

# Boston College Environmental Affairs Law Review

---

Volume 19

Issue 3 *The 1991 Bellagio Conference on U.S.-U.S.S.R.  
Environmental Protection Institutions*

Article 17

---

5-1-1992

## A Brief Summary of the Report “Ideology and Ecology”

Sergei Zalygin

Follow this and additional works at: <http://lawdigitalcommons.bc.edu/ealr>



Part of the [Environmental Law Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Sergei Zalygin, *A Brief Summary of the Report “Ideology and Ecology”*, 19 B.C. Envtl. Aff. L. Rev. 635 (1992),  
<http://lawdigitalcommons.bc.edu/ealr/vol19/iss3/17>

This Symposium Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Journals at Digital Commons @ Boston College Law School. It has been accepted for inclusion in Boston College Environmental Affairs Law Review by an authorized editor of Digital Commons @ Boston College Law School. For more information, please contact [nick.szydowski@bc.edu](mailto:nick.szydowski@bc.edu).

## A BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE REPORT "IDEOLOGY AND ECOLOGY"

*Sergei Zalygin\**

All collisions, all conflicts of peoples and nations with each other—such as war, revolution, and political and economic enslavement of one people by another—necessarily affect the state of nature, because they lead to a predatory use of its resources. Ideology in international and internal affairs also determines a society's use of ecological resources and thus its system of protecting nature. If one were to trace these interrelationships in a socialist society, it would be necessary to begin with the central thesis, which Marx advanced, that whereas philosophers strove before merely to explain the world, their real purpose is to change it.

For decades changes occurred in our society under slogans such as the Michurinite one: let us not wait for the gifts of nature—let us take them from her. Later, during the realization of the Great Stalin Plan for the Transformation of Nature, these changes continued under the assumption that all natural resources belong to the state, and in reality to the government departments, which exercise control over them with no oversight and to the state's gain.

Because socialism is "transforming the world," the use of natural resources in the Soviet Union is governed by gigantomania. The first author of the giant constructions back in the 1930s, the national building projects such as the White Sea-to-Baltic canal and the canal named "Moscow," was none other than Stalin. These building projects allowed him to use millions of prisoners and "dekulakized" peasants. After the war, during the 1940s and 1950s, such building projects acquired a colossal scale. Even today the practice of our departments reflects this same Stalinism.

The ecological thinking of our society remains deformed. Those limitations and those ideological conceptions that can be called "so-

---

\* Former member, Congress of Peoples' Deputies. Chair, Mir i Priroda.

cialist" still remain the determining ones in the relations between our citizens and nature, in their very conception of nature. Without considering these facts, it is impossible to evaluate or understand either those processes occurring in our country that we can call "ecological" or the Green Movement, which differs so sharply from the Green movements in the West.

During the period of perestroika, social organizations and movements were able to promote several projects for the rational use of the environment, but as a rule this was done spontaneously, without sufficient technical review or expertise and without judicial involvement. As a result, their proposals were not always well-grounded in fact. It is impossible, however, to discount such definite and significant accomplishments as the discontinuation of certain environmentally damaging projects, including the building of the Volga-Chograi canal and the proposed reversal of the flow of northern rivers to the south in order to irrigate arid lands.

Nevertheless, the Green Movement already is dying out under the pressure of economic conditions. People today are worried not by the prospects of their existence, but by the problem of how to survive. Moreover, the Green Movement is quite disorganized and is retreating under the pressure of the newly rejuvenated government departments, this neo-bureaucracy that, unlike the bureaucracy of the "stagnation" period, is no longer afraid of anything or anyone—not even the leadership. These government departments have revived a significant number of previously cancelled projects.

Around sixteen percent of our territory is already a collection of ecological disaster zones: Chernobyl, Aral, Kuzbas, Upper Dneper, and many others. The ecological condition of one-sixth of our land mass is grounds for grave concern on the part of the entire world, and prospects for improvement are very bleak. The world community and the highest international institutions must increase their efforts. The discussion should focus not so much on economic aid as on the international organization of environmental protection. In this light, I would like to support ideas advanced earlier with three specific proposals: the creation of an international ecological school; the creation of an international ecological inspection system (on the basis of obligatory norms for environmental use); and the creation of an international ecological tribunal.