STRUCTURES OF MOBILIZATION AND RESISTANCE: CONFRONTING THE OIL AND GAS INDUSTRIES IN RUSSIA
This thesis is an extension of the article to be found in appendix 3.
Abstract

Drawing on recent developments in the problematic relationship between the oil industry and local communities in the Republic of Komi, a case study of environmental grassroots mobilization in northwest Russia is developed. Using a qualitative methodology comprising semi-structured interviews and participant observation, I analyse the movement's actions in terms of the concept of Governance Generating Networks (GGN), with reference to the global network of non-governmental environmental organizations and other institutions. The thesis focuses on the network of non-state actors, examining the spatial levels from local to global in an environmental movement seeking to challenge Lukoil, the major oil company in the region. I investigate the strategies adopted by the environmental movement and the responses of the oil industry and various governmental institutions, with this analysis including an examination of power between the different bodies and networks involved. In particular, I analyse different forms of corporate social responsibility seen in the steps taken by Lukoil to avoid more severe reactions.
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**List of abbreviations**

AC = Arctic Council

CCPR = International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

CERD = Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination

CSR = Corporate Social Responsibility

EBRD = European Bank for Reconstruction and Development

GDP = Gross domestic product

GGN = Governance Generating Networks

GRI = Global Reporting Initiative

ICCPR = International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights

IFC = International Finance Corporation

ILO = International Labour Organization

IMF = International Monetary Fund

INFOE = Institut für Ökologie und Aktionsethnologie e.V.

IWGIA = International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs

NAO = Nenets Autonomous Okrug

NGO = Non-Governmental Organization

POS = Political Opportunity Structure

PR = Public Relations

RAIPON = Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North

SPC = Save Pechora Committee

UN = United Nations

WB = World Bank

WWF = World Wildlife Fund
Glossary

Izviatas: indigenous association based in the Komi Republic going against the oil industry and fighting for indigenous status in Russia, amongst others

Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug: federal subject of Russia located in Western Siberia, inhabited by some Komi-Izhemtsi people and one of the most important oil producing regions in Russia

Komi-Izhemtsi: a people living in the district of Izhma (and a minority part in other regions)

Murmansk Oblast: federal subject of Russia north of the Artic Circle, inhabited by some Komi-Izhemtsi people

Nenets Autonomous Okrug: state in the north of Russia, populated to a large extend by indigenous reindeer herders

Nenets: group of indigenous people in the northeast of Russia and northwest Siberia

Rosprirodnadzor: federal government agency in Russia responsible for monitoring environmental issues, for example the monitoring and reporting of oil leaks

Save Pechora Committee: local resistance group with purpose to defend the environment in the Komi Republic in Russia against the oil industry

Silver Taiga Foundation: environmental Russian NGO, working together with Izviatas and Save Pechora Committee
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Chapter 1. Introduction & problem statement: on the ongoing political and economic debate in Russia’s oil development

Indigenous peoples and the oil industry have co-existed for many years in the Komi Republic, a region located in the northwest of the Russian Federation. Since the 1990s, however, citizens have been affected by oil spills as a result of growing industrial activity. Studies have found that the industry burdens local communities with an environmental risk adversely impacting their wellbeing (Yakovleva 2014). The Komi-Izhemtsi, not recognized as an indigenous people by the Russian state but recognized as such by the UN, are making an effort to influence the oil giant Lukoil by engaging with global associations and networks.

Due to the increasing importance of energy resources for the global economy, the Russian state is determined to rely on the energy sector for its institutional and geopolitical existence (Wilson & Stammler 2006), even in a period of declining oil prices (years 2015-2016). The Russian oil and gas industry accounts for over 70 per cent of the nation’s total exports (EIA 2014). The country holds more than 20 per cent of the world’s known gas reserves and five per cent of its proven oil reserves and the supply of oil and gas makes up a large part of Russia’s exports to Europe (EU Commission 2016). The West is dependent on the Russian oil and gas industry and this constitutes a viable way forward for Russia to develop a geo-political strategy to influence the Western economy.
Oil is the main export resource in the Komi Republic, output being 257 thousand b/d\(^1\) (EIA 2014). The oil and gas industry figures prominently throughout the region, with facilities stretching from Ukhta to Pechora and Usinsk being the centre of production (TED 1997).

Lukoil is the main player in the industry in the region today, operating through its subsidiary Lukoil-Komi. Each year, the area produces 2.3 million tons of oil, which constitutes about two-thirds of Russia’s total heavy oil production (Annenkova 2012). Lukoil was founded in 1991 and is the second-largest oil company in Russia, and the second-largest producer of oil (Lukoil 2015), producing 89,856 million tons of oil in 2012 (Lukoil 2015). A major oil spill occurred in Komi in 1994; at that time, oil extraction was carried out by Komineft, which was later bought up by and is now an official subsidiary of Lukoil (Lukoil 2015). Lukoil has been trying to ‘clean up the effects of the 1994 spill and replace the ageing network of pipelines’ (Wilson 2016), but oil spills nevertheless still occur.

It is the local resistance to Lukoil, viewed as action embedded in a global network, that is the focus of interest in this thesis. The research question: ‘In what relationship does the bottom-up NGO resistance network stand vis-a-vis the company Lukoil and the state?’ will be answered in throughout the thesis.

\(^{1}\) Barrels per day
A brief introduction to the actors most prominent for this research

The Komi-Izhemtsi are a people inhabiting the Izhma district in the Komi Republic. Traditionally, they engage in reindeer herding, see themselves as indigenous people, but are not recognized as such by the Russian state. Therewith, certain benefits are denied to them. Two Komi-Izhemtsi resistance groups are analysed in this thesis: The Save Pechora Committee and Izviatas. They want to influence the oil company Lukoil by engaging with global associations and networks.

Lukoil is the largest oil operator in the Komi Republic, and second largest producer of oil in Russia. It is responsible for many oil leakages in the republic, and as a result of local resistance, it does not pay compensation, but instead engages in socio-economic agreements with communities. It declares commitments to global standards, but the implementation of these varies significantly.

Various global institutions and associations cooperate with the local resistance groups. Institutions such as the UN, Arctic Council, IMF, or the World Bank can ensure the sustainability of oil production and the protection of local and indigenous peoples’ rights. They also develop global standards and guidelines for companies.

Finally, the Russian state owns more than 20 per cent of the world's known gas reserves, and 5 per cent of oil reserves. It is reliant on its energy sector for its institutional and geo-political existence, as it is for example a large distributor of oil and gas to the European Union.
Outlook of this thesis

The thesis structure is as follows: in the next part, chapter 2, the theoretical framework is presented, including a brief look at Castell’s theories of networks and power in relation to the local-global realm, and the concept of the Governance Generating Networks (GGN), laying the foundation of the analysis in conjunction with social movement theory and concepts relating to CSR. Chapter 3 lays out the research methodology and presents the research questions used in this thesis. This is followed by chapter 4, including a description of the case study and a brief history of environmental movements in Russia, the emergence of the movement in the Komi Republic, transitioning to the globalized movement today. Of further interest are the movement’s structure and survival strategies over the years under a political regime that is constantly trying to eliminate such efforts, mostly through the Foreign Agent Law enacted by the Putin administration in 2012. In particular, the responses of different actors are examined, such as the oil industry and different levels of government, to the movement on multiple scales (from the local to the global). The way in which companies make use of corporate social responsibility strategies is considered, and the analysis is based on a renewed EU Strategy for Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) (EUR-Lex 2011). In the discussion, chapter 5, I argue that local resistance is seeking to change a global industry using local as well as global resources and has, through different kinds of framing, succeeded in surviving over the past two decades. Furthermore, the benefits of CSR for the resistance movement and different forms of power are discussed. In

---

2 The Foreign Agent Law has been in effect since November 2012, initiated by the ruling party United Russia, and actively promoted by President Vladimir Putin. It states that non-profit organizations throughout Russia are required to list themselves as foreign agents when receiving grants from foreign sources, in order to avoid ‘any direct or indirect interference in [Russia’s] internal affairs (...)’ (Kremlin 2013, Kupina 2012)
chapter 6, I summarize the most important outcomes of my analysis and give a brief recommendation to Lukoil, local and regional municipalities, as well as the movement itself.

Chapter 2. Literature Review: Theoretical and analytical framework

Introduction

In this chapter I aim to give a brief overview of the current political, social and economic state of affairs, as well as the theoretical debate regarding social movements surrounding the case of oil pollution in the Komi Republic and the response of local communities to it. I will go more into depth on theoretical concepts, i.e. social movement theories, resource mobilization, concepts of networks and power (Castells 2013), a GGN concept (Tysiachniouk 2012) incorporating the transnationalization of the movement, and a conception of corporate social responsibility (EUR-Lex 2011). The fact that I was researching on a case in a slightly conflicted setting was taken into account, as it shaped my own perspective on how the ‘world works’ and also shaped the perceptions that I developed of different theoretical and analytical ideas and social phenomena connected to the case, and how I framed the problem(s).

Networks and Power

Networks and power structures play an important role in the analysis of the movement’s strategies and their communication and dealings with the oil industry, state, national and international NGO communities. Monge and Contractor (1999, p. 3) define networks by arguing that they are ‘communicative structures, created by the flow of messages among communicators through time and space’, thus have no fixed boundaries and are ‘open-
ended and multi-edged’ (Castells 2013, p. 20). Castells further argues that the networks’, or communicative structures’ (as defined by Monge & Contractor) relationships with each other is simply cooperation. As Castells has pointed out, ‘the environmental movement is a locally rooted, globally connected network which aims to change the public’s mind as a means of influencing policy decisions to save the planet or one’s own neighbourhood’ (Castells 2013, p. 49).

According to Castells (2013), power can be seen as a relationship which is framed by domination. The dominating party can thus always be met with resistance, a counterpower, enhanced by a range of actors, including individual or collective actors, organizations, institutions and networks. This counterpower is a power to do something against someone, ‘or against the values and interests of this someone that are enshrined in the apparatus that rule and organize social life’ (Castells 2013, p. 13). It has been argued that collective action, or collective agency, yields higher benefits as compared to individual action in the case of resistance, or when forming a counterpower, against resource extraction (Stammler & Wilson 2006). Power relations are ‘organized around networks, not single units’ (Castells 2013, p. 50) and those are not limited to a national level in which the state would be the only or primary dominating power, but are rather global and local at the same time; so ‘the boundary of society changes, and so does the frame of reference of power relationships that transcend the national’ (Castells 2013, p. 18). Also Sassen (2008) claims the importance to understand power relations on all levels; thus on the global, national, local and individual level.

---

³ ‘Collective agency is the capacity of a group of actors to act together towards certain goals; as such it is a prerequisite for meaningful collective action.’ (Stammler & Wilson 2006)
In the case at hand, I am studying the dynamics of interaction in oil governance networks, dynamics determined by the power of the actors involved (Castells 2007), for example, the economic power of private actors, the political power of the nation-state, and the normative and symbolic power of the NGOs and indigenous peoples involved. Normative power in this scenario is referring to a collective mindset, confirming to the assumptions people have as a group - establishing norms. Actors exercise power by attempting to influence the behaviour of others through multiple negotiations that occur on both transnational and local levels. Castells focuses on the concepts of agency and power in the world-network society (Castells 2007). As a next step, to be able to study the interrelations of the actors in the networks in a more direct manner, I draw on the integrated theoretical framework of multi-level, multi-actor global networks, known as Governance Generating Networks (GGN) (Tysiachniouk 2012, Tysiachniouk & Henry 2015, Tysiachniouk & McDermott 2015) [see Figure 1] - growing out of the existing body of literature of Castells (2007). Governance Generating Networks are networks, taking a fundamental position in the development of global regulatory tools, products, or standards to be implemented in different parts of the world. The GGN concept shows governance beyond national regimes and involves forms of private and public-private authority. It is a key element of the research, because it is able to record the global-local interplay of governance actors throughout the network. The strengths of the GGN is that its focus does not only lie on social actors who design new global policies, but also involves the role that the corporate industry and the state play in the procedure of generating global governance arrangements. Oil companies, together with state and civil society networks – the oil GGN – link processes at the transnational and local levels. The actors in these networks are involved in continuous negotiations involving interactions within and between networks.
To ensure the sustainability of oil production and protection of local and indigenous peoples’ rights, global institutions at the transnational level, such as the UN, the AC, IMF and WB, develop global standards and guidelines for companies. While oil companies often declare their commitments to the global standards, the ways in which they implement these standards on the ground vary significantly (Henry et al. 2016, forthcoming).

When the standards are not met, indigenous peoples’ associations and groups may appeal not only to national, but also to global institutions in their efforts to influence the behaviour of the oil companies. Studies show that such transnationalization occurs when a movement’s home state offers it few political opportunities and its influence in decision-making processes is weak (Keck and Sikkink 1998). It may also be the case that activists have sound political opportunities in their home state and that local and transnational civil society networks intersect and reinforce each other (Kraemer et al. 2013). While mobilization of national and transnational activists’ networks against corporate behaviour has been well studied, there is a gap in our knowledge as regards the interaction between civil societies, state and corporate networks across the full range of scales from local to global; for example, the dynamics of the interactions within oil GGNs have not been well researched. This thesis attempts to fill this gap, focusing on the NGO networks – in particular, the environmental movement organized from below by the Save Pechora Committee and the indigenous peoples’ organization Izviatas – and their relationships with the oil companies and state networks in the Komi Republic. On the transnational level and across the full range of scales from local to global, local and global actors can be engaged in the interplay directly, without involving the national actors.

---

4 In this research, activists are referred to as citizens involved with the SPC, Izviatas, or both, and wanting to campaign for change
Social movements, resource mobilization, political opportunity structures and framing

As Mena and Waeger note, ‘core to social movement research is an understanding of the social world as intimately contentious, and as one in which outsider groups challenge established social and regulatory institutions in their attempts to make their claims heard and bring about social or political change’ (2014, p. 7). In the case at hand, state or corporate institutions, such as Lukoil and the government, fall within the category of ‘established social and regulatory institutions’.

The resource flow in the oil GGN is analyzed partly through the lens of resource mobilization theory, which focuses on the willingness and ability of a given NGO network to mobilize depending on the different resources available. According to the theory, social
movement organizations often fail because the infrastructure needed for the movement is lacking (McCarthy & Zald 1977); in other words, the needed (and appropriate) resources, for example money or time, are not available within the NGO network. Social movements need to ‘mobilize resources from inside and outside their movement to reach goals’ (Jenkins 1983, p. 113). According to resource mobilization theory, there are various strategies that are used in combination. Edwards and Gillham name four different supporting strategies: (1) self-production, (2) aggregation, (3) co-optation/appropriation and (4) patronage. Self-production relies solely on the people within the movement, who produce human resources by training people around them, and also their children, providing them with a certain ideology or idea or something they believe in. Networks are built (Edwards & Gillham, 2013), and people with the same problem should be brought together for these (Chomsky, 2012: 76). Also meetings and events are organized (Edwards & Gillham, 2013). Edwards and Gillham (2013) argue that objects can be produced with a more symbolic significance, which also raises the movement’s awareness level in public, making them more visible in order to be more successful in the end, reaching a higher number of people that can join them. Donations can be in the form of monetary, human or moral resources, the latter could be a list of well-known individuals who stand for the group goal. In aggregation, individual or group donations are used in order to reach the group’s goal. In the co-optation/appropriation strategy, relationships with other organizations are of high importance, as resources previously used by those organizations are now used by the mobilizing organization (movement). Patronage describes the case where an individual or a group gives money for the cause, but then is also able to decide on how that money is used.
The resources itself can be of a differing nature. Fuchs (2006) argues that there are tangible and intangible resources, while Edwards and Gillham (2013) specify into five different types of resources: (1) moral, (2) cultural, (3) social-organizational, (4) human, and (5) material. Moral resources include aspects like legitimacy, mimicking mainstream expectations to appeal, integrity, solidarity support, sympathetic support and the use of celebrities, also to raise appeal and sympathy. Cultural resources include more the know-how to access and mobilization (how to hold conferences, events, meetings, forming an organization, how to use social media, etc.). Media is especially important, as it influences the ‘politics of social movement by informing the elites and public’ about what the movement is doing and also interpreting their actions (Jenkins, 1983). The movement is most likely to be presented in a positive light when its actions are peaceful, those in a negative light when they are more aggressive or even violent (Flynn, 2009).

‘Social movements are made up of several, more or less organized, individuals and groups with a general preference for, or resistance to, change concerning some aspect of social life’ (Mena & Waeger 2014, p. 7). Movements can be framed in different manners on different levels, such as on the national vs. the international level. According to Chomsky (2012: 76), the media should be reconstructed and involved in such a way that the message is coming right out of the communities and from there is spread to the public. Through participation, social-organizational resources or infrastructures (such as roads, the internet, postal services) and (the access to) social networks and organizations, as well as human resources (labor, experience, skills, expertise, and leadership), are accessible. Nevertheless, Edwards and Gillham (2013) state that not every participant has the same capabilities and many different skills, thus people are needed, depending on the case (for example lawyers, web designers, social media consultants, dynamic speakers, etc.). Material resources are
mostly monetary resources which can be transformed into other material resources, such as property, office space, equipment, or supplies (Edwards & Gillham, 2013).

Fuchs (2006) distinguished resources in a different way, also including organizations, manpower, technology, means of communication, and media into material resources, while he makes up non-material resources as a second category, including legitimacy, loyalty, social relationships, networks, personal connections, public attention, authority, moral commitment, and solidarity. Edwards and Gillham argue that all these resource types and means of access can be combined to create exchange relationships. That way social movements have ‘various mixes of resources they use to pursue their social change goals’ (Edwards & Gillham, 2013). Then it depends on who/what the movement wants to reach and which resource mix the movement will use.

Applying the resource mobilization strategy on its own does not suffice in this case study, as it would be reductionist towards the belief that social movements arise out of lacking resources or a missing infrastructure, and the mobilized resources would be not sufficient in pointing out the major challenges of a movement. In order to include an analysis of the political context and its influence on resistance mobilization, with reference to the assumption of transnationalization (p. 8) and an abundance, or few, political opportunities, I include the approach of political opportunity structure (POS), which analyzes the influence of the political context on collective action. I look at the ‘constraints and opportunities configured by the institutional arrangements and the prevailing patterns of political power’ (Rootes 1999). Environmental movement and state networks are meant to be brought together using this approach. Important to bear in mind are the opportunities for political participation, as well as freedom of speech or organization. The more politicized the core of the movement, the more political opportunities can be
considered by a movement. As, according to Rootes (1999), the political opportunity structure acts on the movement's choice of strategies, it fits in well with the research.

As a last theory in this domain, used in combination with network, power, and movement theories, framing is utilized in order to analyze the promotion of alternative discourses in the movement on a transnational scale. Benford & Snow (2000) focus on collective action frames and argue that 'movement adherents negotiate a shared understanding of some problematic condition or situation they define as in need of change, make attributions regarding who or what is to blame, articulate an alternative set of arrangements, and urge others to act in concert to affect change' (Benford & Snow 2000). This definition encompasses a shared value among for example the counterpower in a movement, a creation of the problem statement and a suggested unfolding of solutions to the problem, therewith stands in line with social movement theory and ideas of networks and power.

In this thesis, I assess the available resource mobilization strategies and political opportunity structures (Rootes 1999), having maintained the ability of the environmental movement in the Komi Republic to deal with the conflict between the region's indigenous peoples and the oil company and state networks. A look has been taken at grievances, oppression and how these issues have been framed on the different networks and scales within networks, with the help of resources mobilized from different levels.

Corporate Social Responsibility

To illustrate how oil company networks relate to state and NGO networks, I look at the concept of corporate social responsibility (CSR). Embracing such responsibility can help companies to facilitate certain activities by easing potential tensions within the community
in which they operate. Doing so can also indirectly challenge the resource mobilization of NGO networks.

According to the definition of the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD), CSR is ‘the continuing commitment by business to behave ethically and contribute to economic development while improving the quality of life of the workforce and their families as well as of the local community and society at large’ (WBCSD 2015). This definition is rather a theoretical ‘de jure’ concept, often misused by corporations as a tool of public relations, maybe also partly in a sense of fear to ruin their public image (The Economist 2008). In addition, scholars argue that the more concerned companies are about a negative impact of their operations, the more CSR strategies they apply (Small 2012, Lii & Lee 2012).

A modern understanding of CSR is that defined by the EU: ‘the responsibility of enterprises for their impacts on society’ (EUR-Lex 2011), including ‘respect for applicable legislation, and for collective agreements between social partners’. Furthermore, businesses ‘should have in place a process to integrate social, environmental, ethical, human rights and consumer concerns into their business operations and core strategy in close collaboration with their stakeholders, with the aim of:

– maximizing the creation of shared value for their owners/shareholders and for their other stakeholders and society at large;
– identifying, preventing and mitigating their possible adverse impacts’ (EUR-Lex 2011).

This definition takes into account the size of the enterprise and the field in which it operates, and emphasizes the value of a long-term commitment to CSR in order to ‘contribute to societal wellbeing and lead to higher quality and more productive jobs’ (EUR-
Large enterprises are encouraged to ‘carry out risk-based due diligence, including through their supply chains’ (EUR-Lex 2011).

It is often thought that companies need to put their demands in terms of economic gains at first priority level to be able to sustain themselves and their workers and employees, which then also adds to the well-being of the communities of which the employees and workers originate. Nonetheless, having a high regard for ethics in the corporate philosophy ‘is often ignored by many in the CSR field’ (Schwartz 2011, p. 22).

Companies contribute to local communities using established and strategic arrangements, such as socio-economic agreements with municipalities and indigenous groups, and/or proceed with compensation for damage, although they are not legally bound to do so (CERD 2013, Wilson 2016). These agreements help companies to build relationships with local communities (Henry et al. 2016, forthcoming; Wilson 2016). Potential benefits and the dynamic of the interactions occasioned by these contributions will be analysed in the thesis.

**Conclusion: Connecting the theories**

In this chapter, I have discussed the different theories I applied in the course of my research, in order to study the emergence and transnationalization of the environmental movement in the Komi Republic. In order to assess the (1) structure and (surveillance) strategies of the movement, I find it necessary to look at social movement and resource mobilization theory in a local-global realm, as well as political opportunity structures and framing; the (2) transnationalization of the movement, analysed through the lens of the GGN, as well as theories of network and power; and the responses of the oil company and state towards the movement, for which I use the theories of CSR, as well as POS and the GGN. In the course
of the thesis, the theoretical framework and its analysis is blended in among the different topics of analysis.

Chapter 3. Research Methodology

Scope of research

The research takes a case study approach in order to provide depth and accuracy (Hammersley & Atkinson 2007), focusing on the how and the why of the focal phenomenon (Yin 1994) - activists’ resistance to oil companies - and its context. The company, state and NGO networks analyzed are made up of local, regional, national and transnational actors. This research is based on the case of local communities resisting the oil industry activities in the Komi region in Russia, within a global network. The preparation phase for the field work took around three months; writing a research proposal and preparing myself for the field (getting a visa, learning basics of Russian, etc.). The fieldwork in Russia was of a period of around four months (February-May 2015). I spent this time traveling within the Komi Republic with a team of four researchers, led by Maria Tysiachniouk, my supervisor and the chair of the Environmental Sociology Group at the Center for Independent Social Research in St. Petersburg. Furthermore, I spent time by myself and with a co-researcher in St. Petersburg and Moscow, where I conducted interviews with Lukoil, WWF, and governmental bodies, and where I started analyzing the data gathered.

The company in the foreground of this research is Lukoil, having its’ headquarters in Moscow, but having the subsidiary Lukoil-Komi operating in the Komi Republic, specifically in the district of Izhma. From Lukoil I found out about the CSR strategies that the company is employing. From WWF, I learned about environmental monitoring schemes, and with a
professor at the European University in St. Petersburg, I discussed the social movement theories I was planning to use in my research proposal and for activities in the Komi Republic. Together with the research team, I conducted interviews with activists from the Save Pechora Committee and the indigenous organization Izvitas in the Komi Republic.

**Research questions and objectives**

In this thesis, the NGO network constructed around indigenous and environmental organizations is presented - involving grassroots as well as global players - that has mounted and sustained continuous resistance towards the transnational oil company Lukoil with its headquarters in Moscow, and its subsidiary Lukoil-Komi, operating in the Komi Republic and Nenets Autonomous Okrug.

The main research question is:

> In what relationship does the bottom-up NGO resistance network stand vis-a-vis the company Lukoil and the state?

Sub-questions are:

1. What factors have enabled the resistance to sustain itself over the years when confronted with powerful players?

   This is a question necessary to understand the survival of the movement, under a regime that is constantly trying to eliminate such movements. The power of local and global networks, survival strategies, political opportunity structures and resource mobilization theory is considered.
2. In which way is the movement framed on different levels within the GGN?

This question seeks to answer pivotal questions related to the issue of framing the Komi-Izhemtsi in different cultural and social contexts.

3. What are ways in which Lukoil and the state respond to the movement?

This question focuses on forms of corporate social responsibility enacted by Lukoil; including socio-economic agreements, as well as discrepancies between different levels of the corporation.

**Qualitative research**

During my research, I was taking a collaborative research approach, meaning that I worked together with partners, helping me to facilitate the research process (granting access and translating). Furthermore, I was taking a reflexive approach (Green & Thorogood 2014: 23), thus taking in mind to apply critical thought to my own research and engage in the fact that the world cannot be studied objectively. ‘Both research and researchers are part of the world, and there is no privileged place we can occupy from which to study that world objectively’ (Green & Thorogood 2004: 23). My own view and background is shaping the way I construct things in the research, the way I ask questions and engage with people, and the way I interpret them. Nevertheless, discussing data with the team of researchers had the result that different perspectives could be presented.

I was aware of the different stages within the process of research; proposal, literature review, data collection, data analysis, etc. I was handling these in a flexible way, and let them overlap.
Interviews

The outcomes of this study are based on qualitative interviews, document analysis, and participant observation. In order to receive qualitative and in-depth data, I chose interviews as the main research tool. The interviews were in-depth and semi-structured. I was using the method of probing to get more in-depth data. Interviews with the different actors, ranging from a local to a national and global level, were carried out to illuminate the interplay between local and global actors, as well as to investigate the relationship between the NGO resistance network and Lukoil, the sustainability of the movement over the years and its’ overall strategies, and Lukoil’s CSR strategies in response to the movement. Qualitative interviews were carried out between February and May 2015. 16 qualitative interviews were conducted with local activists in the district of Izhma, and two qualitative interviews with activists in the urban district of Usinsk – all 18 interviewees being members of the NGO Save Pechora Committee and the indigenous peoples’ organization Izviatas. Furthermore, three interviews were carried out with local (Izhma) governmental bodies, six interviews with regional (Usinsk and Syktyvkar) governmental bodies and three interviews with national (Moscow) governmental bodies. Three interviews were carried out with the representatives of the Lukoil office in Moscow, and four interviews with representatives of the Lukoil-Komi office in Usinsk. Further interviews were carried out with WWF Russia, reindeer herding brigades in Komi, and a social researcher of the European University in St. Petersburg (see Table 1 in the appendices). Five additional interviews conducted by my supervisor in 2016 were also used for this research: one interview with members of IWGIA (International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs) and INFOE (Institut für Ökologie und Aktionsethnologie e.V.), three interviews with activists of the Save Pechora Committee and
Izviatas in the urban districts of Usinsk and Syktyvkar, and one interview with a researcher of the University of Lapland and European University St. Petersburg.

Almost all interviews were carried out in Russian, with an exception of three interviews\(^5\) (those were carried out in English), and translated into English. Working with a translator brought some minor difficulties, as answers were surely sometimes brought across differently with the translator as a mediator. I was taking handwritten notes during the interviews, although not everything in the interviews was translated. After each interview, my translator and I (plus sometimes my supervisor and the other researcher) went through the interview in depth to translate, discuss and make sure that everything was captured. Most interviews were recorded with a voice recorder. Since I have transcriptions of all interviews in Russian, I was using a translating programme on the internet from time to time to double-check the data. My field notes and field diary were helping me remember things more easily later on, when I needed to look back at the data. Other data-collection methods included analysis of documents: protocols of meetings organized by the company, agreements, proposed by activists to the company, company CSR policies, GRI public reports, and UN reports. The study also involved participant observation. The data analysis involved the reconstruction of the networks’ structure, and the overall interactions and negotiations between actors of different networks.

**Research as a team**

During the field work period in the Komi Republic, I was working with a team of three researchers: my supervisor; a postdoctoral researcher at Wageningen University and in
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\(^5\) Interviews with representatives of WWF Russia, INFOE and IWGIA, and researcher of European University St. Petersburg
addition affiliated with the Centre for Independent Social Research in St. Petersburg (CISR), a researcher from a Finnish university interested in laws and policies around oil issues, and a PhD student from Russia, who translated the interviews from Russian into English. We each had our own agenda, but were interested in the same overall topic, so we were able to work together on conducting interviews, and discussing those afterwards. Two of the researchers are fluent in the Russian language, while the other two researchers needed translations.

**Research limitations and ethical considerations**

I stayed in Russia for around four months, spending around half of the time in the Komi Republic, and half of the time in St. Petersburg and Moscow. I was naturally limited to a certain scope of research. I therefore did not have the opportunity to engage in ethnographic or anthropological research, which was my plan initially. Limitations that I faced during the fieldwork were that I felt to not be able to participate fully, due to the barrier of understanding simply due to speaking different languages.

I did research on the basis of informed consent, thus making sure that activists understood the type of research we were engaged in, and understood the questions that were asked. Naturally, this could not fully be applied when talking to the companies, as I was not able to fully explain my motives and research questions. The privacy of people I visited has been respected, and names of people, who mentioned that they wish not to be published, are protected. Some interviewees uttered the wish for me to not publish raw interview material, wish I accepted. It was made clear that we are researchers, going to
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6 I was advised to not mention my exact research topic to avoid mistrust which could have resulted in denied access.
publish some papers on the matter, and therewith, attention might be drawn to the case, but that this is all that is going to happen from our side in particular.

**Granting access**

Access to the interviewees was granted through an active approach by the research team. The snowballing technique was used for finding and accessing more local interviewees. NGO leaders and leaders of indigenous peoples’ groups also helped to identify other informants. Activists were open to sharing their experiences and opinions with us. Appointments with Lukoil and Lukoil-Komi, as well as state authorities, had to be made formally and in advance through the communications and public relations departments.

**Themes**

Separate sets of interview guides were developed for civil society activists, Lukoil, and state officials. Questions were formulated to provide a view of the social movement in historical perspective, to ascertain the activists’ grievances, the movement’s tactics and repertoire of collective action as well as bring to light the interplay of local and global actors within the movement and activists’ interactions with Lukoil and the state. Company representatives on different levels were asked what their CSR policies were, both socially and environmentally, how these policies were developed and by whom, and how they were implemented. These questions sought to provide an understanding of the interaction between Lukoil offices, as well as the dynamic of interaction between civil society activists, the company and the state. The state representatives were asked about the history of oil development in the region, how the region benefits from oil development and what the
costs are, as well as about the dynamic of interactions between municipalities, state agencies, oil companies and civil society.

**Analysis of the data**

The interview data was analysed by means of transcribing, coding, and thus finding overlapping themes, patterns and relationships. The generalizations that could be drawn were then examined in the context of the theoretical framework.

**Chapter 4. Relationships between the resistance network, Lukoil, and the state**

In this chapter, the research question ‘In what relationship does the bottom-up NGO resistance network stand vis-a-vis the transnational Lukoil?’ will be answered. I start with a description of the case, as it is necessary to get an understanding of the situation at hand. Next, the environmental movement is put into historical perspective, transitioning to a transnational movement today. In the following part, (survival) strategies of the movement are explained, as well as the relationships of local and regional actors within the NGO network. Likewise, discrepancies between the NGO and corporate network are expanded upon. The structure of and communication in the movement is presented after, detailing the different resources applied by the movement and elaborating on how these benefit the movement. Additionally, I enlarge on the oil company’s response to the movement in terms of CSR, evaluating social-partnership agreements, the company’s efforts to integrate various CSR and sustainable policies into their operations; and lay open disparities between national and regional Lukoil offices. Finally, I shed light on the recognition of the Komi-Izhemtsi as an indigenous people on a national and global level, highlight the benefits of
holding the indigenous status and employ the discourse of framing, as well as engage in political networking opportunities that arise for the movement.

Description of the case study

The Komi Republic in Russia is a multi-ethnic region lying to the west of the northern Ural Mountains. In the Russian Federation, being a republic means having a great amount of autonomy. Laws in the republic cannot contradict the Constitution and laws of the Russian Federation. Furthermore, the republic must control state property within its region and establish ‘an administrative-territorial structure’ (Nuttall 2012). The Komi Republic can enter into economic relations with Russian or external partners, and the socioeconomic development, ‘as well as possession and utilization of its mineral rights are collaterally carried out by the Federation and the Republic’ (Nuttall 2012). Furthermore, according to Nuttall, ‘local bodies of power pass local budgets, establish taxes, and govern municipal property’. Also, in an agreement of 1996, the republic is recognized as a region of the Extreme North and hence shall be protected by policies of the Federation.

The population density in the Komi Republic is 2.8 inhabitants per sq km - much lower than in other parts of northwest Russia (Nuttall 2012). Half of the population of roughly 900,000 identify as Russian, and ethnic indigenous Komi minorities make up less than 25 per cent of the population (FSSS 2010a). With a system of collectivized agriculture from 1928 to 1932, the destruction of the Komi traditional way of life began. The share of Komi peoples in the Komi Republic has been declining since then, reaching 26.6 per cent in 1994 because of industrialization: a lot of migrants from outside the Republic were needed, bringing a specific set of skills with them (Shabayev & Sharapov 2011). 75 per cent of Komi
live in urban areas due to a higher amount of work possibilities; in the cities however they account for less than 15 per cent overall (Shabayev & Sharapov 2011).

15,000 of Komi today belong to the Komi-Izhemtsi, a Finno-Ugri peoples (Kula 2014). The Komi-Izhemtsi have been engaging in hunting, fishing, and reindeer breeding, having borrowed the latter from the Nenets in NAO in the 17th century, taking the ‘entire cultural complex, including clothing, mobile homes, vehicles and even folklore’ (Shabayev & Sharapov 2011). Komi-Izhemtsi populate the Izhma district, and small numbers inhabit NAO, Murmansk Oblast, and Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug. What distinguishes the Komi-Izhemtsi from the Komi is their special dialect in language, and their engagement in reindeer herding; its success and commercialization. The Komi-Izhemtsi are recognized by the indigenous peoples’ association RAIPON, but not by the state (RAIPON 2014).

Oil is the main export resource, providing 63 per cent of the area’s total revenue, while timber-related products account for 16 per cent and coal for 11 per cent. Oil, coal and gas together make up 50 per cent of Komi’s GDP (Alexander 2009). Timber and agriculture are the main economic contributors in the south part of the republic, where Syktyvkar, the capital, is located. Oil and gas dominate in the area stretching from Ukhta to Pechora, with coal being the main natural resource from Pechora to the north.

The town of Usinsk was established in 1966 at the newly discovered deposits of petroleum in the north of the republic; the centre for the production of oil and gas in Komi (TED 1997), it is also informally called ‘the oil capital of Komi’. Seventy per cent of the oil in the republic is produced in the Usinsk region (Usinsk Municipality 2014). The district contains 24 settlements and depends heavily on the socio-economic partnerships formed
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7 Informal conversation with independent research and scientist, July 2016
with multiple oil companies pursuing oil development, such as Lukoil-Komi, RN-Northern Oil (a subsidiary of Rosneft), Enisey company and Kolva Neft (Usinsk Municipality 2014). The Izhma district is the second-largest oil district in the Komi Republic, containing 34 settlements accounting for 4.4 per cent of the Republic's population (FSSS 2010b). Lukoil-Komi is the only oil company operating in the Izhma district. Its production is falling along with oil prices; in 2012, for example the company produced 192.9 thousand tons of oil, but only 141.17 thousand in 2013 (Lukoil 2015). The Izhma district also depends on socio-economic agreements with Lukoil-Komi.

In both the Usinsk and Izhma districts, the population in more rural areas has been dealing with several oil leaks for years, most caused by Lukoil-Komi. The company operates in both districts, maintaining offices in Usinsk and Naryan-Mar. Lukoil-Komi is a subsidiary of Lukoil, which has its headquarters in Moscow and operates in several regions in Russia, as well as abroad. Major decisions, for example those related to CSR, commitments to the UN Global Compact or banks, are made at Lukoil’s headquarters in Moscow. Instructions and funds then get distributed to subsidiaries, amongst them Lukoil-Komi.

Eighty-nine spills were reported between 2011 and 2013, and major spills occurred in 1988, 1992, 1994 (Staalesen 2014) and 2016 (Novaya Gazeta 2016). In 1994, for example, 100,000 tons of oil leaked from a pipeline between Usinsk and Kharyaga, making it the biggest oil spill in the area (Staalesen 2014). According to activists in the villages, the spills have caused health problems among the population and its animals, as well as economic problems, constraints on livelihoods and a feeling among the population of betrayal by the government⁸.

⁸ Interview with local activist, Krasnobor, 21 February 2015
In the following, I will go more into depth regarding the problems that have occurred due to the activities of the companies Lukoil and Lukoil-Komi, according to local activists. For activists and the local population, the problems that are the most visible are the most likely to be protested for. Polluted soil has been observed by citizens in the summer when the ground is free from snow, indicating that spills in winter were sometimes not reported to the authorities. Polluted water has been spotted in the form of a rainbow-coloured film on the water’s surface in the main rivers in the region, the Pechora and the Kolva. According to individual respondents, the water has caused health problems, with cases of cancer being reported, for example. Water has been tested for radiation, but the results have come back negative. In addition, polluted water causes economic harm to the local population when animals, such as cows or reindeer, die from the water but no compensation is paid for the loss. Furthermore, local people reportedly face constraints on their daily lives, as certain areas used at one time for recreational purposes or for subsistence are now cut off because they contain oil deposits. These areas include forests and lakes where people once spent their leisure time picking berries or fishing.

Local activists feel they are not taken seriously by the local administration or higher institutions within the government. Citizens complain that they are not involved in the decision-making processes pertaining to the building of new oil-drilling stations. Local inhabitants are often not informed about future plans, although drilling stations are reportedly built close to the villages, for example, within 1.5 km of a school, or near water.
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9 Interview with local activist, Izhma, 20 February 2015
10 Interviews and informal conversations in Krasnobor and Scheliaboz, 21 February 2015
11 Interview with local activist, Izhma, 20 February 2015
12 Interview with local activist, Krasnobor, 21 February 2015
13 Interview with local activist on the Save Pechora Committee, Izhma, 20 February 2015; CERD 2013
wells, as happened in the village of Krasnoborsk\textsuperscript{14} in the Izhma district (see Figure 2). People have a negative view of the oil company itself: according to local activists in the Izhma district, it has burned leaking oil, covered leakage with moss or not properly cleaned up spillage\textsuperscript{15}.

![Figure 2. Map of the Komi Republic and Lukoil-Komi drilling sites (Tysiachniouk & Landonio 2015)](image)

\textsuperscript{14} Informal conversations and interviews with local activists in Krasnabor, 21 February 2015

\textsuperscript{15} Interview with local resident in Krasnabor, 21 February 2015
The state supervisory agency rospidodnadzor is tasked with ensuring that oil companies take specific measures after a leak has occurred. It ensures that the oil company is taking three steps. First, a leak must be found (localization); secondly, the polluted land must be removed (liquidation); and thirdly, the land is restored (re-cultivation). The agency then checks upon the satisfactory or dissatisfactory result of carrying out these steps. This process is carried out twice a year, in spring and in autumn, when the ground is accessible and not frozen or covered with large amounts of snow. According to a representative of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of the Komi Republic, Lukoil scored best in environmental performance among the oil companies in the region, although all companies try to hide leaks\textsuperscript{16}. The ministry is working on an online register, eventually to be made available to the public, containing statistics on all the polluted areas and their re-cultivation, as well as information on the condition of pipelines, so that ‘no information disappears’\textsuperscript{17}. It also plans to include the findings on leaks by NGOs. Greenpeace, for instance, has been involved in uncovering some of the leaks, although a representative of the organization noted that some reports were false as the alleged leaks had in fact only been reflections in water\textsuperscript{18}. However, Greenpeace has taken the lead in a local youth summer camp programme in which the organizers showed participants how to find, provide GPS coordinates for, and eventually map leaks and send the information to the ministry.

\textsuperscript{16} Interview with representative of Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of the Komi Republic, Syktyvkar, 4 March 2015
\textsuperscript{17} Interview with representative of Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of the Komi Republic, Syktyvkar, 4 March 2015
\textsuperscript{18} Interview with representative of Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of the Komi Republic, Syktyvkar, 4 March 2015
Nevertheless, it is often difficult to locate oil leaks, as the territory is inaccessible in winter; but it is also claimed that the prevention of leaks is difficult, given the lack of technological progress within the oil industry in Russia, which is plagued by an aging infrastructure.\(^{19}\) According to the representative of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection, 80 per cent of the pipes are overused. The lifespan of a pipe is estimated at around ten years, and even less when used at full capacity. In the Komi Republic, where pipes were taken over from oil companies previously doing business in the region, the pipes have been used beyond their intended lifespan, becoming corroded and rupturing. Replacing or renewing pipes takes effort and is costly. The existing budget is insufficient, and Lukoil’s investment programme for 2015-2016 is meant to cover the development of all of Lukoil’s operations, not just the modernization of pipes.\(^{20}\) Lukoil has stated that it plans to modernize all pipelines by 2025;\(^ {21}\) yet, the local activists doubt this, as it is more profitable for the company to pay fines than to replace pipes. In an interview done by a Greenpeace Russia activist in 2016, Lukoil claimed to change 400km of pipelines, from a budget of 20 billion roubles allocated for ecological purposes (Novaya Gazeta 2016).

Grievances related to the oil spills, as well as a lack of recognition of indigenous peoples’ rights, have led to the rise of an environmental movement stretching from the grassroots to global levels. The following section begins with a history of environmental movements in Russia and concludes with a description of the movement against Lukoil in the Komi Republic today.

\(^{19}\) Interview with representative Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection, Syktyvkar, 4 March 2015  
\(^{20}\) Interview with Lukoil representative, Usinsk, 26 February 2015  
\(^{21}\) Interview with a representative of Lukoil, Moscow, 23 April 2015
Environmental movements in historical perspective

Already during the Russian Revolution, the working class’ main problem was argued to be the maximization of the political effectiveness of its struggle rather than assuring class unity. The bourgeoisie was not capable of carrying out its tasks, which set the ‘stepping-stone for the seizure of political power by the proletariat’ (Laclau & Mouffe 2001). In other words, power was involuntarily given to the people, who used this power to overcome the Tsarist autocracy, which led to the rise of the Soviet Union.

With Gorbachev’s pursuit of a radical restructuring of all institutions within the Soviet regime in 1986, known as perestroika, different informal (neformalye) groups were founded; with the aim of those being established by the people, rather than the forming of state inherent organizations. Some scholars even argue that the environmentalists contributed to the collapse of the Soviet regime (Evans 2006, Henry 2010). By the end of the 1990s, environmental movements had gained noteworthy citizen support. However, the movements ultimately ‘struggled under conditions of economic and political instability that led [them] to seek a new mobilizing platform’ (Henry 2009, p. 48).

The local environmental movement in the Izhma district in Komi arose in the former Soviet Union. The Save Pechora Committee was formed in 1989, on the wave of the perestroika, after various economic and social problems had emerged in the region. People on the Committee relied on ‘existing social and cultural arrangements [from the Soviet times] to shape institutions in response to changing situations’ (Cleaver 2009). The first chairperson of the Committee claimed that ‘something can only be achieved by the resistance of the people’22. The Committee reached out to the people in the villages in the
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22 Interview with local activist on Save Pechora Committee, Izhma, 20 February 2015
Pechora district and held its first conference. Among Save Pechora’s first successes were a referendum on the issue of a national park in the region and another against building a nuclear power plant in the Inta district. After the big oil spill near the town of Usinsk in 1994, the Save Pechora Committee and the Komi-Izjemtsi organization Izviatas dedicated themselves to addressing the matter. Working together with the non-profit Silver Taiga Foundation, as well as getting support from Greenpeace Russia (in 2015), they have created a list of ‘ten demands’ for the oil company, most of which emphasize environmental safety issues and the necessity of replacing old, outdated oil pipes.

The Save Pechora Committee has 29 members from eight villages and volunteers from all over the Pechora region campaigning against Lukoil. Their main goal is to protect the environment and ecology in the district, but they also aim for greater involvement in the decision-making processes of the oil industry and the state. The Committee uses resources of the larger NGO, the Silver Taiga Foundation, and partners with the Komi-Izjemtsi organization Izviatas.

Local resistance towards an oil company and the state

Like many civil society organizations involved in global civil society (Veltmeyer & Bowles 2014), the Save Pechora Committee, is situated in a value-based network concerned with the environment, fairness and social justice (Karjalainen & Habeck 2004). To be able to exist with the intention of changing the environmental situation in today’s Komi Republic, the Committee applies a major strategy of keeping itself an informal civic organization. After having been registered in the past, the Committee strategically decided to gain
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Interview with the leader of Save Pechora Committee, 22 February 2015, interview with the leader of Izviatas, 28 February 2015, documents provided by the NGO leaders
independence from the state by becoming a non-registered entity in 2012, one with no physical address or accounting system. This is made possible by relying on infrastructural support from the registered NGO Silver Taiga Foundation and partnering with the registered NGO Izviatas, which can accept grants from Russian funding sources but accepts only in-kind support from foreign sources. This limitation is a strategic choice, ensuring that no allegations of being a foreign agent can be brought by the state. Volunteering is possible as most of Save Pechora’s members are retired or have another main job and thus are not afraid of losing their jobs and livelihood. Another issue is the organization of activists of the Save Pechora Committee and Izviatas. They are two different organizations; nevertheless, a lot of joint collaboration is taking place. The movements’ actors are usually not individual actors, but rather work as collective actors, exchanging ideas with different institutions in the network and working together towards a shared goal. Roles are not clearly divided in Save Pechora, but regular meetings are set up; usually once in every three months.

One established strategy of the Committee is letting public hearings, officially announced and organized by Lukoil, ‘fail’, declaring them invalid by voting, because the Committee would not be satisfied with the actions and responses of the oil company taken at the meeting and thus would not find a consensus. The organization of a public hearing goes as follows: the oil company notifies the local administration that a hearing is necessary; the administration then decides where and when it is going to take place, and

---

24 Interview with local activist, Izhma, 20 February 2015
25 Interview with Save Pechora activist, Izhma, 21 February 2015
26 Interview with activist of Izviatas, Izhma, 28 February 2015; interview with the leader of Save Pechora Committee, Siktivkar, February 2015
publicly announces it in a newspaper. Voting is not officially part of public hearings, as they are held to inform citizens about Lukoil’s projects and collect and consider citizens’ suggestions. However, activists on the Save Pechora Committee insist on voting, and then insist that records of the meeting state that the hearings have failed. Such statements jeopardize the CSR of the company and its social license to operate. In one example, the oil company brought some 30 oil workers to a hearing in order to have more pro-Lukoil voices present, resulting in a positive voting outcome for the company. Nevertheless, activists caused the hearing to fail. Public hearings are supposed to give a voice to the public, enabling them to express their opinions and their demands to Lukoil. The local population often complain that they have not been notified about an upcoming hearing and therefore not been able to attend. Earlier, the public hearings were often held in Usinsk, which is very difficult to reach from the region’s villages. Lukoil has responded to these complaints citing infrastructural problems; in other words, it is too difficult to find a location that can be reached by everyone.

Activists in the Izhma district strongly believe in the power of the people, which can be seen as the normative or symbolic power that is used to mobilize and organize the general public around them. With the guidance and aid of larger NGOs, power can then be exercised and results achieved. This power in the movement is directed against the oil company, Lukoil, and government policies that hinder the development of the communities’ values and interests, as there is a discrepancy between these and those of Lukoil and the government. An example of the discrepancy between the values and interests of the community and NGO network and those of the industry can be taken from
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27 Interview with administration representative, Usinsk, 27 February 2015
28 Interview with activist of Save Pechora Committee, Izhma, 21 February 2015
Lukoil-Komi’s interference with the media. According to the NGO Bankwatch, Lukoil-Komi blocks information in the media on the company’s environmental violations. The local population ‘fails to receive trustworthy information and sees a big difference between the environmental achievements described in press releases and the real situation’ (Bankwatch 2008). Bankwatch also reported that in May 2006 Lukoil-Komi bought out an entire edition of the newspaper Novyi Sever after it had published an article on the environmental violations of the company. In another comment, Bankwatch has pointed out that one can see the relation between the Save Pechora Committee, on the one hand, and Lukoil-Komi and the state, on the other, in the cooperation between the company and the regional state authorities. The authorities have refused to respond to reported violations concerning the company’s activities, and have refused the Save Pechora Committee entry to view drilling sites, giving the company enough time to eliminate traces of pollution (Bankwatch 2008).

According to a local leader, the people can bring about change by ‘making noise’ and standing up for their rights to fight ‘a disgusting creature’29. The instruments used by Save Pechora are usually not ones of active and visible resistance, in terms of mobilizing their resources in a certain way, but more strategic and invisible ones. Events in which people followed the principle of ‘making noise’ were the street protests organized by the Committee in several villages in the Izhma and Usinsk districts and their use of different media outlets to publish information. In large cities in Russia, activists are prosecuted for organizing unauthorized protests; village-based protests are an exception. However, in 2016, internal security forces (OMON30) were sent to the villages in the Usinsk district to
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29 Interview with local activist, Izhma, 20 February 2015
30 OMON = Otryad Mobilny Osobogo Naznacheniya (Russian), Special Purpose Mobility Unit (English)
shut down protests after a big spill happened in April (Novaya Gazeta 2016). State authorities monitor such protests and people can openly express their grievances and publish information about protests on the Internet. It is important to note that the relationship between the civil society network and the state agencies differ on different levels and scales. The majority of activists generally support Putin's policies, acknowledging the need for the economy to develop additional fossil fuel resources. Most of the protests are against local municipalities for a lack of transparency in using money generated by the oil industry, for violating the terms of socio-economic agreements and for tolerating oil spills and local construction projects. Save Pechora and Greenpeace activists constructively work with the Ministry of Natural Resources of the Komi Republic on identifying and registering oil spills31.

**Structure and communication in the NGO network**

As mentioned previously, in the NGO network the Internet is used to publish protest information for example, and is utilized as a viable resource and powerful tool for communication and keeping the network alive. Information is published and distributed to members of the network on a website run mostly by one member of the Committee, an example of reliance on the self-production strategy (Edwards & Gillham 2013), as everything is organized around the available human resources. Additional resources include the newspapers Veskhyd Shorny and Ekologichesky Vestnik, which are published locally by the Committee (Ekologichesky Vestnik) or which describe the activities of the Committee. This normative/symbolic power via communication has brought the Committee support from international media, such as Al Jazeera TV, which covered some grassroots protests.
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31 Interview with the activists of Save Pechora Committee, 20 January, 2016
However, most of the attention the Committee has received has come from local and national media; it could not have achieved global influence on its own.\(^{32}\)

Collaboration, based on the ability to communicate within the network (Castells 2007), is happening between the indigenous associations and NGOs in the Komi Republic and the Nenets Autonomous Okrug (NAO). Applying the co-optating/appropriating strategy (Edwards & Gillham 2013) allows the different committees and NGOs to use each other’s resources. For example, the Save Pechora Committee is helping the local branch of Izviatas in the NAO to identify issues related to oil development and to bring these to the attention of the media. Save Pechora and Izviatas are working together very closely, sharing active members and resources. Izviatas has links to Komi-Voityr, another interregional movement, although the relationship has been marked by recurring conflicts (Shabayev & Sharapov 2011), as well as to the Silver Taiga Foundation. Izviatas is a member of the indigenous peoples’ association RAIPON and through it is connected to the transnational level, for example the UN and the Arctic Council.\(^{34}\) Together with RAIPON, the international organization IWGIA and the German organization INFOE\(^{35}\) are trying to pressure the Russian government by publishing reports on the racial discrimination by the Russian state against Izviatas (CERD 2006, Pechora Portal 2007). The effort is aided by two UN committees: the UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) and the UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR), as well as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). The organizations argue that
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\(^{32}\) Interview with IWGIA representative, 4 February 2016

\(^{33}\) Komi-Voityr signed a partnership agreement with Lukoil April 15, 2015 (http://www.lukoil.com/static_6_5id_2256_.html)

\(^{34}\) Interview with the Izviatas activist, Izhma, 28 February 2015; Interview with Save Pechora Committee, Izhma, 22 February 2015

\(^{35}\) http://www.infoe.de/web/
the Russian state is denying indigenous peoples the right to practice traditional livelihoods, that authorities and private corporations fail to ‘seek the indigenous peoples’ informed consent prior to extractive activities’, that indigenous communities are being excluded ‘from legal access to fish, hunting rights and other biological resources vital for their collective survival’, and that the ‘combination of a weak and dysfunctional protection regime with the drive towards full privatisation of the country’s natural wealth’ is having a ‘discriminatory effect on indigenous communities by perpetuating their disadvantaged and disempowered status’ (INFOE 2008). In short, the fact that the Komi-Izhemtsi are not recognized by the state as an indigenous people and that Lukoil is therefore not obliged to pay them compensation is framed as racial discrimination.

Ties to Greenpeace Russia have been established via a member of the Izhma district community who worked for the Save Pechora Committee and later joined Greenpeace. Through this connection, a first press conference was held in Saint Petersburg in spring 2015. Greenpeace is seen as ‘the greatest hope’ by many activists. The NGO is said to work constructively in negotiations with the oil industry and government, and not seen as radical as is often the case with the overall Greenpeace philosophy on an international level. The in-kind support provided by Greenpeace has made it possible to arrange roundtables with state representatives in Usinsk. Extensive discussions were held centring on combating oil spills and fostering environmental improvements. In April 2016, a large oil spill occurred in the Usinsk district, for which Lukoil-Komi was held responsible. This led to another roundtable meeting in June 2016 in Ukhta. Participants included representatives of the local administration, the Komi Ministry of Natural Resources, and activists on the Save
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36 Interview with member Save Pechora Committee, Izhma, 21 February 2015
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Pechora Committee. The possibilities of holding the company accountable for the damage were discussed\(^{38}\). In 2016, Greenpeace started a large national campaign, collecting signatures with the aim of requesting the federal government to force oil companies to replace outdated pipes and diminish spills in the country\(^{39}\). In order to raise awareness about the issue of oil spills on a global scale, Greenpeace has sent Izviatas representatives to international meetings, such as the Arctic Council meeting in Iqaluit, Canada, in 2015\(^{40}\).

In the meeting, the Arctic Council, consisting out of eight Arctic states\(^{41}\), brought together representatives of the Arctic states, including representatives of the Indigenous Permanent Participant organizations. Here, the activists’ network communicated its grievances to the regional and global levels and mobilized citizens nationally.

Aspects of resource mobilization and social movement theory have been discussed, and it is clear that the movement can function because of various resources made available to it, such as human resources - people who are voluntarily engaged in the matter - a shared ideology and networks merging into the transnational realm, providing opportunities for working with different media, participating in global conferences – making voices heard. Opposing factors, such as the Foreign Agent Law, depict constraints to the movement. According to individual reports, the Komi- Izhemtsi feel excluded and ill-treated, and therefore start something out of reasons that have to do with a shared identity; going against something their values contradict with, fighting for a better future and overcome domination.


\(^{40}\) Interview with the leader of Izviatas, Izhma, 28 February 2015

\(^{41}\) Canada, United States, Russia, Finland, Iceland, the Kingdom of Denmark (including Greenland and the Faroe Islands), Norway, and Sweden
Corporate social responsibility and the oil company’s response

Donations, community assistance, the sponsorship of social events, commercial community investments (Schwartz, 2011) and more of these type seem to be something Lukoil makes up with for what they are doing (wrong), but it is not a solution to a much deeper problem - and not solving this deep problem of the original actions of the company that does others harm. Committing to corporate social responsibility could have several reasons for the company; surely to strengthen the image of the company, and possibly to defend many aspects of modernization by stressing on the social value that can be achieved by the infrastructure projects the company initiates. However, this aspect of CSR is only a small piece of the picture. Greenpeace has been involved in targeting oil companies suspected of violating the rights and/or values of the communities adjacent to oil extraction sites. The organization’s actions have identified issues related to safety and the performance of the oil companies, which indirectly set up an agenda for policy changes and called upon companies to honour their environmental and social responsibility (Pappila 2015). Scholars argue that the issue of CSR is important today and will become even more important in the future, and that especially oil companies have to take this into account, due to several reasons. CSR can serve as a practicable strategy for oil companies, as conflicts with local communities or environmental institutions can be reduced (Pappila 2015); in addition, employing CSR practices is likely to strengthen a company’s image, leading to higher sales and potentially attracting investment banks. It has also been argued that global movement networks could impact developments by evaluating listed companies based on their environmental performance or the way they deal with the issue of human rights, prompting shareholders and investors to re-evaluate their relationship and overall attitude towards the companies (Castells 2007).
Lukoil does not play down the importance of CSR. It signed the UN Global Compact (2008) in 2008 and adheres to the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) in presenting its performance to shareholders. Amongst other companies, Lukoil has committed itself to a precautionary approach to environmental challenges, undertaking initiatives to promote greater environmental responsibility and encouraging the development and diffusion of environmentally friendly technologies. Furthermore, in a 2008 report, the company stated that it has made efforts geared to ‘reducing oil and petroleum product losses and decreasing related emissions/discharges’ and to ‘preventing accidents and remedying their consequences’ (Lukoil 2008, p. 26).

CSR commitments are decided upon at the company’s headquarters and, as in other vertically integrated holding companies, environmental and social aspects of CSR are channelled to the regional offices. Regional offices have personnel who are responsible for implementation but must adhere to the budget allocated for them by headquarters. According to our Lukoil-Komi informant, the company’s limited regional budget prevents it speeding up replacement of its outdated oil infrastructure. Other responsibilities that Lukoil must take on originate from bank loan agreements with the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD 2007). Since 2000, Lukoil has received five loans from the bank totalling USD 840 million, part of which was distributed to Lukoil-Komi (Bankwatch 2014). In 2007, for a loan of USD 300 million from EBRD and other multilateral banks, Lukoil committed itself to the implementation of an environmental security scheme, thus ‘inter alia pollution clean-up, pipeline replacement, gas flaring reduction, health and
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43 Interview with the head of PR Lukoil-Komi, Usinsk, 25 February 2015
safety measures, [and] social infrastructure (...)’ (EBRD 2007). The EBRD provided funds to Lukoil headquarters; funds for the clean-up of legacy spills were allocated mostly to the Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug, home to the Khanti and Nenets peoples, who are recognized by the Russian Federation as indigenous people44. There, due to the bank requirements, the company expresses its CSR towards indigenous peoples using international EBRD standards and generously pays them compensation for oil extraction and pollution on native lands45. Furthermore, Lukoil employs a CSR policy, one limb of which is headed Environment, to be implemented in a five-year programme titled Energy Efficiency, Employees’ Well-Being and Sponsorship. Sponsorship is implemented mainly through social-partnership agreements with the regions in which the company operates. Lukoil-Komi receives approximately 100 million roubles from the company’s national headquarters. This money is distributed between different administrations in Komi and NAO46. Reindeer-herding enterprises are registered in NAO even if they operate in the Komi Republic. Lukoil-Komi pays compensation to Komi-Izhemtsi reindeer herders in NAO for oil spills and damage to the land. The fact that Komi-Izhemtsi have the status of small numbered populations of the north and far east was essential in the process of coming to the socio-economic agreements and compensations from oil companies.

On the local level, Lukoil-Komi spends time and effort on engaging with the municipalities and communities in the republic. The company and local administration have had social partnership agreements for some ten years. These are usually focused on supporting education, culture, the environment, health, preservation of tradition,

44 Interview with the head of corporate coordination unit, Moscow, 24 April 2015
45 Research in progress, conducted by Maria Tysiachniouk in 2014-2016 in Khanti-Mansiiski Autonomous Okrug, unpublished manuscript
46 Interview with the head of corporate coordination unit, Moscow, 24 April 2015
agriculture and small business. In 2014, a total of some 15 million roubles was given to the local administration in Izhma. According to an informant of Greenpeace, in 2016, Lukoil allocated 20 billion roubles towards ecological purposes and is planning to renew some 400 km of pipelines (Novaya Gazeta 2016). Together with the local administration, Lukoil decides what to finance and how much money to give, with the decision based on the wishes of the institutions in need, for example schools or kindergartens. Local activists have complained that the community only receives the money through the local administration, rather than directly, and that its distribution is not transparent. Furthermore, the social partnership agreement itself is not public and transparent; NGOs and local citizens in the communities affected do not know its exact content, which undermines open and democratic municipal decision-making. Despite its grievances with regard to Lukoil-Komi’s environmental performance, Izviatas has recognized that it needs to look for different opportunities for benefit sharing, and in February 2015, signed a socio-economic agreement with the company. This agreement focuses mainly on social concerns, but takes in some environmental considerations as well. Lukoil-Komi agreed to inform citizens about all oil spills regardless of their extent. Since the agreement has been signed, Lukoil-Komi has become more transparent about oil spills in the Izhma district, where the Izviatas office is located; however, our informants have reported that Lukoil-Komi continues to hide oil spills occurring in the Usinsk district. An examination of the EU guidelines on CSR (EUR-Lex 2011) reveals that Lukoil acknowledges its responsibilities
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47 Interview with the head of PR Lukoil, Usinsk, 25 February 2015
48 At the time of interviewing, 15 million roubles equalled approximately 208,700 €
49 Interview with local administration representative, Izhma, 24 February 2015
50 Interview with local activist of Save Pechora Committee, Izhma, 22 February 2015
51 * Or social partnership agreement
52 Interview with Save Pechora activist, Syktyvkar, January 21, 2006
towards social problems and towards society at large. It is ‘doing more’ (Schwartz 2011) by engaging with the communities rather than simply looking at the production of goods and services for a profit, showing that the bottom line is not the only value of importance.

According to local activists, there still is a big gap between their reality and what representatives of the oil company imagine the situation in the villages to be. In line with the activists’ explanations, deputies of Lukoil were in the past quite shocked to see the actual situation in villages, as they had imagined it to be much more rural and un-inhabited, thinking that a village would look like ‘three people and some reindeer’53. This displays the discrepancy in how the situation is seen within the different networks, and thus how it is portrayed to the outside by either the NGO networks or the oil company. Both Lukoil-Komi and regional governmental institutions have brought up an argument related to the Komi-Izhemtsi wanting to gain the indigenous status; i.e. that, from the point of view of authorities and the oil company, it cannot be understood that the Komi-Izhemtsi want to live a modern life with facilities such as the internet, and for example use vehicles that run on oil, but at the same time want to gain the indigenous status54. For the oil company and some individuals within governmental institutions, these, in their eyes, contrasting ideas do not go hand in hand, and are apparently not to be merged – someone using oil and gas in their daily lives, and simultaneously wanting the oil company to leave the district. This might be a fixed attitude of many policy makers, based on a scornful imagine of and towards these people, although not stemming from Russian law.

53 Interview with local activist, Vertep, 21 February 2015
54 Interview with representative of Ministry of Natural Resource of the Republic of Komi, Syktyvkar, 4 March 2015
The company cannot afford to improve its infrastructure and is focusing on social partnership agreements instead. Activists nevertheless insist that the company meet the ten demands they have put forward; as one informant put it, they do not want to ‘sell the environment’\textsuperscript{55}, but protect it. In other words, people would rather have a clean environment without oil leaks than money for philanthropic projects. Lukoil-Komi is continuing its business as usual and the movement continues to organize protest actions. This has resulted in ongoing negotiations and discussions, mostly without any changes in favour of the communities and activists, and leading to ‘a silent death of the indigenous people’\textsuperscript{56}, as activists have described the situation.

**Framing the indigenous as a network strategy**

‘Industrial operation, which might bring about pollution of the environment, is prohibited on the lands designated as the territories of traditional natural resources of indigenous small-numbered peoples. Why can one of the neighbouring ethnic groups enjoy such rights while the other cannot? This is indeed the situation today…’

Izviatas chairperson on 28 June 2003 at the congress of the Izviatas movement

The Komi-Izhemtsi have sought indigenous status for many years, as this would make them eligible for benefits on the national level and require oil companies to consult and compensate them for damage. Although environmental impact assessments require consultations with local communities, in Russia indigenous peoples with a recognized status are treated differently by oil companies than unrecognized peoples. For example, on

\textsuperscript{55} Interview with local activist of Save Pechora Committee, Izhma, 20 February 2015

\textsuperscript{56} *Poleznyn Iskopomie / Round-table discussion with local activists, Izhma, 27 February 2015
Sakhalin Island, the requirements of the World Bank and the International Finance Corporation have been implemented better with peoples that are recognized as indigenous (Wilson 2016).

In the following, light will be shed on ways in which the Komi-Izhemtsi have explored the international arena, where they are recognized as indigenous peoples, with the help of international players as well as on how they are seen differently by national and regional governmental entities, which treat them as local communities and not as indigenous peoples. On the global level, the United Nations Development Group characterizes indigenous people as tribal peoples, using the guidelines set out in the ILO Convention on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples, 1989 (No. 169), who identify themselves as indigenous or tribal, whose ‘social, cultural and economic conditions’ (UN 2009) distinguish themselves from other groups by their own customs or traditions and who are descendants of populations ‘which inhabited the country, or a geographical region to which the country belongs, at the time of conquest or colonization or the establishment of present State boundaries and who, irrespective of their legal status, retain some or all of their own social, economic, cultural and political institutions’ (UN 2009). In the Russian Federation, 41 indigenous groups are legally recognized as ‘indigenous, small-numbered peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East’. To be recognized as indigenous, a group must:

- Have no more than 50,000 members;
- Maintain a traditional way of life;
- Inhabit certain remote regions of Russia;
- Identify itself as a distinct ethnic community (IWGIA 2012).
The national guidelines are formulated in such a way that they exclude tribes that do not meet all four criteria (Rohr 2014), whereas the global guidelines are much more flexible, employing self-identification as the key criterion for being indigenous. The indigenous peoples in NAO engage in reindeer herding, regarded as a traditional livelihood practice. Also the Komi-Izemtsi have been engaged in reindeer breeding and herding for many years, have had close ties to the indigenous peoples in NAO, but the reindeer husbandry activities in Komi are in decline (CCPR 2015). There are only some 90 herders among the local Komi-Izemtsi (Shabayev & Sharapov 2011) and the largest reindeer husbandry enterprise is based in Siziabsk, in the Izhma district, where herders seasonally migrate with their reindeer from the Komi Republic to NAO. These enterprises receive compensation from Lukoil-Komi because they have registered their traditional activity in NAO (see Figure 2), where all reindeer herders receive compensation. This means that companies extracting parts of pastures for oil drilling need to receive herders’ consent and pay compensation to the reindeer herding enterprises. Earlier, compensation took the form of a socio-economic agreement with indigenous peoples’ organizations; since 2011 it has been paid directly to them (Henry et al. 2016, forthcoming).

The Komi-Izemtsi are a ‘specific ethnic community’ (Anufriyeva 2007). According to a study done by Shabayev and Sharapov (2011), there is a high degree of group solidarity and sustainable positive identity amongst them. In the study, they found that the Izemtsi oppose themselves to the Komi peoples; they feel that they have a much more advanced historical memory, are more specified in their economy and dialect, as well as in folk customs, culinary preferences, and entrepreneurial spirit. Overall, they see themselves more ‘oriented towards Russian cultural traditions’ (Shabayev & Sharapov 2011). As noted above, the Komi-Izemtsi are not registered as an indigenous people on the national level.
The law requires the governors of all regions inhabited by Komi-Izhemtsi – Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug, Murmansk Oblast, and Komi Republic – to file a petition with the federal government requesting permission to include the Komi-Izhemtsi in the national registry of indigenous, small-numbered peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East. However, only the governor of the Komi Republic filed such a petition. In 1993, the Izhma region was put on the list of areas inhabited by indigenous peoples of the North, but today competition for finances, land and resources is harsh (Shabayev & Sharapov 2011). During the 5th World Congress of Finno-Ugric Peoples in June 2008 in Khanty-Mansi, ‘the panel on the ethno-politics and rights recommended the inclusion of the appeal of the Izviatas organization, with a request to grant them the status of indigenous peoples’ (Shabayev & Sharapov 2011), which was not included in the resolution, after all. According to Shabayev and Sharapov (2011), the population census in 2002 marked an important achievement in the political standing of the Izviatas, in which the appeal to acknowledge the ethnic belonging of the Komi-Izhemtsi during the census as Komi-Izhemtsi, instead of Komi, was supported.

Concrete examples supporting their issue are having their own language, own traditions and practicing activities such as fishing and reindeer herding. Still, when put in perspective, the life of the rest of the Komi-Izhemtsi, who number around 15,000, does not differ significantly from that of any other local citizens, although they descend from indigenous inhabitants of the region, maintain close ties to the land, regard themselves as a marginalized group (CCPR 2014) and self-identify as indigenous (UN 2009). Many Komi-Izhemtsi still claim that the indigenous status should be granted to them. Simultaneously, critical thoughts towards this pursuit were expressed, stating that this would only risk the
unity of the Komi, because it could cause a chain reaction, attracting other small peoples to want to apply for the status as well (Shabayev & Sharapov 2011).

Despite the Komi-Izhemtsi being denied indigenous status in Russia, RAIPON, including the Komi-Izhemtsi organization Izviatas, is trying to frame their situation differently in the international arena and thereby secure them recognition as an indigenous people. If this effort is successful, the Komi-Izhemtsi could become eligible for protection under indigenous peoples’ rights globally, as the international and Russian national definitions of indigenous differ. Indigenous status would bring state support for the preferred right to use the land, tax exemption for using natural resources, free authorization to catch fish and marine animals, granting young people from among the indigenous people entrance to state-commissioned student places in institutions of higher education, and the right to alternate military service (Shabayev & Sharapov 2011). Izviatas has received support from Greenpeace International, RAIPON, IWGIA, and the UN Human Rights Committee in its problems with the oil company and in its fight for indigenous status (IWGIA 2015).

Representatives of Izviatas participate in global indigenous gatherings, including a 2015 Arctic Council meeting in Iqaluit, where Izviatas had the opportunity to advise a body of representatives of the Nunavut territory to use its indigenous status to ban drilling around the region.
Chapter 5. Discussion

In these final chapters (Chapter 5 and Chapter 6), I am bringing together the most relevant points from this research and am going back to theories used in the framework throughout the research. Only by combining the different theories, it was possible to make a well-grounded analysis of the case. The main approaches to this research were the GGN and network theories, as a significant factor within the struggle, social movement-, and resource mobilization theory, taking into consideration the socio-economic and political background, for which the discourse of political opportunity structure was needed. The strategies used in order to understand motives were analyzed through the lens of discourse analysis (framing) and theories of power, combined with CSR strategies of the oil industry as a new approach.

Resources, power and sustainability of the NGO network in the local-global realm of the GGN

‘In the last resort, it is only the power of global civil society acting on the public mind via the media and communication networks that may eventually overcome the historical inertia of nation-states and thus bring these nation-states to accept the reality of their limited power in exchange for increasing their legitimacy and efficiency.’

(Castells 2013, p. 42)

As scholars have pointed out, power can be achieved by networks in civil society, with the right resources (Castells 2013, Wilson 2016). In the case of the Komi Republic, people have formed a resistance group, the Save Pechora Committee, based on their identity and their environmental and ethnical beliefs. The movement is trying to convince
the world, the Russian community and the Russian government that the environment is of a high importance and to be valued more than gains that might arise out of an individual benefit from socio-economic agreements based on CSR, although these are accepted in a compromising manner. The movement, in particular from the side of Izviatas, wishes to make a statement towards the value of indigenous customs, indigenous ways of life and the preservation of those. People want to continue within their culture, as free, independent, indigenous people. In this resistance group, normative power attempts to appeal to and convince more people to become involved, securing the movement's objectives. The NGO network to which the committee belongs uses normative power in order to pressure Lukoil to meet the people's demands by addressing the problems related to oil spills. Within the context of this work, normative power can be seen playing out in environmental and ethnic issues. The power of NGOs and indigenous organizations appeal towards the environment, culture, the preservation of culture, language, etc. NGOs in the network have objectives related to environmental protection and sustainability that align with the interests of their constituencies and pursue an ethnic legal demand in trying to gain indigenous status; an ethnic claim. Political opportunities could be created for the NGO network: an opportunity arose when an external NGO, INFOE, challenged the national government by framing the treatment of Izviatas by the state as racism. The oil spills have also created an opportunity for the movement, as international players have taken an interest and challenged the state through media pressure.

This research examined a GGN with unique power relations and resource flows between actors and networks. As the local movement is rather small, they could not survive without the bigger organizations in the shadow of which they can hide, but also thrive. The global environmental movement is beneficial for the Save Pechora Committee, as
international organizations in general can shape media, have an influence on the public and involve/integrate bigger crowds into their values and appeals. That way, they assist the Save Pechora Committee and Izviatas, even though these might not have applied the same frames in their movement, or might not have the same global/holistic image of the environmental movement. Available resources are mobilized locally as well as taken from the experience and power of larger, transnational players in the network, such as the Silver Taiga Foundation, Greenpeace Russia, Greenpeace International, IWGIA, RAIPON and several UN committees. Through networking, the Save Pechora Committee and Izviatas have learned certain strategies that they can apply on a global scale. Resources tapped in the global sphere by the NGO network include media support - which frames the problems as an indigenous issue - and financial resources. Local resources are of a simple nature, and limited in itself, as they are, in line with Edwards and Gillham (2013), of a self-productive origin, relying on human labour, and on educating oneself and others, bringing in a dedication for the matter, as well as time. Furthermore, the movement exchanges intangible resources, such as experience and knowledge, with Izviatas and the Silver Taiga Foundation, applying a co-opting strategy (Edwards & Gillham 2013) and bringing local expertise to the regional, national and transnational levels. The Committee has at its disposal the infrastructure and resources of the Silver Taiga Foundation on a national level, or Greenpeace on an international level. The mobilization taking place is of a rather peaceful nature: except for some street protests organized by the Save Pechora Committee in several villages in the Izhma district, no protesting events are taking place.

In GGNs, networks are meant to bring the global closer to the local. The study demonstrates the mechanism underpinning this global-local interplay of actors. The local (people, activists) are able to get access to national media and even global institutions,
mostly through a broker from within the community or through other individual change agents. All Finno-Ugric peoples, including Komi-Izhemtsi, are recognized according to the UN definition, and can partake in UN meetings. The only thing holding them back is the fact that funds are needed to do this, and the ability to communicate in the English language – which is a barrier for most of the Komi-Izhemtsi, so they rely on brokers; on the indigenous networks and international organizations, such as Greenpeace, to be able to act on international platforms. The broker knows what is happening on the ground and can possibly combine the different interests and needs of the various actors involved; parts of civil society may become more closely connected to the space in which the environmental pollution, and possibly injustice, is taking place. In the present case, new institutional spaces were created on the transnational level: the roundtables in the Izhma and Usinsk regions, the civic action that is taking place, the learning networks established through summer schools initiated by Greenpeace and the possibility of local activists participating in Arctic Council meetings. Without these brokers, the Committee probably would not have had incentive to establish connections with transnational institutions such as the UN or the Arctic Council. Reaching out to these brought the Committee tremendous support, allowing it to bypass the national level, on which it felt powerless.

The resistance movement is making use of the normative power in its will to resist the oil industry. Nevertheless, the actors working against the environmental movement, or working in a different direction, hold much more power in this scenario than the grassroots actors on the other side of the table. The dominant actors within the GGN that oppose the movement include the oil company and, on the national level, the Putin administration, which has made the work of environmental NGOs receiving foreign funding and involved in political activity very difficult. In line with Castells (2013), one sees that the nation-state is
guided by traditional political principles, that is, the maximization of the state’s interests and the prioritization of the political (and economic) interests of political actors within the state. In a global sense, the Russian state as an institution has a great amount of power: because of its natural energy resources, it can enact power towards the West, especially the EU, as it is supplying it with oil and gas. Lukoil, as the second largest oil company in Russia, therewith has an enormous economic power as the state is reliant on its energy sources.

The Silver Taiga Foundation, which provides infrastructural resources to the Save Pechora Committee, may run the risk of being labelled a foreign agent pursuant to the Foreign Agent Law should it accept foreign funding from international foundations. Yet, the NGO network in this case found a successful strategy for overcoming powerful actors in the GGN. The survival of the movement can be explained with reference to factors originating partly from the local and partly from the global level. Some of the members of the Save Pechora Committee are former communist leaders, who share particular ideas and values and are, as leaders, able to understand the post-Soviet ‘system’ as well; they know its ins and outs and can thus adjust very well. The Committee has not registered itself as an official committee, allowing it to avoid the sanctions that would ensue from the Foreign Agent Law. Most of its members are retired or have another primary occupation, which makes them advantageous actors vis-a-vis the state and its surveillance mechanisms. They are thus not afraid of a possible ‘punishment’, cannot lose their jobs or their identity, as they in a way work underground. The study shows that the grassroots actors may not be suppressed under the current political regime, if they find ways to survive the current political situation. However, the current political situation should not be given too much weight in this particular research, as the main initiator of the movement’s drive is the oil
company and the problems it causes. Nevertheless, the company can use political power and get support from the government.

If brought to bear in local activism, the power of the global actors could have an influence on companies’ CSR policy by impacting the mind of the public. When regulations are broken, penalties are not strong enough, which results in Lukoil-Komi finding it easier to pay off the fines, rather than improve their infrastructure. Fines could become an issue if companies for example lose the public’s (including investors, suppliers, etc.) confidence due to public pressure stemming from ethical problematics. This can result in the declining of shares and overall negative consequences for the company. Due to multiple NGO campaigns, investment banks and global stakeholders demanding greater CSR, Lukoil has developed appropriate policies at its national headquarters. However, these policies are formulated in such a way that regional offices, Lukoil-Komi for example, fail to implement them. This can be attributed to a lack of funding for replacing old, Soviet-era infrastructure.

In this thesis, the long-term sustainability of the NGO network in the Komi Republic has been explored. I argue that the power of the networks creates an alternative, one that is still a work in progress in enforcing corporate accountability. The case reveals a large discrepancy in power and interests on the national level between the state and the oil industry, on the one hand, and civil society on the other.

The issue of trust in GGNs and the interplay of actors’ networks

The case of local communities, including the Komi-Izhemtsi, fighting against a giant oil industry in today’s Russia, marked by a general vulnerability and a large dependency on this sector, is a flagship example of how sustainable environmental movements and, more
specifically, resource-sharing networks can operate. The value of framing grievances and alleged discrimination against minorities in this case should not be understated.

There is a discrepancy between the responses to framing the indigenous on a national and on an international level. The World Bank and International Finance Corporation recognize indigenous peoples as social groups with social or cultural identities that are distinct from mainstream groups or the dominant society (IFC 2012). The Komi-Izhemtsi identify themselves as an indigenous people but have received attention beyond the borders of Russia only with the assistance of international NGOs, indigenous associations and the media. Indigenous peoples have gained noteworthy support, especially with the 2008 United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Among other rights, the Declaration provides for the right of control over traditionally owned or used lands, territories and resources (UN 2008, Article 26) and ensures ‘just, fair and equitable compensation, for [those] lands, territories and resources (...) which have been (...) occupied, used or damaged without their free, prior and informed consent’ (UN 2008, Article 28). Thus, on a global level, the injustices suffered by the Komi-Izhemtsi are recognized and means of redressing such wrongs are being adhered to. On the global level, the issue has been framed as such that Lukoil is the culprit and the indigenous people the victims. On the national level, the Komi-Izhemtsi are not considered different to any other people living in rural areas, and therefore they are treated as members of local communities. In any event, the current law in Russia does not offer any possibilities for the Komi-Izhemtsi to gain more benefits from oil companies (Rohr 2014). Therefore, it proves to be difficult for environmental movements and NGO networks to pin down a company operating, as in this case, within national borders and laws and customs. Certain global standards do not apply, or differ from the national standards. The movement should focus
its efforts first and foremost on trying to influence state authorities who determine the indigenous status and its benefits. However, it can be argued that recognition is also a very important factor: being able to not only change current policies to the favor of the indigenous movement, but being recognized as a legitimate actor and overseer within the respective domains.

The dominating and controlling industry and state are able to plunder the region’s natural resources (Ross 2009, Alexander 2009) without ensuring ‘long-term sustainable benefits for [its] populations’ (Stammler & Wilson 2006, p. 6). This state of affairs is a consequence of the weakness of democratic institutions, which failed to develop because of a rather weak central political structure (Ross 2009). The distrust in governmental institutions and the oil company, despite their corporate social activities within the communities, signals that there is no control mechanism in place, as local activists have in fact claimed. For example, test results were not fully trusted when they came back negative after water samples were sent in to check for radiation. Activists claim that oil leaks are not properly checked and monitored by the responsible governmental agency. Looking at the relationships between the state and industry in this example, these observations, gathered in talking to local activists, suggest that the agency is working in favour of Lukoil-Komi and potentially against the movement. Confronting Lukoil for failing to meet global standards, such as certain components of the UN Global Compact, proves to be rather difficult. Although many promises are not fulfilled on the ground in the Komi Republic, it is not easy to prove this, as Lukoil’s global commitments are few and, moreover, too vague. One potential opportunity for the Komi-Izhemtsi lies in the commitment that Lukoil signed when engaging in contracts with EBRD for several loans earmarked for the development of a clean environment in the company’s zone of operation. It is thus far unclear whether the
movement can claim higher compensation or other sorts of restitution based on Lukoil’s loan commitments.

In the past Lukoil has failed to carry out many of the promises it made, and has had to pay fines.

The distrust of local activists towards governmental bodies and Lukoil is not one-sided. Local and regional administrations, as well as Lukoil, claim that the Save Pechora Committee is using dubious strategies to get its way, despite its peaceful nature. The Committee uses a strategy of causing hearings to fail on purpose in order to get attention and show that they are not satisfied with Lukoil-Komi’s actions and will not rest until a satisfactory result is obtained. This demonstrative act portrays the wish to act out symbolic power through exhibition. Whether the Committee will achieve anything using this strategy is questionable. The informants from Lukoil-Komi and from the local and regional administrations consider the Committee mostly an inconsistent and incompetent organization due to what they see as its lack of organization and rather rigid attitude. For example, they state that the demands of the Committee are excessive and that they cannot completely discontinue drilling for oil. Izviatas, on the other hand, has become more compromising than its partner Save Pechora Committee, choosing to rely on the social partnership agreements and the positive social impacts these promise for the communities. This implies a de-radicalization of the movement on the part of Izviatas, whereas the Save Pechora Committee continues to be more critical. Lukoil-Komi, in turn, continues with its CSR activities and honours its environmental commitments, albeit only in
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57 Greenpeace covered up some spills, which resulted in a fine of 614 million rubles for nine spills since 2011 in the Komi Republic (Bankwatch 2014: http://bankwatch.org/sites/default/files/briefing-Lukoil-SGC-22Dec2014.pdf)
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part. CSR has not been a favourable implementer (yet) to tackle the environmental problems. The question remains if Lukoil’s CSR strategies can be improved in a way that it would make an effort towards the environmental problems, rather than focusing on socio-economic agreements only.

Chapter 6. Conclusion

In this thesis, the analysis has shown that the NGO network involved in the oil GGN is focused primarily on resolving environmental issues. The activists involved in the network desire a clean environment - a value they find important in their lives. In this environmental movement in the Komi Republic, industrial development meets with opposition from local communities. Communities have taken action out of a desire to protect their lives and rights and have been supported by several organizations, including global actors contributing to environmental grassroots movements on the local level. The three sub-questions applied in this research will be answered in this conclusion, giving an answer to the main research question: In what relationship does the bottom-up NGO resistance network stand vis-a-vis the company Lukoil and the state?

Sub-question 1: What factors have enabled the resistance to sustain itself over the years when confronted with powerful players?

This question was necessary to understand the survival of the movement, under a regime that is constantly trying to eliminate movements in the Russian Federation. In line with Castells (2013) and the concept of a GGN (Tysiachniouk 2012), civil society networks in the Komi Republic act on local and global levels, but are rooted in the region’s problems; global actors on the local level influence capacity-building across a hierarchy of scales in the GGN, forming a counterpower to the power of a giant industry. The integration of the local
counterpower into the global one is achieved by networking with global actors. What is remarkable in this case study are the local and global networks of the GGN, with the counterpower being a local force trained against a powerful, global player. The local movement is trying to reach the global through networking, mostly with regional and international civil actors. The resistance does not remain local, but rather expands into a larger sphere, involving actors from the international scale and bypassing the national level.

Power in society comes from the public recognizing the environmental movement and organizing themselves in support of its objectives, thus driving change through an organized systematic movement. People are fighting for their land and are not satisfied with CSR-mandated promises only. Nevertheless, the movement remains small, as it cannot rise up as a large-scaled and powerful organization against the oil industry. As discussed in this thesis, there are constant and persistent pressures against such movements, hindering them from growing, as the political and economic direction of the country is different to that of its environmental activists. As we can see, the civil society network is outweighed by companies and the state in terms of power, despite the network’s successful resource mobilization strategy. While the network can survive, can organize and mobilize actors locally and globally and can demand greater CSR, little change has occurred in oil companies’ environmental practices as a result.

Sub-question 2: In which way is the movement framed on different levels within the GGN?

Questions related to the issue of framing the Komi-Izhemtsi in different cultural and social contexts are addressed here. As described in this thesis, a very pivotal option seen by many activists is the gaining of the status of indigenous peoples. Together with transnational organizations, the activists have tried to frame the problems of the Komi-Izhemtsi differently on an international level, in order to get support there, as the national state does
not recognize them, and as there are currently no possibilities for the Komi-Izhemtsi to gain more benefits from oil companies on a national level. Reasons for the denial of the status to the Komi-Izhemtsi stem from the facts that the Komi-Izhemtsi outnumber the limit of 50,000 people, because they do not only live in the Komi Republic, but are scattered around the country; furthermore, every administrative authority of each region the Komi-Izhemtsi live in would need to petition to the federal government on their behalf – so far only the governor of the Komi Republic has done it; and finally, the traditional lifestyle, which is a national criterion for the recognition of the indigenous, of the Komi-Izhemtsi is fading: few are still engaged in traditional reindeer herding. However, Komi-Izhemtsi self-identify as indigenous, speak a special Komi dialect, and see their culture as distinct – factors partially important for the national recognition, but more valued by the international institutions.

Due to the lack of recognition by the state, the movement has appealed to international NGOs and published a report on the racial discrimination by the state towards the Komi-Izhemtsi, via several UN committees. As a UN member state, Russia has to reply to the allegations, however, has not changed anything in its related policies.

**Sub-question 3: What are ways in which Lukoil and the state respond to the movement?**

The third sub-question discusses forms of corporate social responsibility enacted by Lukoil, including socio-economic agreements, as well as discrepancies between different levels of the corporation. The social movement seen in the Komi Republic can be interpreted as activism demanding better CSR by appealing to global standards. Whereas Lukoil headquarters has declared its commitment to global standards related to the environment, indigenous rights and the overall sustainability of oil production, the implementation of CSR by Lukoil-Komi is constrained by regional and local factors. These include expectations about the behaviour of the oil company on the part of state administrators involved in
shaping the local institutional environment for CSR and the expectations of stakeholders beyond the social movement. The local context is shaped by the low capacity of the state to deliver welfare and infrastructure and the lingering effects of the integration of political and economic decision-making in the Soviet period. Despite privatization in the 1990s, the arrival of transnational corporations, and profound changes in governance since the end of the Soviet regime, the local factors cited have resulted in a high degree of continuity with the past in relations between industry and local communities (Henry et al., 2016 forthcoming).

Lukoil-Komi has responded to stakeholder expectations with certain levels of CSR, such as community assistance, the sponsorship of social events, and commercial investments in the community. The funds available are spread among these different activities, leaving very little to address the environmental concerns relating to the company’s oil drilling activities; the problems connected to oil spills and the associated degradation of the environment go unsolved. Lukoil-Komi’s response to the movement is one of investing in strategies focusing on communication with the communities at stake, trying to diminish grievances. The company prioritizes this approach over possible investments in technological advances, an alternative that would put its profits at risk - as the communities affected are small and are rather easy to handle. For Lukoil, timely financial investments in community services is a strategy to keep the communities from protesting on a much higher level by giving them just as much as is necessary and no more.

It can be argued that the state is an instrument of domination along with the oil industry rather than an institution of representation, because it intervenes in the public sphere on behalf of specific interests that prevail in the state. Sustainability within environmental policy has been declared a goal, but has yet to be implemented.
Recommendations to Lukoil
Lukoil may not underestimate the movement, and should take into account global rules and regulations that could affect the company if the movement’s global appeals are successful. Furthermore, Lukoil ought to hold on to its promises to renew the 400km of pipelines, which would prevent more leaks from happening. In the case of leaks, Lukoil should compensate the people affected – with or without indigenous status. Moreover, Lukoil could in its CSR strategies include agreements with NGOs involved in the matter, such as Greenpeace. It would also be constructive if Lukoil improved the communication between the national and its regional offices; for example, establishing feedback loops and making more definite and concrete plannings of budget allocations.

Recommendations to local and regional municipalities
Local municipalities play a big role in the protests organized by the NGO network. The distribution of funds given to municipalities by Lukoil from socio-economic agreements should be made more transparent, terms of these agreements should be hold on to, and it would be favourable if the municipalities become more critical towards the handling of oil spills and local construction projects. In order for citizens to know its content, municipalities will have to make these agreements public. From there, a base can be established, seeking prior and informed consent, allowing for more democratic and fair decision-making processes when it comes to new extractive activities in the region.

Recommendations to the movement
In my personal opinion, the movement is likely to not grow much further, considering the current national political opportunity structure and economic environment in the GGN. Nevertheless, one essential point in the organization of the movement is its structure. I
think that it is important for the Save Pechora Committee to have an organized and coherent structure, if possible considering the political opportunity structure, and in order to establish an esteemed image of themselves; a reputation that makes companies and governmental entities see them with appreciation. Another issue is that the movement needs to stay flexible in order to achieve something. The Committee's demands are often seen as disproportionate, whereas Izviatas has already de-radicalized - engaged in a more flexible attitude, accepting and getting the best out of the social partnership agreements and the positive social impacts that arise out of those for the communities. The Committee needs to see for itself if it wants to keep this more critical attitude, or follow its partner Izviatas in adopting a more flexible approach. It could be possible that it is tolerable for the Save Pechora Committee to keep its critical attitude, as they are hiding in the shadow of its partner organizations Izviatas and Silver Taiga Foundation as an informal civic organization, thus could be more free in their actions as they do not have to fear a punishment by the state. In order to receive more attention to their issue from international institutions and media, the movement can try to include a broader range of institutions from within Russia – for example NGOs or universities, so it can make use of their networks, in order to expand to a broader, transnational, arena. The use of social media by the movement has not been analysed in this report, however it seems that expanding on this could be another option for the movement. A question that arises is if more visibility in general also means more protection, which then should be aimed for.

**Recommendations for further research**

A question for future research is the evolvement of the agreement between Izviatas and Lukoil-Komi. At this point in time, it cannot be foreseen how the laws will possibly change
and especially how the Foreign Agent law will evolve. Right now, the organization still manages to exist. Izviataz is taking money from Lukoil, is participating in the Arctic Council, and international reports coming from civil society recognize them.

A second issue connected to this is the future research into the exact structures of applicable laws, in order to find ways to achieve the greatest output of the effort of the movement. A comprehensive analysis of the formulation of laws, its interpretation and implementation by various enforcers can be recommended to uncover possible corrupt mechanisms in this process and to analyse more in-depth the way movements deal with these.

A third topic that I recommend to look into is a comparative analysis of the relationship between Lukoil and indigenous peoples in the Komi Republic, NAO, and Khanty-Mansi Autonomous Okrug. Looking at the involvement of global actors, at global standards, EBRD commitments, and the overall operations of Lukoil in these three regions would be interesting, as these differ in those three regions.

Finally, I recommend looking into a research approach that focuses on the relationships between social movements and the political outcomes. What effect does a social movement have on the political, economic and social realm, and how are policies changed as a result of a successful social movement? If a social movement fails, how are activists’ networks affected, and how does it effect the future of the movement or its’ remains?
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## Appendices

### Appendix 1. Tables

Table 1. List of interviews in 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 February - 4</td>
<td>Izhma</td>
<td>Activists</td>
<td>Activists in Save Pechora and Izviatas</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 March 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 February 2015</td>
<td>Syktyvkar</td>
<td>Rosprirodnadzor Komi Republic (Russia’s environmental protection agency)</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 February 2015</td>
<td>Krasnoborsk</td>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>Activist in Save Pechora and school teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 February 2015</td>
<td>Vertep</td>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>Activists in Save Pechora and school teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 February 2015</td>
<td>Scheljejur</td>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>Activist in Save Pechora</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 February 2015</td>
<td>Izhma</td>
<td>Local administration</td>
<td>Deputy Social Issues Izhma</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 February 2015</td>
<td>Izhma</td>
<td>Local administration</td>
<td>Heads of</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Department/Region</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Izhma</td>
<td>administration of the municipal district Izhma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 February 2015</td>
<td>Usinsk</td>
<td>Director of Legal Affairs</td>
<td>Lukoil-Komi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 February 2015</td>
<td>Usinsk</td>
<td>Representatives Public Relations/Public Affairs</td>
<td>Lukoil-Komi</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 February 2015</td>
<td>Usinsk</td>
<td>Museum guide of the Lukoil-Komi museum</td>
<td>Lukoil-Komi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 February 2015</td>
<td>Syktyvkar</td>
<td>Leader of Save Pechora</td>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 February 2015</td>
<td>Usinsk</td>
<td>Head of Territorial Development of Ecology and Nature</td>
<td>Regional Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 February 2015</td>
<td>Usinsk</td>
<td>Representative of Department of Regional Development and Nature Management</td>
<td>Regional Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 February 2015</td>
<td>Syktyvkar</td>
<td>Leader of Izviatas</td>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Role and Title</td>
<td>Quantity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2015</td>
<td>Pechora</td>
<td>Trinity-Pechora region Deputies Save Pechora Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2015</td>
<td>Kolva</td>
<td>Reindeer herding companies</td>
<td>Representatives</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 March 2015</td>
<td>Syktyvkar</td>
<td>Ministry of Natural Resources of the Republic of Komi</td>
<td>Minister and representative</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 March 2015</td>
<td>Siziabsk</td>
<td>Reindeer herding brigade</td>
<td>Director of the Reindeer herding brigade <em>Izhemtsi Olenevod</em> Vise-director of <em>Izhemtsi Olenevod</em></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 April 2015</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>European University St. Petersburg</td>
<td>Professor, Researcher on social movements</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 April 2015</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>State Duma</td>
<td>Members of State Duma Committee on Natural Resources, Environment and</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 April 2015</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>State Duma</td>
<td>Deputy chief of staff of the State Duma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Committee on Budget and Taxes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 April 2015</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>Lukoil</td>
<td>Representatives of the Department of Social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 April 2015</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>Lukoil</td>
<td>Head of Department of Corporate Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 April 2015</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>WWF Russia</td>
<td>Representative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-21</td>
<td>Syktyvkar</td>
<td>SPC, Izviatas</td>
<td>Activists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 February 2016</td>
<td>Skype</td>
<td>IWGIA, INFOE</td>
<td>Employee and activist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 February 2016</td>
<td>St. Petersburg</td>
<td>University of Lapland, European University, St. Petersburg</td>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Participant observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22 February 2015</td>
<td>Izhma</td>
<td>Activists</td>
<td>Activists in focus group discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 February 2015</td>
<td>Izhma</td>
<td>Activists</td>
<td>Activists’ discussion in hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 February 2015</td>
<td>Izhma</td>
<td>Activists</td>
<td>Round Table discussion with activists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2. Interviews

In the following, a sample of an interview is presented. It is an example of an interview done with an activist from the Save Pechora Committee. The interview was recorded, transcribed, translated into English, and coded.

In this thesis, I chose to not present an interview transcript of an interview conducted with Lukoil HQ, Lukoil-Komi, State Duma and local and regional municipalities, as those gave instructions to not publish any raw interview material.

For the interview, the original transcript in Russian is provided, as well as the English translation, including notes that I took during and/or right after an interview. The interview material presented is raw and unedited data.

Interview codes

The following codes were used to analyse the interviews:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lukoil in the Komi Republic</th>
<th>Actions of SP and Izvatas, strategies (amongst it failing hearings), or people telling about them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How Lukoil cleans (let people clean for a reward); deals with spills</td>
<td>Affiliates of SP or Izviatas, collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation, social partnerships, CSR</td>
<td>Political influences, governmental programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of situation past and today</td>
<td>Penalties, how government functions as a protectionist entities, laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem with Lukoil today</td>
<td>About Komi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local economy</td>
<td>Indigenous status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for spills</td>
<td>Story of the individual/ company/ organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Имя файла: 711_0059_Bratenko_Ishma_200215  
Время записи: 02:42:07  
(разговор о проекте, местоположение регионов 00:00-17:30)  

И: Когда вообще началось всё это, все эти истории по поводу... Когда вообще сюда пришёл «Лукойл»? Не в девяносто седьмом?  
Р: Нет. Я работал в Администрации, когда вообще сюда начали идти нефтяники, но это была частная фирма(нрзб название 17:58), или как, сейчас я уж не помню. Тогда мы могли противопоставить наши требования, и, когда работали сейсмики, то мы даже к ним так отнеслись, что они(нрзб 18:50) держались за двадцать километров. То есть, если мы говорили: «Пожалуйста, делайте, но чтобы все профили были чистыми, освобождёнными от леса, и чтобы весь этот лес был распилен на сортименты, и разложен, чтобы местное население могло его взять на дрова, на другие дела». И они всё выполняли под козырёк. Когда пришли нефтяники, то мы согласились только с тем, что они здесь поставят небольшой перерабатывающий пункт для бензина. И вот с такими условиями они вошли, и они, в общем то, всё что мы требовали, делали. Но, пришёл «Лукойл», он пришёл я ещё работал, я до седьмого года работал в администрации, где-то лет десять назад.  
И: Мне кажется в девяносто шестом, в девяносто седьмом.  
Р: Да. И тогда впервые в Республике мы, как «Лукойл» пришёл, договорились, что: «Давайте сперва договор соцпартнёрства». И они согласились на соцпартнёрство, сперва дали миллион три, по-моему, или два, или один, и потом с каждым годом это повышалось. И они требования соблюдали, и повышали вклады, и до десяти миллионов они увеличили. Это конечно мелочь, но всё равно, для бедной деревни кое-что. А вот, например, за счёт этого мы что сделали, мы организовали соревнования по чистоте в районе, и каждый месяц у нас каждый глава отчитывался: что сделано за месяц. И начали красить дома, и начали делать ограды, чистить кладбища, свалки делать и так далее. Каждый год, первое место кто занял, тот получал автобус или трактор, что ему там надо. Понимаете? И вот это уже настолько вросло, что у нас очень чисто и хорошо. И когда меня спросили сегодня, вот ваша Александра: «Покажите мне какую-нибудь грязную прегрязную большую мусорную яму или свалку?». Я говорю, что у нас такого нет, понимаете? Ну а вот потом, последнее время «Лукойл» абсолютно изменился. Ушли люди, которые понимали нас и работали с нами. Теперь пришли люди...  
И: А договор был заключён с Администрацией, да?  
Р: С Администрацией района, я там работал.  
И : И это в рублях, сначала один миллион рублей...  
Р: И до десяти довели. И за счёт этого мы в том числе, ведь сельское хозяйство, которое было в колхозах, оно было развалено за тем, что дотации перестали платить. И мы создали пятнадцать молокоприёмных пунктов за счёт этих денег. И то есть пятнадцать(нрзб 22:40), люди уже не имели колхоз, но имели свои хозяйства, они сдавали молоко и мы им дали возможность. А за счёт молока они получали дотации и деньги и так далее. И они начали жить и даже очень много начинали заводить коров, потому что было выгодно, больше то негде заработать. Но вот это всё со временем ушло, как, во-первых, мы ушли из Администрации, нас уволили, и во-вторых в «Лукойле» поменялись люди. Раньше это был серьёзный разговор деловых людей, а теперь это просто «Лукойл», который подмял под себя руководство республики, руководство района и диктует свои условия, и плевать им на всё остальное. И вот поэтому то и теперь возник конфликт. Потому что нас не слушают, делают что хотят, если аварии случаются, они скрывают. Если мы где-то, так, не услышим, что вот где-то там есть авария, не проверим, то всё чино, всё прекрасно. Особенно обострилась
ситуация когда, в прошлом году, мы обнаружили большой разлив нефти, который скрывали, который сожгли, и полтора суток дым шёл, огонь на пятнадцать километров был виден, вот тогда уже просто люди возмутись. И вот в районе Краснобора, они стали прямо рядом с домами ставить вышки. Ну, люди очень сильно возмутились, в двухстах метрах от домов вышка, а там же и водяные скважины и так далее. Вот тогда всё взвилось очень крепко, как раз эти совпали по времени, вот разлив разлив за рекой и постановка вышки без слушаний, без разрешений. Они до того уже обнаглели, что даже слушания перестали делать.

И: А какой это год был?
Р: Ну, прошлый год.
И: Разливы здесь были?
Р: Да, большой разлив был.
И: И новая вышка?
Р: Ну, новая вышка, вот где Краснобор.

И: Администрация купила коров и выделила районам?
Р: Нет, вы не поняли. Мы купили систему переработки молока. То сеть мы привезли туда, установили и они стали принимать молоко, пропускать через серию препаратов, ну, соответственно, технологии, и уже сдавать всё это.

И: Люди сами покупали коров?
Р: Люди сами покупали коров и сдавали молоко, но мы давали ещё кредиты беспроцентные за счёт этих десяти миллионов, чтобы, если человек хочет купить корову, козла чего угодно, мы под ответственность сельсовета, Администрации сельсовета, даём на год этот кредит, который он возвращает без процентов. И поэтому кто-то покупал сенокосилку, кто-то покупал дробилку, кто-то покупал корову, кто-то ещё чёго-то, то сеть им давалась, была такая возможность эти деньги, обратно возвращать и мы опять его туда вкладывали, понятно?

И: Понятно. Можете сказать, в чём причина разливов? Потому что очень старые...

Р: Совершенно верно. Срок службы трубы лет пятнадцать должен быть, а тут семь восемь лет и на тебе. И причём, это уже не первый раз, здесь уже случался разлив, и совершенно случайно не дошло до воды, там рельеф местности помог. Поэтому мы задавались этим вопросом, значит, соответствующая частная фирма, которая строила не качественно, возможно даже и с использованием старых труб. Я когда-то, уже, когда перестал работать в Администрации, а делать было нечего, энергии хватает, ко мне обратились мол: «Давайте, поработайте с нами у нефтяников». Вот как раз где Вертеп, в этом месте, ну, я согласился организовать как менеджер, организовал бригаду из местного населения, мы поехали туда, строить нефтепровод. И во-первых, трубы привозят разного диаметра, одни покрыты антикоррозийным, другие не покрытые, вентиля, которые должны работать привезли старые, их пришлось в керосине держать, чтобы они как то начали работать. То есть они, вот эта частная фирма, работала очень плохо. А нанимал «Лукойл», «Лукойл» нанимает себе, уменьшает расходы за счёт старых труб, за счёт всего угодно. И вот они его строят, и поэтому на том месте, где мы строили, уже были нефтеразливы. Я поработал там месяц два, потом начал везде жаловаться, и потом мне сказали: «Либо уходи, либо работай как мы прикажем и нечего вякать». Я оттуда ушёл, потому что мне моё имя дороже, нежели тогдашние шестьдесят тысяч, которые мне платили за месяц. Поэтому, не качественное строительство.

И: А когда вы стали активистом? Сразу после того, как ушли из Администрации?
Р: Я был активистом всегда. Значит, я вам скажу, я работал там, в окраине, в школе, и потом меня пригласили ещё в Райком партии, и когда партия закрылась, тогда я решил работать в охране природы и меня избрали председателем Районного Комитета по Охране Природы. И вот в охране природы я понял, что если работать так, как работают все комитеты, то ничего
не добьешься. Можно чего-то добиться, если организовать народ на это. И вот, двадцать пять лет назад, я и мои товарищи организовали «Комитет спасения Печоры». Хотя я был госслужащим, но я понимал, что чего-то добиться можно только благодаря сопротивлению народа. И вот, мы разослали письма и пригласили всех с населённых пунктов при Печоре от истоков до устья, и около сотни человек приехали на это…так сказать, «Комитет спасения Печоры» мы сделали в Щельяюре. И меня избрали первым его председателем, и вот эти двадцать пять лет я активист. Хотя я работал в Администрации главой, но тогда уже работала председателем Валентина Томасовна Семяшкина. Мы всегда работали вместе. Один из главных успехов «Комитета спасения Печоры», когда он стал везде известен, в момент демократизации общества были не плохие законы про референдум, и мы организовались на референдум, для этого надо было собрать, я не помню, пятнадцать тысяч подписей, или что-то там такое, по пяти вопросам. Тогда ещё не было границ у парка национального «Огый ва».
И: А где это?
Р: Это где Уральские горы. Вот у этого парка не было границ. Мы предложили обозначить границы, и чтобы это уже существовало как территория. Второй вопрос касался устья Печоры. Там стояла железная сетка по вылову сёмги для государственных чиновников, так, грубо говоря. И мы поставили вопрос, чтобы снять эту сетку. Затем тогда прорабатывался вопрос о строительстве в Иnte, там хотели построить атомную станцию, это была задумка у Спиридонова. И мы сказали: «Нет атомной станции в Инте!» Затем на Новой Земле проводили ядерные взрывы, и мы сказали: «Нет ядерным взрывам на Новой Земле!» И дальше мы сделали следующее, мы провели этот референдум в Ижемском районе, людей оповестили и избирательной комиссии сказали, что: «Платить не можем, вы будете работать бесплатно ради этих вопросов». И где-то, по-моему, в июле месяце шестьдесят процентов населения пришли на наш референдум.
И: А какой год?
Р: Я сейчас не помню.
И: Есть, наверное, документы, да?
Р: Конечно, можно найти. И девяносто пять процентов проголосовали за то, чтобы все вопросы были решены в пользу экологии. А я в это время был депутатом верховного совета республики. Ну, Госсовета республики, или как там…Работал в экологическом комитете депутатом, и поэтому мы обратились в правительство с этими вопросами и сказали: «Либо вы нам уступаете, либо мы будем проводить референдум по всей республике, и вы знаете, чем это кончится, на примере Ижмы». Дважды этот вопрос на правительстве, и правительство вынуждено было уступить нам, потому что тогда так закон грубо не нарушали, как сегодня. Ну и вот так мы работали, так что конфликт этот уже давно и у нас уже, я считаю что, в районе есть демократическое сообщество, которое возглавляют две общественные организации «Комитет спасения Печоры» и «Извватас». «Изва» - это Ижма на коми, а «тас» это ижемский человек, люди, живущие на Ижме, так скажем, население Ижмы, ну даже не столь население...
И: Это тоже экологическая организация?
Р: Это национальная организация, но занимается в том числе экологией. И самое интересное, и там и там, ну, практически одни и те же люди. Я, например, зам у председателя «Извватаса», и я куратор по ижемскому району «Комитета спасения Печоры». Человек пять и там и там фигурируют.
И: Как вы оповещаете людей, обычно письма, или теперь уже по поводу?
Р: В смысле? Оповещаем людей о чём?
И: Ну, допустим о разливах, или что надо проводить слушания?
Р: Люди сами оповещают нас, потому что уже нас знают. Вот, например, я ещё и зам редактора этой газеты. Вот, например, телефоны всегда здесь есть, и мы всегда пишем по экологии и вот по этим телефонам: мой телефон, редактора телефон, звонят. Знают также
телефон председателя «Изьватаса», председателя «Комитета по спасению Печоры». Если я всю жизнь работал здесь, то меня все знают уже в районе, восемь тысяч человек, и поэтому найдут, как связаться.

И: А кто(нрэб словосочет 52:15-52:16) для «Лукойла», это Роспотребнадзор, или…?

Р: Дело ведь в том, чтобы лишить лицензии, надо чтобы чиновники до этого дошли, а чиновники все за «Лукойл», и поэтому, теоретически это возможно, а практически бесполезно. Поэтому, мы идём по другому пути, мы знаем что Гайзер и Олег Перов, мы взяли ещё год назад, но они уже вот недавно снова вынуждены были встретиться, потому что подняли здесь собраниями, а потом, митингами в Щельюре в Усть-Усе и собраниями в других населённых пунктах. То есть, мы показываем, что мы не согласны. И мы привлекаем туда, чтобы было понятно, компания «Аль-Джазир», телевизионная всемирная компания, она приезжала всё это снимала. И мы это делаем для того, чтобы попробовать лишить лицензии, потому что лишают лицензии российские чиновники, они этого не сделают, а мы пробуем, чтобы им кредиты международный банк не давал, потому что все организации такие большие крупные пасутся за рубежом, забирают оттуда деньги под маленькие проценты. У нас у Сбербанка они никогда кредит не возьмут, только нам, дуракам, их дают. Вот такую мы ведём политику, поэтому и с «Гринписом» связывались, ездили в Санкт-Петербург, провели прессконференцию, там пятьдесят человек пришло, в течение часа, рот разинули, слушали. Вот в таком направлении мы работаем, чтобы поднять шум, чтобы было понятно: «Лукойл» это отвратительное существо, ненавидящее законы и не исполняющее законы. И вот таким способом хотим…но вот пока есть моменты, что «Лукойл» уже начинает задумываться, но пока на встречу нам не идёт. Мы ведь, в-первых, поставили им десять условий…

И: (перевод 54:36-56:18) Вы сами написали в мировой банк, или…?

Р: Мы пытались это сделать через «Гринпис», но пока результат не известен. У нас в московском «Гринписе» есть свой человек из «Комитета спасения Печоры», Владимир Чухров, и поэтому, мы много общаемся, и они нам много помогают. В этом наша большая надежда.

И: Вы давно сотрудничаете с «Гринписом»?

Р: Володя Чухров уехал из Печоры, из «Комитета спасения Печоры», наверное лет пятнадцать двадцать назад, ну не сразу это всё установилось, но потихонечку всё больше и больше, Семяшкина Валентина Томасовна, она его нашла в Печоре и вырастила, и отпустила в полёт, в Москву, и поэтому у нас не плохие связи. Очень много сделала для «Комитета спасения Печоры» Валентина Томасовна, удивительно много, она более десяти лет, если не пятнадцать лет, работала председателем. Меня удивляет, даже когда то в докладе про то, как общественность работает, её фамилию не упоминали, это вообще стыдно. Я обыкновенно концентрируюсь на районных вопросах, экологии, политике и так далее, а она масштабно по Республике.

И: Районный Совет или Верховный Совет Республики, они могут что-то поделать здесь, или это только Москва?

Р: Объясню. В районный совет стараются запустить и выбрать таких депутатов, которые являются голосовальной машиной, и назначать центром. Только один раз Районный Совет поддержал наши решения. Точно так же Верховный Совет Республики, или теперь Госсовет. Я помню, только один раз очень хорошо поддержал нас по границам Национального Парка. В него выбирают точно так же, сперва в кабинете Гайзера, а потом выносят на голосование и как всегда, проходят те кандидатуры. Поэтому это не есть мозговой центр, точно так же, голосовальная машина. Поэтому этот демократический принцип, он только поверхностно наблюдается, а на деле этого демократического принципа советов нет. Командуют чиновники. Ну, и Госдума абсолютно также куплена, засолена, и работает строго по указке(нрэб 01:01:08).

И: Если вы хотите, вы могли бы жаловаться о(нрэб 01:01:16) для добычи нефти в Суде или…вы
могли бы, или это не возможно?
Р: Я считаю, что только через большой шум, через общественность можно чего-то добиться. Я считаю, что суды давно все куплены и проданы, и поэтому там судиться себе дороже, толку не будет, лицензии никто не лишит ни какой суд. Ну, смотрите сами, как с Навальным работают суды и так далее. То есть, у нас аналогичная ситуация, у нас нет серьёзной демократии, чтобы надеяться на суды. У нас есть только реакция на шум. Большой шум - начинают отступать, шум утих - опять начинают наступать. «Лукойл» первое, что спрашивает, когда у нас предполагается митинг или какое-нибудь мероприятие: «А будет ли там «Аль-Джазир»?». То есть, вот чего они боятся, единственное что... А лицензии их не лишат, не суд Республики, не Суд России. Потому что Государство сидит на нефтяной игле и не может себе от этого отойти, сразу вымрет. Сейчас конкретно, мы добиваемся выполнения десяти пунктов, которые нам предложили жители усинских и ижемских районов, которые мы предложили «Лукойлу» в июне месяце четырнадцатого года. После этого у нас были два круглых стола в Администрации Усинска, встреча с главой Республики Гайзером вместе с генеральным директором «Коми-Лукойл», три совещания в Ижме с заместителем директора «Коми-Лукойла» по общественным связям. Так как это всё ничего не дало, превращено было в болтовню и даже не рассмотрены были требования, я по предложению одного из репортёров «Эхо Москвы» в Санкт-Петербурге предложил заваливать все слушания по новым месторождениям, по новым промыслам, по новым скважинам и по всем, которые проходят. Голосуя, считать слушания не состоявшимися из-за невыполнения наших требований.
И: (перевод 01:05:37-01:05:52) А почему такая стратегия?
Р: Стратегия заключается в следующем, что других вариантов остановки, чтобы они к нам прислушались, нет. Потому что слушания, если люди пришли, то считаются уже состоявшимися, и если не принять такого решения официального, за которое проголосуют что, считать слушания не состоявшимися, то тогда им путь открыт. Они считают слушания состоявшимися и дальше прут, хотя ты скажи, что это всё равно плохо, хоть тут вот это надо убрать, вот тут где-то так не правильно по проекту, вот это не правильно. Они всё равно считают слушания состоявшимися и прут.
И: (перевод 01:06:36-01:07:55)

Р: Вот пример, как нам помог «Гринпис», они организовали встречу в Санкт-Петербурге с представителями прессы, и вот тогда подошёл этот человек с «Эха Москвы» и говорит: «Вот, мы в Санкт-Петербурге завалили скоростную железную дорогу таким способом». И объяснил, что Путин сказал построить экспресс-дорогу для этих быстрых поездов в Финляндию, и эта линия обрезала много населённых пунктов возле залива, потому что переезд через железную дорогу очень сильно шлагбаумами преграждался, и они вынуждены часами стоять. И вот они трижды заваливали так слушания, и вынуждена была железная дорога прекратить даже проектировать, потому что они требовали: «Либо вы делаете переходы, либо мы считаем слушания несостоявшимися». Власти поддержали и в итоге, эта скоростная железная дорога так и не была построена. И вот он нам это рассказал, мы приняли это на вооружение, и три слушания завалили. После этого следующие три слушания они уже сами сняли, понимая, что бесполезно с нами разговаривать. И вот сейчас вот такая ситуация непонятная. Они дальше не наступают, ждут, думают, как нас обмануть, мы пока держим оборону.
И: (перевод 01:09:38-01:11:20) У вас были проблемы (нрэб фраза 01:11:20-01:11:27)?
Р: Дело в том, что мы ухитрились не регистрироваться, поэтому нам не могут объявить агентами, мы не зарегистрированы (нрэб 01:11:35), у нас нет счёта, у нас нет денег, кроме как, если сами собирать.
Р: Это в девяностых годах, может быть, или когда? Или новые разливы? Сейчас? Когда? Это
же было много…всегда разливов много.
И: В прошлом году.
Р: Нет, не слышал. Я интересуюсь районом. Мир не перевернуть, в районе ещё можно что-то сделать.
И: И «Лукойл» никогда не платили штрафы за разливы?
Р: Здесь...Смешные цифры может быть и платили, а серьёзные нет.
И: То есть, в принципе, никто в суды не обращается?
Р: Я не помню такого случая. Я считаю это дурной, утомительной работой, потому что, я повторяю уже, что суды работают не на общество, а на власть.
И: А с кем-нибудь вы ещё сотрудничаете помимо «Гринписа»? Есть ещё какие-нибудь сторонние организации, которые сотрудничают?
Р: Вы знаете, если нам что-то надо, чтобы дошло до Республики, мы выходим на сайт «7*7», этот сайт часто нас публикует, и поэтому, кто хочет знать в Республике, тот знает про нас. Раньше мы сотрудничали с «Красным Знаменем», но «Красное Знамя» закрыли.
И: А что это была за организация?
Р: Это республиканская газета, которая работала почти всё советское время и была закрыта, буквально, в прошлом году. Так что, это со средствами массовой информации...
И: (перевод 01:14:52-01:15:30). А как правильно называется телевизионная компания?
Р: «Аль-Джазир», создана, по-моему, в арабских странах, где есть нефть, за счёт их держится, в Москве у них есть свой (нрзб 01:15:55), и вот из Москвы к нам приезжали двое.
И: А когда-нибудь «Лукойл» убирал за собой места разлива?
Р: Да, вот здесь вот когда разлили первый раз, это было года два, три назад, то сразу вышли, убрали. А в прошлом году они не убрали, а сожгли. Здесь вот был большой шум. А почти после этого, сразу, был в(нрзб 01:16:46) район разлив, но это не наш район, поэтому воздействия то у нас нет, но там просто засыпали тракторами, закрыли землёй. А по всей тундре полно разливов, ещё двадцать лет назад и тридцать, и новые и так далее. Но там нет контроля, поэтому...Вот недавно ещё «Гринпис» приезжал патрулем в Усинск, и зелёный патруль был в августе прошлого года, и они нашли много и старых и новых разливов, всё это оформили, соответственно, и направили в республиканский Росприроднадзор. Росприроднадзор не признал их за разливы. Я же говорю там это всё...
Джазир».

И: (перевод 01:19:56-01:21:37) Вы знаете в Ижме или в Усинске других людей, которых мы могли бы интервьюировать?
Р: Конечно, конечно я много людей знаю, которые могут давать интервью. В Усинске мой брат, Братенков Валерий Терентьевич, но он сейчас на вахте, правда.
И: А когда он приедет?
Р: Он приедет к первому числу. В Усть-Усе Новикбож, деревня есть, село. В Усть-Усе Дьячкова Екатерина Валерьевна. В Колве - Донцевич.
И: В Усть-Усе, там стоят вышки рядом?
И: А у вас есть взаимодействие? Совсем не далеко, в принципе, этот район. Вы сотрудничаете, объединяетесь районами?
Р: Вот, как «Комитет спасения Печоры», со всех районов приезжают на заседания, которые мы проводим раз в квартал теперь.
И: А вы проводите в Щельяюре или в Ижме?
Р: А когда как. Мы в Печоре проводим иногда, иногда в Ухте, где какая проблема возникает, бывает и в Ижме. Бывает в разных местах.
И: Когда у вас следующее собрание?
Р: А вот уехал у нас председатель до конца марта, поэтому пока не будет, хотя было запланировано. Так что где-то будет в апреле. Предыдущее было в декабре, в Ухте по(название 01:24:30), там серьёзная проблема, но(название 01:24:35) у нас самый спокойный район, живут там население русское, оно приехало сюда в девятнадцатом веке, но оно особенное, оно не такое как наше. Поэтому, есть там активисты, но такого активного действия как, допустим, здесь, или теперь, после того как мы съездили сюда, здесь, активные у нас в районе активисты очень серьёзные работают, то здесь немного застой.
И: А это какой район?
Р: Усинский.
И: Вы сами Коми?
Р: Мы Коми.
И: Наверное, мы могли бы посмотреть какие-то разливы, или это не возможно?
Р: Дело в том, что сегодня мы не знаем, где-то есть сейчас разливы или нет. Если узнаем, то другое дело. Может быть пока и нет, потому что, ну, крепкий шум поднялся бы наверное. Увеличили работу над безопасностью.
И: А с компаниями у вас нет связи, вы не пробовали с ними как-то договариваться?
Р: Я вам только что долго рассказывал, как мы с ними договаривались, договаривались, но так и не договорились.
И: Они не приезжают на ваши собрания?
Р: Нет, они стали уже приезжать на наши собрания, но, понимаете, собрание говорит одно, они пишут другое, они врут что всё в порядке, что жители успокоились. Тогда как жители приняли решение....Вот вам самый последний пример, как они врут(читает): «Жители Усинского района и компания «Лукойл» по-разному оценили общественные слушания по строительству нового проекта». То есть жители из семидесяти сорок человек проголосовали, считаются не состоявшимися слушания, а вместо этого компания «Лукойл» и администрация пишут, что слушания состоялись. То есть они в наглую врут и говорят: «Нет......
И: А документы у вас можно посмотреть, протоколы заседаний?
Р: Протоколы заседаний мы не запросили, но нам не прислали.
И: А кто ведёт у вас протоколы?
Р: Протоколы ведёт у нас председатель и секретарь. Председателем избрали главу поселения, который получил от нефтяников квартиру в Усинске, и поэтому, там что хотят, то и пишут. «Комитет спасения Печоры» попросил прислать документы. Что же там написано,
состоялись или не состоялись? Нам до сих пор не прислали, но вот свидетель, Дьячкова, мой брат, Братенков, они говорят: «Мы шумели, мы голосовали, сорок из семидесяти это больше половины», принято считать не состоявшимися, а тут на тебе, написали, что состоялись. Вот такие у нас контакты. То есть раньше если можно было найти компромисс со старыми работниками «Лукойла», то сегодня набрали туда полностью молодых, для которых золотое тельце нефти значит всё и больше ничего. И плевали они на местное население, они их не считают за людей.

И: А можно будет посмотреть этот договор социопартнёрства?
Р: Это надо в Администрацию идти.
И: Наверное, можно из архивов там запросить?
Р: Я думаю, что если вы попросите, должны дать. А не дадут, так у меня, наверное, может где-то и есть первый из договоров, которые были заключены. Надо посмотреть.
И: А сейчас действует какой-нибудь Социальный договор?
Р: На этот год я не знаю, заключён или нет, но на прошлый год был заключён на десять миллионов. Но вот, одно из десяти требований: «Увеличить до сорока миллионов», потому что это сегодня не деньги, что сорок миллионов вот наше предложение, причём это просто рассчитан один процент дохода.

И: А как распределяются эти деньги?
Р: Раньше мы распределяли следующим образом, собирали на сессию, наши предложения, и сессию утверждали. Теперь это делается тайно в кабинете. Не известно, куда идут деньги.
И: (разговор по теме 01:29:14-01:29:51) А помимо договора, который заключён, оказывают какую-нибудь спонсорскую поддержку с «Лукойл», или проводят какие-нибудь?
Р: Вот и есть спонсорская поддержка, десять миллионов.
И: Только вот этот договор, всё, больше ничего нет?
Р: Если где-то там сильно попросят чего-то там помочь, окна поменять, там, где-то что-то, может быть да, но велкой помощи больше нет. Они считают себя правыми, они говорят: «Мы налоги все платим, мы вам ничего не должны».

И: (разговор по теме 01:30:43-01:31:06) Интересно посмотреть, конечно, документы очень.
Р: Какие конкретно?
И: Ну, вот этот договор.
Р: Ещё что?
И: Протоколы, если они придут, конечно, к вам.
Р: Ну, вряд ли придут. А протоколы вот... Есть, допустим... на митинге что принимается? У митингов решение есть.
И: Да, вот это тоже можно просмотреть.
Р: Ну хорошо, я посмотрю что-нибудь.
И: А вот этот ещё референдум?
Р: Ой, это было знаете в каком году?
И: Да я знаю, но вот хотя бы даты найти, или что-нибудь, чтобы оттолкнутся. Это в принципе, как, начало было положено.
Р: Да, это огромный был такой всплеск и удивительно.... И: Поэтому и интересно было бы принятие решения референдума, либо итоги. Я понимаю, конечно, что это очень давнишний документ (разговор по теме 01:32:20-01:35:01)
Р: Вас Усть-Цильма с какой точки зрения интересует?
И: Во-первых то, что здесь был разлив тоже, и второе, да, это интересно исторически.
Р: Может быть исторически да, а с точки зрения экологии там слишком всё спокойно. Они считают, что пусть добывают нефть. Они не достаточно понимают, что всё, что идет оттуда сюда. И рыба если пахнет керосином, то для здоровья это очень плохо. Больных раком у нас уже очень много.
И: А почему, кстати, вода у вас так пахнет?
Р: Чем?
И: Я не знаю, либо это здесь пахнет, либо это вообще по Коми пахнет.
P: Нет, нет нет... Во-первых, железные трубы по которым идёт вода, наверное, лет тридцать уже, поэтому ждать чистой воды не приходиться.
И: С скважины, или как?
P: Да с скважины. Мы сами пьём, вообще, другую воду. Есть местечко, из колодца, родник, и мы оттуда пьём. Кто имеет машины, все пьют оттуда. Кому не лень, ходят с тачками туда. Кому лень, пьют эту воду. Вам хоть и не лень, но вы не знаете где брать.
И: (разговор о воде, разговор по телефону 01:36:26-01:38:17) И здесь живут русские или Коми?
P: Да, староверы.
И: Обычно Коми более активные, чем русские люди здесь?
P: Не знаю. Но Ижма у нас бурлит, а не скажу, что все Коми бурлят, есть и спокойные Коми.
И: А здесь есть какие-нибудь вышки?
P: Ухта, это нефтедобывающий район, оттуда началась вся нефтяная история Республики.
И: То есть, сначала пришли отсюда и потом пошли дальше на север?
P: Да.
И: Как имя того человека, который работает в Москве, в «Гринписе»?
P: Чупров Владимир. Он руководит каким-то отделом.
Talking about the project, location of regions 00: 00-17: 30

I: When did all of this start, all these stories about ... When did "Lukoil" come here? Not in the nineteen-seventies?

R: No. I worked in the administration, when all oil companies began to go here, but it was a private company (name inaudible 17:58), or both, now I do not remember. Then we could oppose our demands, and when seismic work started, we even reacted to them so that they (inaudible 18:50) were kept for twenty kilometers. That is, if we say, "Please do, but that all were clean profile, liberated from the forest, and that the whole forest was cut into assortments, and opened to local people could take the wood, and other things." And they all performed under a visor (=some sort of helmet). When they came to oil, we only agreed to the fact that they are here to put a small processing unit for gasoline. And with such conditions as they entered and they in general, then, everything that we needed to do. But, come "Lukoil", he came I was still working, I'm up to the seventh, he worked in the administration, somewhere about ten years ago.

I: I think in ninety-six, ninety-seven.

R: Yes. And then for the first time in the Republic, we, as "Lukoil" came, agreed that: "Let's first contract sotspartnerstva." And they agreed to sotspartnerstvo, first gave three million, I think, or two, or one, and then every year it increases. And they complied with the requirements, and increased deposits, and up to ten million they have increased. This is of course a trifle, but still, for a poor village something. Here, for example, due to this we have done, we have organized competitions for cleanliness in the area, and every month we reported to each chapter: what has been done in the past month. And they began to paint at home and started to do the fence, clean cemeteries, landfills do and so on. Each year, who took first place, he was getting a bus or a tractor that he must be there. Do you understand? And now it is so ingrained that we have a very clean and well. And when I was asked today, here is your Alexander: "Show me some filthy pregryaznuyu large garbage pit or dump?" I say that we have no such, you know? Well, but then, last time "Lukoil" completely changed. Gone are the people who understand us and worked with us. Now it's people ...

I: A contract was signed with the Administration, wasn't it?

R: With the district administration, I worked there.

I: And that in rubles, first one million rubles ...

R: And brought to ten. And due to this we are including, for agriculture, which has been in the collective farms, it has been falling apart for the fact that the subsidies stopped paying. And we have created molokopriyemnyh fifteen points at the expense of the money. And then there are fifteen (inaudible 22:40), people no longer having a farm, but having their farms, they gave milk and we gave them the opportunity. And due to the milk they receive grants and money and so on. And...
they began to live and even a lot of cows began to start, because it was profitable, then there is no place more money. But now it’s all gone with time, as, firstly, we have moved from the Administration, we were taken away, and the second in the "LUKOIL" changed people. Previously, it was a serious conversation business people, and now it's just a "Lukoil", which bend under the leadership of the republic, the district administration and dictates the conditions, and spit it off everything else. And that's why even now there is a conflict. Because we do not listen, do what they want, when accidents happen, they hide. If we are somewhere, so do not hear that here somewhere there is an accident, not checked, then all decorum, everything is fine. Especially when the situation worsened in the last year, we discovered a large oil spill, which hides that burned and the smoke went half days, the fire fifteen kilometers was visible, that’s when people have simply rebelled. And in the area of Krasnobor, they began right next to the houses to put the tower. Well, people are very indignant, two hundred meters from the tower houses, and in the same place, and water wells, and so on. That’s when everything was raised very hard, just these coincided, that spill (inaudible 24:32), that’s spilling over the river and staging the tower without a hearing, without permits. They already before insolent that even hearing stopped making.
I: And what year was it?
R: Well, last year.
I: Spills were here?
R: Yes, a big flood was.
I: And the new rig?
R: Well, the new tower, that's where Krasnobor. (Telephone conversation, translation 25: 13-29: 03)
I: Administration bought cows and identified areas?
R: No, you do not understand. We bought milk processing system. That network, we brought there, and they have established to take the milk to pass through a series of drugs, well, respectively, technology, and has to take it all.
I: And people will buy cows?
R: People will buy milk cows and passed, but we have given more credit-free due to the ten million, so that if a person wants to buy a cow, a goat anything, we are under the responsibility of the village council, the Administration of the village council, give the credit for the year, which he returns without interest. And that is why someone buys mower, someone bought a grinder, someone buys a cow, someone else something, then the network they were given, there was a possibility (inaudible 30:05) the money back and we return again put it in there, okay?
I: I see. (Translation 30: 10-30: 57) Can you tell us the reason for spills? Because it is very old ...
R: That's right. The service life of the tube should be about fifteen years, and now seven and eight years on you. And moreover, this is not the first time here already happened spill, and quite by accident did not reach the water, where the terrain helped. Therefore, we asked this question, then, accordingly, a private firm which built not qualitatively, perhaps even using the old pipes. I once already, when I stopped working in the Administration, and there was nothing, enough energy, I was approached by a pier, “Let us, work with us in oil.” That's just where the Nativity scene, in this place, well, I agreed to organize as a manager, organized a team of local people, we went there to build the pipeline. And firstly bring different diameter pipes, one coated with anti-corrosion and other uncoated, ventel that must operate brought old, they had to keep in kerosene, so that they are started to operate. That is, they, here, this private company, worked very bad. A hired "Lukoil", "Lukoil" hires itself, reduces costs due to old pipes, due to just anything. And here they are building it, so at the point where we have built, have been oil spills. I worked there for two months, then
started to complain about everywhere, and then I said, "Either leave or work as we will order and nothing blather." I went there because I my name is more expensive than the then sixty thousand, which I paid for a month. Therefore, high-quality construction.

I: (translation 33: 05-35 has been: 28) And when you become an activist? Immediately after left the Administration?

R: I was always an activist. So, I tell you, I worked there in the outskirts, in a school, and then I was invited back in the district party committee, and when the party was closed, so I decided to work in the protection of nature and I was elected chairman of the District Committee for Nature Protection. And in the protection of nature, I realized that if you work as work all the committees, it will get you nowhere. You can achieve anything if people organize it. And now, twenty-five years ago, my colleagues and I organized a "Committee to Save Pechora." Although I was a civil servant, but I knew that something can only be achieved by the resistance of the people. So, we sent letters and invited all with settlements at Pechora from the source to the mouth, and about a hundred people came to this ... so to speak, "Committee to Save Pechora" we did Schelyayure. And I was elected its first chairman, and these twenty-five years I have been an activist. While I was working in the administration of the head, but was already working chairman Valentine Tomasovna Semyashkina. We have always worked together. One of the major successes of "Committee to Save Pechora" when he became known everywhere, at the time of the democratization of society were not bad laws about the referendum, and we organized a referendum, this should be collected, I do not remember fifteen thousand signatures or something there is, on five issues. Did not yet exist at the boundaries of the national park "Yugyd Va."

I: And where is it?

R: This is where the Ural Mountains. Here at this park there were no borders. We have proposed to designate the border, and that it already existed as a territory. The second question concerned the mouth of the Pechora River. There was an iron mesh catch salmon for government officials, so roughly. And we put the question to remove the grid. Then, when examining the construction of Inta, they wanted to build a nuclear power plant, it was the idea at Spiridonov. And we said, "No nuclear power station in Inta!" Then on Novaya Zemlya nuclear explosions were carried out, and we said, "No nuclear explosions in the New Earth!" And then we did the following, we conducted the referendum in Izhma area and alerted people Election Commission said that "we can not pay, you will be free to work for these issues." And somewhere, in my opinion, in July, sixty percent of the population came to our referendum.

I: And what year?

R: I do not remember now.

I: Yes, probably, documents, huh?

R: Of course, you can find. And ninety-five percent voted that all issues have been resolved in favor of the environment. And at that time I was a member of the Supreme Council of the Republic. Well, the State Council of the Republic, or whatever ... He worked in the environmental committee deputy, and so we asked the government to these issues and said: Either you give in to us, or we will hold a referendum throughout the country, and you know how it will end, for example Izhmy."

Twice this question (inaudible 44:10) on the government, and the government was forced to concede to us, because then the law so rudely violated, as it is today. Well, that's the way we worked, so that the conflict is a long time and we have, I believe that, in the vicinity of a democratic community, which is headed by two public organization "Committee to Save Pechora" and "Izvatas." "Izva" - is Izhma Komi and "TAS" is Izhma people, people living on Izhme, so to speak, the
population Izhmy, well, not even as the population...
I: This is also an environmental organization?
R: This is a national organization, but engaged, including the environment. And the most interesting, and here and there, well, almost the same people. For example, I have the deputy chairman of the "Izvatas", and I curated by Izhma district "Committee to Save Pechora." Five people there and there appear.
I: How do you feature to email people, usually letters, or now on the (inaudible 47:17)?
R: In what sense? Notifies people talking about?
I: Well, let spills, or that it is necessary to hold a hearing?
R: People will notify us, because we already know. For example, I am also a deputy editor of the newspaper. For example, phones are always there and we always write on ecology and here on these phones: My Phone, Editor phone call. Know phones chairman "Izvatas" chairman "Committee to Save Pechora." If I worked all my life here, I know everything already in the region, eighteen thousand men, so find out how to contact. (Talking on the phone 48:02-52:14)
I: And who (inaudible slovosochet 52:15-52:16) "Lukoil", this CPS, or ...?
R: After all, it is to deny a license, it is necessary that the officials come to this, and all the officials of the "Lukoil", and therefore, it is theoretically possible, but practically useless. Therefore, we go the other way, we know that Gaiser and Oleg Perov, we met here a year ago, but they've just recently again had to meet, because meetings are raised, and then rallies in Schelyure Ust-Usa and Meetings in other localities. That is, we show that we do not agree. And we draw back, to make it clear the company "Al Jazeera" TV global company, she came all this filming. And we do it in order to try to deprive not a license because the license deprive Russian officials, they do not, and we are trying to international bank loans they did not give, because all organizations are more large grazing abroad, take out money at low interest rates. We Sberbank they never take credit not only to us, fools, they are given. Here we conduct a policy, and therefore with "Greenpeace" contacted, went to St. Petersburg, held a press conference, where fifteen people came within an hour, mouth slack, listened. Here in this direction, we are working to make noise so that it is clear: "Lukoil" is a disgusting creature who hate laws and not to execute the laws. And in this way we want ... but yet there are moments that "Lukoil" is already starting to think about, but until the meeting we are not talking. We're in the first place, put them ten conditions ...
I: (translation 54:36-56:18) You have written in the World Bank, or ...
R: We tried to do it through "Greenpeace", but as long as the result is not known. Here in Moscow "Greenpeace" has a man from the "Committee to Save Pechora" Vladimir Chukhrov, and therefore, we talk a lot, and they help us a lot. This is our greatest hope.
I: How long have you been cooperating with "Greenpeace"?
R: Volodya Chukhrov left Pechora, from the "Committee to Save Pechora", probably about fifteen years ago, twenty, well, it's all at once established, but little by little, more and more, Semyashkina Valentine Tomasovna, she found him in the Pechora and raised and released in flight to Moscow, and so we have no bad connection. Has done a lot for the "Committee to Save Pechora" Valentina Tomasovna surprisingly much, it more than a decade, if not fifteen years, working chairman. It surprises me, even when the report about how public works, her name is not mentioned at all ashamed. I usually concentrate on regional issues, ecology, politics, and so on, and it is a large scale for the Republic.
I: And the District Council or the Supreme Council of the Republic, they can do something here or is it just Moscow?
R: Let me explain. In the district council are trying to run and select those MPs who are golosovalnoy machine, not a think tank. Only once the District Council supported our decision. Similarly, the Supreme Council of the Republic, or now the State Council. I remember only one time very well supported us along the boundaries of the National Park. It is selected in the same way, first in the office Gayzer, and then put to the vote and, as always, are those candidates. Therefore, it is not a think tank, just golosovalnaya machine. Therefore, this democratic principle, it only superficially observed, but in fact this democratic principles of the Council no. Team officials said. Well, the State Duma is absolutely also bought, salted, and works strictly on the instructions of (inaudible 1:01:08).

I: If you want, you could complain about (inaudible 1:01:16) for oil in the Court or ... you could, or it is not possible?

R: I believe that only through a lot of noise through the public can achieve something. I believe that the courts had long been bought and sold, and so there is a more expensive to litigate, nothing will: no license nor deprive any court. Well, see for yourself how the courts work with Navalny and so on. That is, we have a similar situation, we have a serious democracy, to rely on the courts. We only have a reaction to the noise. A lot of noise - begin to recede, the noise died down - again begin to attack. "Lukoil" the first thing asked when we expected to rally or some event: "And will there be "Al Jazeera"?". That is, this is what they are afraid, the only thing that ... A license shall not be deprived, not a court of the Republic, not the Court of Russia. Because the state is sitting on the oil needle and can not afford to move away from it, will die immediately. Who specifically, we achieve implementation of the ten points that we offer residents and Usinskaya Izhma areas that we proposed “LUKOIL” in June 2014. After that we had two round tables in the Administration Usinsk, meeting with the head of Gayzer together with the CEO of "Lukoil-Komi" Izhme three meetings with the Deputy Director "Komi-Lukoil" public relations. Since all this has given nothing, turned boltologiyu was not even considered the requirements were, I at the suggestion of one of the reporters, "Echo of Moscow" in St. Petersburg offered to fill up all the hearings on the new fields for new fisheries for new wells and all that pass. By voting, consider a hearing was not held because of the failure of our requirements.

I: (translation 01: 05: 17 - 01: 05: 52) And why such a strategy?

R: The strategy is this, what other options stop, that they listened to us, no. Because hearing if people come, they are considered to have taken place, and if you do not take this decision official, who will vote for that, take the hearing did not take place, then the way is open to them. They believe the hearing took place, and on the rod, even though you say it is still bad, though here it is necessary to remove here, here somewhere so wrong on the project, this is not correct. They still believe hearings were held and the rod.

I: (translation 01: 06: 36-01: 07: 55)

R: That's an example of how we helped "Greenpeace", they organized a meeting in St. Petersburg with the press, and that's when the man went to the "Echo of Moscow" and says, "Here, we are in St. Petersburg flooded high-speed railway in such method." He explained that Putin is said to build a rapid way for these fast trains in Finland, and this line has cut a lot of settlements near the bay, because crossing over the railway greatly barriers blocking, and they are forced to stand for hours. And they filled up three times since the hearing and had the railroad stop even design because they require: "Either you make the transition, or invalid, we believe the hearing." Authorities supported and eventually, the high-speed railway was never built. And he told us this, we took it into service, and three had stopped listening. After this, the following three hearings they have removed themselves, knowing that it was useless to talk to us. And now behold, this situation is unclear.
They do not come on, wait, think about how to deceive us, we still keep the defense.


R: The fact that we managed not to register, so we cannot declare agents, we are not logged in *(inaudible 1:11:35)*, we do not have an account, we have no money, except if they themselves collect.

I: We read on the internet that "Lukoil", probably, there were spills and ... they had to pay the penalty for these spills. How did this happen? *(Translation 01: 12: 08-01: 12: 28)* What, when the case was heard, "Greenpeace" won the case in "Lukoil", do you know anything about this? When there were floods.

R: It's in the nineties, perhaps, or when? New or spills? At The Moment? When? It's always been a lot ... a lot of spills.

I: In the past year.

R: No, I have not. I am interested in the area. The world does not turn over, in the area you can still do something.

I: And "Lukoil" never paid fines for spills?

R: Here ... Funny figures can be paid, and not serious.

I: That is, in principle, no one does not go to the courts?

R: I do not remember such a case. I think this is bad, tedious job, because, I repeat already that the courts do not work on society and the authorities.

I: And with someone you still cooperate in addition to "Greenpeace"? There are still some third-party organizations that work?

R: You know, if we need something that came to the Republic, we go to the website "7 * 7", this site often we publish, so who wants to know in the Republic, he knows about us. Previously, we worked with the "Red Banner", but "Red Banner" was closed.

I: And what was the organization?

R: This is the republican newspaper that ran almost all the Soviet era and was closed just last year.

So, it is with the media ...

I: *(transfer 01: 14: 52-01: 15: 30)*. And what is properly called the TV company?

R: "Al Jazeera", was created, in my opinion, in the Arab countries, where there is oil, due to their holding in Moscow they have their own *(inaudible 1:15:55)*, and here from Moscow came to us two.

I: And someday "Lukoil" clean up after a spill site?

R: Yes, here's when poured the first time, it was about two years, three years ago, I immediately went out, was removed. And last year, they are not removed and burned. There was a lot of noise here. And then almost immediately, was *(inaudible 1:16:46)* area of the spill, but it's not our district, so the impact that we have, but there's just filled with tractors, closed ground. A fully across the tundra spills another twenty and thirty years ago, and the new and so forth. But there is no control, so ... That's more recent "Greenpeace" patrol came to Usinsk, and green patrol was in August last year, and they found a lot of old and new and spills it all drawn up, respectively, and sent to the Republican RPN. Rosprirodnadzor did not recognize them for spills. I'm telling you there is everything ....

I: *(translation 01: 17: 47-01: 18: 08)*

R: The site "7 * 7" All of this information is.

I: And what was with houses that are here? They put the tower?

R: No, they stopped. Not yet built.

I: And how did it happen? They brought the project documentation?

R: Not at all, they do not even held a hearing. They just began to carry sand to the base of the drill,
people noticed an initiative group, I, including, went there, and we have raised the level of noise that one meeting made it a hundred and fifty ...
I: It was last year, right?
R: Yes, Krasnobo. The second meeting made a hundred and fifty people came to the first meeting of oil did not show up, the second came and did not recognize, said that: "We do not do anything, we just spend preparatory work." Sorry, the preparatory work must be carried out on the design and estimate documentation, which should be discussed at the hearing. Therefore, when the third time we said: "The last time we're going if you do not decide the question, we will further constitutional way to go." The third time they brought two affiliated deputies from the State Duma, and they began vengeance defend themselves once worked in "Komi-LUKOIL". And they began to defend the oil, specially brought in by helicopter Schelyayur two deputies who, well, frankly, quite simply their obsmyeat, people. And yet, and when nothing happened, we have already entered the rally, which was more than a hundred people, and where there was "Al-Jazeera."
I: (translation 01: 19: 56 - 01: 21: 37) You know Izhme or Usinsk other people we could interview?
R: Yes, of course I know a lot of people who can be interviewed. In Usinsk my brother, Valery Bratenkov Terentevich, but he is now on watch, though.
I: And when he comes?
R: He will come to the first number. In Ust-Usa Novikbozh, the village has a village, district. In Ust-Usa Dyachkova Ekaterina V.. In Colva - Dontsevich.
I: In Ust-Usa, there are a number of towers?
I: And you have interaction? It is not far away, in principle, to the area. You cooperate, combines areas?
R: That's how "Committee to Save Pechora" from all areas come to the meetings that we hold once a quarter now.
I: And you spend Schelyayure or Izhme?
R: And when both. We Pechora spend sometimes, sometimes in Ukhta, where some problem occurs, it happens and Izhme. It happens in different places.
I: When is your next meeting?
R: And here we went to the chairman of the end of March, so do not be, though it was planned. So it will be somewhere in April. Previous was in December, according to Ukhta (inaudible 1:24:30 name), there is a serious problem, but (inaudible 1:24:35 name) we have the most peaceful area, Russian population live there, it arrived here in the nineteenth century, It is particularly but it is not as ours. So is there activists, but such an active action as, for example, here, now or after we went here, here, active in our district activists very serious work, here a little stagnant.
I: And what is the area?
R: Usinsky.
I: You Komi?
R: We Komi.
I: Perhaps we could see some flooding, or is it not possible?
R: The fact is that today we do not know, somewhere there is now spills or not. If you know, then another matter. Maybe there is not yet, because, well, strong noise probably would have risen. Increased work on security.
I: And with companies you do not have communication, you have not tried them somehow agree?
R: I have just talked for a long time, as we agreed with them, agreed, but did not agree.
I: They do not come to your meetings?
R: No, they have already come to our meetings, but, you know, the meeting says one thing, they write more, they lie that everything is in order that the people have calmed down. While residents have decided ... Vot you the latest example of how they lie (reading): "The people of the Usinsk region and the company "Lukoil" in different ways assessed the public hearings on the construction of a new project." That is, the people of seventy forty people voted, are not considered a hearing, but instead the company "Lukoil" and Administration wrote that the hearings were held. That is, they are in a brazen lie and say, "No ......
I: And the documents you can see the minutes of meetings?
R: Minutes of the meetings we have not asked, but we did not send.
I: Who leads you reports?
R: Protocols leads we chairman and secretary. Chairman of the elected head of the settlement, which has received from oil sale in Usinsk, and therefore, there is what they want, then write. "Committee to Save Pechora" asked to send documents. What is written there, held or not held? We have not yet been sent, but the witness Dyachkova, my brother, Bratenkov, they say: "We were noisy, we voted, forty of the seventy more than half", is considered to be not valid, and here you have written that took place . Here are our contacts. That is, if earlier it was possible to find a compromise with older workers "Lukoil", now gained back full of young, for whom the golden calf of oil means everything and nothing more. And they spat on the local population, they do not consider them as human beings.
I: And you can see this treaty sotsiopartnёрства?
R: It is necessary to go to the Administration.
I: I guess you can request it from the archives?
R: I think that if you ask, should give. And do not give, so I probably could somewhere and is the first of the agreements that have been concluded. We need to look.
I: And now operates some social contract?
R: This year I do not know, signed or not, but last year was signed by ten million. But here, one of the ten demands: "Zoom to forty million" because it's not money that forty million here in our offer, moreover it's just designed a percentage of income.
I: And how are distributed the money?
R: We used to be distributed as follows collected for the session, our proposals, and claimed the session. Now it is done secretly in the office. Do not know where the money goes.
I: (off topic conversation 01: 29: 14 - 01: 29: 51) And in addition to the contract which prisoners have some sponsorship with "Lukoil", or spend any ...?
R: That is the sponsorship of ten million.
I: But that's the treaty, all have nothing else?
R: If there where -So much asked for something there to help, to change the window where something something, maybe yes, but great care is no more. They see themselves as a rule, they say: "We all pay taxes, we will have nothing."
I: (off topic conversation 01: 30: 43 - 01: 31: 06) It is interesting to see, of course, very documents.
R: What specifically?
I: Well, this contract.
R: Did what?
I: Protocols, if they come, of course, to you.
R: Well, it is unlikely to come. A protocol that's ... Yes, let's say ... a rally that was adopted? At rallies solution is.
I: Yes, here it is also possible to view.
R: Well, I'll see anything.
I: And this one more referendum?
R: Oh, it was know in what year?
I: Yes, I know, but at least the date found, or something to push. This principle, as it had begun.
R: Yes, it was such a huge splash and amazing ....
I: Therefore, it would be interesting decision of the referendum or the outcome. I understand, of course, that this is a very long-standing document (not a conversation on the topic 01: 32: 20 - 01: 35: 01)
R: You Ust-Tsilma from what point of view are interested in?
I: Firstly that there was a flood, too, and the second, yes, it is interesting historically.
R: Maybe historically, yes, but from an environmental perspective there is all too easy. They believe that even if oil is extracted. They do not quite understand that everything that comes out here. And if the fish smells like kerosene, then health is very bad. Cancer patients, we are already very much.
I: And why, by the way, the water so you smell?
R: What?
I: I do not know, or it smells here, or at all by the Komi smell.
R: No, no, no ... First, iron pipes through which water comes, perhaps, thirty years already, so expect clean water is not necessary.
I: C, wells, or both?
R: Yes, with the well. We do drink, in general, the other water. There is a place, from a well, spring, and from there we drink. Who has a car, everyone drinks there. Sundry, go there with wheelbarrows. Too lazy to drink this water. Even though you are not lazy, but you do not know where to take.
I: (talking about water, talking on the phone 01: 36: 26 - 01: 38: 17) And here live Russian or Komi?
R: Yes, the Old Believers.
I: Usually Komi greater than the Russian people here?
R: I do not know. But we Izhma rages, not to say that all the rage Komi, Komi and quiet there.
I: And there are some towers?
R: Ukhta, this oil-producing area, and from there began the entire history of the oil.
I: That is, first came here and then went further north?
R: Yes.
I: As the name of the man who works in Moscow, "Greenpeace"?
R: Vladimir Chuprov. He manages some department.
- Organizes public hearings in Izhma, Krasnabor, Shelyayur (55km from Izhma)
- Lukoil sent letter that they’re not ready
- Hearings because of new drillings (20km from Izhma), 20 Dec 2014
- He shows us newspaper article from 12 Febr 2015
- License Lukoil 2005-2020, but research only until 2009
- New elections coming up: looking for people opposite of the party in place now
- Pechora, Izhma
- 10 drilling sites between the rivers and above also some
- 8-10 years
- Below Izhma some small drilling stations, but want to make more
- 1995-97 administration he was working at, Lukoil started social partnership agreement, gave administration first 1 million rubles, then 10 million for social events, competition cleaning the towns
- 15 districts, had cows, could sell milk, now conflict, because Lukoil doesn’t pay attention
- Last year: leak, burning 15km, smoke
- Also station was built 200m from houses away (they didn’t tell people, then 1st meeting against: 150 people came, nowadays the preparation drilling stopped)
- In the beginning they were people at Lukoil that cared, but now people changed and they don’t care anymore [diff. to what WWF guy said]
- Period of use of oil pipes 15 years
- Leaks? Because Lukoil makes contract with sub-companies, technology old
- He started complaining about those violations, local administration said you either shut up or we fire
- He was always very active
- First working school, then in the party, chief of committee who defends nature
- If you organize population, you can achieve something
- 25 years ago, they created SP River with his friends
- 1st meeting in Schelyeyur: he was elected first chief
- However also chief of administration [so thinks that it can’t be combined,
Success, when became popular: good laws about referendum, had to get 15.000 signatures, 5 questions on agenda --> make it a national park// 1. Park: didn’t have any borders, so make borders// 2nd: metal net for fishing salmon for civil servants --> take away this net// 3rd question: nuclear station in Inta --> nuclear explosion on the land above

They made referendum in Izhma district, people were announced, election

Committees working for free (there was no money)

In July, 60% of population came to referendum

95% were FOR ecological questions that were on this agenda

He was deputy of state committee of republic was working in ecological committee

They applied to government, questions of whole republic

2 times discussed on governmental level and the government had to say yes to this agenda (because laws were more enforced)

That’s why now the democratic society exists in area; 2 NGOs (Izviataz and SP) lead!

Substitute chief of committee around 5 people are in both committees

18.000 people, everyone knows him here, people are interested, he’s one of the deputy chief of main editor people involved in newspaper, they are names and telephone numbers in newspaper that people can call

Greenpeace press conference in Saint Petersburg

Mass media they use

Lukoil gets credit from abroad and not from central bank; say that Lukoil is not reliable, so that foreign banks

Trying to apply to WB through Greenpeace, but don’t know yet, have friend at Greenpeace in Moscow (Chuprov)

Guy from Pechora, moved to Moscow, gradually set this network (about 15 years)

Valentina (from Pechora) name in newspaper

Environmental local and political issues are his thing

Valentina more republic level

1 time council supported decision of population (borders of national park)

Deputies are just volting machine, not the brain center

Democratic principle is just on paper
- If there’s lot of sensation --> something will be done, otherwise not
- Now 10 questions they want to reach, offered it to Lukoil in June 2014
- After that 2 round tables in Usinsk administration meeting chief of republic
- 2 meetings in Izhma with deputy director Lukoil PR, but no results, it was not discussed
- Offer from Moscow radio station
- Greenpeace organized meeting mass media in Saint Petersburg, reporter decided to fail meeting (because Lukoil didn’t give good enough answers)
- Izhma 3 times fail: not registered, only a people’s movement, so they couldn’t even be foreign agent
- Mass media: publishes notes, before republic newspaper
- Aljazeera TV, Greenpeace
- 1 time (3 years ago) they cleaned, one other it burned
- No control
- Greenpeace came to Usinsk, found oil leaks
- Rospriradnadzor (supervising authority) didn’t confirm leaks
- They pay money to local authorities, so we don’t owe you anything
- Some small stuff, not really sponsorship, just some small stuff
- Cancer
- One town quite calm (ust-Pilma), other quite the fighters (Scheljejur)
- OOO smaller, OAO bigger
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Drawing on recent developments in the problematic relationship between the oil industry and local communities in the Republic of Komi, we develop a case study of environmental grassroots mobilization in northwest Russia. Using a qualitative methodology comprising semi-structured interviews and participant observation, we analyse the movement’s actions in terms of the concept of Governance Generating Networks (GGN), with reference to the global network of non-governmental environmental organizations and other institutions. The article focuses on the network of non-state actors, examining the spatial levels from local to global in an environmental movement seeking to challenge Lukoil, the major oil company in the region. We investigate the strategies adopted by the social movement and the responses of the oil industry and various governmental institutions, with this analysis including an examination of power between the different bodies and networks involved. In particular, we analyse different forms of corporate social responsibility seen in the steps taken by Lukoil to avoid more severe reactions.

Key words: Governance Generating Networks; oil/gas companies; environmental movement; Russia; indigenous peoples
1. Introduction

Indigenous peoples and the oil industry have co-existed for many years in the Komi Republic, a region located in the northwest part of the Russian Federation. Since the 1990s, however, citizens have been affected by oil spills as a result of growing industrial activity. Case studies have found that the industry burdens local communities with an environmental risk adversely impacting their wellbeing (Yakovleva 2014). The Komi-Izhemtsi, not recognized as an indigenous people by the Russian state but recognized as such by the UN, are making an effort to influence the oil giant Lukoil by engaging with global associations and networks. It is this local resistance to Lukoil, viewed as action embedded in a global network, that is the focus of interest in this paper.

Due to the increasing importance of energy resources for the global economy, the Russian state is determined to rely on the energy sector for its institutional and geo-political existence (Wilson & Stammler 2006), even in a period of declining oil prices (years 2015-2016). The Russian oil and gas industry accounts for over 70 per cent of the nation’s total exports (EIA 2014). The country holds more than 20 per cent of the world’s known gas reserves and 5 per cent of its proven oil reserves and the supply of oil and gas makes up a large part of Russia’s exports to Europe (EU Commission 2016). The West is dependent on the Russian oil and gas industry and this constitutes a viable way forward for Russia to develop a geo-political strategy to influence the Western economy. Oil is the main export resource in the Komi Republic, output being 257 thousand b/d (EIA 2014). The oil and gas industry figures prominently throughout the region, with facilities stretching from Ukhta to Pechora and Usinsk being the centre of production (TED 1997). Lukoil is the main player in

59 Barrels per day
the industry in the region today, operating through its subsidiary Lukoil-Komi. Each year, the area produces 2.3 million tons of oil, which constitutes about two-thirds of Russia’s total heavy oil production (Annenkova 2012). Lukoil was founded in 1991 and is the second-largest oil company in Russia, and the second-largest producer of oil (Lukoil 2015), producing 89,856 million tons of oil in 2012 (Lukoil 2015). A major oil spill occurred in Komi in 1994; at that time, oil extraction was carried out by Komineft, which was later bought up by and is now an official subsidiary of Lukoil (Lukoil 2015). Lukoil has been trying to ‘clean up the effects of the 1994 spill and replace the ageing network of pipelines’ (Wilson 2016), but oil spills nevertheless still occur.

In this study, we investigate the NGO network constructed around indigenous and environmental organizations - involving grassroots as well as global players - that has mounted and sustained continuous resistance directed towards Lukoil at its headquarters in Moscow and its subsidiary, Lukoil-Komi, which operates in the Komi Republic and Nenets Autonomous Okrug. The major research questions we address are: In what relationship does the bottom-up NGO resistance network stand vis-a-vis the transnational Lukoil; and what factors have enabled the resistance to sustain itself over the years when confronted with powerful players? We look briefly at the emergence and transnationalization of the environmental movement in the Komi Republic. Of interest are the movement’s structure and survival strategies over the years under a political regime that is constantly trying to eliminate such efforts, mostly through the Foreign Agent Law enacted by the Putin administration in 2012. In particular, we examine the responses of different stakeholders,

---

60 The Foreign Agent Law has been in effect since November 2012, initiated by the ruling party United Russia, and actively promoted by President Vladimir Putin. It states that non-profit organizations throughout Russia are required to list themselves as foreign agents when receiving
such as the oil industry and different levels of government, to the movement on multiple scales (from the local to the global). We also consider the way in which companies make use of corporate social responsibility strategies, basing our analysis on the renewed EU Strategy for Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) (EUR-Lex 2011).

After describing the research methodology, we present the theoretical framework, with this including a brief look at Castell's theories of networks and power in relation to the local-global realm. We then go on to introduce the concept of the Governance Generating Networks (GGN), which forms the foundation of our analysis in conjunction with social movement theory and concepts relating to CSR. This is followed by a description of the case study and a brief history of environmental movements in Russia, building on which we proceed to the globalized movement today. We argue that local resistance is seeking to change a global industry using local as well as global resources and has, through different kinds of framing, succeeded in surviving over the past two decades.

2. Methodology

The research takes a case study approach in order to provide depth and accuracy (Hammersley & Atkinson 2007), focusing on the how and the why of the focal phenomenon (Yin 1994) – citizens' resistance to oil companies – and its context. The conclusions of this study are based on semi-structured interviews carried out between February and April 2015 and between 20 January and 4 February 2016. These comprised 16 interviews with local activists in the district of Izhma, five interviews with activists in the urban district of Usinsk - all 21 interviewees being members of the NGO Save Pechora Committee (SPC) and the grants from foreign sources, in order to avoid 'any direct or indirect interference in [Russia's] internal affairs (…)' (Kremlin 2013, Kupina 2012)
indigenous peoples’ organization Izviatas - and one interview with members of IWGIA (International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs). In addition, three interviews were carried out with local (Izhma) governmental bodies, six with regional (Usinsk and Syktyvkar) and three with national (Moscow). Three interviews were carried out with representatives of the Lukoil office in Moscow, and four with representatives of the Lukoil-Komi office in Usinsk (see Table A.1 in the Appendix). Interviews with the different actors, ranging from the local to national and global levels, were carried out to illuminate the interplay between local and global actors as well as to investigate the relationship between the NGO resistance network and Lukoil, the sustainability and strategies of the environmental resistance movement over the years and Lukoil’s CSR strategies in response to the movement. The active approach adopted by the research team established contact with the interviewees and the snowballing technique was used for finding and accessing local stakeholders. NGO leaders and leaders of indigenous peoples’ groups also helped to identify other informants. Activists were open to sharing their experiences and opinions with us. Appointments with Lukoil and Lukoil-Komi, as well as state authorities, had to be made formally and in advance through the respective communications and public relations departments. In-depth, semi-structured interviews served as the main research tool. Separate sets of interview guides were developed for civil society activists, Lukoil and state officials. Questions were formulated to provide a view of the social movement in historical perspective, to ascertain the activists’ grievances, the movement’s tactics and repertoire of collective action as well as to bring to light the interplay of local and global actors within the movement and activists’ interactions with Lukoil and the state. Company representatives on different levels were asked what their CSR policies were, both socially and environmentally, how these policies were developed and by whom, and how they were implemented. These questions sought to
provide an understanding of the interaction between Lukoil offices, as well as the dynamics of the interaction between civil society activists, the company and the state. The state representatives were asked about the history of oil development in the region, about the benefits - and costs - to the region from oil development, as well as about the dynamic of interactions between the region's municipalities, state agencies, oil companies and civil society.

Apart from two interviews carried out in English\textsuperscript{61}, all interviews were conducted in Russian; these were translated into English when needed. The interview data was analysed by means of first transcribing and then coding them, with this revealing shared themes, patterns and relationships. The generalizations that could be drawn were then examined in the context of the theoretical framework. Other data-collection methods included analysis of documents and participant observation. The former encompassed records of meetings organized by the company, agreements proposed by activists, company CSR policies and public reports based on the GRI (Global Reporting Initiative) Guidelines. The latter focused on discerning the structure of the networks involved and delineating the overall interactions and negotiations between actors of different networks.

3. Theoretical approach

3.1 Networks and Power

Networks and power structures play an important role in the analysis of the movement’s strategies and their communication and dealings with the oil industry, state, national and international NGO communities. As Castells has pointed out, ‘the environmental movement is a locally rooted, globally connected network which aims to change the public’s mind as a

\textsuperscript{61} Interviews with representatives of: WWF Russia, IWGIA and INFOE
means of influencing policy decisions to save the planet or one’s own neighbourhood’ (Castells 2013, p. 49). He continues that power can be seen as a relationship which is framed by domination. The dominating party can thus always be met with resistance, a *counterpower*, enhanced by a range of actors, including individual or collective actors, organizations, institutions and networks. It has been argued that collective action, or collective agency\(^\text{62}\), yields higher benefits as compared to individual action in the case of resistance, or when forming a counterpower, against resource extraction (Stammler & Wilson 2006). In the case at hand, we are studying the dynamics of interaction in oil governance networks, dynamics determined by the power of the actors involved (Castells 2007), for example, the economic power of private actors, the political power of the nation-state, and the normative and symbolic power of the NGOs and indigenous peoples involved. Actors exercise power by attempting to influence the behaviour of others through multiple negotiations that occur on both transnational and local levels. We examine the interrelations of the actors in the network, informed by the integrated theoretical framework of ‘a multi-level, multi-actor global assemblage’ known as Governance Generating Networks (GGN) (Tysiachniouk 2012, Tysiachniouk & Henry 2015, Tysiachniouk & McDermott 2015) [see Figure 1].

Oil companies, together with state and civil society networks – the oil GGN – link processes at the transnational and local levels. The actors in these networks are involved in continuous negotiations involving interactions within and between networks. To ensure the sustainability of oil production and protection of local and indigenous peoples’ rights, global institutions at the transnational level, such as the United Nations (UN), the Arctic Council

\(^{62}\) ‘Collective agency is the capacity of a group of actors to act together towards certain goals; as such it is a prerequisite for meaningful collective action’ (Stammler & Wilson 2006)
(AC), the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (WB), develop global standards and guidelines for companies. While oil companies often declare their commitments to the global standards, the ways in which they implement these standards on the ground vary significantly (Henry et al. 2016, forthcoming). When the standards are not met, indigenous peoples’ associations and groups may appeal not only to national, but also to global institutions in their efforts to influence the behaviour of the oil companies. Studies show that such transnationalization occurs when a movement’s home state offers it few political opportunities and its influence in decision-making processes is weak (Keck and Sikkink 1998). It may also be the case that activists have sound political opportunities in their home state and that local and transnational civil society networks intersect and reinforce each other (Kraemer et al. 2013). While mobilization of national and transnational activists’ networks against corporate behaviour has been well studied, there is a gap in our knowledge as regards the interaction between civil societies, state and corporate networks across the full range of scales from local to global; for example, the dynamics of the interactions within oil GGNs have not been well researched. This paper attempts to fill this gap, focusing on the NGO networks – in particular, the environmental movement organized from below by the SPC and the indigenous peoples’ organization Izviatas – and their relationships with the oil companies and state networks in the Komi Republic. On the transnational level and across the full range of scales from local to global, local and global actors can be engaged in the interplay directly, without involving the national actors.
3.2 Grievances and resource mobilization

As Mena & Waeger note, ‘core to social movement research is an understanding of the social world as intimately contentious, and as one in which outsider groups challenge established social and regulatory institutions in their attempts to make their claims heard and bring about social or political change’ (2014, p. 7). In the case at hand, state or corporate institutions, such as Lukoil and the government, fall within the category of ‘established social and regulatory institutions’. We analyse the resource flow in the oil GGN through the lens of resource mobilization theory, which focuses on the willingness and ability of a given NGO network to mobilize depending on the different resources available. According to the
theory, social movement organizations often fail because the infrastructure needed for the movement is lacking (McCarthy & Zald 1977); in other words, the needed (and appropriate) resources, for example money or time, are not available within the NGO network. Social movements need to ‘mobilize resources from inside and outside their movement to reach goals’ (Jenkins 1983, p. 113).

According to resource mobilization theory, there are various strategies that are used in combination. Edwards and Gillham (2013) name four different supporting strategies: (1) self-production, (2) aggregation, (3) co-optation/appropriation and (4) patronage. Self-production relies solely on the people within the movement, who produce human resources by training people around them. In aggregation, individual or group donations are used in order to reach the group’s goal. In the co-optation/appropriation strategy, relationships with other organizations are of high importance, as resources previously used by those organizations are now used by the mobilizing organization (movement). Patronage describes the case where an individual or a group gives money for the cause, but then is also able to decide on how that money is used. In this research, we assess the available resource mobilization strategies and other factors that have maintained the ability of the environmental movement in the Komi Republic to deal with the conflict between the region’s indigenous peoples and the oil company and state networks.

3.3 Corporate Social Responsibility

To illustrate how oil company networks relate to state and NGO networks, we look at the concept of corporate social responsibility (CSR). Embracing such responsibility can help companies to facilitate certain activities by easing potential tensions within the community in which they operate. Doing so can also indirectly challenge the resource mobilization of
NGO networks. A modern understanding of CSR is that defined by the EU: ‘the responsibility of enterprises for their impacts on society’ (EUR-Lex 2011), including ‘respect for applicable legislation, and for collective agreements between social partners’. Furthermore, businesses ‘should have in place a process to integrate social, environmental, ethical, human rights and consumer concerns into their business operations and core strategy in close collaboration with their stakeholders, with the aim of:

- maximizing the creation of shared value for their owners/shareholders and for their other stakeholders and society at large;
- identifying, preventing and mitigating their possible adverse impacts’ (EUR-Lex 2011).

This definition takes into account the size of the enterprise and the field in which it operates, and emphasizes the value of a long-term commitment to CSR in order to ‘contribute to societal wellbeing and lead to higher quality and more productive jobs’ (EUR-Lex 2011). Large enterprises are encouraged to ‘carry out risk-based due diligence, including through their supply chains’ (EUR-Lex 2011). Companies contribute to local communities using established and strategic arrangements, such as social-economic agreements with municipalities and indigenous groups, and/or proceed with compensation for damage, although they are not legally bound to do so (CERD 2013, Wilson 2016). These agreements help companies to build relationships with local communities (Henry et al. 2016, forthcoming; Wilson 2016). Potential benefits and the dynamic of the interactions occasioned by these contributions will be analysed in the case study below.
4. Findings

4.1 Description of the case study

The Komi Republic is a multi-ethnic region lying to the west of the northern Ural Mountains. Half of the population of roughly 881,000 identify themselves as Russian; Komi make up less than 25 per cent of the population, with 15,000 of them identifying themselves as indigenous Komi-Izhemtsi. They are recognized by the indigenous peoples’ association RAIPON, but not by the state (RAIPON 2014). Oil is the main export resource, providing 63 per cent of the area’s total revenue, while timber-related products account for 16 per cent and coal for 11 per cent. Oil, coal and gas together make up 50 per cent of Komi’s GDP (Alexander 2009). Timber and agriculture are the main economic contributors in the south part of the republic, where Syktyvkar, the capital, is located. Oil and gas dominate in the area stretching from Ukhta to Pechora, with coal being the main natural resource from Pechora to the north. The town of Usinsk was established in 1966 at the newly discovered deposits of petroleum in the north of the republic; the centre for the production of oil and gas in Komi (TED 1997), it is also informally called ‘the oil capital of Komi’. Seventy per cent of the oil in the republic is produced in the Usinsk region (Usinsk Municipality 2014). The district contains 24 settlements and depends heavily on the socio-economic partnerships formed with multiple oil companies pursuing oil development, such as Lukoil-Komi, RN-Northern Oil (a subsidiary of Rosneft), Enisey company and Kolva Neft63. The Izhma district is the second-largest oil district in the Komi Republic, containing 34 settlements accounting for 4.4 per cent of the republic’s population. Lukoil-Komi is the only oil company operating in the Izhma district. Its production is falling along with oil prices; for example, the company

63 www.zainashix.ru/city/Usinsk, reviewer 08.08.2016
produced 192.9 thousand tons of oil in 2012 but only 141.17 thousand in 2013. The Izhma district also depends on socio-economic agreements with Lukoil-Komi.

In both the Usinsk and Izhma districts, the population in more rural areas has been dealing for years with several oil leaks, most caused by the Lukoil-Komi. The company operates in both districts, maintaining offices in Usinsk and Naryanmar. Lukoil-Komi is a subsidiary of Lukoil, which has its headquarters in Moscow and operates in several regions in Russia as well as abroad. Major decisions, for example those related to CSR, commitment to the UN Global Compact or banks, are made at Lukoil’s headquarters in Moscow, with instructions and funds then distributed to subsidiaries, amongst them Lukoil-Komi. Eighty-nine spills were reported between 2011 and 2013, and major spills occurred in 1988, 1992 and 1994 (Staalesen 2014). In 1994, for example, 100,000 tons of oil leaked from a pipeline between Usinsk and Kharyaga, making it the biggest oil spill in the area (Staalesen 2014). According to activists in the villages, the spills have caused health problems among the population and its animals, as well as economic problems, constraints on livelihoods and a feeling among the population of betrayal by the government. Polluted soil has been observed by citizens in the summer when the ground is free from snow, indicating that spills in winter were sometimes not reported to the authorities. Polluted water has been spotted in the form of a rainbow-coloured film on the water’s surface in the main rivers in the region, the Pechora and the Kolva. According to individual respondents, the water has caused health problems, with cases of cancer being reported, for example. Water has been tested for radiation, but the results have come back negative. In addition, polluted
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64 Interview with local activist, Krasnobor, 21 February 2015
65 Interviews and informal conversations in Krasnobor and Scheliaboz, 21 February 2015
66 Interview with local activist, Izhma, 20 February 2015
water causes economic harm to the local population when animals, such as cows or reindeer, die from the water but no compensation is paid for the loss. Furthermore, local people reportedly face constraints on their daily lives, as certain areas used at one time for recreational purposes or for subsistence are now cut off because they contain oil deposits. These areas include forests and lakes where people once spent their leisure time picking berries or fishing. Local activists feel they are not taken seriously by the local administration or higher institutions within the government. Citizens complain that they are not involved in the decision-making processes pertaining to the building of new oil-drilling stations. Local inhabitants are often not informed about future plans, although drilling stations are reportedly built close to the villages, for example, within 1.5 km of a school, or near water wells, as happened in the village of Krasnoborsk in the Izhma district (see Figure 2). People have a negative view of the oil company itself: according to local activists in the Izhma district, it has burned leaking oil, covered leakage with moss or not properly cleaned up spillage.
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67 Interview with local activist, Krasnobor, 21 February 2015
68 Interview with local activist of SPC, Izhma, 20 February 2015; CERD 2013
69 Informal conversations and interviews with local activists in Krasnobor, 21 February 2015
70 Interview with local resident in Krasnabor, 21 February 2015
Figure 2. Map of the Komi Republic and Lukoil-Komi drilling sites (Tysiachniouk & Landonio 2015)
The state supervisory agency *Rospridodnadzor* is tasked with ensuring that oil companies take specific steps after a leak has occurred. According to a representative of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of the Komi Republic, Lukoil scored best in environmental performance among the oil companies in the region, although all companies try to hide leaks. The ministry is working on an online register, eventually to be made available to the public, containing statistics on all the polluted areas and their re-cultivation, as well as information on the condition of pipelines, so that ‘no information disappears’. It also plans to include the findings on leaks by NGOs. Greenpeace, for instance, has been involved in uncovering some of the leaks, although a representative for the organization noted that some reports were false as the alleged leaks had in fact only been reflections in water. However, Greenpeace has taken the lead in a local youth summer camp programme in which the organizers showed participants how to find, provide GPS coordinates for, and eventually map leaks and send the information to the ministry.

Nevertheless, it is often difficult to locate oil leaks, as the territory is inaccessible in winter; but it is also claimed that the prevention of leaks is difficult, given the lack of technological progress within the oil industry in Russia, which is plagued by aging infrastructure. According to the representative of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection, 80 per cent of the pipes are overused. The lifespan of a pipe is estimated at around ten years, and even less when used at full capacity. In the Komi Republic, where
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71 Interview with representative of Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of the Komi Republic, Syktyvkar, 4 March 2015
72 Interview with representative of Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of the Komi Republic, Syktyvkar, 4 March 2015
73 Interview with representative of Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection of the Komi Republic, Syktyvkar, 4 March 2015
74 Interview with representative Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Protection, Syktyvkar, 4 March 2015
pipes were taken over from oil companies previously doing business in the region, the pipes have been used beyond their intended lifespan, becoming corroded and rupturing. Replacing or renewing pipes takes effort and is costly. The existing budget is insufficient, and Lukoil’s investment programme for 2015-2016 is meant to cover the development of all of Lukoil’s operations, not just the modernization of pipes\textsuperscript{75}. Lukoil has stated that it plans to modernize all pipelines by 2025\textsuperscript{76}; yet, the local activists doubt this, as it is more profitable for the company to pay fines than to replace pipes. Grievances related to the oil spills, as well as a lack of recognition of indigenous peoples’ rights, have led to the rise of an environmental movement stretching from the grassroots to global levels. The following section begins with a history of environmental movements in Russia and concludes with a description of the movement against Lukoil in the Komi Republic today.

4.2. Environmental movements in historical perspective

With Gorbachev’s pursuit of a radical restructuring of all institutions within the Soviet regime in 1986, known as *perestroika*, different informal (*neformalnye*) groups were founded; by the end of the 1990s, environmental movements had gained noteworthy citizen support. However, the movements ultimately ‘struggled under conditions of economic and political instability that led [them] to seek a new mobilizing platform’ (Henry 2009, p. 48).

The local environmental movement in the Izhma district in Komi arose in the former Soviet Union. SPC was formed in 1989, on the wave of Perestroika, after various economic and social problems had emerged in the region. People on the Committee relied on ‘existing

\textsuperscript{75} Interview with Lukoil representative, Usinsk, 26 February 2015
\textsuperscript{76} Interview with a representative of Lukoil, Moscow, 23 April 2015
social and cultural arrangements [from the Soviet times] to shape institutions in response to changing situations’ (Cleaver 2009). The first chairperson of the Committee claimed that ‘something can only be achieved by the resistance of the people’\textsuperscript{77}. The Committee reached out to the people in the villages in the Pechora district and held its first conference. Among SPC’s first successes were a referendum on the issue of a national park in the region and another against building a nuclear power plant in the Inta district. After the big oil spill near the town of Usinsk in 1994, the SPC and the Komi-Izhemtsi organization Izviatas dedicated themselves to addressing the matter. Working together with the non-profit Silver Taiga Foundation, as well as getting support from Greenpeace Russia (in 2015), they have created a list of ‘ten demands’ for the oil company, most of which emphasize environmental safety issues and the necessity of replacing old, outdated oil pipes\textsuperscript{78}.

The SPC has 29 members from eight villages and volunteers from all over the Pechora region campaigning against Lukoil. Their main goal is to protect the environment and ecology in the district, but they also aim for greater involvement in the decision-making processes of the oil industry and the state. The Committee uses resources of the larger NGO, the Silver Taiga Foundation, and partners with the Komi-Izhemtsi organization Izviatas.

\textit{4.3. Local resistance towards a company and the state}

Like many civil society organizations involved in global civil society (Veltmeyer & Bowles 2014), the SPC, an NGO, is situated in a value-based network concerned with the environment, fairness and social justice (Karjalainen & Habeck 2004). To be able to exist

\textsuperscript{77} Interview with local activist on SPC, Izhma, 20 February 2015
\textsuperscript{78} Interview with the leader of SPC, 22 February 2015, interview with the leader of Izviatas, 28 February 2015, documents provided by the NGO leaders
with the intention of changing the environmental situation in today’s Komi Republic, the Committee applies a major strategy of keeping itself an informal civic organization. After having been registered in the past, the Committee strategically decided to gain independence from the state by becoming a non-registered entity in 2012, one with no physical address or accounting system. This is made possible by relying on infrastructural support from the registered NGO Silver Taiga Foundation and partnering with the registered NGO Izviatas, which can accept grants from Russian funding sources but accepts only in-kind support from foreign sources. This limitation is a strategic choice, ensuring that no allegations of being a foreign agent can be brought by the state. Volunteering is possible as most of Save Pechora’s members are retired or have another main job and thus are not afraid of losing their jobs and livelihoods.

One established strategy of the Committee is letting public hearings, officially announced and organized by Lukoil, ‘fail’, declaring them invalid by voting, because the Committee would not be satisfied with the actions and responses of the oil company taken at the meeting and thus would not find a consensus. The organization of a public hearing goes as follows: the oil company notifies the local administration that a hearing is necessary; the administration then decides where and when it is going to take place, and publicly announces it in a newspaper. Voting is not officially part of public hearings, as they are held to inform citizens about Lukoil’s projects and collect and consider citizens’ suggestions. However, activists of the SPC insist on voting, and then insist that records of the meeting state that the hearings have failed. Such statements jeopardize the CSR of the

79 Interview with activist of Izviatas, Izhma, 28 February 2015; interview with the leader of SPC, Syktyvkar, February 2015
80 Interview with administration representative, Usinsk, 27 February 2015
company and its social license to operate. In one example, the oil company brought some 30 oil workers to a hearing in order to have more pro-Lukoil voices present, resulting in a positive voting outcome for the company\textsuperscript{81}. Nevertheless, citizens caused the hearing to fail. Public hearings are supposed to give a voice to the public, enabling them to express their opinions and their demands to Lukoil. The local population often complain that they have not been notified about an upcoming hearing and therefore not been able to attend. Earlier, the public hearings were often held in Usinsk, which is very difficult to reach from the region’s villages. Lukoil has responded to these complaints citing infrastructural problems; in other words, it is too difficult to find a location that can be reached by everyone.

Activists in the Izhma district strongly believe in the power of the people, which can be seen as the normative or symbolic power that is used to mobilize and organize the general public around them. With the guidance and aid of larger NGOs, power can then be exercised and results achieved. This power in the movement is directed against the oil company, Lukoil, and government policies that hinder the development of the communities’ values and interests, as there is a discrepancy between these and those of Lukoil and the government.

An example of the discrepancy between the values and interests of the community and NGO network and those of the industry can be taken from Lukoil-Komi’s interference with the media. According to the NGO Bankwatch, Lukoil-Komi blocks information in the media on the company’s environmental violations. The local population ‘fails to receive trustworthy information and sees a big difference between the environmental achievements described in press releases and the real situation’ (Bankwatch 2008).

\textsuperscript{81} Interview with activist of SPC, Izhma, 21 February 2015
Bankwatch also reported that in May 2006 Lukoil-Komi bought out an entire edition of the newspaper Novyi Sever after it had published an article on the environmental violations of the company. In another comment, Bankwatch has pointed out that one can see the relation between the SPC, on the one hand, and Lukoil-Komi and the state, on the other, in the cooperation between the company and the regional state authorities: the authorities have refused to respond to reported violations where certain of the company’s activities are concerned and have refused the SPC entry to view drilling sites, giving the company enough time to eliminate traces of pollution (Bankwatch 2008).

According to a local leader, the people can bring about change by ‘making noise’ and standing up for their rights to fight ‘a disgusting creature’. Instances where the people followed the principle of ‘making noise’ were the street protests organized by the Committee in several villages in the Izhma and Usinsk districts and their use of different media outlets to publish information. In large cities in Russia, activists are prosecuted for organizing unauthorized protests; village-based protests are an exception. State authorities only monitor such protests and people can openly express their grievances and publish information about protests on the Internet. It is important to note that the relationship between the civil society network and the state agencies differ on different levels and scales. The majority of activists generally support Putin’s policies, acknowledging the need for the economy to develop additional fossil fuel resources. Most of the protests are against local municipalities for a lack of transparency in using money generated by the oil industry, for violating the terms of socio-economic agreements and for tolerating oil spills and local
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82 Interview with local activist, Izhma, 20 February 2015
construction projects. Save Pechora and Greenpeace activists constructively work with the Ministry of Natural Resources of the Komi Republic on identifying and registering oil spills\textsuperscript{83}.

### 4.4. Structure and communication in the NGO network

In the NGO network the Internet is used as a viable resource and powerful tool for communication and keeping the network alive. Information is published and distributed to members of the network on a website run mostly by one member of the Committee, an example of reliance on the self-production strategy (Edwards & Gillham 2013), as everything is organized around the available human resources. Additional resources include the newspapers \textit{Veskhyd Shorny} and \textit{Ekologichesky Vestnik}, which are published locally by the Committee (\textit{Ekologichesky Vestnik}) or which describe the activities of the Committee. This normative/symbolic power via communication has brought the Committee some support from international media, such as Al Jazeera TV, which covered some grassroots protests. However, most of the attention the Committee has received has come from local and national media; it could not have achieved global influence on its own\textsuperscript{84}.

The indigenous associations and NGOs in the Komi Republic collaborate with their counterparts in the Nenets Autonomous Okrug (NAO). For example, the SPC is helping the local branch of Izviatas in the NAO to identify issues related to oil development and to bring these to the attention of the media. Save Pechora and Izviatas are working together very closely, sharing active members and resources. Izviatas has links to \textit{Komi-Voityr}\textsuperscript{85}, another interregional movement, although the relationship has been marked by recurring conflicts
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\textsuperscript{83} Interview with the activists of SPC, 20 January, 2016
\textsuperscript{84} Interview with IWGIA representative, 4 February 2016
\textsuperscript{85} Komi-Voityr signed a partnership agreement with Lukoil April 15, 2015 (http://www.lukoil.com/static_6_5id_2256_.html)
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(Shabayev & Sharapov 2011), as well as to the Silver Taiga Foundation. Izviatas is a member of the indigenous peoples’ association RAIPON\(^{86}\) and through it is connected to the transnational level, for example the UN and the Arctic Council\(^{87}\). Together with RAIPON, the international organization IWGIA and the German organization INFOE\(^{88}\) are trying to pressure the Russian government by publishing reports on the racial discrimination by the Russian state against Izviatas\(^{89}\); the effort is aided by two UN committees, amongst them the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD\(^{90}\), CESCR\(^{91}\)), as well as a covenant (ICCPR\(^{92}\)). The organizations argue that the Russian state is denying indigenous peoples the right to practice traditional livelihoods, that authorities and private corporations fail to ‘seek the indigenous peoples’ informed consent prior to extractive activities’, that indigenous communities are being excluded ‘from legal access to fish, hunting rights and other biological resources vital for their collective survival’, and that the ‘combination of a weak and dysfunctional protection regime with the drive towards full privatisation of the country’s natural wealth’ is having a ‘discriminatory effect on indigenous communities by perpetuating their disadvantaged and disempowered status’ (INFOE 2008).

In short, the fact that the Komi-Izhemtsi are not recognized by the state as an indigenous people and that Lukoil is therefore not obliged to pay them compensation is framed as racial discrimination. Applying the co-optating/appropriating strategy (Edwards & Gillham 2013) allows the different committees and NGOs to use each other’s resources.

\(^{86}\) Russian Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North

\(^{87}\) Interview with the Izviatas activist, Izhma, 28 February 2015; Interview with SPC, Izhma, 22 February 2015

\(^{88}\) Institut für Ökologie und Aktions-Ethnologie (http://www.infoe.de/web/)


\(^{90}\) UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination

\(^{91}\) UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights

\(^{92}\) International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
Ties to Greenpeace Russia have been established via a member of the Izhma district community who worked for the SPC and later joined Greenpeace. Through this connection, a first press conference was held in Saint Petersburg in spring 2015. The in-kind support provided by Greenpeace has made it possible to arrange roundtables with state representatives in Usinsk. Extensive discussions were held centring on combating oil spills and fostering environmental improvements. In April 2016, a large oil spill occurred in the Usinsk district, for which Lukoil-Komi was held responsible. This led to another roundtable meeting in June 2016 in Ukhta. Participants included representatives of the local administration, the Komi Ministry of Natural Resources, and activists on the SPC. The possibilities of holding the company accountable for the damage were discussed. In 2016, Greenpeace started a large national campaign, collecting signatures with the aim of requesting the federal government to force oil companies to replace outdated pipes and diminish spills in the country. In order to raise awareness about the issue of oil spills on a global scale, Greenpeace has sent Izviatas representatives to international meetings, such as the Arctic Council meeting in Iqaluit, Canada, in 1998. Here, the activists’ network communicated its grievances to the regional and global levels and mobilized citizens nationally.

4.5. Corporate social responsibility and the oil company’s response

Greenpeace has been involved in targeting oil companies suspected of violating the rights and/or values of the communities adjacent to oil extraction sites. The organization’s actions
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93 Interview with regional SPC activist, January 21, 2016
96 Interview with the leader of Izviatas, Izhma, 28 February 2015
have identified issues related to safety and the performance of the oil companies, which indirectly set up an agenda for policy changes and called upon companies to honour their environmental and social responsibilities (Pappila 2015). CSR can serve as a practicable strategy for oil companies, as conflicts with local communities or environmental institutions can be reduced (Pappila 2015); in addition, employing CSR practices is likely to strengthen a company’s image, leading to higher sales and potentially attracting investment banks. It has also been argued that global movement networks could impact developments by evaluating listed companies based on their environmental performance or the way they deal with the issue of human rights, prompting shareholders and investors to re-evaluate their relationship and overall attitude towards the companies (Castells 2007).

Lukoil does not play down the importance of CSR. It signed the UN Global Compact (2016) in 2008 and adheres to the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) in presenting its performance to shareholders. Amongst other companies, Lukoil has committed itself to a precautionary approach to environmental challenges, undertaking initiatives to promote greater environmental responsibility and encouraging the development and diffusion of environmentally friendly technologies97. Furthermore, in a 2008 report, the company stated that it has made efforts geared to ‘reducing oil and petroleum product losses and decreasing related emissions/discharges’ and to ‘preventing accidents and remedying their consequences’ (Lukoil 2008, p. 26). CSR commitments are decided upon at the company’s headquarters and, as in other vertically integrated holding companies, environmental and social aspects of CSR are channelled to the regional offices. Regional offices have personnel who are responsible for implementation but must adhere to the budget allocated for them.
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by headquarters. According to our Lukoil-Komi informant, the company’s limited regional budget prevents it speeding up replacement of its outdated oil infrastructure\(^9^8\). Other responsibilities that Lukoil must take on originate from bank loan agreements with the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)\(^9^9\). Since 2000, Lukoil has received five loans from the bank totalling USD 840 million, part of which was distributed to Lukoil-Komi (Bankwatch 2014). In 2007, for a loan of USD 300 million, Lukoil committed itself to ‘inter alia pollution clean-up, pipeline replacement, gas flaring reduction, health and safety measures, [and] social infrastructure (…)’ (EBRD 2007\(^1^0^0\)). The EBRD provided funds to Lukoil headquarters; funds for the clean-up of legacy spills were allocated mostly to the Khanti-Mansiiski Autonomous Okrug, home to the Khanti and Nenets peoples, who are recognized by the Russian Federation as indigenous\(^1^0^1\). There, due to the bank requirements, the company expresses its CSR towards indigenous peoples using international EBRD standards and generously pays them compensation for oil extraction and pollution on native lands\(^1^0^2\).

Furthermore, Lukoil employs a CSR policy, one limb of which is headed *Environment*, to be implemented in a five-year programme titled *Energy Efficiency, Employees’ Well-Being and Sponsorship*. Sponsorship is implemented mainly through social-partnership agreements with the regions in which the company operates. Lukoil-Komi receives approximately 100 million roubles from the company’s national headquarters. This money is

\(^9^8\) Interview with the head of PR Lukoil-Komi, Usinsk, 25 February 2015
\(^1^0^0\) http://www.ebrd.com/work-with-us/projects/psd/lukoil-environmental-loan.html
\(^1^0^1\) Interview with the head of corporate coordination unit, Moscow, 24 April 2015
\(^1^0^2\) Research in progress, conducted by co-author of this paper in 2014-2016 in Khanti-Mansiiski Autonomous Okrug, unpublished manuscript
distributed between different administrations in Komi and the NAO\textsuperscript{103}. Reindeer-herding enterprises are registered in NAO even if they operate in the Komi Republic. Lukoil-Komi pays compensation to reindeer herders for oil spills and damage to the land. On the local level, Lukoil-Komi spends time and effort on engaging with the municipalities and communities in the republic. The company and local administration have had social partnership agreements for some ten years. These are usually focused on supporting education, culture, the environment, health, preservation of tradition, agriculture and small business\textsuperscript{104}. In 2014, a total of some 15 million roubles\textsuperscript{105} was given to the local administration in Izhma\textsuperscript{106}. Together with the local administration, Lukoil decides what to finance and how much money to give, with the decision based on the wishes of the institutions in need, for example schools or kindergartens. Local activists have complained that the community only receives the money through the local administration, rather than directly, and that its distribution is not transparent\textsuperscript{107}. Furthermore, the social partnership agreement itself is not public and transparent; NGOs and local citizens in the communities affected do not know its exact content, which undermines open and democratic municipal decision-making. Despite its grievances with regard to Lukoil-Komi’s environmental performance, Izviatas has recognized that it needs to look for different opportunities for benefit sharing, and in February 2015, signed a social economic agreement\textsuperscript{108} with the company. This agreement focuses mainly on social concerns, but takes in some environmental considerations as well. Lukoil-Komi agreed to inform citizens about all oil

\textsuperscript{103} Interview with the head of corporate coordination unit, Moscow, 24 April 2015  
\textsuperscript{104} Interview with the head of PR Lukoil, Usinsk, 25 February 2015  
\textsuperscript{105} At the time of interviewing, 15 million roubles equalled approximately 208.700 €  
\textsuperscript{106} Interview with local administration representative, Izhma, 24 February 2015  
\textsuperscript{107} Interview with local activist of SPC, Izhma, 22 February 2015  
\textsuperscript{108} * or social partnership agreement
spills regardless of their extent. Since the agreement has been signed, Lukoil-Komi has become more transparent about oil spills in the Izhma district, where the Izviatas office is located; however, our informants have reported that Lukoil-Komi continues to hide oil spills occurring in the Usinsk district. An examination of the EU guidelines on CSR (EUR-Lex 2011) reveals that Lukoil acknowledges its responsibilities towards social problems and towards society at large. It is ‘doing more’ (Schwartz 2011) by engaging with the communities rather than simply looking at the production of goods and services for a profit, showing that the bottom line is not the only value of importance.

The company cannot afford to improve its infrastructure and is focusing on social partnership agreements instead. Activists nevertheless insist that the company meet the ten demands they have put forward; as one informant put it, they do not want to ‘sell the environment’, but protect it. In other words, people would rather have a clean environment without oil leaks than money for philanthropic projects. Protests and discussions continue, but mostly without any changes in favour of the communities and activists, and leading to ‘a silent death of the indigenous people’, as activists have described the situation.

4.6. Framing the indigenous as a network strategy

The Komi-Izhemtsi have sought indigenous status for many years, as this would make them eligible for benefits on the national level and require oil companies to consult and compensate them for damage. Although environmental impact assessments require
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109 Interview with Save Pechora activist, Syktyvkar, January 21, 2006
110 Interview with local activist of SPC, Izhma, 20 February 2015
111 *Poleznue Iskopoemie / Round-table discussion with local activists, Izhma, 27 February 2015
consultations with local communities, in Russia indigenous peoples with a recognized status are treated differently by oil companies than unrecognized peoples. For example, on Sakhalin Island the requirements of the World Bank and the International Finance Corporation have been implemented better with peoples that are recognized as indigenous (Wilson 2016). In the following, we shed light on ways in which the Komi-Izhemtsi, with the help of international players, have explored the international arena, where they are recognized as indigenous peoples, and exemplify how they are seen differently by national and regional governmental entities, which treat them as local communities and not as indigenous peoples.

On the global level, the United Nations Development Group characterizes indigenous people as tribal peoples, using the guidelines set out in the ILO\textsuperscript{112} Convention on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples, 1989 (No. 169). In the Russian Federation, 41 groups are legally recognized as ‘indigenous, small-numbered peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East’. To be recognized as indigenous, a group must:

- Have no more than 50,000 members;
- Maintain a traditional way of life;
- Inhabit certain remote regions of Russia;
- Identify itself as a distinct ethnic community (IWGIA 2012).

The national guidelines are formulated in such a way that they exclude tribes that do not meet all four criteria (Rohr 2014), whereas the global guidelines are much more flexible, employing self-identification as the key criterion for being indigenous.

\textsuperscript{112} International Labour Organization
Reindeer husbandry in Komi is in decline (CCPR 2015). There are only some 90 herders among the local Komi-Izhemtsi (Shabayev & Sharapov 2011). Reindeer herding enterprises receive compensation from Lukoil-Komi because they have registered their traditional activity in NAO, where all reindeer herders receive compensation (see Figure 2). Companies appropriating pastureland for oil drilling need to receive herders’ consent and pay compensation to the reindeer-herding enterprises. Earlier, compensation took the form of a social-economic agreement with indigenous peoples’ organizations; since 2011 it has been paid directly to them (Henry et al. 2016, forthcoming).

As noted above, the Komi-Izhemtsi are not registered as an indigenous people on the national level. In 1993, the Izhma region was put on the list of areas inhabited by indigenous peoples of the North, but today competition for finances, land and resources is harsh (Shabayev & Sharapov 2011). The law would require the governor of each region within the Komi Republic would have to file a petition with the federal government requesting permission to include the Komi-Izhemtsi in the national registry of indigenous, small-numbered peoples of the North, Siberia and the Far East. In fact, the life of the rest of the Komi-Izhemtsi, who number around 15,000, does not differ significantly from that of any other local citizens, although they descend from indigenous inhabitants of the region, maintain close ties to the land, regard themselves as a marginalized group (CCPR 2014) and self-identify as indigenous (UN 2009). Despite the Komi-Izhemtsi being denied indigenous status in Russia, RAIPON, including the Komi-Izhemtsi organization Izviatas, is trying to frame their situation differently in the international arena and thereby secure them recognition as an indigenous people. If this effort is successful, the Komi-Izhemtsi could become eligible for protection under indigenous peoples’ rights globally, as the international and Russian national definitions of “indigenous” differ. Indigenous status
would bring ‘state support for the preferential right to use the land, tax exemption for the use of natural resources, free license to catch fish and marine animals, giving the young people from among the “indigenous peoples” access to state-commissioned student places in institutions of higher education, and the right to alternative military service’ (Shabayev & Sharapov 2011).

Izviatas has received support from Greenpeace International, RAIPON, IWGIA, or the UN Human Rights Committee in its problems with the oil company and in its fight for indigenous status113. Representatives of Izviatas participate in global indigenous gatherings, including a 2015 Arctic Council meeting in Iqaluit, where Izviatas had the opportunity to advise a body of representatives of the Nunavut territory to use its indigenous status to ban drilling around the region.

5 Discussion

5.1 Resources, power and sustainability of the NGO network in the local-global realm of the GGN

In the last resort, it is only the power of global civil society acting on the public mind via the media and communication networks that may eventually overcome the historical inertia of nation-states and thus bring these nation-states to accept the reality of their limited power in exchange for increasing their legitimacy and efficiency.

(Castells 2013, p. 42)

As scholars have pointed out, power can be achieved by networks in civil society, with the right resources (Castells 2013, Wilson 2016). In the case of the Komi Republic, people have

formed a resistance group, the SPC, based on their identity and their environmental and ethnical beliefs. In this union, normative power attempts to appeal to and convince more people to become involved, securing the movement’s objectives. The NGO network to which the committee belongs uses normative power in order to pressure Lukoil to meet the people’s demands by addressing the problems related to oil spills. Within the context of this work, normative power can be seen playing out in environmental and ethnic issues. NGOs in the network have objectives related to environmental protection and sustainability that align with the interests of their constituencies and pursue an ethnic legal demand in trying to gain indigenous status for the Komi-Izhemtsi. People can bring about change and while they have formed networks, these may be outweighed in terms of power by dominant actors, such as oil companies and the nation-state. Our study has examined a GGN with unique power relations and resource flows between actors and networks. As was mentioned earlier, the SPC is engaged in a larger transnational network of NGOs and other institutions. Available resources are mobilized locally as well as taken from the experience and power of larger, transnational players in the network, such as Greenpeace Russia, Greenpeace International, IWGIA, RAIPON and several UN committees. Furthermore, the movement exchanges intangible resources, such as experience and knowledge, with Izviatas and the Silver Taiga Foundation. On the local level, activists engage in collective action and receive attention from larger, more powerful entities, such as regional, national, and international NGOs.

The powerful actors within the GGN that oppose the movement include the oil company and, on the national level, the Putin administration, which has made the work of environmental NGOs receiving foreign funding and involved in political activity very difficult. For example, the Silver Taiga Foundation, which provides infrastructural resources
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to the SPC, may run the risk of being labelled a foreign agent pursuant to the Foreign Agent Law should it accept foreign funding from international foundations. Yet, the NGO network in our case found a successful strategy for overcoming powerful actors in the GGN. It was presented with and seized a political opportunity when an external NGO, INFOE, challenged the national government by framing the treatment of Izviatas by the state as racism. The oil spills have also created an opportunity for the movement, as international players have taken an interest and challenged the state through media pressure.

Activists from the SPC joined larger organizations such as the Silver Taiga Foundation and Greenpeace, bringing local expertise to the regional, national and transnational levels. In turn, the Committee has at its disposal the infrastructure and resources of the bigger movements. The fact that it is involved in a wider, global network within civil society means that it can receive support and help in framing issues in global terms. The larger organizations have helped the SPC in mobilizing regional, national and international institutions and in drawing their attention to the local issues in the Komi Republic. The SPC and Izviatas have not been isolated: through networking they have learned certain strategies that they can apply on a global scale.

Resources tapped in the global sphere by the NGO network include media support - which frames the problems as an indigenous issue - and financial resources. As we can see, the local is intertwined with the global. If brought to bear in local activism, the power of the global actors could have an influence on companies’ CSR policy by impacting the mind of the public. Due to multiple NGO campaigns, investment banks and global stakeholders demand greater CSR, and Lukoil has developed appropriate policies at its national headquarters. However, these policies are formulated such that regional offices, Lukoil-
Komi for example, fail to implement them. This can be attributed to a lack of funding for replacing old, Soviet-era infrastructure.

In GGNs, networks are meant to bring the global closer to the local. Our study demonstrates the mechanism underpinning this global-local interplay of actors. The local (people, activists) are able to get access to national media and even global institutions, mostly through a broker from within the community or through other individual change agents. The broker knows what is happening on the ground and can possibly combine the different interests and needs of the various stakeholders involved; parts of civil society may become more closely connected to the space in which the environmental pollution, and possibly injustice, is taking place. In the present case, new institutional spaces were created on the transnational level: the roundtables in the Izhma region, the civic action that is taking place, the learning networks established through summer schools initiated by Greenpeace and the possibility of local activists participating in Arctic Council meetings. Without brokers, the Committee probably would not have had incentive to establish connections with transnational institutions such as the UN or the Arctic Council. Reaching out to these brought the Committee tremendous support, allowing it to bypass the national level, on which it felt powerless. We argue that the power of the networks creates an alternative, one that is still a work in progress in enforcing corporate accountability.

Our case reveals a large discrepancy in power and interests on the national level between the state and the oil industry, on the one hand, and civil society on the other. In line with Castells (2013), one sees that the nation-state is guided by traditional political principles, that is, the maximization of the state’s interests and the prioritization of the political (and economic) interests of political actors within the state. We have explored the long-term sustainability of the NGO network in the Komi Republic. The survival of the
movement can be explained with reference to factors originating partly from the local and partly from the global level. Some of the members of the SPC are former communist leaders, who share particular ideas and values and are, as leaders, able to understand the post-Soviet ‘system’ as well; they know its ins and outs and can thus adjust very well. The Committee has not registered itself as an official committee, allowing it to avoid the sanctions that would ensue from the Foreign Agent Law. Most of its members are retired or have another primary occupation, which makes them advantageous actors vis-a-vis the state and its surveillance mechanisms.

5.2 The issue of trust in GGNs and the interplay of actors’ networks

The case of local communities, including the Komi-Izhemtsi, fighting against a giant oil industry in today’s Russia, is a flagship example of how sustainable environmental movements and, more specifically, resource-sharing networks can be. The value of framing grievances and alleged discrimination against minorities in this case should not be understated. The World Bank and International Finance Corporation recognize indigenous peoples as social groups with social or cultural identities that are distinct from mainstream groups or the dominant society (IFC 2012). The Komi-Izhemtsi identify themselves as an indigenous people but have received attention beyond the borders of Russia only with the assistance of international NGOs, indigenous associations and the media. Indigenous peoples have gained noteworthy support, especially with the 2008 United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Among other rights, the Declaration provides for the right of control over traditionally owned or used lands, territories and resources (UN 2008, Article 26) and ensures ‘just, fair and equitable compensation, for [those] lands, territories and resources (...) which have been (...) occupied, used or damaged.
without their free, prior and informed consent’ (UN 2008, Article 28). Thus, on a global level, the injustices suffered by the Komi-Izhemtsi are recognized and means of redressing such wrongs are being adhered to.

On the global level, the issue has been framed as such that Lukoil is the culprit and the ‘indigenous’ people the victims. On the national level, the Komi-Izhemtsi are not considered different to any other people living in rural areas, and therefore they are treated as members of local communities. In any event, the current law in Russia does not offer any possibilities for the Komi-Izhemtsi to gain more benefits from oil companies (Rohr 2014). Therefore, it proves to be difficult for environmental movements and NGO networks to pin down a company operating, as in this case, within national borders and laws and customs; certain global standards do not apply, or differ from the national standards.

The dominating and controlling industry and state are able to plunder the region’s natural resources (Ross 2009, p. 47-48 and Alexander 2009, p. 135) without ensuring ‘long-term sustainable benefits for [its] populations’ (Stammler & Wilson 2006, p. 6). This state of affairs is a consequence of the weakness of democratic institutions, which failed to develop because of a rather weak central political structure (Ross 2009). We have seen that the distrust in governmental institutions and the oil company, despite their corporate social activities within the communities, signals that there is no control mechanism in place, as local activists have in fact claimed. For example, test results were not fully trusted when they came back negative after water samples were sent in to check for radiation. Activists claim that oil leaks are not properly checked and monitored by the responsible governmental agency. Looking at the relationships between the state and industry in this example, these observations, gathered in talking to local activists, suggest that the agency...
is working in favour of Lukoil-Komi and potentially against the movement. Confronting Lukoil for failing to meet global standards, such as certain components of the UN Global Compact, proves to be rather difficult. Although many promises are not fulfilled on the ground in the Komi Republic, it is not easy to prove this, as Lukoil’s global commitments are few and, moreover, too vague. One potential opportunity for the Komi-Izhemtsi lies in the commitment that Lukoil signed when engaging in contracts with EBRD for several loans earmarked for the development of a clean environment in the company’s zone of operation. It is thus far unclear whether the movement can claim higher compensation or other sorts of restitution based on Lukoil’s loan commitments. In the past Lukoil has failed to carry out many of the promises it made, and has had to pay fines.

The distrust of local activists towards governmental bodies and Lukoil is not one-sided. Local and regional administrations, as well as Lukoil, claim that the SPC is using dubious strategies to get its way, despite its peaceful nature. The Committee uses a strategy of causing hearings to fail on purpose in order to get attention and show that they are not satisfied with Lukoil-Komi’s actions and will not rest until a satisfactory result is obtained. Whether the Committee will achieve anything using this strategy is questionable. Our informants from Lukoil-Komi and from the local and regional administrations consider the Committee mostly an inconsistent and incompetent organization due to what they see as its lack of organization and rather rigid attitude. For example, they state that the demands of the Committee are excessive and that they cannot completely discontinue drilling for oil. Izviatas, on the other hand, has become more compromising than its partner,

---

124 Greenpeace covered up some spills, which resulted in a fine of 614 million rubles for nine spills since 2011 in the Komi Republic (Bankwatch 2014: http://bankwatch.org/sites/default/files/briefing-Lukoil-SGC-22Dec2014.pdf)
choosing to rely on the social partnership agreements and the positive social impacts these promise for the communities\textsuperscript{115}. This implies a de-radicalization of the movement on the part of Izviatas, whereas the SPC continues to be more critical. Lukoil-Komi, in turn, continues with its CSR activities and honours its environmental commitments, albeit only in part.

6. Conclusion

Our analysis has shown that the NGO network involved in the oil GGN is focused primarily on resolving environmental issues. The citizens involved in the network desire a clean environment, clearly a value they find important in their lives. In this environmental movement in the Komi Republic, industrial development meets with opposition from local communities. Communities have taken action out of a desire to protect their lives and rights and have been supported by several organizations, including global actors contributing to environmental grassroots movements on the local level. In line with Castells (2013) and the concept of a GGN (Tysiachniouk 2012), civil society networks in the Komi Republic act on local and global levels, but are rooted in the region’s problems; global actors on the local level influence capacity-building across a hierarchy of scales in the GGN, forming a counterpower to the power of a giant industry.

What is remarkable in this case study are the local and global assemblages of the GGN, with the counterpower being a local force trained against a powerful, global player. The local movement is trying to reach the global through networking, mostly with regional and international civil actors. The resistance does not remain local, but rather expands into

\textsuperscript{115} Interview with regional activist, Syktyvkar, 20-21 January 2016
a larger sphere, involving actors from the international scale and bypassing the national level. Power in society comes from the public recognizing the environmental movement and organizing themselves in support of its objectives, thus driving change through an organized systematic movement. People are fighting for their land and are not satisfied with CSR-mandated promises only. Nevertheless, the movement remains small, as it cannot rise up as a large-scaled and powerful organization against the oil industry. As discussed in this article, there are constant and persistent pressures against such movements, hindering them from growing, as the political and economic direction of the country is different to that of its environmental activists. As we can see, the civil society network is outweighed by companies and the state in terms of power, despite the network’s successful resource mobilization strategy. While the network can survive, can organize and mobilize actors locally and globally and can demand greater CRS, little change has occurred in oil companies’ environmental practices as a result.

The social movement seen in the Komi Republic can be interpreted as activism demanding better CSR (Mena & Waeger 2014) by appealing to global standards. Whereas Lukoil headquarters has declared its commitment to global standards related to the environment, indigenous rights and the overall sustainability of oil production, the implementation of CSR by Lukoil-Komi is constrained by regional and local factors. These include expectations about the behaviour of the oil company on the part of state administrators involved in shaping the local institutional environment for CSR and the expectations of stakeholders beyond the social movement. The local context is shaped by the low capacity of the state to deliver welfare and infrastructure and the lingering effects of the integration of political and economic decision-making in the Soviet period. Despite privatization in the 1990s, the arrival of transnational corporations, and profound changes in
governance since the end of the Soviet regime, the local factors cited have resulted in a high degree of continuity with the past in relations between industry and local communities (Henry et al., 2016 forthcoming). Lukoil-Komi has responded to stakeholder expectations with certain levels of CSR, such as community assistance, the sponsorship of social events, and commercial investments in the community. The funds available are spread among these different activities, leaving very little to address the environmental concerns relating to the company’s oil drilling activities; the problems connected to oil spills and the associated degradation of the environment go unsolved. Lukoil-Komi’s response to the movement is one of investing in strategies focusing on communication with the communities at stake, trying to diminish grievances. The company prioritizes this approach over possible investments in technological advances an alternative that would put its profits at risk - as the communities affected are small and are rather easy to handle. For Lukoil, timely financial investments in community services is a strategy to keep the communities from protesting on a much higher level by giving them just as much as is necessary and no more. It can be argued that the state is an instrument of domination along with the oil industry rather than an institution of representation, because it intervenes in the public sphere on behalf of specific interests that prevail in the state (in line with Castells 2013). Sustainable development within environmental policy has been declared a goal, but has yet to be implemented.
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