

sources, attempts to widen its constituency, etc.), in the latter phase all possible resources, be it at hand or distanced should be find out and mobilized.

Besides, I would stress that in all above cases the resources of civil society organizations are usually not ‘stored’ and ready to use as in the case of governmental rescue organizations, but they should be find out or mainly produced by civic organizations themselves. These search for or self-production of resources means the critical change of their habitual way of life. First of all it related to established order of man—nature relations. That is why, U.Beck said: ‘The hardcore sociological question is: Where is the support for ecological changes supposed to come from, the support which in many cases would undermine their lifestyles, their consumption habits, their social status and life conditions in what are already truly very uncertain times?’(Beck, 2010: 2).

4. Framing the issue and changing the sense and structure of a SM

Though as I mentioned earlier, recently nearly all Russian SMs are in the first phase of mobilization, every disaster needs its own set of frames: master frame, motivation, mobilization, etc. To my mind, the master frame is the same that of worldview or general disposition. It should answer to the key question: why we, the SM and its activists and allies, should be mobilized? In our case (forest, steppe and peat fires) the master frame is ‘People and nature in calamity - they needs our aid!’, Motivation frame: ‘We are needed because nobody can help them but ourselves’, Mobilization frames: ‘They need help immediately!’ and ‘All who can do it, united!’ Literally speaking, the 2010 Summer mobilization can be called as the short-term ‘The International Alliance of Civil Rescuers’, which above all, activates the ‘sleeping’ resources and networks of the environmental, charity, local lore and other social movements and grassroots.

It is quite natural that the focal point of all activities of all SMs involved is a rescue operations of those who have been affected by a disaster. It was massive action, but of spot-like and not a protest character. The key limits of rescue activity were time and resistance of local residents who did not want to leave their long-occupied places. Hence, not a socio-ecological *conflict* become a focal point of a SM’s activity, but *a field* of required help. It means that a SM activity has not defensive of offensive (if not militant), bun *humanitarian* character. The hot summer of 2010 discrowns the myth cultivated

by official media that Russian SMs have predominantly radical character. Instead, they showed their constructive and charity potential.

As I mentioned above, a disaster use to determine character of a SMs activity. Since the fire (and consequently, the size and margins of the zone of emergency) depends of a speed and direction of wind which has been permanently changing, the aid network constructed by a SM to help should follow the these fluctuations as well. Thus, the first distinguishing feature of the structure SM-at-disaster is *high mobility* and *quick change of functions* of a SM. It SMOs began to function as a station, command post and distributor of resources.

Then, the organizational (logistic) function of a SMOs came fourth. The one thing is to organize mass protest campaign, and quire another to govern the process of rendering the assistance in right place and due time. This logistic function become more complicated since a SM's activists have to coordinate their actions with other actors -- of state rescue commands, on the one hand, and with local experts and lay people, on the other.

I should stress that in mitigation of a disaster consequences local activists were both outsiders and insiders that never happened in their struggle with state bodies in 'normal' cases of mobilization for nature protection defense. In the situation of natural disaster they were forced to be insiders, that is, direct participants of fire extinguishing and people rescuing. Otherwise, they would be not capable to 'follow the actor', i.e. fire's twists.

Obviously, the *networks* was its key function element. In structural terms, the system of aid presents a very disperse system of networks and their nodes which operate in regime of prompt decisions and permanent switching the channels of information and material flows. This case could be seem as antithesis to 'programming and switching' implemented by media attached to power structures (Arsenalt and Castells, 2008: 489-90). And with constant feed-back. Three main features of this network should be mentioned. First, it was spread far beyond the limits of the SMOs of a particular social movement. Second, the SMOs as such turned into multi-functional command centers whose main function was to gather, process and disseminate information concerning where, what and how urgent the particular aid is needed. Then, they organized delivering the asked (inquired) aid to the client's address, be it a person or settlement. So they worked as logistics centers. Thirdly, the overall country far beyond the fire areas was dotted with numerous ad hoc

civil groups aimed at the giving help to victims of fires. Sometimes these groups collaborated with SMOs, sometimes acted independently. The latter case is indicative because it is a clear evidence that Russian civil society do exist and capable to act independently both from its other units as well as from state organizations. Their power was in their capability to be in right place and in right time and above all with particular help needed right now.

Let us turn to *resources as such*. If disaster actually happened, which resources the SMs can actually mobilize for coping with a catastrophe? Again, resources for nature protection repertoire are different from those needed in disaster. Apart from their professional knowledge, their major resource was their experience of communication with various organizations of our society: power and business structures, other movements, expert groups, sister groups abroad, local people, etc. Of course, the rationalism and rational resource supply are needed in both cases. Nevertheless, in the protest campaigns activists are first of all *fighters* armed with knowledge of weak and sensitive points of their adversaries. In the case of disasters the major roles of activists are *helpers, assistants* who brings to those who suffered the empathy, human sympathy, and the feeling that they are not ‘throwaway people’. Above all, local civic rescuers be acquainted with local situation and culture were capable to do much more than the state rescuers.

As events of hot Summer 2010 showed, the Russian eco-activists fulfill a lot of functions. They were creators of particular resource mobilization networks, local knowledge finders, processors and carriers as well as local resource mobilizers, managers (distributors), guides, rescuers, volunteers and so on. The last but not least. Activists-turned-rescuers mobilized know-how of local residents and stimulate their creativity.

5. The role of Internet

It is now trivial that if someone use an IT networks, he/she is usually capable to attract more attention, resources and peoples and make a society more concerned. More important that civil self-organized forums and other internet communities worked against the disorganized force of central media whose favorite tactics is to pile one sensation over the other resulted in collage-like perception of the life process by ordinary people. Now, they felt that they were not alone, they experienced the feeling of fellowship and received the guide what has to be done first. Besides, at the civil self-organized