not may be members of a SM. Their main function is to organize the aid and provision of the first two and to monitor the process of development of a disaster.

The permanent exposure of population to different kinds of risk (all-embracing, temporal or everyday) gives the impetus to the emergence of different SMOs. Here I'd distinguish the only two: a stable and permanent. In Russian condition the leader's core is usually stable. First of all because they have not opportunity to mount by the social ladder and therefore they are forced to implement routine work within a SMO (recruiting, fundraising, distribution of resources, etc). But in the emergency cases, the temporal structures are mushroomed. These emergent structures are the result of internet communication, by means of which the SMs leaders capable to mobilize volunteers and local population for coping with the disasters and its aftermaths. When the critical points have passed these structures may be transformed into new SMOs or its sustainable communicative structures (forums, social networks) or to switch their attention to another emergency case.

9. Social interpretation of natural and technical knowledge

It is not sufficiently reflected by the scholars of SMs that their object of study is multi-functional and multi-sided. It is obvious that interaction of SM with their counterparts – the state and its branches, business structures, NGOs, various experts and population strata – have their own subculture and language. What a sociologist sees from the 'top', (public opinion survey) is does not always coincide with the view from the 'bottom', ie of local people. I fully agree with those western sociologists who introduced and used in their empirical research the concept of local knowledge (Brush and Stabinsky 1996; Irwin, 2001; Irwin and Wynne 1996; Fisher 2003; Gregory and Miller 1998). Besides, many conflicts in which a SM is involved have rather complex, multi-sided character. All said speaks for the need of a more interdisciplinary approach to the study of SMs. In addition, I'd stress that natural and technical sciences have their own manner to present an accident in the media which is rarely resembles the actual causes and consequences of a given accident.

But there is more general substantiation of the necessity of interdisciplinary approach to the study of social movements. The further the more we are witnessing disasters and accidents, in particular of continental or global scale, when a behavior of individuals and collective actors is governed by natural and technical processes. To be capable to response to these calami-

ties adequately, SM's researchers have to be armed with methods of social and political interpretation of the cumulative effects of these critical events.

There are three possible way to cope with this problem. The first is to have a mediator (translator) who is able to translate from one language to another. It is a widely used method. However, it has two principal defects. The translator gives to a sociologist 'the objective information' whereas he is needed in subjective, ie contextually sound knowledge. Then, translator gives 'the static information' but sociologist should convert it into a form of 'dynamic information' (say, in some form of action repertoire) by himself. Needless to say, that translator is never thinks about possible 'knowledge gaps' (Gross 2010; Gross and Heinrichs 2010), when for a sociologist it is very important information.

The second way is to have a very solid research collective which is capable to organize periodically a brain-storming and to solve the majority of emergent problems by themselves. Or they invite well-known to them experts. It is a regular practice of a routine work of some core groups of a SM. It is clear that in this case the majority of such core members should be specialists in three-four realms of knowledge. And it is actually so. The practical deficit of this scheme is that, keeping in mind the huge distances from one 'hot-spot' to another, it is rather difficult to gather all necessary experts in a due time. Another deficit is that the brain-storming is usually resulted in strategic, principled decisions, when activists are needed in decision 'here and now'. In Russia nearly all eco-activists are overloaded with work and nearly all possible time is spent in urgent business trips, and it is an additional impediment to shift from strategy to action repertoire.

The third way is the combination of the above two. It is practices in big umbrella organizations with sufficient budget for attracting volunteers and with the ability to communicate with sister organizations abroad. In small local SMs with a permanent budget deficit it is impossible. Therefore, these SMs are capable to fight against things and events which are before their eyes (pipe-line construction, forest cuts or fires, etc.). In this latter case it would be more accurate to call them not SMs but SMOs which in urgent cases attract local population and volunteers. Here we see a difference between the western and Russian SMs. The western SMs use to act all over the world, while the Russian SMs tries to attract all possible resources to resolve the particular socio-ecological conflict.