

Defining a Conceptual Framework for Identity Construction in Georgia in the 1900s

*Iveta Gogava
Ivane Javakhishvili
Tbilisi State University
(igogava@ucss.ge)*

*Keywords: identity markers, intellectuals, national question, political
nation, self-consciousness*

Introduction

The final decades of the XIX century and the beginning of the XX century were characterized by significant changes in the world: the formation of an International World Order, distribution of power between the Empires and emergence of nation-states. As Andrew Heywood states, "...by the end of the XIX century, nationalism had become a truly popular movement with the spread of flags, national anthems, patriotic poetry and literature, public ceremonies and national holidays. Nationalism became the language of mass politics, made possible by the growth of primary education, mass literacy and the spread of popular newspapers"¹. Writers on nationalism have long appreciated the centrality of intellectuals to the emergence of national consciousness and political mobilization. As Suny and Kennedy argue, intellectuals were those enlighteners and liberators, who articulated the spirit of the nation².

The study aims to examine the role of Georgian intellectuals in defining a conceptual framework of identity construction in Georgia in 1900s. Hence, the research question of the paper is the following: what was the role of Georgian intellectuals in the formation of the Georgian national

¹ Heywood A. *Political Ideologies: An Introduction*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2003, p. 170.

² Suny R., Kennedy M. (ed.). *Intellectuals and Articulation of the Nation*. The University of Michigan Press, 2001, p. 3.

identity and how did they define a conceptual framework for identity construction in 1900-1921? The major argument of the paper is that the intellectual movement made a bridge from the past to the future of Georgia. The intellectuals of the 1900s received a cultural and intellectual heritage from the *Tergdaleulebi*³ of the 1860s, who contributed greatly to determining Georgian identity markers.

The significance of the topic is stipulated by the following factors: First, the formation of a national identity is the central problem on the agenda of every sovereign state in the world; Second, the questions proposed by Georgian intellectuals at the beginning of the XX century remained significant for the next decades and have not lost their relevance to date.

This paper uses a qualitative approach for collecting and interpreting the data. Social discourse analysis examines the social and political reality at the beginning of the XX century. Content analysis scrutinizes the letters of the intellectuals of the 1900s. Using a case study, it explores the ideas of the intellectuals of the 1900s as a concrete example of identity formation in Georgia.

The article adopts the theoretical framework of Miroslav Hroch's three phases of national awakening. He describes the main characteristics of a national movement, the role of different actors in the formation of a national identity and key elements of mobilizing masses for the special goal. In order to show the role of Georgian intellectuals, the paper investigates the letters of Georgian intellectuals Archil Jorjadze, Noe Zhordania and Tedo Ghlonti.

The paper is divided into three parts. The first part introduces the state of research and theoretical framework used while working on the paper. The second part touches upon the role of intellectuals in defining Georgian national identity. The third and final part presents the main findings of the study.

³ *Tergdaleulebi* are literally 'those, who have drunk the water from the river Terek.' They were Georgian intellectuals, attempting to modernize their fatherland, to lead it to 'national rebirth' and a 'new life'.... (More at: Reisner O., *Travelling between Two Worlds - The Tergdaleulebi, their Identity Conflict and National Life* // Identity Studies, Vol. 1., 2009.

Terms and Definitions

In accordance with the aims of the study, the following terms are central for the paper: nation, identity and intellectuals. The paper shares the interpretation of nation proposed by Miroslav Hroch. He identifies three characteristics that define a group of people as a nation: (1) a 'memory' of some common past treated as a 'destiny' of the group - or at least of its core constituents; (2) a density of linguistic or cultural ties enabling a higher degree of social communication within the group than beyond it; (3) a conception of the equality of all members of the group organized as a civil society⁴.

Considering identification as a process of forming the values of the group, Hall suggests the following definition of the identity: “identity emerges as a kind of unsettled space or an unresolved question in that space, between a number of intersecting discourses. ... [Until recently, we have incorrectly thought that identity is] a kind of fixed point of thought and being, a ground of action... the logic of something like a ‘true self.’ ... [But] Identity is a process, identity is split. Identity is not a fixed point but an ambivalent point. Identity is also the relationship of the other to oneself”⁵.

Intellectuals, as Suny and Kennedy describe, are significant in the articulation of a nation. They struggle to set the nation in their ideology, reconciling the expectations of the nation with its current condition. Intellectuals are frequently treated as symbols of the nation’s existence. With this definition, the authors showed the importance of intellectuals in setting and solving the issue of national identity⁶.

Literature Review

The end of the XIX century and the beginning of XX century was a period of the formation of Georgian identity. Ronald Grigor Suny in his book “The Making of the Georgian Nation” (1988) reviews the historical context of nation-building in the XIX century, examines the main factors

⁴ Hroch M., *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe*. Cambridge University Press., 1968, p. 79.

⁵ Hall S., *Ethnicity: Identity and Difference* // *Radical America*, 1989, p. 9.

⁶ Suny R., Kennedy M. (ed.). *Intellectuals and Articulation of the Nation*. The University of Michigan Press, 2001, p. 349.

contributing to the emergence of a political nation, and determines the role of intellectuals in the construction of national identity. The cornerstone for creating a sense of nationhood is rewriting history, which plays a significant role in the formation of a nation. As Suny argues, under the impact of the Russian rule, Georgian intellectuals initiated their own search into the country's past, a search that immediately raised doubts about Georgia's present and future while at the same time it created a congenial view of the past and a source of national pride. Thus, historians, like poets, provided the small Georgian reading public with the images required to regard Georgia as a nation.

Writing about Georgian intellectuals in the XIX-XX centuries, Suny shows changes in the paradigm from *Tergdaleulebi* to the young Social Democrats. He emphasizes the role of the intellectuals of the 1860s in defining the vision of Social Democrats to form a political nation at the end of the XIX century. He also highlights that the young Marxists (Social Democrats) had got the spirit from Russian revolutionary thoughts. "In the view of the Marxists, Georgia could be returned to the Georgians only when revolution eliminated the dual domination of Russian bureaucracy and Armenian industrialists. This would require, first, a political revolution and, later, a socialist revolution"⁷.

"Socialism in Georgian Colors" by Stephen Jones (2005) emphasizes the significance of socialism, the appearance of different generations of intellectuals and summarizes the most favorable factors for Georgia's path to socialism. According to Jones, at the beginning of the XX century Georgia was "ethnically, socially and economically divided, but increasingly educated, urbanized and national". In his words, Georgian social democracy was determined by the *Tergdaleulebi* of the 1860s and 1880s. Their answer to the challenge of colonialism, multi-ethnicity, regionalism, and social division was a combination of romanticism, nationalism and pragmatism. They advocated for education in the native

⁷ Suny R., *The Making of the Georgian Nation*, Indiana University Press, Hoover Institution Press, 1988, p. 145.

language and promoted history, art, and literature as weapons in the struggle for unity⁸.

Jones shows the ties between the Georgian intellectuals of the 1860s to the young Marxists and highlights that they were both nationalists⁹. The *Tergdaleulebi* started with nation building by making Georgian society have a common understanding of its values. Jones states that the Georgian Social Democrats, like their nineteenth-century intellectual predecessors, were “nationalists”, but in terms of cultural nationalism: “Georgian Social Democracy drew the ideas of the the *Tergdaleulebi* and was strongly influenced by their concern for national unity, economic development and political reform. Tsereteli’s vision of the Georgian future was crucial to the Social Democratic principles of the Georgian Republic of 1918-1921: property-owning peasantry, private and public commerce, cooperatives, and government control of large-scale capital.”¹⁰

The sources for this paper are the letters of Archil Jorjadze, Noe Zhordania and Tedo Glonti. The selection of the mentioned intellectuals was based on several factors. First, it is the common ideological affiliation – all of them were Social Democrats and shared the values of the young Georgian Marxists. Second, they were the ones who defined the concepts of nationalism and assessed the political and economic situation of Georgia.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework of the paper is based on Miroslav Hroch’s three phases of national awakening in which phase A is the period of scholarly interest, phase B implies the period of patriotic agitation, and phase C is a mass national movement. The selected theory ties in with the research topic, because it presents the process of an emerging nation and emphasizes the meaning of intellectual activity.

According to Hroch, the emergence of a nation starts with a collection of information about the history, language, and customs of an ethnic group,

⁸ Jones S. F., *Socialism in Georgian Colors. The European Road to Social Democracy*. Harvard University Press., 2005, p. 29.

⁹ *Ibid*, p. 2.

¹⁰ *Ibid*, p. 44.

which later becomes a critical element in patriotic agitation. This intellectual activity and its subject-matter elements of symbolic culture and history are key instruments in the political process of nation building. Georgian intellectuals started spreading new words throughout nation via newspapers, meetings, and theatre plays to give a common understanding to the same new terms, to share ideas of a common past and present a vision of a common future.

Hroch discusses the role of intellectuals in accordance with the following criteria: (1) Social status (occupation), and the relevant alterations in this; (2) Social origins; (3) Territorial distribution, and location of patriotic activities; (4) Place or district of origin; (5) Educational background. The intellectuals who played a substantial role in national revival in Georgia were from different social origins, worked in different fields, lived in different areas of Georgia, had different educational backgrounds and spread the word in distinct parts of the country¹¹.

The Role of Georgian Intellectuals of the 1900s in the Formation of Georgian Identity

The final decades of the XIX century and the beginning of the XX century marked a transitional phase for the formation of Georgian identity. Asking questions like “Who are we?” “Who are the others?” “What is the difference between us and the others?” was a key element of the process itself. The formation of identity became a precondition for the formation of the Georgian nation. Ronald Suny (1988) marks out different factors, which facilitated the process of emergence of political nation in Georgia. Economic development, improvement of urban life, advancing the ways of communication and industrialization were central factors in national mobilization. On the other hand, Georgian intellectuals showed their readiness to start social activism. Simultaneously, social activism was reflected in their contribution to the educational sphere via establishing different organizations, publishing newspapers and promoting cultural life among the people.

¹¹ Hroch M., *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe*. Cambridge University Press., 1968, p. 15.

There were three generations of Georgian intellectuals who contributed to the formation of the conceptual framework of Georgian national identity. The first steps of fighting for independence were done in the beginning of the XIX century. Several mass uprisings in different regions of Georgia, the conspiracy of 1832 and Georgian Romanticism were followed by the *pirveli dasi* (First Generation), *meore dasi* (Second Generation) and *mesame dasi* (Third Generation) of Georgian intellectuals.

The intellectuals of the 1860s (*first generation*) defined the vision of the Social Democrats (*third generation*) to form a political nation at the end of the XIX century and lead it to independence. The *Tergdaleulebi* started building a nation via establishing common values in society. Meanwhile, the Social Democrats, following the path of their predecessors, made Georgia a cultural nation.

As mentioned, the study analyses the letters of Noe Zhordania,¹² Tedo (Tevdore) Ghlonti¹³ and Archil Jorjadze.¹⁴ They are significant for this

¹² Noe Zhordania was the head of the Democratic Republic of Georgia (1918-1921). He was born in 1868, in Lantchkhuti, Georgia. In 1891, he became a student at the Veterinary Institute in Warsaw. He studied the European socialist and revolutionary theories and movements as well. Back in Tbilisi in 1893, he presided over the birth of the Georgian Social Democratic party, and then took part in a study tour to Switzerland, France, Germany, and England. From there, he sent articles to the Georgian press about Georgia's national past, the European workers' movement, rural organization, etc. When he returned to Georgia after four years, he was considered a highly talented journalist and writer. A year later, he became the editor of the newspaper *Kvali* (The Furrow), which turned into a rallying call for the young generation in the revolt against the Tsarist regime. He was arrested and imprisoned. In 1902, he launched the idea of a confederation of the peoples of the Caucasus. On May 26, 1918, Noe Zhordania, leader of the Social Democratic party, on behalf of the National Council, proclaimed the independence of Georgia. (Phaghava K. *Noe Zhordania. First Republic of Georgia Blog*. Retrieved in June, 2015)

¹³ Tedo Glonti, a prominent public and political figure in early 20th century Georgia, was born in Lanchkhuti in 1888. In addition to being a journalist, economist, and agricultural worker, he became a leading member of the Georgian Socialist-Federalist party in 1912 and leader of the left wing of the Georgian Socialist-Federalist party (1915-1916). He was an active participant in the establishment of Georgian independence by serving as a member of the National Council of Georgia and a member of the Constituent Assembly of Georgia (1918-1921). In 1919, he founded the newspaper *Zviti* and in 1919-1921, he acted as the

research, because they present the meaning of identity in relation to the “others” (in this case, other ethnic groups), describe the scholarly interest of that period and express ideas about the Georgian nation. In the letters, the authors propose different understandings regarding the term nation and the main elements of national identity. Thus, topics such as the national question, national identity and “the others” occupy a larger part of the writings of intellectuals.

The National Question

Noe Zhordania posed the question of nationality. He considered the national question as a political question, because it is based on the relationships between the nation and the state: “It is clear that the national question, as one of the parts of a political problem, requires popular desire and actions... Posing the national question depends on the desire and actions of the nation itself...”¹⁵. Discussing the national question in Georgia at the beginning of the XX century, Zhordania (1922) carved out two main requests. One group of people called for establishing relationships between the nation and state to ensure the development of national culture, while the second group demanded the creation of a sovereign republic of Georgia. “The first [group] aims to have national culture and second strives for national governance... The first is the continuation of the work of the 1860s and the second takes us back to the first quarter of the XIX century, when

editor of the newspaper *Sakhalkho Purtseli*. Tedo Ghlonti became the 3rd Rector of Tbilisi State University in June 1926 and served until September 1928. In 1937, Tedo Ghlonti was shot as an “Enemy of the People and Traitor of Motherland.”

¹⁴ Archil Jorjadze was a political figure, publicist, philosopher, and sociologist. He was born in 1872. He graduated from the Tbilisi Gymnasium in 1892 and continued his studies at universities in Russia, England, France and Switzerland. In 1900, he came back to Tbilisi and founded *Tsnobis Furceli* (Informational Paper). He was one of the leaders of Socialist-Federalist party. In 1904, he represented the Socialist-Federalist party at the Interparty Conference in Geneva. His works were dedicated to national issues, individualism etc. (Ramishvili L. *Archil Jorjadze – Biography. Matiane Blog*. Retrieved in June, 2015.)

¹⁵ Zhordania N., *Collection of Works on the National Issues* // Committee of Communist Party of Russia, 1922, p 167. (Translations for citations originally in Georgian are provided by the author)

autonomy was the slogan of our battles...”¹⁶. This paragraph illustrates the disintegration of the Georgian nation in terms of setting the questions of nationality and the author’s attitude towards the problem itself.

While discussing the question of nationality, Zhordania emphasized the importance of self-determination, because he believed that all nations are equal no matter the extent of their territory and the size of their population: “A person, government or nation does not have the right to legally or illegally own other people, occupy their territory or use other means of force...” he wrote¹⁷. Speaking about self-determination, Zhordania marked out two actors in international society, the Proletariat and Bolsheviks. He thought that political and social difficulties were the results of clashes between imperialism and national self-determination. “Georgian national self-determination was outlined in this concrete framework, and it has experienced victory and defeats... It stands in the center of national knot and when it is opened, the Georgian nation will be free and restore its dignity...”¹⁸. This passage shows that not only is the idea of a common past mentioned as a key element of Georgian self-determination, but so are territory and geopolitical location.

Tedo Ghlonti started his letter “Integrity of the Georgian Nation” with a problematic issue of national integrity: “...Georgian social life is quite weak, the Georgian economy lacks integrity, there is no tradition of loving your nation, there is no national politics, the Georgian nation is scattered and there are no objective conditions in which to arrange national political life...”¹⁹. The author carves out several markers of Georgian national consolidation: economic integrity, patriotism, and national politics, which establish the “objective conditions” for creating a Georgian nation.

Tedo Ghlonti suggested the term “National Organism” (in Georgian: *erovnuli skheuli*) as a basis for national integrity. He presented the nation as a living organism that is united in its common actions. He also discussed the

¹⁶ Ibid, p. 170.

¹⁷ Ibid, p. 64.

¹⁸ Ibid, p. 68.

¹⁹ Ghlonti T., *Integrity of Georgian Nation: Part One* // Sakhalko Furceli (People’s Paper), #279, # 315, # 316, 1915.

different aspects of social life. In the words of Tedo Glonti, “The national-territorial governance of the Georgian nation is a cornerstone of ethnicity, national arrangement... framing the Georgian nation in social life.” He views Georgian villages as the best model of territorial arrangement, despite the fact that they lack economic integrity, social relations and unity. “Due to social and natural circumstances he [Georgian man – I.G.] does not go far from his country, therefore the villages and towns maintain ethnical integrity.”²⁰

Similar to other intellectuals, Archil Jorjadze posed the question of nationality. He presented the problem of the uncertainty of the Georgian nation in terms of questions of nationality: “There is no other nation or society that has such an obscure and uncertain opinion about nationality than the Georgians”²¹. Jorjadze sought to find the key elements of nationality: “If we want to study nationality, we should pay attention to the particular environment where it was created and developed. The concrete precondition can be the state. We should clarify the extent to which the state is related to the process of the emergence of nationality, i.e. what is the link between the nationality and the state?”²².

Jorjadze gave the definition of the state in order to show its link to nationality: “The state is a coercive organization, where the minority has authority on the majority, and this authority is powerful when the kingdom is bigger. Therefore, the essence of the state is to seek expansion and occupation”²³. He considered that two main elements of Georgian self-identification were the Monarchy and periods of war. Loyalty to kings was the way to create a new political organism, which helped the nation deal with its enemies. Describing the psychological portrait of the nation under the conquest of another nation, he emphasized the strength of the nation-state itself. Simultaneously, he explained the logic of occupying other

²⁰ Ibid

²¹ Chikovani N., Chkhaidze I., Kakitelashvili K., Kvrivishvili M., Tsereteli I., *Narratives of Identity in Georgia: At the Edge of Multiethnic Georgian Nation (1860-1918)*, Tbilisi, Georgia, 2014, pp. 375-376.

²² Jorjadze A., *Homeland and Patriotism: The National Problem in Georgia*, Tbilisi University Press, 1990, p. 43.

²³ Ibid, p. 42.

countries for the purpose of making the kingdom more influential. “After several attempts to fight against seizure, the nation gets used to proposed limits and borders and feels safer, while the process of consolidation can emerge in those people who have ethnographic and religious ties to other inhabitants of the state”²⁴.

Writing about the basis of Georgian national life, Jorjadze emphasized the significance of economic and cultural relationships: “Bonds between the peasant and his master, employee and employer are part of economic relations, which has its legal form... The essence of cultural relations is progress in literature, art and science, the proof of our existence...”²⁵.

According to Chkhaidze, Archil Jorjadze considered that economic resistance and clashes of different social classes weakened the unity of the nation²⁶. Therefore, it is important to step forward and ensure national consolidation. “Unity and indivisibility of the nation is a guarantee of prosperity, rather than division and breaking up”²⁷. In contrast with Noe Zhordania and Tedo Ghlonti, Archil Jorjadze put the emphasis on the unity of nation-state and considered ethnographic relations as one of the key elements of national identity.

National Identity

Noe Zhordania distinguished two different perceptions of a nation: cultural and territorial. From a territorial perspective, the nation could be considered an ethnographical entity. One of the main bases for territorial division and economic development was agriculture. Economic integrity, from this perspective, was based on social relations and industry. Noe Zhordania considered economic integrity as a key element in territorial unification. Therefore, the ethnic composition living on a proposed territory is less important than economic and social ties. Particularly, he mentions,

²⁴ Ibid, p. 37.

²⁵ Ibid, p. 46.

²⁶ Chikovani N., Chkhaidze I., Kakitelashvili K., Kvrivishvili M., Tsereteli I., *Narratives of Identity in Georgia: At the Edge of Multiethnic Georgian Nation (1860-1918)*, Tbilisi, Georgia, 2014, p. 74

²⁷ Ghlonti T., *Integrity of Georgian Nation: Part One* // Sakhalko Furceli (People’s Paper), #279, # 315, # 316, 1915.

“First of all, the state is an economic phenomenon... Territory cannot be surrounded by a nation, but by economic priorities...”²⁸.

From a cultural perspective, society could be considered as a producer of the culture, because “...it is based on modern industry which should... Therefore, nations take part in creating a common culture according to their historical past... This natural unification is a cornerstone for national and cultural consolidation”²⁹. The main actors in the unification process should be those who are more interested in creating national culture – the proletariat, because proletarians apply their energy to ensure the economic prosperity of the nation.

Noe Zhordania considered economic inequality as the main factor of national development. In his words, “...a nation exists, lives and develops, and we are the witnesses of national events in the world. Some nations step forward, others have obstacles on their way. The obstacles cause disagreements and clashes in society and hinder social progress. The cornerstone of these clashes is economic inequality.” Thus, in comparison with Tedo Ghlonti, Noe Zhordania emphasized the significance of not only economic but also cultural unification for raising awareness among the Georgian nation.

For a proposed definition of the term nation, Tedo Ghlonti cited Archil Jorjadze, who defined nationality with “three factors: language, territory and morals.” Ghlonti also called for another definition of nation: “If different nationalities live on the same territory, they adopt the culture, manners, language of this land and resemble the locals of that territory.” The author suggested the definition of Petrograd International Congress: “One can clear up the question of the nation in the following ways: 1) Ethnological features 2) “*Lingua Parlee*” and 3) Mother Tongue.” Ghlonti himself distinguished two different notions: “ethnicity” and “nationality” and considered that “Ethnic group belongs to one ethnological group which is united by language, while nationality is a part of spiritual and cultural entity.” Particularly, he wrote, “Neither Gregorian, nor Moses’ nor

²⁸ Zhordania N., *Collection of Works on the National Issues* // Committee of Communist Party of Russia, 1922, p. 172.

²⁹ Ibid, p. 177.

Muhammad's teaching, nor other religious skepticism hinders a person from being Georgian or belonging to another nation..." This passage indicates that Ghlonti did not consider religion as a marker of Georgian identity. A person can be a part of the nation regardless of his confession³⁰.

The above-cited paragraphs emphasized the importance of history, territory, language and social relations as elements in the formation of national identity. Talking about the ethnic composition of Georgia, and showing the statistical picture of different nationalities living in Georgia were the ways to illustrate the role of intellectuals and their importance in establishing a nation-state.

“Us” and the “Others”

Tedo Ghlonti's view of the “others” in Georgia becomes clear through his reference to the ethnic composition of Georgia and attention paid to the different ethnic groups. Identifying the “others” helps the author to mark out who are these groups, how integrated they are and how they communicate with other groups. “As a result of the existing situation, the vast majority of Georgians have changed their confession: some of them are Catholics, some of them are Muslims, some of them are Gregorians. They have also changed the surnames and forgotten their languages...”, Tedo Ghlonti argued³¹.

Here are two passages from the letter about Armenians and Jews in Georgia:

“Do not forget the essence of the Armenian nation, Gregorians are Georgians (clashes between Georgian and Armenian Churches occurred in the 7th century and Georgians kept the Gregorian confession) culturally and physically. They are the elements of Georgian villages, together with Ossetians and Jews”³².

“I feel excited when I read our letters about nationality and I ask a big question: Which nationality or which ethnicity do Georgian Jews belong to? Are they part of Georgian society or not? I mean nationality and not

³⁰ Ghlonti T., *Integrity of Georgian Nation: Part One* // Sakhalko Furceli (People's Paper), #279, # 315, # 316, 1915.

³¹ Ibid

³² Ibid

confession, of course...”³³. The passage about Jews shows the author’s attitude towards Georgian Jews and indicates Tedo Ghlonti’s perception of Jews as being part of the Georgian society. Moreover, he uses the adjective “Georgian” to present this belonging. Simultaneously, it emphasizes the meaning of nationality and pays less attention to religion.

It is worthwhile to cite the story of the man from Akhalkalaki: “The man from Akhalkalaki admitted that the inhabitants of this city are Georgians, but they are Muslims. Fortunately, he also gave permission to me to examine the skull of him and other inhabitants...”³⁴. This observation made Tedo Ghlonti think that despite the diverse ethnic composition in the territory, the shape and type of the skulls of locals were not different from a Georgian one. In this passage, he emphasizes the problem of the disintegration of Georgian nation. Simultaneously, it is one of the best examples of the controversial thinking of the author. From the beginning, he spoke about the nation as a whole body, which included the “others” as well, but in the citation, he discusses biological differences as a part of detachment. This indicates that identity formation is a process that goes parallel to thoughts by the author about Georgian reality.

In the letters, Jorjadze expressed ideas about the nation-state, and preconditions for the consolidation of the nation and ideology. In his words, “...The state appeared on the basis of inequality, it strengthened clashes between different social groups... The Georgian state created a Georgian nationality and Georgian consciousness. It was strong during the prosperous time of Georgia. Moreover, our national consciousness, as well as our state, was created on a forced basis...”³⁵.

Talking about consolidation, nationalism and markers of national identity, Jorjadze emphasized the importance of the self-perception of each person as a member of a nation, and his/her connection with the group. “Nationality i.e. nationalism is the understanding of the idea that I, an individual, have a material and spiritual connection to my nation. Where do

³³ Ibid

³⁴ Ibid

³⁵ Jorjadze A., *Homeland and Patriotism: The National Problem in Georgia*, Tbilisi University Press, 1990, p. 33

these connections come from? They come from the consciousness that this connection is the basis of living, freedom and happiness. This historical path should be passed by each member of society and create a group of people and these groups of people create the nation itself³⁶. In the words of A. Jorjadze "...Those people who have self-perception and self-consciousness can be considered a nation. The nation is a group of self-educated people, and nationality is the understanding of connections within the group for mobilization against a common enemy"³⁷.

Conclusion

The Georgian intellectuals of the beginning of the XX century - Tedo Ghlonti, Noe Zhordania and Archil Jorjadze, shared the ideas of the intellectuals of the 1860s. They analyzed the existing situation from a scholarly perspective and provided the very first academic definitions for the notions of nation, nationalism, and nation-state.

Their understanding of the nation was outlined in the modernist perspective. The letters of Archil Jorjadze, Noe Zhordania and Tedo Ghlonti marked out the importance of the unification and consolidation of the nation by carving out elements of national identity such as the history of the nation, territorial and cultural integrity, and language.

As the letters presented, the ethnic, religious and social groups in the country should be included in the forming of nation-state. Economic integrity and social ties are considered the cornerstones for individuals to feel more connected to their country and nation. The self-identification of a nation was understood as the acceptance of different social and ethnic groups in the society for establishing a strong nation-state.

³⁶ Ibid, p. 43.

³⁷ Ibid, p. 42

**Սահմանելով 1900-ականներին Վրաստանում ինքնության
կառուցման կոնցեպտուալ շրջանակ**

Իվետա Գոգավա

Իվանե Ջավախիշվիլու անվան

Թբիլիսիի պետական համալսարան

(igogava@ucss.ge)

19-րդ դարի վերջին և 20-րդ դարի սկզբի տասնամյակների համար բնորոշ էին աշխարհի կարգի նշանակալի փոփոխություններ. միջազգային աշխարհակարգի ձևավորումը, կայսրությունների միջև իշխանության բաշխումը և ազգային պետությունների առաջացումը:

Ստավորականները կարևոր դերակատարում են ունեցել ազգային ինքնությունների զարթոնքի և քաղաքական համախմբման հարցում՝ որպես «լուսավորիչներ» շրջանառելով ազգի ոգին:

Սույն հոդվածը նպատակ ունի ուսումնասիրել վրացի ինտելեկտուալների դերը 1900–1921 թթ. Վրաստանում ինքնության կառուցման կոնցեպտուալ շրջանակը սահմանելու գործում: Մասնավորապես, քննվելու են վրացի ինտելեկտուալներ Արչիլ Ջորջաձեի, Նոյե Ժորդանիայի և Թեդո Դլոնտու նամակները: Հնդվածում ընդգծվում է, որ ինտելեկտուալ շարժումը կամրջեց Վրաստանի անցյալն ու ապագան: 1900–ականների մտավորականները մշակութային և մտավոր ժառանգություն են ստացել Թերգոլալեուլիներից (1860-ականներ), որոնք մեծապես մասնակցել են վրացական ինքնության ցուցիչների սահմանմանը: