989. They joined and later started to shape a movement that, if compared with its western contemporaries, inevitably grew out of a much narrower range of influences and inspirations. Environmentalism was not allowed to develop as a social and political critique of or as a visionary alternative to the existing social order. The most visionary perspective was probably that advanced by Josef Vavroušek, a key movement intellectual both before and immediately after 1989, who placed a strong emphasis on value and lifestyle conversions at the individual level as a precondition of the more harmonious relationship between the environment and society. But other sources such as women’s rights-, radical participatory-, anti-nuclear- and animal rights movements and various spiritual and eastern philosophical currents were not part of the Czech environmental movement experience.

The influences that were reported as significant included some surprises. When asked to identify other than educational and family influences that they thought had a formative effect on their environmental views, five of our interviewees mentioned their tramping experience and four their membership in boy scouts. Four interviewees
mentioned as their childhood formative experience romantic books by authors such as Karl May (a 19th century German writer of books about the US Wild West), Ernst Thompson Seton and Jaroslav Foglar, the Czech writer of books on boy-scouting.6

These findings were a reminder that the pre-1989 Czech environmental movement developed in virtual intellectual isolation from western environmental thought of the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s. During the Communist period communication of Czech environmentalists with their western counterparts or academics was non-existent and western environmentalist literature was not accessible. In the early 1990s Kundrata [1992: 34] noticed that ‘even within the (Czech) environmental movement there are few people who have a deep knowledge of the works of the Club of Rome; the names of E.F. Schumacher, A. Toffler, F. Capra and others are almost unknown’.7

The 1990s brought only a marginal improvement in this area. Very few classic books of western environmentalism were published in Czech during the 1990s. The consequence was that many Czech environmental movement intellectuals were only cursorily acquainted with western literature on social and political analysis of environmental problems. This was confirmed during our interviews. The most frequently mentioned foreign environmentalist authors were: Erich Fromm (3), Robert Jungk (3), Al Gore (3) and Konrad Lorenz (2), The Ecologist magazine was mentioned twice, another magazine - Resurgence - once. James Lovelock, E.F. Schumacher, Peter Singer, Herbert Marcuse and K. G. Jungk each appeared once, along with another two well-known books The Limits to Growth and Factor 4. The only three Czech authors, who gained recognition among the respondents were Jan Keller (4) and Hana Librová (4) (both taught sociology at Brno university at the time of the interviews) and Erazim Kohák (2), a professor of philosophy from the United States, who returned for his retirement to the Czech Republic. The strong representation of philosophy and psychology corresponds with the belief of many activists in the decisive role of individuals’ consciousness. The main thrust of Librová’s influential book [Librová, 1994] could be interpreted as reaffirming the belief within the Czech environmental movement about the importance of individual changes towards an environmentally less damaging lifestyle based on voluntary modesty.

Our central finding here is that relatively little happened within the movement during the 1990s to compensate for those traditions and influences that shaped western environmentalism in the past and that were missing in the Czech case. It was quite revealing that many respondents perceived with great suspicion, sometimes bordering on outright rejection, the ideas of Hnutí DUHA, the only major Czech environmental group that explicitly links environmental issues with their social and political dimension. For the majority of our respondents, current attitudes seem strongly linked to ideas from the 1980s, so we thought it necessary to go back to earlier sources to check whether their recollections were directing our attention to significant past events.
Tramps, Brontosauri and Pollution Monitoring: Czech Environmental Knowledge Interests of the Late 1980s

Drawing on our own memories of pre-1989 Czechoslovak environmentalism and on historical literature [Vaněk 1996 and 2002; Kundráta, 1992], we present, in the rest of this section, our interpretation of the knowledge interests of the late 1980s in relation to the social and political context of the time. The pre-1989 traditions of the current Czech environmental movement are mainly related to the activities of three officially recognised organisations, ČSOP, Hnutí Brontosaurus and Ekologická sekce Biologické společnosti Československé akademie věd (Ecological Section of the Biological Society of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences) and an unofficial movement that was, nevertheless, tolerated by the Communist authorities – tramping.

Tramping is a loose movement whose origin dates back to the period after the First World War. Its origin is linked to the spread of American values and culture as communicated through literature and westerns about the 19th century American West [Waic and Koessl, 1992]. Tramping has gone through several major transformations. During the decades of Communism tramping enabled people to find refuge from oppressive every-day reality with a group of like-minded friends in their log cabins or camp sites.

Tramping and its culture, while nurturing positive attitudes to nature, perceived nature in oppositional contrast to society as a refuge from society, thus separating the social and the environmental. Tramping experience has also taught its adherents that it was possible to lead a modest lifestyle with very limited means, at least for several summer days or weeks. Despite the universal familiarity of Czechs with tramping’s cultural dimension (music, jargon, and romantic literature), its social base was always somewhat limited. Tramping appealed mainly to urban dwellers with a technical orientation in terms of education and employment. It is estimated that up to 50,000 people were part of the movement in the 1980s.

Brontosaurus started in 1973 as a programme of the Socialist Union of Youth aimed at ecological education and summer camps in which volunteers were engaged in practical conservation work. ČSOP, established in 1979 as a successor of a similar organisation called Tis (Yew) that was forced by authorities to disband itself, had a similar range of activities as Brontosaurus. Although some local branches of these two organisations had a more political agenda, in particular if they had links to Ekologická sekce or even the dissident Ekologická společnost (Ecological Society), the majority of the members were engaged in non-political activities called in the contemporary jargon ‘small ecology’. They were cleaning streams of rubbish, looking after protected areas, disseminating knowledge on functioning of ecosystems and educating young people in ecology in strictly scientific terms.

The only legal environmental organisation that perceived and discussed ‘big ecology’ issues (decision making processes on strategic and politically charged issues) was Ekologická sekce. This elitist expert organisation (which had 400 members at its peak in 1989) evolved from a group of friends and colleagues, most of whom held jobs in various institutes of the Academy of Sciences. Employment in the Academy meant that they enjoyed privileged access to environmental data, most of which were treated by the regime as secret information. Scientific expertise, access to data and the links of some of
the Section’s members to the dissident Charta ‘77 made it the most influential and respected group of the Czech environmental movement prior to 1989. Ekologická sekce’s interpretation of environmental issues was by and large confined to domestic issues – to the visible impacts of local industrial pollution that was deemed to have a detrimental effect on human health. The international dimension of environmental problems was recognised only in the form of transboundary effects of air and water pollution, while the global dimension was almost absent.

The key feature of the pre-1989 environmental debate was that ‘environmental problems were primarily viewed through the twin lenses of science and technology’ [Tickle and Welsh, 1998: 157]. If the environmental movement wanted to enter a dialogue with the authorities, it had to comply with the scientific, technical, rational, apolitical and value-free interpretation of environmental issues. This type of reasoning did not contradict the official ideology of social advancement based on scientific-technological progress. The key battle was then about gaining access to the data, which would enable the environmental movement to mount more effective scientific arguments in communication with the authorities.

However, the only causes of environmental problems that could be voiced were temporary and asystemic failures of Communist economic management. The solution to environmental problems rested in better scientific understanding and required better monitoring and application of a less damaging technology. This line of argument was supposed eventually to persuade the authorities to enforce the already existing regulations based on the emissions reduction principle and to install end-of-pipe devices. In the understanding of many Czech environmentalists this was an approach that resolved problems of environmental pollution in west European countries in the 1970s and early 1980s.

Czech environmentalism of the late 1980s was a curious blend of the officially sanctioned moderate current of rational, technocratic and scientific (ecological) perception of environmental issues with the unofficial romanticising undercurrent extolling virtues such as beauty of pristine nature and individual freedom. While in the specific social and political context of the Communist period, this intellectual amalgam amounted to a mildly rebellious protest current, from western environmentalism’s point of view it represented a politically and socially conservative shade of environmentalism. Whereas western environmentalism emerged at least partly as a new-left related counterculture, Czech environmentalism represented a moderate counterculture to the real ‘existing socialism’ and politically leaned to the right or centre rather than left. As Vaněk [2002: 250] concludes ‘(f)ears of repression and dislike for leftwing views gave rise to a particular type of the Czech environmentalist: a cautious person with the ideal of tolerance and democracy and of mild and placid nature’.

In his socio-anthropological analysis of post-1989 Czech society, Holy [1996: 5] argues that the discourses which emerged in a situation of dramatic social change brought about by the post-Communist transformation of society either have explicitly invoked discourses current in pre-Communist Czech society or have been constructed in conscious opposition to the official discourses current during the Communist period. It should be added that both types of discourse were already constructed before 1989. Furthermore, part of the oppositional discourse was based on juxtaposing the realities of the Communist period with perceptions of the western liberal democracies. As Vaněk
reminds us, ‘ecological damage in Czechoslovakia was perceived as a consequence of the centrally planned socialist system. Czech environmentalists saw the capitalist system and market economy as their hope’. Not surprisingly, therefore, a number of movement intellectuals found it initially difficult to comprehend that the arrival of the market and liberal democracy did not automatically lead to the reversal of detrimental approaches to the environment.

I was really taken by surprise when after the revolution, politicians and economists were attacking the ecological movement, in particular Václav Klaus in 1992 and 1993. It became a sort of dichotomy, in fact economic arguments were used against the nature protectionists (INTERVIEW 11/2/99).

(I)n 1990, we did nothing against (the construction of the nuclear power plant) Temelín. We thought: There is a new government, the government of our heart, democratic, and they will certainly close Temelín down. But a year passed and nothing happened, so we got a bit angry and decided to do something against it (INTERVIEW 20/1/99).

The Continuity of Czech Environmental Knowledge Interests

What makes Czech environmental knowledge interests of the late 1990s distinctly different from those in the West is not something that the Czech movement has in addition to them, but precisely what is missing in comparison to western environmentalism. Not only had the environmental movement under state socialism a shorter tradition, as Herrschel and Forsyth [2001] point out, but it developed under constraints that were not experienced by their western counterparts. As a consequence, important pre-1990s influences informing the movement’s knowledge interests in the West were not part of the Czech environmental movement’s experience.

Our central argument in this section is that the interaction of the Czech environmental movement with western actors during the 1990s had relatively little effect in terms of compensating for these missing formative experiences. As opposed to changes at the practical organisational level, such as professionalisation and fundraising techniques, changes at the deeper, cognitive level were relatively minor and, as a consequence, the Czech environmental movement has retained many features of the pre-1989 ‘Czech local perspective’. We support this claim by proceeding in two steps. First, we argue that western involvement in transformation of the Czech environmental movement did not significantly enrich the deeper cognitive dimension of the movement as it usually refrained from this activity. Second, we argue that there were considerable barriers for the Czech environmental movement intellectuals to evolve interest in broadening and deepening its cognitive dimension by catching up with the past sources of western environmentalism. Apart from the specific formative experience of movement intellectuals described earlier in this article a major barrier was the domestic transitional political context during much of the 1990s.
The nature of western involvement

The demise of the Communist system in CEE broadly coincided with the culmination of the most significant shift of the western environmental governance over the last 30 years, characterised by Bernstein [2000] as convergence of environmental and economic norms towards ‘liberal environmentalism’. As Bernstein argues further, in the form of the concept of sustainable development, the 1992 Earth Summit institutionalised these norms, which predicate environmental protection on the promotion and maintenance of liberal economic order. This was the approach which western agencies, whether governmental or non-governmental started to promote in CEE following the initial meeting of the ‘Environment for Europe’ process in the Dobříš castle near Prague in June 1991. This was later further strengthened by the process of harmonisation of policies and laws in the applicant countries for membership in the European Union (EU).

Since the beginning, western management of the process of transition in the environmental field [Slocock, 1999: 155] and western environmental assistance have relied for their implementation on the involvement of environmental NGOs. The argument that was usually invoked was that strengthening environmental NGOs brings double benefit; apart from enhancing environmental protection it also strengthens democracy through the development of the prime actor of civil society. However, as Pearce [1998] explains in the case of the 1990s’ process of capitalist modernisation in Central America, democracy was not perceived by external assistance actors so much as an outcome as a means of achieving economic development. It was East European revolutions which gave the concept of civil society a great respectability and pitched it against the authoritarian and interventionist state. Civil society became a concept that links the strategy of marketisation with political liberalisation. The attractiveness of civil society lies in the notion that it mirrors in the political realm the principles of self-regulation understood to be the source of economic well-being and growth [Pearce, 1998: 184]. Civil society is supposed to be a means of reconciling problems arising from the introduction of the market economy. In this context environmental NGOs’ role as civil society actors is to mediate in conflicts arising from the impact of economic development on the environment.

In the Czech Republic, as elsewhere in CEE, the emphasis of western assistance was initially placed on training programmes for environmental activists with the objective of transferring knowledge and practice from the West to CEE. As Lipschutz [1996: 156-157] found in the Hungarian case, the training programmes of US agencies, whether government or private and non-profit, did not aim at teaching environmental groups about ecology, but concentrated on transferring the organisational culture of US civil society and the US environmental community in particular. Later the focus of foreign assistance shifted to grant funding of NGOs’ projects. Partly as a result of foreign assistance, the Czech environmental movement failed to develop its own membership base and became almost fully dependent on external funding. Funders, whether private foundations, western governments or various EU intermediaries, wanted to see tangible results of their assistance. Hence they typically funded: public ecological libraries and their networking; ecological counselling for the public; participation of environmental groups in environmental decision-making processes, in particular through the EIA process; strengthening the co-operation of environmental groups with state authorities.
and local governments; collecting information (e.g. mapping installations of renewable energy in a region); publications of information brochures and leaflets (rarely publication of books, either original or translated); drafting policy proposals; and projects on nature conservation (applied ecology). In short these are activities that can be, borrowing from Waller [1998: 41-42], best described as ‘integrative’ and ‘issue-raising’ rather than contributing to broadening the movement’s worldviews, substantive knowledge and analytical skills.  

Many concepts promoted in the Czech Republic by western agencies in the 1990s conformed to practices to which the Czech environmental movement was accustomed in its pre-1989 experience. The importance of scientific competence and expertise, for which availability of data was crucial, was deeply familiar. Consultative, moderate and rational behaviour of the environmental movement in its co-operative relationship with other actors was also reminiscent of past practices. Similarly deeply entrenched in the Czech environmentalists’ conscience was the belief in education, dissemination of information and resulting changes of lifestyle as the most effective means of achieving a more harmonious relationship between society and nature. The message of western actors that positive change can be achieved through changes at the individual level without the need for a major structural change resonated with views held by Czech environmentalists too. The earlier association with environmental reform predicated on systemic change should not be seen as a contradiction. The belief in the necessity to replace Communism by liberal capitalism as a precondition for the improvement of the environment was not based on a deep structural analysis of the two social systems, but on the perceived ‘unnaturalness’ of the former and ‘naturalness’ of the latter.

Transitional political context

After the short revolutionary ‘movement politics’ period 1990 – 1991, major political parties started to pursue the goal of ‘stabilisation’ of democracy. This effectively meant the attempt to close the political system to all political actors other than large political parties. This policy was particularly targeting environmental groups that, despite their embrace of the market economy and belief in the role of individual consumers in achieving their goals, were deemed by political parties to represent the main threat to the doctrine of unfettered economic growth stimulated by the introduction of the free market and privatisation. Furthermore, the attempts of some environmental groups to open the environmental policy-making sector to civil society actors, although still mainly on grounds of scientific and rational argumentation, were at odds with the tendency to perceive this policy sector as basically technical and the domain of experts.

What was particularly detrimental to the environmental movement’s reputation in the eyes of both the media and the political elite, whether on the left or right of the political spectrum, was the association of their activities and arguments with emotions and the ‘unnatural’. Holy observes that in Czech conceptualisation ‘emotions’ connote an unsuitable or inappropriate expression of feelings. The word ‘emotion’ acquires its meaning in opposition to ‘reason’. Particularly in political rhetoric, politicians, political commentators, and ordinary people commenting on political events and decisions condemn as irresponsible the appeal to emotions by extremists, both ultra-left-wing and
ultra-right-wing populists, and they negatively evaluate ‘emotional solutions to problems’ and ‘emotional answers to complex questions’ [Holy 1996: 181 – 182].

However moderate Czech environmental groups were during the 1990s in their behaviour, their goals and arguments were still questioning the dominant social paradigm of the transitional period – development, economic growth and catching-up with western countries in terms of levels of affluence – and hence were seen as questioning the ‘natural’. This experience also strengthened the apolitical character of most Czech environmental movement intellectuals and their increased use of scientific rationality and technical expertise. Czech environmental groups were making a considerable effort to present themselves and to behave as not only independent of political parties, but also as actors who consciously avoid any possible association with all types of vested political, economic and ideological interests.

Conclusion

Although we have discovered a great deal of affinity between the knowledge interests of Czech environmental movement intellectuals and 1990s liberal environmentalism, we argue that this is not solely due to the western influences shaping the thought of Czech movement intellectuals. Rather than the western ideational paradigm replacing the local perspective, a more complex combination of domestic and imported ideas occurred in the course of the 1990s. With its emphasis on civil society, access to information and the role of lifestyle changes, western knowledge transfer in the 1990s was largely compatible with the Czech pre-1989 oppositional environmental discourse.

By stressing the importance of influences that originated during the Communist period for the cognitive dimension of Czech environmentalism in the late 1990s, we wish to contribute to the growing body of literature that interprets post-Communist transformation as a ‘mix of inherited experiences of socialism and western-inspired aspirations’ [Herrschel, 2001]. This literature [e.g. Herrschel and Forsyth, 2001; Pavlínek and Pickles, 2000]) argues that post-Communism is in many respects a unique condition and the impact of western influence has been less far-reaching than previously thought.

Czech attitudes consistent with liberal environmentalism did not originate in 1990s western influence but in predispositions with a much longer history. This seems to us a vindication of Jamison’s approach, with its sensitivity to local specificities and political style, even in times of much closer international and even global linkages. The fact that Czech movement intellectuals display exactly the tension that Jamison [2000] identifies – between a dominant positivist instrumental rationality and a weaker cultural and hermeneutic rationality – suggests that they, like us, need to pay more attention to oppositional voices if environmentalism is not to become merely the voice of green business.
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NOTES

1 Czech acronym for Independent Social-Ecological Movement.
2 To identify our respondents we used the ‘purposeful sample’ technique [Overton and van Diermen, 2003].
3 More than three quarters of respondents took this position.
4 The English word ‘tramping’ is actually used in the Czech language to describe this distinctively Czech cultural form.
5 Given the age of our respondents, only a few of them could actually have been members of boy scouts, as during the Communist period boy scouting was legally allowed only between 1968 and 1970.
6 Foglar’s books were removed from public libraries during the Communist regime except for the 1968 - 1970 period.
7 A telling story is related to the publishing of a semi-official Czech translation of ‘Limits to Growth’ shortly after its publication in the West. Bedřich Moldan, a leading figure of Ekologická sekce and later the first Czech Republic’s post-Communist environment minister, who was mainly responsible for this act, bitterly recalled in an interview for Nová přítomnost monthly at the beginning of the 1990 that this effort had no impact on Czech environmental discourse as it met with no response.
8 Associated initially with the process of modernization of Czech society, tramping provided a temporary escape from constraints of the urban, bureaucratic and industrial society. Thus in the 1920 and 1930s it was a moderate protest movement and an alternative lifestyle to bourgeois society.
9 Politically, the most controversial act of Ekologická sekce was the leaking of the government commissioned Report on the State of the Environment in Czechoslovakia to the dissident group Charta ’77 and its publication in the western media in 1984.
10 An example of foreign assistance that partly aimed to extend knowledge and ideas of CEE environmental movements is the activity of Quebec-Labrador Foundation (for details see Carmin et al. [2003]).
11 Holy [1996] offers an insightful explanation of the superior standing of capitalism to Communism in Czech perception in the early 1990s. According to Holy, in the Czech conceptualisation, things are perceived either as having emerged naturally, or as the result of deliberate human design. The evolution of human society and of its specific institutions is itself seen as ‘natural’ in the sense that these institutions cannot be attributed to particular human agents as their conscious or deliberate creations. The market economy is seen as ‘natural’ because ‘nobody created it’ [Holy 1996: 180]. The
market economy is seen as superior to the planned Communist economy, as natural things often have a higher value than those deliberately created.