sphere returns to these people the sense of being a citizen. Fourthly, this independent public sphere which is up to now beyond the state control makes its participants more free and creative in their mental and practical activity. Fifthly, the membership in a SM via internet helps to the newcomers to shape or reshape their identity, which in turn gives an impetus to reshape their primary eco-structures. Sixthly, a political activity in the internet tends to be more *ad hoc*, less dependant on the variety of local situations and conflicts. Internet as a global network facilitates the emergence of the grassroots and other forms of local activism. The diversity of situations requires a variability of local forms of internet activity of a SM or of its branch. In all cases, the internet communication is an instrument of positive selection of various forms of a SM's activity as well as of its leaders. Simultaneously, the ordinary people have become convinced that information is not simply knowledge, but it is a power too. Counter-expertise, counter-information and shaping an alternative public opinion are the main tools of it. It should be noted that if the pressure of adversarial forces (the state, counter-movements inspired by it, or the environment which has overcome its carrying capacity) has become excessive, two interrelated transformations are happened. The activity of SMs shifts to the internet and social movement organizations (SMOs) are converted into the NGOs. In the emergency cases the internet has become an instrument of a first aid. Finally, not only in the EC but in recent Russia as well, 'contemporary social movements and their use of ICT constitute a major element in the landscape of late modern democracy' (Dalgren 2004: XIII). And communication among activists and ordinary citizens via internet I see as a basic prerequisite for their civic and political activity.

6. The carrying capacity of an environment

The tern 'carrying capacity' is borrowed by me from the natural sciences. What is new here is that when the social capacity of a particular environment is surpassed (by corruption, law violation, concentration of criminals or drug-takers, etc.) it transforms from the absorber of risks into its producer (Yanitsky 2000). If such transformation infects many human communities and the whole settlements, it calls in question the very possibility of emergence of 'positive' SMs aimed at the bettering of living environment, – natural, social or institutional. In Russia the state and its institutions are the main environment. If this environment is totally alien to a SM, the latter acquires a defensive if not illegal character (Yanitsky 1999).

If the situation is not critical, there is a sense to introduce one more term: *generating* or *engendering environment*. It is a micro-milieu which is shaping in the pores of already existed legal institutional structures. This micro-milieu is aimed at the establishment of core actors cohesion which in the future would be legal leading groups for the creation of an alternative, in particular, pro-ecological form of public life. In the transition period of Russian society the role of engendering environment is played by universities, research institutes, professional unions and associations of intelligentsia, clubs of free lancers of various kinds. Today social networks play the leading role as generating environment.

One more question is closely associated with the problem of SM-environment relationships. It seems to me reasonable to distinguish between *foreign and domestic politics* of the SMs. Foreign politics of the SM it is first of all its public policy targeted at modernization of the state policy by means of collective actions. Participation (in decision-making made by representative and executive bodies) is a key word here. These outward-directed actions are aimed at the institutionalization of organizations of civil society which have emerged in the run of a SM's activity. Foreign politics of a SM includes the establishment of contacts and exchange of information and other resources with sister movements abroad as well. To my mind, the ultimate goal of this politics is 'diversity within unity', that is, the establishment of world-embracing network of organizations fighting for health, safety and well-being of the majority of world population. If anybody wants to calls it 'the Network International', it will be the International of entirely new type: Not only of poor workers but of all those who strive to live in safe and healthy environment.

A domestic politics of a SM is the politics of its leading core in relation to its rank-and-file activists or in relation to other SMs (Yanitsky 2011). In particular, it includes recruiting new members, teaching and adapting them to the SM's spirit and mode of living. The domestic politics means establishment of business-like relations with various wings of the SM, and with local population, the resolving a problem of fundraising and dissemination of resources at hand, etc. The neutrality of a leading core of a SM in relation to its branches and sister groups, offering them the maximum of self-dependence on condition of their full responsibility for their tactics and action repertoire are the typical examples of domestic politics. Of course, I am speaking of true SMs and not about counter-movements initiated and sponsored by the state or even criminals. Finally, the leaders of this politics were changing in the course of time. In the years of perestroika (1987-91),

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-stricture 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[3].

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

---

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