

it was predominantly academic intelligentsia and representatives of free professions. Why dissidents did not head any SM – it is still an open question. Recently the SM's leaders are mainly representatives of the 'new Russian middle class', that is, they are relatively young (22-35 years old), well educated, white-color employees came from the information industry and the service-class.

## **7. How to reconcile individuality and collectivity?**

The EC and mainly Russia are the world of individuals. At the same time, we observe a growth of collective forms of social action. Is it the temporary phenomenon, ie the result of 'turbulent times' pressure, or having more deep roots? The sociology of SM always draws our attention to macro-processes such as mass rallies, marches, demonstrations, etc. The attention to micro-processes is mainly given in the research of recruiting processes.

As a step for reconciliation of these two sides of shaping a SM, I offer the concept of the primary eco-structure. Structurally, it is double-sided. On the one hand, it is a social micro-structure with an individual in the centre. On the other hand, it is a structure of networks which allows to an individual to enlarge his/her human and social capital and at the same time to be protected from the excessive pressure of outside world. A primary eco-structure is functioning in the regime of permanent switching of networks with the aim of transforming the 'global' into the 'local', that is, collective aims, norms, and modes of action into individual attitudes, decisions and actions. The specificity of the primary eco-structure concept is that its links tie an individual not only with other SM activists, but with his/her past (family and its history, relatives, friends and other people). At the same time, an individual builds ties with his/her foreseeable future. Using the words of A.Giddens, the primary eco-structure is a kind 'of cocoon of basic trust'.

Initially it seemed to me that for Russian researchers of SMs, this concept would be much more important than for Europeans, because any strong opposition to the existing regime could mean the destruction of this eco-structure. But in 'turbulent times' this concept also has a value to the EC researches of the SMs<sup>3</sup>.

Besides, this theoretical explanation of the interdependence between individuality and collectivity, there is another – direct – form of it. Being

---

<sup>3</sup> This concept was offered by me in 1984 and empirically tested many times later (see: Yanitsky 1988; 2010).

deeply rooted in the culture of Russian revolutionary intelligentsia in the late XIX century ('Going to people'), it is based on two ethic principles which should guide a SMs researcher: To be an insider and an advocate of population affected by the invasion in natural and social ecosystems of huge construction projects like 'River diversion project' (Zalygin 1987). I am deeply convinced that such researcher should be first of all an insider or even participant of a particular movement (as adviser, expert, etc.). And only in the second turn he should be a distant observer, that is, to gain information from second hands (interviewers, local informants, media sources, etc.). In this vein, my understanding of SMs advocates is a bit different from that of in the western sociology in which the term 'advocacy science' has a neutrally-market character (offering a service). In the Russian context this term has moral coloring: to support, to explain, to teach practically, and always free of charge. My empirical studies have shown that there is a ladder of such advocates built by the criterion of their involvement: neutral-distanced; those who understand the issue; partly involved in a SMO's activity; and fully integrated in it (Yanitsky 2009).

## **8. SMs in emergency cases**

To begin with, there are two kinds of a SM mobilization: 'a regular', for example, in preparation of mass protest campaigns, marches and rallies, and of 'emergency character' when SM members are mobilized for rescue activity. But in our disciplinary structured sociological community, the activity of collective social actors dealing with disasters is related to a separate discipline called the sociology of mass emergences and disasters (Perrow 1984; Quarantelli 1998). The discipline has its own legal status, journals and textbooks, research networks and other institutional arrangements. In cases of disasters SMs continue to act but in other forms. Of course, participants of some SMs may be seen as victims of a disaster only. But many others, for example, the charity, environmental and local lore movements, in essence, are of a rescue nature. How their role, structure and functions are changing in such critical conditions – this question is rarely discussed in sociological literature, especially in Russian one.

I think that at least four concepts are of a paramount importance here: The already mentioned the concept of all-embracing risk, a social order in conditions of disaster, a risk-reflection of SM's leaders, and risk-solidarities of affected people (Ianitskii, 1998; Yanitsky, 2000a).

In conditions under consideration, the concept of all-embracing risk may be presented as a 'critical case', that is, the state of a human community in