

Briefly about the differences which exist between the POS and the SOS. In practice they are closely tied and turn one into another. Nevertheless, they are different matters. In the end, the struggle of a SM for changing POS it is a struggle for power, for changing the rules of the game. This struggle is not necessarily has a military character. We know now the many examples of peaceful ‘velvet’ and ‘orange’ revolutions. I mean revolutions in a classical (Marxist) sense of the term. Nevertheless, the SM’s struggle for changing POS it is always the battle for seizing power (Tilly 2004). So called a civic protest which spread across many Russian cities and towns in 2011-12s contained the appeal to the ruling elite to play in accordance with the established rules of games, that is, with the Constitution. So, the essence of SOS is the struggle for basic rights and freedoms declared in this Constitution and for the observance of lawfulness. In this sense, the struggle of recent Russian civic activists is not strongly differ from that of the Soviet dissidents in the 1960s. The struggle for changing POS is usually happens in the streets, whereas the struggle aimed at changing SOS presents a routine desk-work in offices, at various sittings, public hearings and litigations².

3. The relativity of social capital

Recently, the social capital of a SM is mostly produced in social networks (Diani and McAdam 2003). It is a matter of course, and there is no sense to concentrate on this topic. More important, is that this capital is relative in character. Its value depends on the SM-context relationships, or, more exactly, on the degree of involvement of a social actor in a particular context, ie his/her embeddness in one or another social networks. Therefore, this capital may exist as actual capital only, that is, produced in a particular network community, and the accessibility of activists and their groups to this capital depends on the openness/closeness of this community. The relativity of this capital depends on two more things. First, this capital, informational in particular, is short-lived and therefore its permanent renewal is needed. Secondly, some pieces of information may be directly used, whereas others should be treated, decoded and, what is most important, may be used after sociological interpretation only. Thirdly, ‘re-

² It is interesting to note that in the comparative analysis of the role of civil societies in the old and new member-states of the EU such eminent British theorist as D. Lane had mentioned an NGO the only one time but no one time the role of SMs in this giant transformative process (Lane 2010).

sources need resources'. It means that some part of accumulated capital should be spent for the treatment of accumulated new information. Fourthly, as A. Arsenalt and M. Castells pointed out, the importance of two mechanisms of regulation of social capital: programming and switching. 'On the one hand, the power to exclude human communities ...from networks ...is the most fundamental mechanism of domination. On the other hand, if we consider those who are included in the networks, the capacity to assert control over others depends on two basic mechanisms: (1) the ability to program/reprogram the goals assigned to the network(s); and (2) the ability to connect different networks to ensure their cooperation by sharing common goals and increasing their resources. The holders of the first power position are the programmers; the holders of the second power position are the switchers' (Arsenalt, and Castells 2008: 489).

4. Risk and energy of decay

Intentionally, SM's activists are in a manner 'progressists' because they strive for a better world. Or at least, they are the 'evolutionists', that is, they perceive the world as rationally functioning: Something dies, something emerges. Unfortunately, our recent world has lost this balance: It became more and more risky.

A society of all-embracing or all-encompassing risk is a basic concept of my model of modern society. All-encompassing risk is the state of a social organism when the positive logic of public production (accumulation and dissemination of public wealth) is more and more overlapped by the negative logic of production of risks which this wealth destroys. Such situation undermines the principles of market economy in any form, leads to a devaluation of national wealth, transforming the living environment into the source of threats to health and the very live of any individual and threatening to the basic underpinnings of rational organization of human existence – to science and democracy (Yanitsky 2000a). Under conditions of all-embracing risk there are no more absolutely safe living conditions (shelter, food-staffs, medicine) – there are only more or less dangerous. In other words, any SM exists in a risky and wasted environment.

The problem is that these risks and wastes do not disappear. They are there and active, considerably hampering and disorganizing any kind of modernization process. Paraphrasing Beck, one could say that the risks of decay are an ineradicable product of civilization (Beck 1992). This is one of the key points of this article. Emission of energy of decay is not a social pathology in a particular part of a 'healthy society' but its overall immanent