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Oleg Yanitskii is a distinguished Russian sociologist. He is the leader of the Ecopolitics and Ecological Movement's Research Group in the Institute of Sociology, Russian Academy of Sciences. He started his academic career in Soviet sociology in the 1970s as a specialist in Western urbanization theories. His book Urban Ecology: Western Interdisciplinary Conceptions (1984) displayed his thorough knowledge of the field. For many Russian sociologists, starting an academic career in the field of Western sociological theory proved to be very rewarding in the years of transformation. Critique of bourgeoisie social science became a niche where researchers could get acquainted with the state of the art within their sphere of interest. Professor Yanitskii has always possessed pronounced interest in urban ecology, and the book that was published a year ago (April, 1996) is an important landmark in his academic career. It sums up both his theoretical considerations and the empirical studies which he has been conducting with other members of the research group since the second half of the 1980s in Russia.

The book The Ecological Movement in Russia (Russian Academy of Science, Institute of Sociology, 1996) is based on empirical studies that were carried out in the large cities of the Soviet Union where ecological organizations had been visible and of political importance during the mobilization period of Perestroika (1985-1991) (Moscow, St. Petersburg, Novgorod, Nizhny Novgorod, Nal'chik, Cherny, Novosibirsk, Kirov, Donetsk, Tallinn, Tartu, and others). The methods used in the studies include the following: individual and group interviews with the leaders and rank-and-file members of the movement, politicians, and experts; discursive analyses of official and non-official press coverage and publications on ecological issues; analysis of the movement documents, participant observation (participation in the meetings, rallies, and conferences of the movement); and sociological intervention (in cooperation with the French sociologist A. Tourain). As his methodology shows, Yanitskii is very supportive of the movement. He can be considered an expert on the ecological movement whose empirical research and analysis are oriented very much towards promotion of the movement.

Discourse on Social Movements in Russia

To properly place Yanitskii's book within Russian sociological discourse, one has to understand that political sociology in general (including social movement research) is a brand new field of study in Russia. The first sociological observations on social movements appear in the ascending wave of protest at the end of the 1980s together with the movements themselves. At that time Yanitskii was among the few other sociologists (such as L. Gordon, E. Klevop, L. Ionin, V. Tishkov, L. Drobsheva, E. Zdravomyslova, V. Koshtsians, V. Voronkov, and A. Temkina) who were the first to draw attention to the new political realities of collective action. Yanitskii concentrated his attention on ecological groups from the beginning, being highly knowledgeable of Western theories of urbanization. His first publications on the eco-groups appeared in 1987, and he later developed his account of the movements and their role in the Russian transformation in more depth. Most of the Russian social movement researchers' conceptualization of political participation and social movements focus on Russia's transformation in an attempt to understand what Soviet society in the 1980s was and in what direction it was moving. The ecological element of Perestroika attracted the special attention of researchers, which was caused by the intensity of collective actions in this social movement (Yanitskii, 1994, 1992, 1989; Dauzay and Tsipkova, 1993).
The lack of traditions in the movement made Russian sociologists look towards Western paradigms. Initially (at the end of 1980s) the main intellectual effort was to test Western models of social movements in the Russian context. Yanitkii tried to apply recent theoretical findings in social movement studies to the Russian situation. Though he concluded that it is still necessary to prove that perspectives and concepts developed for the analysis of advanced highly modernized democratic Western societies can be applied to the analysis of the movement that emerged in post-totalitarian society (8), he actively uses these concepts to show that it is quite possible to use Western models in the Russian context.

I also think that it is plausible to use Western sociological concepts for Russian movement studies, based on the simple fact that they are sociological. I argue that being a modern social science (one that studies the complex society of modernity), sociology developed concepts as instruments of analysis applicable to any modern society whatever specific type of modernity it presents. One cannot avoid such terms as organization, resources, classes, stratification, power, elite, etc. in describing modernity. Though, the content of these terms may differ, they belong to the language of the social sciences; they constitute the only terminology available for understanding and describing reality.

As is well-known, three basic paradigms in social movement research are distinguished — collective behavior (or the traditional paradigm), the resource mobilization paradigm (including resource mobilization theory and the political process approach), and the new social movement (or identity) paradigm.

Yanitkii conceptualizes SMs in the frame of resource mobilization theory when he analyzes organizational building of the social movement sector in the context of the Russian transformation. When referring to the issues of movement emergence and the mass mobilization wave of Perestroika, Yanitkii theorizes in the framework of the political process model with its emphasis on the categories of political opportunities, political cycles, and protest mobilization as developed in the works of C. H. Tilly and S. Tarrow.

I strongly believe that attempts to apply Western models to the Russian context promote development of the scientific vocabulary in the field, show limitations of their usage, and promote the formation of original theories of political participation, imbedded in sociological classics.

**Conceptualizing the Russian Transformation**

Several frames were used conceptualize the Russian transformation. In the public and professional discourse the frame of civil society and of a state under the rule of law, which prevailed in the beginning, gradually gave way to the discourse of transition from authoritarianism, which now is being forced out by the frames of transformation or becoming, according to which no definite future can be predicted from structural ambiguities and political actions.

During Perestroika, when the major theme of discussion was civil society and the legal state in Post-Soviet Russia, new forms of political participation were looked upon as important indications of the rebuilding of civil society after the totalitarian oppression of Soviet rule. The whole process of democratization was looked upon as the creation of a civil society ruled by laws. This is the framework in which Yanitkii conceptualizes ecological movements.

In the second cycle of transformation, which was launched by the market reforms of January, 1992, the topic of civil society gradually disappeared from discourse. This was a response to the changes in the political climate, when the counter-mobilization of conservatives, the split of the elite, and mass discontent with radical economic reforms resulted in the coup of October, 1993 and the electoral backlash of December, 1993. Attention shifted to alternatives to the Russian transformation and barriers to democratization. Different interpretations of Russian and Post-Soviet political culture were formulated to explain and prognosticate on the tendencies of the transformation and its outcomes. Since 1993 the term "transition to democracy" is not often employed in discourse. It is rather a theoretical question under what circumstances can the current transformation bring about democracy and what are the opportunities for and barriers to such a development. Conceptualization has been influenced by the ideological strain of researchers who cannot keep distance from political realities. Yanitkii is among those who classify the Russian transformation as a catastrophic one — full of unpredictable risks for the nation-state and its population.

Thus he studies ecological movements in two broader conceptual frames: first — as a force in the formation of civil society in the course of Perestroika and — as a part and parcel of the risk society (using the term of the German sociologist U. Beck). Thus he combines two macrotheories in his analysis of Russian social movements.

**The Ecological Movement**

The subject of his study is the dynamics of the Russian ecological movement in different political contexts. He takes as the case of the Social-Ecological Union as a successful organization which, during the nine years of its existence, found its ecological and social niche in the Russian as well as international social space and provided itself with necessary resources. (118)

Yanitkii claims that the ecological movement emerged more than 30 years ago in the so-called period of Khrushchev's thaw which started after the XX Congress of the CPSU in 1956 and preserved a powerful infrastructural network which could survive under different political regimes. Yanitkii argues that the major difference between ecologists of the 1960-1970s and those of the 1980-1990s was the fact that the former supported the Communist regime (being part of the System) and the latter opposed it.

I would question the continuity of the Soviet and post-Soviet ecological movement. Though the membership is somewhat similar, the strategy, ideology, organizational forms, and repertoire of collective actions are so different that one can hardly find similarities outside of slogans. I think that the issue of continuity of the ecological movement has to be reconsidered. However, the lack of theoretical discussion and empirical studies in Russia, caused by the institutional crisis of science, makes this task difficult.

In his book, Yanitkii clearly formulates the goals of his research: (1) to conceptualize the sustainability and survival of the movement (actually the very fact of sustainability should be carefully reevaluated); (2) to show its interaction with the crisis context; and (3) to articulate the role of intelligentsia in providing sustainability in the movement (7).

As was said before, Yanitkii confirms the existence of ecological movements in the Soviet Union. He considers societal Groups for the Defense of Nature organized in high schools and universities at the end of 1950s to be social movements. At the same time, he applies the concept of totalitarianism to the Soviet political regime after 1956. It becomes obvious that he uses the term totalitarianism to mean something different than the one which is common in the Western discourse initiated by the works of H. Arendt, Baehr and Friedrich, who depicted it as a system which provides total control over both the private and public spheres. Yanitkii's totalitarianism is the one which after the political opennings in the end of the 1950s failed to provide total party-state control. But still he calls such a system totalitarian. According to Yanitkii, the system disrupted itself from within, creating niches for initiatives and uncontrolled activities. Yanitkii and Glasuzheva call such niches for initiative generating environments. Yanitkii identified four types of generating environments: (1) universities and major high schools; (2) research institutes and academic campuses; (3) Soviet professional organizations (the Union of Writers, the Union of Composers, etc.); (4) mass media (especially popular science).

Yanitkii identifies three groups of factors which promoted the emergence of ecological movements in Soviet society. Similar to the American sociologists D. MacAdam, J. McCarthy, and M. Zald, he distinguishes macro-factors, political factors, and organizational factors in the emergence of the movement. He writes: "In order to understand the structure and dynamics of the ecological movement one needs to put it in the framework of the fundamental social process — that of the Russian version of modernization". According to Yanitkii, structural prerequisites for ecological anxiety are specific risks of Soviet modernization (e.g., geopolitical risks and
risks of regressive stability) that precede formation of ecological groups.

The next level of analysis is the political one — the level of the nation-state and political reforms which opened opportunities for the formation of the institutional infrastructure for the ecological movement in Soviet society. The third level Yanitskii describes is that of organizational infrastructure. He is depicting here environmental factors which provide a setting conducive to movement activities. He defines such factors as legitimate, and says that in most cases it is state organizations, that stimulated the emergence of organizations that became a vehicle for social movement activities, provided them with resources including ideology, and promoted informal activities. The environment was not only the public setting of universities, campuses or editorial offices — it was the space-referent of social groups which formed the mobilization potential of the movement. Students, researchers, and intellectuals (the Soviet intelligentsia) were the core groups of the ecological movement. Generating environment also provided resources with curators who became the main resource of the movement, educating and instructing a younger generation of activists. On the micro-level of the movement analysis, Yanitskii describes the motivation and values of movement activists. He identifies the following principal motives which at the same time were the values of the movement organizers: one-initiative activities, self-organization, self-realization collective identification, and self-preservation. To describe the development of the movement in the period of transformation, Yanitskii turns to the concept of political opportunism. This concept often includes a long list of indicators. It is widely used in Western social movement discourse. The version of the concept used by Yanitskii is similar to the one used by the German sociologist D. Rucht. They both prefer to speak about the context that shaped the dynamics, outcome, and strategies of collective action. Yanitskii distinguishes between the three contextual levels of the ecological movement — cultural, institutional, and situational. He is correct in saying that in the situation of stability, cultural context has a major influence on the dynamics of movements, while in the period of transformation and crisis the crucial role transfers to new actors. Pre-reformist reforms gave the impetus to protest mobilization which led to the establishment of ecological groups and their subsequent politicization. However, the mobilization wave was followed by the drastic movement of demobilization which we are now seeing.

Yanitskii claims that the dismantling of the system and consequent social changes brought about new risks, which resulted in demobilization. Since the start of market reforms in January 1992, he argues the population has become exhausted by the struggle for survival — morally suppressed and in turn an insufficient social base for the ecological movement. Movement values are contradictory to the values of the population of a crisis society. This statement sounds very ideological, it is part of the catastrophic scenario which seems very plausible to Yanitskii. Deprivation which accompanies rapid social transformation can also be interpreted as a cause of social unrest. The argument of deprivation and changing values is neither sufficient for the explanation of protest mobilization nor for the account of demobilization. The changes in values in present-day Russia are difficult to measure. Cultural and personal values do not change very quickly. My critique on this point is that priorities in interests and values do change quickly during periods of rapid social changes, and this aggravates risk. Not simply deprivation, but the cross-pressure of social group interests diminishes the mobilization potential of the ecological movement. Social differentiation as well as stratification studies show that it would be an exaggeration to consider Russian society today as a totality sharing the same values, having the same strategies, and encountering the same problems. The complexity of generation, national, class, gender, and ethnic differences determine the mobilization potentials for the ecological movement. Though I share the assumption that the period of rapid economic and social transformation provides new risks, I do not believe that the existence of these risks can account for the withdrawal of attention from environmental issues per se. All new risks have certain environmental dimensions; that is why ecological issues are present in every new political document and cannot be separated from the issues of economic welfare, political safety, etc.

**Concluding Remarks**

A new branch of social science in Russia (political sociology) was in the initial phase of its development in the period 1988-1995. Political sociology is developing in conjunction with political participation in the course of transformation. Until now, research in political sociology could barely be separated from political interests and activities. Yanitskii's book illustrates this statement in a vivid way.

This period of development of the research field is characterized by the accumulation of empirical information, the specialization of scholars in the relevant field of research, and by the establishment of research institutes oriented towards the study of political participation. Now one can name the authors and journals dealing with relevant topics. It is possible to identify their theoretical and political positions. We can name research structures carrying out the studies of political participation. Oleg Yanitskii is one of the foremost Russian researchers of ecological movements and ecological politics.

The general topic for discussion is Russian transformation — with the emphasis on the concept of Post-Soviet political culture. This is a theoretical framework within which empirical data is being analyzed and specific models for political participation are constructed. Attempts to adopt and adapt Western concepts and paradigms are common in the current state of Russian political sociology. One of the reasons for this is that the formation of political science in Russia is taking place in the framework of the liberal tradition of social philosophy. It is not a specifically Russian political science, but the result of the transfer of Western concepts and methodologies directly into the Russian context. To do honor to Russian political scientists it is necessary to say that they reflect upon this transfer. Yanitskii’s contribution to the discussion of the notion of totalitarianism and the prerequisites for civil society in the Soviet system as well as his interpretation of the Soviet and Post-Soviet risk society have broadened discussion of these issues and deserve to be scrutinized.

Let us look at the contributions of Yanitskii's book. First, he gives a typology of ecological groups belonging to the Socio-Ecological Union based on ideological criteria (conservatives, traditionalists, alternativists, eco-techocrats, civic initiatives, ecopatriots, etc.). He analyses the dynamics of BNE and its relations with state authorities; he gives an account of the collective actions performed by the movement, and the motivations of its participants. Theoretically, the ecological movement is looked upon as a structure of civil society. Yanitskii identifies the factors promoting sustainability of the movement through the changes of political regime — self-limitation, withdrawal from the politics and current problems of society, flexibility in the tactics of the leadership which, at times, compromises with the system and, at other times, opposes it.

Yanitskii shows that the movement now finds itself in a crisis caused by the risks of Russian transformation and the regeneration of organization. Bureaucratization and stratification in the movement, gaps between the leaders and members, oligarchization of leadership — all these features are caused by both its strategies for sustainability as well as by contradictions between the values of the population and the values of the movement. His suggestion to resolve the crisis is for those close to the movement to carry out the prescriptions of the sociological intervention method and help in the development of reflexivity and the search for collective reidentification. The participants in the movement should reevaluate themselves and the movement.

One of the most interesting insights in the book is Yanitskii's concept of the late Soviet system. Though he claims that the system was totalitarian, he simultaneously thinks that it gave space to the generating environment and relevant milieux that promoted social movement development. The idea of generating environments contributes to the discussion of the prerequisites of civil society, second society, and the specific Soviet private-public sphere.

The book gives an exhaustive account on the one and only core ecological movement in Russia which survived the Soviet regime, went through the mobilization period of Perestroika, and (although presently in crisis) still has favorable prospects of re-
vival and survival. However, for a thorough understanding of the ecological movement it would be extremely interesting to compare the eco-movement mobilization in different regions of Russia and to compare ecological groups that emerged in the course of Perestroika with those that existed in Soviet times. The very idea of the continuity of the eco-movement is questionable. In my opinion, for the Groups for the Defense of Nature as a social movement which were devoted to opposing the system, collaboration with the Soviet system cannot be called a social movement: no collective action, no real public space for open communication, no actual conflict with authorities — nothing of what is usually thought to be core features of a movement. In what sense was this a movement? Probably only in the sense that some participants still had the same names, though in different status and different generational groups, with the same slogans that probably acquired new meanings in the different political context. I would rather claim that the Soviet Groups for the Defense of Nature can be looked upon as derivative generating environments — they do not meet social movement characteristics and they cannot be seen as actual movements, though they were the seeds from which the social movements of Perestroika appeared.

Chrysovalantes Margaritides

An Industrial Policy for the US?
A Look at The Semiconductor Industry

Introduction
One of the most controversial issues of the past two American Presidential Elections was whether or not the US government should formulate an industrial policy. This question arises from the great success Japan has had in becoming one of the world's most powerful and technologically advanced economies, attributable primarily to the Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI). Many neoclassical economists argue that industrial policy is another form of state intervention and thus destined to fail. Some even say that the claim that the Japanese economy was prosperous due to the guidance of MITI is misleading.1 In recent years, the main issue has been the manner in which industrial policy could be implemented in the United States. In this paper I will attempt to justify the assertion that the US is almost obligated to formulate an industrial policy if it wishes to keep up with international competition, especially in high technology areas. I will examine the US-Japan trade friction in the semiconductor industry and analyze the successes and failures of both governments in promoting the interests of their respective industrial sectors.

Characteristics of the Semiconductor Industry
It will be helpful to first analyze the distinctive aspects of the semiconductor industry. It is a paradigmatic example of an oligopoly — with a few firms dominating the market in each country (Texas Instruments, IBM, Motorola, and Intel in the United States and N.E.C., Toshiba, Mitsubishi, Hitachi, and Fujitsu in Japan). This also holds true for the world market where the Japanese and American giants dominate the market. The products are homogeneous in the lower-end technologies, such as the Dynamic Random Access Memories (DRAM's), and most often differentiated at the higher-end, like the Electrically Programmable Read-Only Memories (EPROM's). Moreover, there exist high barriers to market entry and exit. For example, many European and US firms prefer to remain in certain high-tech industries (i.e., in EPROM's) while suffering losses because they fear that by exiting they will ultimately lose competitiveness among higher-margin products2 as well.

Secondly, it is an industry that is characterized by steep learning curves. Empirical evidence shows there is a long-run logarithmic relationship between change in manufacturing productivity and change in output, essentially due to the experience gained by manufacturers over time. The semiconductor industry took advantage of such steep learning curves since it had often produced more defective than reliable parts: "...[in] new products, yields as low as 25 percent were quite common, while mature products might yield 90 percent." This fact causes prices to fall almost instantly after a new product is introduced because costs tend to decrease more rapidly as time passes and output increases. Firms have to maximize their production process (minimize costs and maximize profit) early in the product cycle — commonly calculated to be about five years — because of the anticipated fall in price that results in quickly diminishing profit margins.

Third, the semiconductor industry is a research and development and capital intensive sector.4 In 1990, R&D accounted for roughly 13 percent of the value of total revenues in the industry while the same figure was 30 percent for capital expenditure. Due to short product cycles, companies in this sector desperately seek the advantage gained by being the first to move. When successful they can employ the "forward pricing" tactic. This means that in the early stages of creation (when new technology is being introduced and applied in the industry and most components assembled are defec-