

Salome Dundua*

Ivane Javakishvili Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1059-3113>

Nationalism and the issue of nation-building in the nineteenth century's Georgian political thought

Among the great number of nationalism theories, one of the widespread and shared is the modernist one. Despite a lot of variations even within this trend, one thing is common: nation is the concept of modern epoch and its birth is connected to the modernist age. Europe of the second half of nineteenth century was covered by the wave of nationalism which has resulted in, on the one hand, collapse of empires and liberation of nations, and on the another hand, unification of already existing nations and creation of new “nation-states”. It was a quite complex and long-term issue. Territorial and political union is not enough for being perceived as one nation. For example, for creation of “Frenchman” and “Italians” a number of reforms were implemented: state enhanced education, compulsory elementary schooling, forbidding languages other than Italian or French and religion teaching, compulsory military service and so on. As Massimo Azeglio, one of the founders of unified Italy, once noted “Italy has been made, now it remains to make Italians”¹.

According to Eric Hobsbawm, along with school education system during the process of communication governments often use the idea of sharing common history. Through education cultural or official languages become the languages of whole population². Speaking about formation of nationalism Ernst Gellner also gives crucial meaning to cultural factors. During the transformation process from agrarian epoch to industrial one, accompanied by cultural transformation, uniform, homogenous culture is formed. This culture is beyond narrow elite scope and results in creation of nations³.

¹ A. Alesina, B. Reich, *Nation-Building*, p. 2, https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/alesina/files/nation_building_feb_2015_0.pdf [access on: 20.12.2017].

² E.J. Hobsbawm, *Nation and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*, Cambridge 1990.

³ E. Gellner, *Nations and Nationalism*, Tbilisi 2003, pp. 4-5, 118-120.

* Correspondence address: Academic Building N6, 8 Ilia Tchavtchavadze Avenue, Tbilisi, 0179, Georgia, e-mail: salome.dundua@tsu.ge.

What Gellner calls “nationalism” in fact is the formation of collective perception which creates the feelings of belonging to concrete nation⁴. As Benedict Anderson considers that creation of collective perception is the main factor of formation of nations as imagined communities. For Anderson nations can be created only in printed capitalist age when people begin to read books and newspapers in their native languages and it becomes commerce. Nationalism should be understood not as political ideology, but as broad cultural system, which then formulates the foundations for political movement⁵.

Among the different streams in modernist theory – political, economical, social⁶ – in this article we are studying the cultural one. In nineteenth century Georgia, there was a poor ground for rising political nationalism. In 1801, after the annexation of Georgia (in particular, at first the kingdom of Kartli-Kakheti, and afterwards other provinces of Georgia) by the Tsarist Russia, in Georgia the royal government was abolished and the country lost independence. Moreover, the Tsarist Russia was not content with the annul of political independence, in 1811 it abolished the autocephaly of the Georgian Orthodox Church as well and directly subordinated it to the Russian Orthodox Church. The country has lost its independence not only from political and religious grounds, but with the threat of destruction of language, culture, Georgian Orthodoxy, and customs. Accordingly, the main problem of Georgia of that time, the use of which even at the terminological level was prohibited by the Tsarist Russia (the Russian Empire legally defined the territory not as “Georgia”, but as Tbilisi and Kutaisi Governors⁷), was the national self-preservation. While a number of revolts by Georgians against the Tsarist Empire ended with failure, restoration of independence remained as something far and hard to achieve.

In the article, we discuss the issue of nation building in the political thought of nineteenth century Georgia. The term “political thought” here is understood in a broad sense. In particular, it means opinions, values, and orientations expressed about creation/developing of the idea of our research topic – nation building by different statesmen, thinkers or intellectuals. As far as in conditions of Tsarist Russia Governance often it was impossible to express political views directly, intellectuals and statesmen of that period had to address the people via indirect ways. Accordingly, in the article the notion of “political thought” includes its surroundings as well, which is the best expressed in that period’s cultural, educational, and publicist activities.

⁴ C. Jaffrelot, *For a Theory of Nationalism*, “Research in Question” June 2003, No. 10, p 14, <http://www.sciencespo.fr/cepi/sites/sciencespo.fr.cepi/files/qdr10.pdf> [access on: 28.11.2017].

⁵ B. Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, Tbilisi 2003.

⁶ Z. Davitashvili, *Nationalism and Globalization*, Tbilisi 2003, p. 101.

⁷ Tbilisi – the capital of Georgia since fifth century up to present; Kutaisi – the second largest city of Georgia, historical and cultural center of western Georgia.

The new generation from the second half of the nineteenth century, the so-called *samocianelebi* “of sixties”, or *tergdaleulebi* (“the ones who drank river Tergi”), that got the Western education in St. Petersburg’s and Moscow’s universities (the only way to get knowledge and spread new ideas was to get education in Russia), became the power which aimed to save the Georgian identity. They were as Anderson notes “pilgrims” – those educated mainly in metropolis and afterwards, using their knowledge and concepts for rising national consciousness in their homeland⁸. If we are speaking about the origins of Georgian nationalism (maybe it is better to define it as nation-building) in this period – the creators of this discourse and main guides were exactly the Georgian public figures and writers. It is necessary to note that rising of national self-consciousness was a result not only getting Western-type education, but also of significant political changes in Russian Empire. Liberal Reforms carried by Alexander II, abolishment of serfdom, judiciary and city government reforms, giving the right of self governance to the big and middle cities has created a good ground for “pilgrims” for spreading their concepts. Although the reforms by Tsarist Russia were not fully carried out in Georgia, but in the sum helped to include non-aristocratic classes in nation-building process and generally, consolidation of Georgian society⁹.

“Let’s be self-sufficient”¹⁰ is a phrase best describing the main purpose of Georgian intellectuals. However, it is noteworthy that the creators of that time Georgian nationalism primarily sought to gain autonomy within the Russian Empire, while full political independence was due to the reality a far and difficult goal. Generally, Georgian nationalism developed during that period was clearly mild and was far from ethno-cultural discrimination that is often characteristic for nationalism. The main factor that led to this was that nationalism of that period (which we often know by the name of the national liberation movement) was largely a response to the clear Russification policy of Tsarist Russia. Georgian nationalism, i.e. the idea of the Georgian nation, was based on the preservation of the three treasures that survived from the ancestors: homeland, language and faith (*mamuli, ena, sarwmunoeba*)¹¹. These three main short and neat signs (declared by Ilia Chavchavadze, the nineteenth-century prominent Georgian writer and public man), expressing identity have become the slogan of the Georgian National Movement of almost for the whole nineteenth century.

⁸ B. Anderson, *op. cit.*, pp. 78-103.

⁹ I. Ckhaidze, *The Moderist Theory of Nationalism and The Georgian National Project*, Tbilisi 2009, pp. 46-47.

¹⁰ I. Chavchavadze, *Mgzavris tserilebi*, “Publicistic Letters, Vol. 2, Tbilisi 2012, p. 140.

¹¹ I. Chavchavadze, *Oriode sityva tavad revaz shalvas dzeeristavis kazlovis mier “seslilis” targmanzeda*, “Publicistic Letters”, Vol. 3, Tbilisi 2012, p. 25.

In this article, we discuss two different directions about the Georgian nationalism of the nineteenth century. First we will consider the trinity of language, homeland, and faith – maybe one of the best classical formulations of nationalist project¹². Secondly, in the process of creation of the nation, in the course of research of the Georgian nation-building of that period, we cannot avoid the role of printed media. Georgian intellectuals published their opinions on general internal problems or foreign policy processes and all the most important ideas expressed by them were widespread by the printed media. Under strict censorship, discussing foreign policy processes was an indirect way to disclose the attitudes of Georgian intellectuals to the building Georgian nation, restoration of state, territorial integrity and independence, as well as to the colonial politics in general.

Language and education as the main weapon of national self-consciousness

Education of the society and accessibility to it, as one of the advantages of national consolidation, played one of the major roles in the formation of nationalism in general, and the Georgian nationalism among them. The low level of education is considered as the main cause of discrimination and dissipation¹³. Opening the schools in different regions, supplying books, financing and, as a result, distributing education by the Society for the Spreading of Literacy among Georgians founded in 1879 served for the creation of a common national self-consciousness that ultimately foreshadowed the consolidation of the nation. “True education is merging of the developed mind and trained character. If a man lacks one or another, he is not educated, and therefore we think that if the school wants to fulfill its purpose, it is necessary to merge that knowledge and study to the training of the character as well”¹⁴ – writes Ilia Chavchavadze, and together with getting the knowledge in the process of formation of national self-consciousness, he was clearly pointing to the school’s function – to care on upbringing of generation with trained morals, who would be good citizens above all.

But only a diffusion of education itself is not enough. The language of this diffusion has crucial meaning. In nineteenth-century Georgia due to the political discourse quite all representatives of high and middle classes knew Russian and Georgian elite often used to speak Russian in public spaces. It was one of the ways of underlining their social status and education. Going to Russia in order to get higher education was very widespread due to the lack of such kind of institutes in Georgia. The main problem in that

¹² G. Nodia, *Saqartvelo: mowyvladobis ganzomilebebi*, [in:] *Statehood and Security: Georgia after Rose Revolution*, edit. B. Copiters, R. Legvold, Tbilisi, 2006, pp. 55-60. Although the concept of “national project” used by Gia Nodia is of general definition and is not directed specifically to the nineteenth-century Georgian nationalist discourse, we think it perfectly expresses the main meaning of nation-building process of that epoch.

¹³ N. Nikoladze, *Georgian Writing*, Tbilisi 1997, pp. 175-178.

¹⁴ I. Chavchavadze, *Pedagogiisafudzvlebi*, “Publicistic Letters”, Vol. 4, Tbilisi 2012, p. 79.

period was not so much getting the education in Russian language and in Russia, as the non-existence or extreme lack of so-called Georgian secular schools for getting basic education. "Mother tongue is known not only for the better and the necessary source of the school to fulfill its purpose, but also the first thing that the child should study and be aware of. Therefore, the school in general and secular in particular should serve for this for the nation"¹⁵ – the main concerns of Chavchavadze and Georgian thinkers of that period was to care for education, especially secular education and spreading of literacy. Education in native language should have become the basis that further would have supported the emergence and strengthening of the sense of Georgian self-consciousness, national identity¹⁶.

Georgian intellectuals were well aware of the necessity of establishing a normative literary language in the formation of Georgian self-consciousness, which should have become the basis for unity. Georgians had to talk not in various dialects, but use a single, consolidated Georgian language, which had to compete with the imperial (Russian) language. The activities of the Society for the Spreading of Literacy among Georgians together with the education dissemination aimed at establishing the unified, modern literary language, its dissemination through school education and, as Oliver Reisner notes, aimed at the establishment of the "Georgian nation's school"¹⁷. The same goal had the introduction of the changes in the Georgian language started by Chavchavadze (for example, omission of the excessive, deductive characters in the alphabet), which, despite the great resistance of the "generation of fathers", was ultimately successful.

If we share Smith's assumption that usually the nationalist movement begins with no protest meetings, declarations or armed resistances, but with the creation of various communities and cultural activities¹⁸, it will become clear that Georgian intellectuals by exercising their own political programme, using current terminology, through the NGOs were establishing traditions of civil participation and rising national consciousness. The steps implemented by "Tergdaleulebi", the edition of their own newspaper (where was discussed the history and culture of contemporary political, social, and economic problems of Georgia), a number of articles dedicated to the issues of the importance of education and study of Georgian language, the establishment of banks for nobility in Tbilisi and Kutaisi provinces (the largest part of the money granted by them was spent on Georgian schools and theater funding), foundation of Society for the Spreading of Lit-

¹⁵ I. Chavchavadze, *Tserilebi saxalxo ganatlebis sakitxebze*, "Publicistic Letters", Vol. 4, Tbilisi 2012, p. 63.

¹⁶ S. Dundua, *Multiculturalism in Georgia: Problems and Perspectives*, "European Journal of Social Sciences Studies", Vol.1, No. 2, 2016. p. 106, <https://oapub.org/soc/index.php/ejsss/index> [access on: 27.11.2017].

¹⁷ O. Reisner, *Die georgische Alphabetisierungsgesellschaft - Schule nationaler Eliten und Vergemeinschaftung*, "Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas" 2000, No. 48, pp. 66-89, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/235694297_Die_georgische_Alphabetisierungsgesellschaft_-_Schule_nationaler_Eliten_und_Vergemeinschaftung_Georgian_Association_for_the_Spread_of_Literacy_-_School_of_National_Elites_and_Association [access on: 2.12.2017].

¹⁸ A.D. Smith, *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History*, Tbilisi 2004, p. 28.

eracy among Georgians, opening of primary, secular schools, or publishing Georgian textbook-s - this is a small list of activities that have contributed to the foundation and development of the national system of education, as well as to the creation of Georgian national spirit and the construction of Georgian identity. As Giorgi Tevzade notes, Society for the Spreading of Literacy among Georgians really was “the school of Georgian nation”, not by the meaning that most of Georgians were studying there, but by the meaning that Georgian nation was nurtured by it, and Georgian nation was born and flourished in Society for the Spreading of Literacy¹⁹.

Chavchavadze and whole generation of “Tergdaleulebi” distinguished themselves with pragmatism and knew well that in the case of national mobilization, the primary target group would be ethnically Georgians and that other ethnic groups would not express great enthusiasm for Georgian national feelings. Therefore, the “Tergdaleulebi” (as the first generation, as well as the next generation, and in many cases even the Georgian social-democrats among them), naturally, did not develop an idea that could not work in real practice, and if it worked, there would have been no great success.

New social and political classes in that time (in Georgia and abroad) had typically ethnic nuances. As Stephen Jones noticed, ethnic relations of nineteenth-century Georgia was mostly based on mutual superstitions and stereotypes, while having generally peaceful character²⁰. For example, financially the most prominent Armenian bourgeoisie, which was originally from Tbilisi, but mostly was separated from other ethnic groups, and often the attitude towards them, was negative. This was attributed to the fact that according to the statistical data of that period, ethnic Georgians had the lowest rate of education and knowledge. “Our ignorance and lack of education stumbles and disturbs us so much that we are not able to dispute against newly arrived foreigners. They are better in everything, they excel us in everything, and they come and take from us all notable things”²¹. The frequent dispute between Georgian intellectuals and the Armenian bourgeoisie living in Tbilisi, the division of “we and they” is a classic expression of the absence of statehood and thus, the weak civil development. In other circumstances, Armenian capital should have been transformed into a Georgian (not in sense of ethnicity) capital and should have become one of the bases for nation state-building and further social and political integration.

Fatherland and Faith

In the perception of Georgia as the territorial integrity the religion, specifically the Orthodoxy, had always played a crucial role. Already in the ninth century Giorgi Mer-

¹⁹ G. Tevzadze, *Qartveli eris dabadeba, identoba da ideologia, erovnuloba da religiuroba*, <https://burusi.wordpress.com/2010/06/24/gigi-tevzadze-5/> [access on: 15.12.2017].

²⁰ Jones St., *Georgia: The Trauma of Statehood; New States, New Politics: Building the Post-Soviet Nations*, Cambridge 1997, p. 508.

²¹ I. Chavchavadze, *Isev ganatlebis sakitxebze*, “Publicistic Letters”, Vol. 4, Tbilisi 2012, p. 147.

chule named Kartli (i.e. Saqartvelo, Georgia) as the territory where the liturgy was lit up in Georgian²².

Faith, i.e. Orthodoxy, was one of the most important markers which formulated the national-state values, and was a powerful weapon for survival. The significant role of Orthodoxy was due to several factors. On the one hand, the absolute majority of the country's population was traditionally Orthodox. On the other hand, historically, according to its geopolitical location, Georgia had a constant struggle with invaders with non-Christian faith: Arabs, Mongols, Turks-Selchuks, Ottomans, Iranians, and others. It was a struggle for self- and identity preservation, and the main marker for maintaining this identity often meant the protection of Orthodoxy. The primary target of all the above mentioned conquerors was Christianity. Diligent kings and nobles were honored by the conquerors and the population who denied Christianity was exempt from taxes (e.g. by Arabs). Consequently, betrayal of Christianity meant betrayal of the fatherland. The unquestioning factor of the conquest of alliances with Orthodox Russia in 1783 (which resulted in the abolition of the Kingdom of Georgia and the reunification with Russia) was the unity of the religion. However, the co-religionist Russian Empire made one of the main blows in the sense of belief to Georgia. None of the invaders have so systematically attacked Georgian Orthodoxy as Russia did. If the non-Christian invaders were basically destroying the churches and monasteries, torturing and killing the Christian kings, nobility and the population, Russia imposed a systematic blow to the Church (the most powerful institution) – they abolished the liturgy in the Georgian language, the autocephaly gained already in the fifth century, and they directly subordinated it to the Russian Church Synod. Overall, we can say that Christianity has broadly shaped Georgian culture and along with statehood has played important role in constructing national identity²³. The historical role of the Georgian Church was well understood by the majority of intellectuals of nineteenth century. According to Archil Jorjadze:

Christianity had a great role in strengthening political life of Georgia. In one of our letters, we mentioned the national character of the Georgian Old Church. This our assumption sounded ridiculous to our fake freely thinkers: you give a great national role to clergy and preach the people only to work and be silent²⁴.

When Chavchavadze named above mentioned three fundamental elements of the Georgian nationality, there is no doubt that he used the triad of Vakhushti Batonishvili (the famous Georgian geographer and historian of eighteenth century): faith, language, king; language and faith is unchanged, and the idea of the king is replaced by the fatherland. What would have been the responsibility of the king in the eighteenth centu-

²² G. Merchule, *Tsxovreba da Mogvaweoba Grigol Xandstelisa*, Tbilisi 2000, p. 12.

²³ S. Dundua, T. Karaia, Z. Abashidze, *National Narration and Politics of Memory in post-socialist Georgia*, "Slovak Journal of Political Sciences" 2017, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 224-225, <https://www.degruyter.com/view/j/sjps.2017.17.issue-2/sjps-2017-0010/sjps-2017-0010.xml?format=INT> [access on: 10.12.2017].

²⁴ A. Jorjadze, *Letters*, Tbilisi 1989, p. 64.

ry discourse, in the nineteenth century became the responsibility of the Georgian people. In addition, fatherland, which was defined by the term which was defining the nation belonging to the territory, is the essential sign of the nation in the modernist sense of nationalism. The main aspect of the idea of waking the nation, i.e. passing from passive to active state should have become the concept of the fatherland. In the contemporary nation's discourse established by the Georgian intellectuals in the nineteenth century, one of the main tasks was to determine the borders of the Georgian nation as an ethno-cultural formation, and subsequently to achieve the political autonomy or in better case the independence. Concept *Mamuli*, unlike the Early Feudal Age, is no longer only the land inhabited by Christian Georgians. *Mamuli* is now the territory historically inhabited by ethnic Georgians, which, as a result of historical processes, has been separated from Georgia. Proper understanding and perception of the idea of fatherland is that which ultimately will unite the Georgian nation and form it as a nation. "The nationality was in some places victorious: in Italy it united Italy, in Germany - Germany, and in this way it gathered together the dispersed nation"²⁵ – said Chavchavadze and pointed to the significance of ethnic kinship.

The factor of offering the liturgy in Georgian goes to the back and like European nationalism, also in case of Georgia, Georgian intellectuals bring the idea of unity of kinfolk and history. At the same time, it should be noted that the great historical role which had the Orthodoxy in the history of Georgia, after annexation the country by co-religionist Russia, it was unable to fulfill the function of main barrier, dividing line, which it had historically, and around which in the nineteenth-century Georgia it could have been possible to raise the Georgian nation-building idea. By these very factors can be explained the fact that in the nineteenth century Chavchavadze transferred Vakhushti Batonishvili's first component of the concept, the faith, to the last position in the triad.

The most important place in this discourse of comprehension of the fatherland, and therefore, the creation of the nation, took the correct solution of the issue of Muslim Georgians. The history of Muslim Georgians living in Georgia is of particular interest and its roots we should seek in the distant past – still in the period when Adjara and a large part of Samtskhe Atabag's fiefdom passed to the Ottoman empire. From this period began the Islamisation of the ancient Christian Georgians living in Adjara, which had been achieved through the efforts of the Ottoman Empire policy.

Over the centuries, Georgia has not lost its sensitivity to the problem of reintegration of the lost territories and together with this returning ethnically similar, but religiously different Georgians to the Georgian borders. "By our thought, neither unity of language, nor unity of faith and kinfolk is not able to interfere people with one another as history"²⁶ – said Chavchavadze in 1877 during the Russo-Turkish war, when the

²⁵ I. Chavchavadze, *Irelandia da inglisi*, p. 1, <http://gdi.ge/uploads/other/0/478.pdf> [access on: 20.12.2017].

²⁶ I. Chavchavadze, *Eri da istoria, osmalossaqartvelo*, "Publicistic Letters", Vol. 4, Tbilisi 2012, p. 8.

issue of the return of Georgian territories got the real character. This vision is a clear proof that according to the political reality the issue of the restoration of the fatherland, i.e. of the territorial integrity is more important and is in the foreground rather than the issue of faith uniformity.

In 1878, after the victory of Russia in the war with Turkey, on the basis of the decisions of the San Stefano truce and the Berlin Congress Adjara was returned to Georgia. The process of integration of the territories inhabited by ethnic Georgians (Adjarian), but by religious beliefs Muslim population, was quite difficult and long. Despite the fact that this event caused universal joy in the Georgian society of that time and practically there was no Georgian intellectual who did not respond to this event, the reality was not so simple. The establishment of the perception of Muslim Georgian by Christian Georgian as ethnic Georgian and not as a "Turk" on the path of nation-building and integration was a big problem for a long time and remained a hindering factor in the closure of the region with political, social, and cultural processes in Georgia.

Aspects of foreign policy as the weapon of national self-consciousness

In the various and rich literary and publicist heritage of the Georgian intellectuals in the sixties of the nineteenth century a vital role had the political thematic. Georgian periodic during its existence showed a particular interest in the modern political-economic and social situation of foreign countries.

If you look at the articles published in Georgian newspapers about domestic and foreign policy of foreign countries in the thirties-forties of nineteenth century, we will see that they often are "dry", plain, written in the protocol style, without any critical evaluation. There is mainly given only the list of the moments reflecting foreign relations of the European states. This is not surprising, given that the Tsarist government was giving people only official information to promote propaganda, and at the same time, they were less likely to give the explanation.

The Georgian periodic press of the second half of the nineteenth century together with the foreign and domestic policies of other major European states was specially focused on the history of the German Empire and the ongoing political processes. "Maybe the reader will rebuke that in our review we often speak about Germany. This is the fault of the circumstances not ours. Germany now is a political center of the whole of Europe, and it is not a surprise that it gets the most attention"²⁷ – writes the newspaper "Droeba". The same idea is shared by the newspaper "Iveria", which points out the important role Germany played in the foreign policy of European countries at that time.

Speaking about German domestic and foreign policy courses, Georgian public figures devoted important attention to national-liberating movements of different nations

²⁷ Journal "Droeba" 1884, No. 276.

within the German Empire. In this regard, most noteworthy is the attention which the Georgian periodic press was paying to the National Movement of Polish people directed against the German Empire. This movement was carried out by Georgian public figures in a well-balanced and impartial manner (as far as they were able to do so in the terms of the censorship of that time). They were sympathetic in their letters to the heroes fighting for independence of Poland and were always loyal defenders of their deeds. In this regard, David Caesal's words are worthy of note: "If the Polaks are sympathetic to me, the reason for this is the nature of my soul, which is always on the side of oppressed, and secondly, that we are frying in one pan together with the Polaks"²⁸.

Georgians of the sixties during their study in St. Petersburg and other cities of Russia, were becoming friends with Polish students, were getting acquainted with their country's history and modern political situation. Niko Nikoladze and Grigol Tsereteli in their works recall Polish students very warmly. One of the reasons for this was that, apart from personal sympathy, they had a common goal: to stir up the national liberation movement in their countries. Like the Poles in the Western countries, also Georgians have resisted to all forms of national oppression in Georgia. The idea of fighting for independence of Georgia is a red line throughout the Georgian periodic press of that period. "We want to be alive with our language, with our nature, with our customs, with our country. In one word, we want to be with our national, special character – the character in which Georgian is distinguished from Armenian, French, Chinese and others"²⁹. Chavchavadze also along with other problems of the world history watched the national struggle of the Polish people under the influence of the German Empire and the episodes of this fight was widely covered in "Iveria" founded by him.

In 1886, Chavchavadze published a letter entitled *Banishment of Polaks* [i.e. Polish people] *from Prussia*. The letter is mainly about a brief report of one session of the German Parliament. The main issue of the meeting was about the attitude to the Poles living in the German Empire. Despite the fact that the letter is written by a seemingly indifferent observer, the observed eye will still notice how sympathetic his author is to the lawmakers who are the national and political rights defenders of Poland. The specialty of this session was that there should have been discussed the issue of the expulsion of Poles from western Polish lands. Bismarck himself supported this policy. Chavchavadze points to Bismarck's relatively weak and incontrovertible domestic policy: "Bismarck, such strong and deeply studied in foreign policy, is very weak and often as if blind in domestic affairs"³⁰. The issue of attitudes towards the Poles was really hard to settle for German politicians not only in the twentieth century, but later as well.

²⁸ D. Caesal, *Polsha*, newspaper "Shroma", March 29, 1883, p. 480; I; 548; 21.

²⁹ Newspaper "Droeba" 1879, No. 1.

³⁰ I. Chavchavadze, *Poliakabis gandevna prusiidan*, "Iveria" 1886, No. 14.

Before the 80s of the nineteenth century, Bismarck held anti-Polish policy mainly under the principle of persecution of Catholics. Together with the seizure of the supervision on schools from the Catholic clergy, Bismarck also carried out the Germanization of western lands. The administrative laws issued in 1872-74 almost entirely banned the study in Polish language at schools. In addition, as a result of the Bismarck's policy, almost always the Germans were appointed on high priestly positions. Faith was traditionally considered as a phenomenon that played one of the most important roles in the nation's history, self-consciousness, and cultural-political identity.

"Iveria" told its readers about the fact that had taken place in Poznan when German priest was appointed as Archbishop instead of Polish one. Traditionally, in Poznan the Archbishops should have been of Polish nationality. After Graph Leokhovski stood against Bismarck's 1873 "May laws", he was forced to resign from the Archbishop's position. This place was left free, because the Pope did not agree with Bismarck's candidacy, which led to great sympathy of the Poles living in Germany (nevertheless, the correspondent of "Iveria" adds further that the Pope and Bismarck had been reconciled as a result of certain political game, and they appointed still German Dinder as the Archbishop of Poznan)³¹.

"Iveria" informed readers about the forms and methods of struggle for national independence, which were used by Polish people living in Poland as well as outside Poland. Here it is meant the Polish merchant's boycott of German goods, about the letter of the famous Polish writer Milkovsky, which he had written to Bismarck about the expulsion of Polish people, etc. It is noteworthy that Georgian public and political figures had a good understanding of the mistakes of the various empires, in particular the mistakes of German's foreign and domestic policy. The aggressive foreign policy that had been trying to carry out Germany against the Polish people could not produce a long-term result. Such policy was only meant for short-term perspectives. When it comes to the Polish National Movement, it should be emphasized that in principle, from the German Empire's side were not taken any reasonable steps for Poland's incorporation and alliance. In Georgian articles, Georgian public figures discuss this issue in this regard in a high degree.

Nikoladze considers humane, fair and equitable attitude a key component of the friendship between the nations. These thoughts are given in his letter *Присоединение Батума*. He notes that it is easier to conquer territories than to annex them. When any nation join the state where they did not live before, in order to incorporate them not only physically, but also spiritually, it is necessary to convince these people on the examples of their everyday life in the superiority of this new life. When a person is convinced that his economic situation is relatively improved, that there is peace and order in the country, that

³¹ "Iveria" 1886, No. 24.

his as a citizen's rights are protected of all kinds of arbitrariness and violence, that his religious looks are inviolable and that no one will be able to force him to get and share other habits and opinions, only then it is possible to incorporate these people not only physically, but also spiritually³².

In order to confirm his opinion and to demonstrate that German's foreign policy towards the conquered people was not prescient, Nikoladze brings an example of Alsace. When Alsace was captured by French people, the local population was against joining France. After one century Alsacians became one of the most patriots of France. In order to illustrate this event, Nikoladze cites the words of German patriots, Heine and Börne, with which they addressed their fellow-citizens and clearly explained why Alsacians sought to the ethnically different people with different language.

You were without any rights, you have suffered permanent tyranny. At the same time, Alsacians gained all civil liberties, the jurors' court, the elimination of feudal privileges, the right to land, the self-government, etc. Alsacians saw that they became genuine human beings only after they obtained freedom, and they are not stupid to change such a situation to your slavery and having no rights³³.

This letter was written in 1878, i.e. since it had already been decided to hand over some Georgian territories in Turkey to Russia. On this important stage of history of Georgia acquaintance of the issue about Germany's incorporation of Alsace-Lorraine to the Georgian public through the newspaper by Nikoladze aimed at showing to the Georgian society those political mistakes, which made Germans and which could also make Georgians. The unity of language and ethnic relation is a significant phenomenon that connects people, but if we do not add such political rights, which will provide the most basic human rights, which already in seventeenth century John Locke, English philosopher, the founder of political ideology of liberalism, called "Natural Rights to Life, Liberty, and Property" and which was owned by all people equally, then one of the main natural human rights, to seek freedom, attracts ethnic unity and fraternal people, whether physically or spiritually, will forever be separated from each other.

I suppose that in the second half of the nineteenth century discussing such political aspects by Nikoladze is interesting not only for the nineteenth century (on the background of ethnically similar and with different language and religion of Adjarian population), but also for the modern period due to the Georgia's political situation became more significant and noteworthy. This approach to solving the problem was not only at that time, but also for the contemporary period of Georgia must be somewhat valuable and worthwhile.

³² N. Nikoladze, *Присоединение Батума*, "Обзор" 1878, No. 214.

³³ *Ibidem*.

As we have seen, the Georgian public-political opinion of the nineteenth century, whose beliefs were completely reflected in the periodic press of that period, was seriously interested in the political (as well as economic-social situation) of foreign countries and did not leave almost any significant event in international politics without attention. Such serious attention to these problems was caused by many circumstances. However, the main among them was that by considering the political situation of foreign countries, public figures at that time tried to answer those significant issues that they had to resist at that difficult socio-political and economic situation of that time Georgia.

Conclusions

The nineteenth century epoch, characterized by the wave of nationalism rather liberal nationalism, impacted Georgia too. If before the middle of century this was expressed in the armed uprisings and conspiracies against Russian empire (these uprisings generally were not rebellions across the whole country but mostly resistances of population of particular parts of Georgia), from the 60th battle for independence has got a different features. For the intellectuals of that time, ahead with Chavchavadze the main goal was creation of "Georgian nation", which afterwards would make the foundation for political independence. They realized that language and education could have the greatest impact in the way of achieving this goal. The proof of this is as follows: language reform, creation of the Society for the Spreading of Literacy among Georgians, publishing journals and newspapers, opening schools and land bank (*saadgilmamulobanki*). Educational reform and creation of common literary language were probably the most influential steps in formatting unified national self-consciousness. Chavchavade and his like-minders realized that Georgian nation will be firstly prepared as one cultural and territorial unity and only afterwards take care of political independence.

To sum up, as Anderson notes, first stage in the creation of nation is the understanding of the necessity of cultural homogeneity. Formation of spoken language as standardized printed media and books language is the main way for achieving this goal. After understanding cultural unity it is only possible to understand the formation of political unity³⁴. In this discourse, nationalism of the second half of nineteenth century Georgia could be characterized as cultural nationalism, according to which Georgian nation will be firstly created and later gain independence. Accordingly, they created national liberation movement of the Georgian people – a healthy ideological programme based on values and principles common to all mankind. This circumstance was one of the contributing factors that played an important role in furthering the national liberation movement of the Georgian people in the right way and made basis for the proper political structure.

³⁴ B. Anderson, *op cit.*, pp. 63-76.

Bibliography

- Alesina A., Reich B., *Nation -Building*, https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/alesina/files/nation_building_feb_2015_0.pdf [access on: 20.12.2017].
- Anderson B., *Imagined Communities*, Tbilisi 2003.
- Chavchavadze I., *mgzavris tserilebi*, "Publicistic Letters", Vol. 2, Tbilisi, 2012.
- Chavchavadze I., *Oriode sityva tavad revazs halvas dze eristavis kazlovis mier "seslilis" targmanzeda*, "Publicistic Letters", Vol. 3, Tbilisi 2012.
- Chavchavadze I., *Pedagogiis safudzvlebi*, "Publicist Letters", Vol. 4, Tbilisi 2012.
- Chavchavadze I., *Tserilebi saxalxo ganatlebis sakitxebze*, "Publicistic Letters", Vol. 4, Tbilisi 2012.
- Chavchavadze I., *Isev ganatlebis sakitxebze*, "Publicistic Letters", Vol. 4, Tbilisi 2012.
- Chavchavadze I., *Eri da istoria, osmalos saqartvelo*, "Publicistic Letters", Vol. 4, Tbilisi 2012.
- Chavchavadze I., *Poliakabis gandevna prusiidan*, "Iveria" 1886, No. 14.
- Chavchavadze I., *Irelandia da inglisi*, <http://gdi.ge/uploads/other/0/478.pdf> [access on: 20.12.2017].
- Ckhaidze I., *The Moderist Theory of Nationalism and The Georgian National Project*, Tbilisi 2009.
- Davitashvili Z., *Nationalism and Globalization*, Tbilisi 2003.
- Dundua S., *Multiculturalism in Georgia: Problems and Perspectives*, "European Journal of Social Sciences Studies" 2016, Vol.1, No. 2, p. 106, <https://oapub.org/soc/index.php/ejsss/index> [access on: 27.11.2017].
- Dundua S., Karaia T., Abashidze Z., *National Narration and Politics of Memory in Post-Socialist Georgia*, "Slovak Journal of Political Sciences" 2017, Vol. 17, <https://www.degruyter.com/view/j/sjps.2017.17.issue-2/sjps-2017-0010/sjps-2017-0010.xml?format=INT> [access on: 10.12.2017].
- Gellner E., *Nations and Nationalism*, Tbilisi 2003.
- Hobsbawm E.J., *Nation and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*, Cambridge 1990.
- Jaffrelot C., *For a Theory of Nationalism*, "Research in Question" June 2003, No. 10, <http://www.sciencespo.fr/cei/sites/sciencespo.fr.cei/files/qdr10.pdf> [access on: 28.11.2017].
- Jones St., *Georgia: The Trauma of Statehood; New States, New Politics: Building the Post-Soviet Nations*, Cambridge 1997.
- Jorjadze A., *Letters*, Tbilisi 1989.
- Merchule G., *Tsxovreba da Mogvaweoba Grigol Xandstelisa*, Tbilisi 2000.
- Nodia G., *Saqartvelo: mowyvlabobis ganomilebebi*, [in:] *Statehood and Security: Georgia after Rose Revolution*, edit. B. Copiters, R. Legvold, Tbilisi, 2006.
- Nikoladze N., *Georgian Writings*, Tbilisi 1997.
- Reisner O., *Die georgische Alphabetisierungsgesellschaft – Schule nationaler Eliten und Vergemeinschaftung*, "Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas" 2000, No. 48, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/235694297_Die_georgische_Alphabetisierungsgesellschaft_-_Schule_nationaler_Eliten_und_Vergemeinschaftung_Georgian_Association_for_the_Spread_of_Literacy_-_School_of_National_Elites_and_Association [access on: 2.12.2017].
- Smith A.D., *Nationalism, Theory, Ideology, History*, Tbilisi 2004.
- Tevzadze G., *Qartveli eris dabadeba, identoba da ideologia, erovnuloba da religiuroba*, <https://burusi.wordpress.com/2010/06/24/gigi-tevzadze-5/> [access on: 15.12.2017].

Journals and newspapers

- "Droeba" 1884, No. 276.
- "Droeba" 1879, No. 1.
- "Iveria" 1886, No. 24.
- "Shroma", March, 29, 1883.
- "O63op" 1878, No. 214.

Abstract: In this article, we discuss two different directions about the Georgian nationalism of the 19th century: first we consider, the trinity of language, homeland, faith – maybe one of the best classical formulations of nationalist project. And second, in the process of creation of the nation, in the course of research of the Georgian nation-building of that period, we can not avoid the role of printed media. Georgian intellectuals published their opinions on general internal problems or foreign policy processes and all the most important ideas expressed by them were widespread by the printed media. Under strict censorship, discussing foreign policy processes was an indirect way to disclose the attitudes of Georgian intellectuals to the building Georgian nation, restoration of state, territorial integrity and independence, as well as to the colonial politics in general.

“Let's be self-sufficient” is a phrase best describing the main purpose of Georgian intellectuals. However, it is noteworthy that the creators of that time Georgian nationalism primarily sought to gain autonomy within the Russian Empire, while full political independence was due to the reality a far and difficult goal. Generally, Georgian nationalism developed during that period was clearly mild and was far from ethno-cultural discrimination that is often characteristic for nationalism.

Keywords: Nationalism, nation-building, education, language, orthodoxy

Article submitted: 22.01.2018, article accepted: 24.06.2018.