

## ENVIRONMENTAL IDEOLOGIES

Historically, beginning from the *ideologues* in post-revolutionary France, the terms “ideology” usually has negative connotations. This view was preserved and extremely popularized by Marxism where ideology is viewed as a distorted or even inverted image of reality. However, the negative connotations conveyed by the term “ideology” were later revised even in neo-Marxist literature. Now, the term ideology is used in mostly neutral sense, coherent system of interrelated group beliefs. The term ideology was mostly developed in the political science literature and the *ideology* most often is equal to *political ideology*. Every political ideology basically answers the two types of questions: “How does society function?” and “How should society work?” More specifically, political ideologies usually discuss the following questions: what is human nature? What is the origin of society? Should people obey the government? What is the function of law? Are people equal? and many others. By using these questions it is possible to define and compare political ideologies.

My argument is that using the same method of analysis can be applied for environmental ideologies which are essentially a particular example of ideology. As political ideologies explain what our society is, what society should be, and what we should do about it, environmental ideologies answer the questions: what are the relationships between human and society, what are these relationships should be, and what should we do about the environment? Ideologies are always action-oriented and guide people what we should do (or should not do) in response to certain environmental issues. Since ideologies differ in their values and there are many values in relation to the environment, it is possible to identify a few fundamental ideologies in it and compare them. That would help us better understand other people’s motives in regard to the environment.

My notion of environmental ideologies is very similar to what Maarten Hajer and John Dryzek call “environmental discourses.” However, I believe that the term “environmental ideology” is not only more appropriate for description of environmental groups beliefs similar to the generally accepted term “political ideologies”, but even Hajer’s and Dryzek’s meanings of “environmental discourse” is different from what I mean by “environmental ideologies.” Obviously, a focus in both Hajer’s and Dryzek’s cases is on practices – written or spoken acts, not belief systems, even though they determine these linguistic acts. Therefore, when I talk about “environmental discourses” I mean these discursive acts – texts and speeches. What stands “behind” these acts – in Dryzek’s words, “assumptions, judgments, and contentions” are “environmental ideologies.”

For a classification of environmental ideologies, I will use a modified Dryzek and Lester’s (1989) typology of environmental worldviews. My typology of environmental ideologies is based on two dimensions. The first dimension is locus of values: anthropocentric or biocentric. In other words—whose values should goes first – humans’ or nature’s? If it is humans’ – who should benefit first – individuals or society/community as a whole? The second dimension is the locus of solutions: state (centralized) or non-state (decentralized). In other words, who plays the most important role in the agenda-setting process develops the policies and finally implements these policies.

Новиков А.

## ЭКОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ ИДЕОЛОГИИ

Анализируется понятие «идеология», рассматриваются экологические идеологии.