

NUMBER 90

THE EMERGENCE OF POLITICAL SOCIETY IN GEORGIA

Ronald Grigor Suny
Oberlin College

Conference on

"NATIONALISM AND SOCIAL CHANGE IN TRANSCAUCASIA"

Co-sponsored by

Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies,
The Wilson Center

and

American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies

April 24-25, 1980

THE EMERGENCE OF POLITICAL SOCIETY IN GEORGIA

An explanation of the emergence of political movements in Georgia in the last third of the nineteenth century does not neatly fit the rather clichéd pattern sometimes proposed for the development of nationalism in small nations. For many observers it has been sufficient to explain nationalism as the byproduct of the confrontation of imperial oppression and an instinctive desire on the part of a colonized people for national independence. Given the "naturalness" of national feelings, there is little need for the historian to explain their appearance and power. But close studies of the historical roots of national movements have exposed a much more complicated picture. In Georgia, political and social resistance to Russian rule was an extremely differentiated process, one in which pressures for accommodation with the existing regime were as great as, if not greater than at times, the counterforces which produced resistance. Secondly, in Georgia the specifically nationalist movement, while contributing significantly to the shaping of a sense of Georgian nationality and alienation from the dominant Russian and Armenian nationalities, was not in the forefront of the liberation movement by the century's end. The appearance, evolution, and relative strength of nationalist versus socialist and liberal answers to Georgia's problems require a detailed look at the social context and intellectual environment in which these movements arose.

The development of nationality and the conscious expression of its aspirations, nationalism, is analagous to, though in no sense identical to, the consolidation of other social formations, most particularly class and

class consciousness. For the purposes of this study, I have borrowed (and modified) a concept from Marx's analysis of class formation and applied it to the history of Georgian national formation. Marx speaks of a class moving from an objective demographic existence as a "class in itself" to a more organized, conscious, and mobilized formation interested and able to act in its interests, a "class for itself." The Georgians, who were incorporated into the Russian Empire in the first decades of the nineteenth century, were still a divided, defeated, inchoate people, who, despite periods of unity and glory in the past, by the late eighteenth century faced virtual extinction, the loss of their language, and possessed little sense of their own nationhood. From this rather desperate and disperate situation, the Georgians under Russian rule began a gradual and steady resurgence. The social and political integration into the Russian Empire, the consequent economic stability, the increase in modes of communication among the Georgians, and the introduction of western education into the Georgian noble elite -- all contributed to the formation of a "nationality in itself" by the end of the second third of the nineteenth century. An ethnic presence existed which would not be eroded away by the efforts of chauvinist administrators and the invisible but palpable effects of modernization. In the 1870s-1890s additional pressures from the government combined with the new forces of the post-Emancipation economic environment to create a sense of nationality, a national consciousness, and the first manifestations of political ideologies. By the last decade of the century, the Georgians had developed into a "nationality for itself," complete with a national leadership and an incipient mass movement for liberation. For many Georgians the sense of national identity had become their primary loyalty, replacing older allegiances to regions, religion, or traditional lords. For many others that national sensibility was intimately tied to an overt socialist worldview.

While in part the product of intellectual developments, the emergence, first, of a Georgian nationality and, later, of a political nationalism occurred primarily as the result of a complex social process. In the first hundred years of Russian rule in Georgia, the efforts of alien governors to eliminate social and cultural peculiarities in Transcaucasia resulted, paradoxically, not in the assimilation of the local peoples, but instead in what can be described as the remaking of nations. Thanks to centralized Russian administration and the growth of trade and industry, Georgia was being reunited, first politically and then economically. Attempts to impose the authority of a bureaucratic state on a traditionally decentralized and highly flexible civil order gave rise to resistance by peasants and some members of the nobility who resented the erosion of their ancient privileges and status. Though many in the traditional Georgian elite turned into denationalized servants of tsarism, dissident voices could always be heard. With the emancipation of the serfs and the increasing power of the urban middle classes, largely Armenian, the Georgian nobility was challenged economically and culturally in new ways. Precisely at a time when the nobility as a social estate was no longer able to lead the nation, there emerged from its midst a series of ideological responses to Georgia's plight — a westernizing liberalism, a nostalgic nationalism, peasant socialism, and in the end Marxism. Educated *déclassé* noblemen of the last third of the nineteenth century provided what leadership there was to a radicalized peasantry and the new working class.

The history of the Georgians has perpetually involved the history of their closest neighbors, their enemies, and their overlords. Despite what overzealous nationalist historians might desire, a history of the

ethnic Georgians written without in-depth treatment of Romans, Persians, Turks, Russians, and Armenians would be a grotesque distortion of the experience of the people of Georgia. Even the Georgians' national formation and the sense of their own ethnicity has been shaped by their contacts and repeated confrontations with other nationalities. In the nineteenth century increased contact with the Armenians who had long dominated Georgia's urban centers was a prime stimulant to Georgian self-definition. The traditional relationships of Georgians and Armenians shifted rapidly after 1860. Whereas the Georgian nobility had always been the unquestioned first estate in the land, its primacy was now threatened by the wealthy Armenian bourgeoisie. And as the agrarian economy turned from the customary mode of production to increasing involvement with the commercial economy of towns, as peasants and lords migrated to the cities, the new proximity with the Armenians raised the likelihood of bitter confrontation. Georgians of various classes came face to face with a well-entrenched, financially secure, urban middle class who spoke a different language, went to a different church, and held very different values from the traditional Georgian values.

Up to 1864 the principal concern of the Georgian nobility had been the protection, preservation, and recognition of their privileges by the Russian authorities who steadily eroded their political powers. After the emancipation of the serfs, however, and until the revolution, the principal blows to the prestige and status of the Georgian nobility no longer came from the state but from the changing economic environment in the Caucasus which increased the wealth and influence of the Armenian middle class. Capitalist relations of production, production for the markets, and considerations of profitability and economic efficiency were

completely foreign to the vast majority of Georgian nobles, who were accustomed to the free labor and obligatory payments that they had for centuries received from their peasants. The predictions of the Georgian princes that the loss of serf labor would undermine their economic foundations proved to be accurate. The last third of the nineteenth century witnessed the rapid economic, and consequently, political decline of the nobility, as most of them failed to meet the challenges of an increasingly capitalist economic order. Twelve years after the emancipation, the nobility petitioned the Viceroy for relief:

After the abolition of serfdom our situation changed. The serfs were taken away from us; there were no free workers; workers' hands became expensive; we fell into debt, and because we were not able to pay them off in time we lost our estates.¹

The causes of the precipitate decline of the Georgian nobles in the half century after emancipation were both material and psychological. Nobles were immediately faced with new demands on their capital — the hiring of workers, buying tools and draft animals — while attempting to pay off old debts incurred during serfdom. The shortage of capital was met by mortgaging or renting their lands, but little effort was made to change over from the relying on peasant payments to improving productivity. For those who made the adjustment to capitalist agriculture, expanding domestic and foreign markets provided new but precarious opportunities. Competition from more efficient producers abroad and an international grain price depression in the last decades of the century made it all but impossible for Georgian producers to meet their costs.²

After centuries of living off peasant dues, the nobles were ill-equipped to shift radically their mode of life and metamorphose into vigorous managers of agricultural enterprises. Taking little interest in their estates, the

nobles were in general satisfied to receive their dues or rents and borrow from money-lenders in the towns. Noble indebtedness grew steadily, until by the early twentieth century over half the privately-held land in Tiflis province had been mortgaged by the nobility.³ Unlike some of their more enterprising contemporaries in central Russia, the Georgian nobility had almost nothing to do with the penetration of capitalism into Transcaucasian agriculture.

While nobles turned away from the countryside to find refuge in state service or a frivolous life in the cities, much of their land fell into the hands of the wealthy merchants and well-to-do stratum among the peasants. When they came into the towns they found that they were forced to do business with an already well entrenched urban bourgeoisie. The economic and social decline of the traditional Georgian elite was accompanied by the simultaneous rise of the Armenian middle class, particularly the rich mokalakebi of Tiflis.

Beginning in the second half of the nineteenth century Georgians began migrating in significant numbers into Tiflis, and the Armenian demographic dominance over the city began to diminish. Whereas in 1801 nearly three-quarters of the twenty-thousand inhabitants of the city had been Armenian (74.3% in 1803) and less than a quarter Georgian (21.5%), by 1897 the percentage of Armenians had dropped to thirty-eight. By the end of the century Russians made up 24.7% of the city's 159,000 inhabitants and Georgians 26.3%.⁽⁴⁾ In absolute terms all three nationalities were increasing their numbers in the city, but the rate of growth was highest for Russians and lowest for Armenians.⁵ Between 1865 and 1897, the number of Russians grew by 190% (from 12,462 to 36,113); the number of Georgians rose 158% (from 14,878 to 38,357); while the Armenians rose by only 88% (28,488 to 55,553).⁶ Thus, in the latter half of the nineteenth century, the Armenians no longer had a majority in the city, merely a plurality, and the percentages of each nationality in the urban

population were moving toward equality. The influx of Russian officials, army officers, and craftsmen, as well as Georgian peasants, was changing, not only the ethnic composition of the town, but creating an ever larger working class made up primarily of Georgians. What distinguished these Georgians most completely from the Armenians and the Russians in Tiflis was their almost complete isolation from positions of political and economic power.

This demographic shift, while increasing the weight of non-Armenians in the urban population, was offset by social and legal factors. The Armenians were displaced neither in the economy nor the political structure of the city. Attempts in the first half of the century by Muscovite merchants to compete with the Armenians had failed, and the Armenian dominated guilds maintained control over commerce and production in Tiflis.⁷ By mid-century some observers argued that the development of Tiflis' economy was being hindered by the ancient restrictions on growth, innovation, and foreign craftsmen imposed by the guilds, but not until 1867 did the state feel confident enough to dissolve the merchant guilds. The craft guilds remained intact, and prior possession, traditions of enterprise, and accumulated wealth helped keep the Armenians in a dominant economic position.

The Soviet historian of Tbilisi, Sh. Chkhetia, paints a detailed picture of how complete the control of the Armenians was in mid-century Tiflis:

In the second half of the 1860s in Tbilisi there were about 3000 shops and commercial enterprises, among them: 17 caravansarais, 5 hotels, 9 confectioners, 4 saloons, 441 dukhani [cafes], 96 kharcheven' [eateries], 71 wine cellars and warehouses, etc. Most of these commercial enterprises belonged to Armenians, in whose hands was held almost all trade; thus, of the 17 caravansarais, 14 belonged to: Begbutiants, Artsruni, Ananiants, Kherodiants, Korkhmaziants, Shnoiants, Shainiants, Movsesiants and Co., Sarkisiant, Vardants, Khalatiants, Tamamshiant, and other Armenian capitalists, who were the spiders of Tbilisi commercial-industrial capital of that time. Armenians also owned most of the hotels, wine cellars, dukhani, etc. Approximately two-thirds of the commercial-industrial class was Armenian.

As the economy of Tiflis gradually shifted from transit trade and small craft production to larger-scale industrial production, new opportunities appeared for enterprising people to build their fortunes. Some capital investment came from eager Russian merchants and even from foreigners, but the bulk of the new workshops and factories was built with local Armenian capital. In 1870 the Russian tariff was introduced in the Caucasus, replacing the lower duties imposed six years earlier and creating a protected area in which infant industries could grow without serious competition from cheaper European goods. Industry became more important in the development of Transcaucasia than the transit trade, and Armenians rapidly entered the world of manufacturing.

By the end of the nineteenth century the position of Armenian merchants and industrialists in the economy of Tiflis and western Transcaucasia was unassailable. Of the 9,725 merchants in the city in 1897, 43.4% were Armenian (4,727), 26.1% were Georgian (2,619), and 6% Russian.⁹ More impressively, of the 150 largest industrial establishments in Georgia in 1900, 44% belonged to Armenians, about the same amount belonged to Russians and foreign capitalists, and only 10% was owned by Georgians and 2% by Azerbaijanis.¹⁰ When one considers only the city of Tiflis, the Armenian presence is even more striking; about one-half of large enterprises and most of the largest enterprises were Armenian.¹¹ The wealthiest Armenians -- the Arzumanovs, Avetisians, and Mantashevs in the oil industry; the Adelkhanovs in leather goods; the Tumaniants, Kevorkovs, Avetisov's and Pitoevs in commerce; the Egiazarovs, Ter-Asaturovs, Bozarjants, and Enfianjants in tobacco -- made up a fraternity of entrepreneurs who worked together in a variety of joint-stock companies, pooling their capital to maintain the

primacy of the local bourgeoisie in the face of Russian and foreign competition.¹²

The urban and bourgeois character of the Tiflis Armenians contrasted sharply with the rural background and agrarian orientation of most Georgians, and the familiar attitudes about the inherent character of these two nationalities grew into racial stereotypes in the second half of the century. A Russian observer, S. Maksimov, early in the 1870s echoed many other travellers to the Caucasus:

Trade in the Caucasus is entirely in the hands of clever and calculating Armenians. Armenians are higher than Georgians in intelligence and in love for work, and for that reason there is nothing surprising in the fact that Georgian properties are rapidly falling into Armenian hands. Georgians are dependent on them just as the Poles are on the Jews and similarly feel toward them the same contempt and hatred (if not more than the Poles feel toward the Jews). The commercial Armenians reveal much cleverness, wilyness, are always ready with flattery; their thirst for profit leads them to cheating and swindling.¹³

The Russian ethnographer, P. I. Kovalevskii, spoke of the Georgians as "merry [and] sociable," but also as noted for their "laziness, insufficient energy and enterprise, instability, lack of self-restraint, little ability in work, light-minded and superficial attitude toward business and matters at hand."¹⁴ The British Georgianist and diplomat, Oliver Wardrop, wrote in the 1880s of his perceptions of relations between Armenians and Georgians:

A local proverb says 'a Greek will cheat three Jews, but an Armenian will cheat three Greeks,' and the Georgian, straightforward, honest fellow, is but too often cruelly

swindled by the artful children of Haik. When the fraud is very apparent, the Armenian often pays for his greed with all the blood that can be extracted from his jugular vein. ¹⁵

However doubtful the accuracy of such national stereotypes described by numerous visitors to Transcaucasia, it might be noted that they reflect characteristics which have more to do with the class position of the most visible representatives of either ethnic group than with inherent or genetic features of a whole people. Not only were there successful Georgian entrepreneurs equipped with the necessary business acumen, there were also Armenian peasants, both in Transcaucasia and Anatolia, who were not known for their "cleverness, wiliness, or flattery," but who displayed attitudes and patterns of life and work much closer to their Georgian counterparts. Ethnic stereotypes contributed to perceptions and mis-perceptions of these two peoples, but they were much more indicative of the positions that Armenians and Georgians held in Caucasian society and the roles they played in the economy and political life of the cities than they were of "race." Also the dominant elites of each people, that group to which social inferiors might look up to for guidance and leadership, were quite different and molded national culture along different lines. The Armenians had long ago lost their nobility, the nakharars of the medieval kingdoms, and were socially and politically dominated by the urban bourgeoisie in cities like Constantinople, Smyrna, and Tiflis, while the Georgians had few native examples of bourgeois leadership and instead had as models a traditional landed nobility then in its final decline.

Armenian dominance in economic life was perhaps the major factor which contributed to Georgian resentment that their increasing presence in the city was not reflected in the distribution of material rewards or political

power. But almost as important was the nearly absolute control that Armenians managed to maintain over municipal government even as they lost their demographic superiority over non-Armenians. Final authority in Transcaucasia always rested with the military-bureaucratic administration of the Russians, but local government was delegated to the wealthy men of property in Tiflis.

The years after the Crimean War are distinguished in Russia's history by the zealous implementation of liberal reforms, beginning with the peasant emancipation of 1861 and culminating in new institutions of provincial and municipal administration and justice. Only a few of these reforms were extended to Transcaucasia in the 1860s-1870s and then usually in incomplete form. In 1866 the judicial reform of 1864 was extended to Caucasia, thus eliminating the local courts and laws and integrating the region into the imperial system. The Transcaucasian administration was revamped the following year, consolidating various departments ¹⁶ and abolishing the Viceroy's Diplomatic Chancellory. Yet no zemstva were established in Transcaucasia, which meant that the Georgian nobility did not enjoy the local political influence that their Russian brethren exercised. Taken together these reforms, usually referred to by Soviet historians as "bourgeois reforms," were quite contradictory in Transcaucasia. Their effect was to introduce judicial and administrative norms congenial to the local bourgeoisie while at the same time preserving to the greatest extent possible the seigneurial order in the countryside and the ultimate authority of the tsarist bureaucracy.

In the first half of the 1860s the Russian government began tentatively to reform the municipal administration in the empire and to introduce elected institutions. The need for such a reform in Tiflis became suddenly apparent

to officials when a popular revolt revealed the potential threat to Russian authority from the traditional guilds. When in June 1865, the mayor of Tiflis and the tsarist treasury decided to impose a new tax on the populace without their prior consent, the guilds decided to shut down all businesses in the city. The acting governor, Grigol Orbeliani, ordered the strike to end, but the ustabashis (guild leaders) proved to be unable to convince the guild members and their allies to return to work. On June 27, approximately ten thousand artisans, shopkeepers, merchants, and simple workers marched through the streets holding meetings and protesting the new taxes. They plundered the house of the mayor, Shermazan Vartanov, and stoned and killed the tax collector, Bazhbeuk Melikov. Only on the fourth day, and after the appointment of a new mayor and the revoking of the tax, was order restored.

What was most remarkable about the June Days in Tiflis was the joint activity of the Armenian craftsmen and shopkeepers with the poorer Georgian workmen, or as the radical publicist Niko Nikoladze put it in Herzen's Kolokol, the musha (worker) shook hands with the mokalake "forgetting that yesterday the mokalake cheated his ally of today, the musha, and that tomorrow the same story will be repeated."¹⁷ In the heat of the protest over taxes and the arbitrary treatment of the townspeople by the government, the Georgian wood and stone haulers joined the Armenian artisans and merchants in a common action against the police regime. Relations between workers and masters in the mid-1860s were still close in this paternalistic pre-industrial society; only in the following decades were such relations to be transformed into the less personal labor-management confrontation of emergent capitalism.

On the advice of local officials the government in Petersburg reacted quickly to the events of June 1865 and issued a new plan for the municipal government of Tiflis, one which shifted the balance of local power away from

the traditional guilds. Based on similar charters granted to Saint Petersburg (1846), Moscow (1862), and Odessa (1863), the law of August 11, 1866, divided the population of Tiflis into four estates for purposes of choosing the city's government. Each estate -- the hereditary nobility, the personal nobility and eminent citizens, the simple citizens who owned property or were engaged in business, and those who owned no real estate but paid city taxes -- elected one hundred electors who then chose twenty-five delegates to the city assembly. A mayor was elected by electors from all estates but had to be a person of substantial wealth, owning property worth at least ten thousand silver rubles. This electoral system brought the nobles into urban government for the first time under Russian rule. Along with the eminent citizens, they made up less than ten percent of the city's population yet they now became the de facto rulers of Tiflis.¹⁸ The so-called "simple citizens" made up about sixteen percent of the population, but neither they nor the propertyless who made up 40-45% had much influence in the assembly. One-half of the assembly, thus, was elected by and made up of the top ten percent of the city's inhabitants.

Most affected by these reforms were the guilds which lost their former prominence after 1866. The very next year, the state reduced the powers of the craft guilds, abolished the merchant guilds altogether, and subordinated the remaining amkarebi to the city administration. Of approximately one hundred guilds, only seventeen remained after 1867.¹⁹ The lesson of 1865 as learned by the tsarist bureaucracy was well expressed by Baron Nikolai: "The disorders which occurred in Tiflis in 1865 revealed that corporations united thus, without any ties to government, could be harmful to the public tranquility."²⁰

The law of 1866 represented the nadir of Armenian power in Tiflis in

the nineteenth century and the most concerted attempt to shift municipal power from the Armenian merchants to the Georgian nobility. As destructive as the reform proved to be to the traditional guilds and their influence in government, the law proved to be only a temporary encumbrance to the re-assertion of bourgeois power in the town. The integration of Tiflis into the urban administrative system of the Russian Empire was completed in 1874 when the municipal statute granted to Russian cities in 1870 was extended to certain cities in the Caucasus.²¹ By this law a municipal дума was to be elected by adult males who owned real estate or paid taxes in the city. This was the widest franchise ever enjoyed by urban dwellers in tsarist Russia and extended even to peasants if they met the property or tax qualifications. Three curiae were established based on the amount of tax paid, and each curia elected one-third of the дума deputies. In practice this meant that a handful of the wealthiest men in the city elected the first third of the дума, the next wealthiest elected a second third, and hundreds of propertied people elected the last third. The дума then would elect an uprava (board) and a mayor. What was novel about this system was that it dispensed with the division of the population into estates (soslovie) and instead distinguished members of the population by wealth and property. The tsenz or property qualification which gave a man the right to vote established a new principle for political participation and power, one quite familiar to bourgeois Europe but new to tsarist Russia. The preponderance of power in the new дума lay with the wealthiest third of the population, the few rich businessmen who chose one-third of the assembly and from whose number the mayor was likely to emerge. Thanks to this law the Armenian bourgeoisie re-emerged as the leading political force in Tiflis.

The elimination of the political privileges of the guilds in the 1860s

and the formal abolition of estate representation in the *duma* in the 1870s reduced both the Armenian bourgeois and the Georgian noble to the position of citizen. The influence each would hold in the next two decades within Tiflis would now depend not on birth or legal status but on their property and wealth. Tsarist law had a dual effect on the Armenian bourgeoisie, forcing its modernization by eliminating the merchant guilds and restricting the craft guilds while at the same time preserving, indeed extending, its privileged political position within the municipality. The "bourgeois" principle of representation based on one's economic status rather than on birth and soslovie aided the Armenian mokalake to maintain his paramount place in the city even as demographic movements were reducing his relative weight in the population. As the Georgian nobility failed to adjust to the spreading market economy and lost its ancient lands to middle-class creditors or land-hungry peasants, it was also pushed aside politically.

II

The perception by Georgians of various classes that their interests were different from those of Armenians and Russians required a long time for gestation. It began at the top of society with the educated sons of the nobility but never succeeded in converting that social caste completely to dedicated opposition. In the second third of the century the nobility, after initial efforts at resistance to Russian rulership, had quickly accommodated itself to the new order and rapidly enhanced its social position by becoming service nobles loyal to their Romanov monarchs. Only in the years after emancipation did the economic strains felt by the nobility facilitate the reception of dissident views. The contact of generations of Georgians with Russian culture and intellectual life had a contradictory influence on the Georgians, turning some toward grateful acceptance of

Russia's "civilizing" mission and others toward rejection. At the same time, while most Georgians in educated society began to perceive the distinctiveness of their own nationality, the issue of whether the interests of all strata of Georgian society were allied divided the more conservative from the liberal and radical elements. On the right the nation was always paramount; as one moved to the left the issue of class rose in importance. The question of nation versus class, as well as the related question of the attitude to be adopted toward Russia, were the major issues which excited, confused, and divided the political forces in Georgia.

By the last third of the century Russian administration and the developing market economy were having profound effects on the formation of Georgian national cohesion. From the dispersed, insecure pieces of seigneurial Georgia with its various princely houses and distinct economies, one national political and economic unit was being formed. The Georgian nation (eri), consolidated out of the autonomous political units which had been eliminated by the 1860s, was being further united as the isolated peasant villages, once largely self-sufficient and only distantly related to towns, were integrated into a national economy.²² As railroads, telegraphs, and improved roads made access to the cities and the outside world easier, increased contact with the towns in which people of different nationality lived forged a growing sense of the distinctions between Georgians and other peoples. Thus, Russian colonial dominance of Transcaucasia, which guaranteed a degree of peace, security, and economic progress in certain sectors, had fostered conditions for national reformation and ethnic confrontation. Not surprisingly, as this new national emergence was expressed in literature and political journalism, the whole question of Georgia's future relationship with Russia appeared at the center of the national debate.

Like other colonial relationships Georgia's subordination to Russia was a mixture of benefits and burdens, and the attitude of many Georgians toward Russian rule could not help but be ambivalent. Protection by tsarist arms was both a necessity and a restrictive imposition for Georgians. The benefits of European civilization were highly desired by a thin layer of Georgian society, and the road to the West lay through Russia. Generations of Georgian students trekked northward to Russian centers of learning to discover the latest intellectual advances of European thinkers. Enlightenment was the means by which Georgia could escape the past dominated by the Muslim East and join the Christian, modern West. At the same time, contact with Russia and the West worked to awaken consciousness of Georgia's unique culture and fears that Georgia would be overwhelmed by foreign values, by Russian political practice and by the alien economic operations of Armenian middlemen. This ambivalence toward "Europeanization" and Russian rule was a constant feature of Georgian intellectual life through the nineteenth century into the twentieth.

The history of the Georgian national intelligentsia begins in the romantic age, when educated young Georgians made their desperate attempt to sever the Russian connection. The plotters were discovered before they could put their sanguinary plans into effect, and the dreams of overthrowing tsarist authority and replacing it with a Bagratid monarch disappeared with the exiles in Siberia. Like the Decembrists, the conspirators of 1832 were much more influential in the afterglow of their failure than they had been in the years leading up to their arrests. Although the example of these last noble plotters was not followed by others, the surviving participants retained enormous prestige, and after

they had made peace with the Russian presence many of them became leading figures, not only in Caucasian politics, but also in letters. By virtue both of their aristocratic status and their intellectual abilities, Alexander Chavchavadze and Grigol Orbeliani reentered state service and rose to high positions. At the same time they became the leading literary lights in the romantic movement in Georgia. The poetry of Chavchavadze lamented the lost past of Georgia. In poems like "vai, droni, droni" ("Woe, time, time"), "isminet msmenno" ("Listen, listener"), and "kavkasia" ("Caucasia"), the golden age of Georgia was favorably contrasted with its mundane present. Orbeliani, who eventually became governor-general of Tiflis province, was a contradictory figure who served loyally as a tsarist officer but in his poems called for restoration of Georgia's past glory.

The close social and intellectual ties of the Georgian romantics were exemplified in the life and verse of the finest poet of the period, Nikoloz Baratashvili (1817-1845). The pupil of Soghomon Dodiashvili, one of the conspirators of 1832, and the nephew of Grigol Orbeliani, Baratashvili found his muse in Ekaterina Chavchavadze, the second daughter of Alexander, and wrote a series of lyric poems to her. The romantic themes of patriotism and nostalgia for a lost past were reflected in Baratashvili's poem "bedi kartlisa" ("Fate of Georgia"), in which the poet reproduced the debate of Erekle II, penultimate king of Georgia, with his advisor who opposed the union with Russia. The wife of the advisor asks her husband, in a lament which became familiar to all literate Georgians: "ra khelhqris pativs nazi bulbuli, galiashia datqvevebuli?" ("What pleasure does the tender nightingale receive from honor if it is in a cage?")

Romanticism in Georgia in the 1830s-1840s was influenced by Russian

poets of the period, as well as by Russian translations of European literature. But the pessimism and patriotism, the lyricism and longing of the romantics was anything but foreign to Georgian literature. Their poets of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, writing under Persian and Turkish influence, composed lyrical songs, elegant laments, and paens to nature, quite close to what Baratashvili and his contemporaries produced several generations later.²³ Still, romanticism was the first literary movement in which Georgians engaged along with Russians. A curious reciprocity cross-fertilized the work of Georgian poets, while the Caucasus and Georgia became a rich image for the exotic and romantic in Russian literature. Pushkin, who visited Georgia in 1829, and Lermontov, exiled to the Caucasus in 1840, used Caucasian motifs and characters and helped raise the Caucasus in the popular imagination from a backwater outpost to a land of passion and temper, violence and adventure.

Interest in Georgian history and language expanded along with the new literature. The French scholar Marie-Félicité Brosset was invited to Saint Petersburg in 1837 and made a member of the Academy of Sciences in order to permit him to continue his Georgian studies. Three years later Brosset published a Georgian-French-Russian dictionary with D.I. Chubinashvili (Chubinov) and a year later completed his translation into Russian of Shota Rustaveli's twelfth-century epic poem vepkhis tqaosani ("The Man in the Panther's Skin"). Late in the 1840s Viceroy Vorontsov invited Brosset to lead an archaeological expedition in Georgia, and thereafter a steady stream of translations and critical editions of the major Georgian chronicles appeared under Brosset's name. As a result of the attention paid to Georgia by a renowned European scholar and in travel accounts of European visitors as famous as Alexander Dumas, Georgia not only became known to people in western Europe but became

the subject of heightened literary and scholarly interest among the Georgians themselves. Native Georgian scholarship had already produced a short history of Georgia in Russian — Kratkaia istoriia Gruzii (St. Petersburg, 1805) — by Prince David Bagrationi, and a geographical survey of the country — Obozrenie tsarstva gruzinskogo naroda (St. Petersburg, 1814) — by Prince Vakhtang Batonishvili. But the first critical history in Georgian was written by Prince Teimuraz in 1848. Under the impact of Russian rule Georgian intellectuals initiated their own search into their country's past, a search which 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 the poets, provided the small Georgian reading public with the images required to regard Georgia as a nation.

The first members of the Georgian intelligentsia, known later as the "fathers," were a small, close-knit group of aristocratic writers who shared with a few others of their noble brothers the benefits of Russian state service. They met occasionally in literary salons to read their works and discuss current issues. With the expansion of education under Viceroy Vorontsov, the number of noble sons and young people of other social classes who gained access to schools rose rapidly. Those who completed their secondary education in the Caucasus and wished to continue their education had to leave for the north and enroll in one of half-dozen Russian universities. From this newly expanding educated group with its close contact with Russia proper a rival tendency emerged within the intelligentsia, soon to distinguish themselves as the "sons." Called in Georgian terqdaleulni (literally, "those who drank the water of the Terek," the river that one crossed to go from Georgia to Russia), the sons were distinguished by their Russian education from their older com-

patriots known as the mtkvardaleulni ("those who drank the water of the mtkvari [Kura], the river that flows through Tiflis). Together the two groups made up what later would be referred to as the pirveli dasi or "first generation" of the Georgian intelligentsia. The members of this tiny intellectual world were similar in social background but their literary tastes and political outlooks differed greatly, and those differences can be traced to the unique experience of the sons in Russia in the late 1850s and early 1860s. Those years early in the reign of Alexander II were years of public discussion and searching analysis of the backwardness of Russian society, so graphically revealed by the empire's defeat in the Crimean War. The debate over emancipation and the literary-political polemics in the pages of the radical journal Sovremennik ("Contemporary") stimulated intense efforts at self-education by the students in Russia's universities. One of those students, the Georgian raznochinets Niko Nikoladze, remembered the euphoria of the early 1860s as a kind of "early spring, not only for me, but for all of Russia and even Europe. After the heavy oppression imposed after 1848, here and there flashed the glow of dawn."²⁴

Numbering about thirty in the early 1860s, the Georgian students in Petersburg lived separately from the Russians. When the various non-Russian minority groups in the university decided to form zemliachestva to provide a minimal form of ethnic organization, some Georgians argued in favor of a pan-Caucasian zemliachestvo. The majority, however, were convinced by the young writer Ilia Chavchavadze (1837-1907) to form separate Georgian, Armenian, Russian and "Lezgin" organizations with strong ties between them.²⁵ At first the Georgians were isolated from the growing tensions in the university, but by the summer of 1861 the radicalization of the Russian and Polish students affected some of the Caucasians.

Inspired by the liberation movements in Italy and Hungary, the more zealous among them adopted the fashion of wearing their hair like Garibaldi. Perhaps the most volatile and politically active was the young Nikoladze (1843-1928), an avid reader of Sovremennik and Herzen's Poliarnaia zvezda. Sympathizing with the views of the leaflet "K molodomu pokoleniiu," Nikoladze and his friends joined other students in the demonstrations of September-October 1861. Arrested and expelled from the university, the coterie of radicals were ordered to leave the city and return to Georgia. For Nikoladze and his friends their formal education in Russia was over, but they were proud of their participation in the first political action against Russian authorities in which Georgians had engaged together with Russians, Poles, and other nationalities. When his father's servant came to fetch him home, Nikoladze went willingly: "Petersburg was oppressive to me; I no longer expected any kind of revolution there."²⁶

The acknowledged leader of the tergdaleulni was the more moderate Ilia Chavchavadze, the orphaned son of a prominent Kakhetian family. As a child he had learned to love Georgian literature from his mother and to read his native language from a village clergyman. He had left for Tiflis at age eleven and studied, first at a private boarding school and later at the noble gimnaziia. Fundamentally affected by the four years he spent at the juridical faculty at Saint Petersburg University (1857-61), Chavchavadze used these years to write a remarkably rich body of poetry and prose. He and his contemporary, the poet Akaki Tsereteli, were the first important Georgian poets to shift from the patriotic romanticism of Orbelliani and Baratashvili to a less rhetorical, more critical realism. In his verse "poeti," written during his student years, Chavchavadze announced his view of his literary and social obligation:

I do not learn from the birds in flight, -
I listen to another voice.
Not for sweet songs
Was I sent by heaven to earth.

.....

To become a brother to the people,
A friend in joy and sorrow,
so that its suffering
in pain lights fire to my soul.

The social commitment to the people which the Russian radical intelligentsia made the touchstone of their ideas and behavior had a profound effect on the Georgians who studied in the north. Akaki Tsereteli remembered the great influence of the radical "sons" of the Russian intelligentsia -- Chernyshevskii and Dobroliubov -- though he rejected their almost total denial of aesthetic values in literature. The question of the social role of art was a key political issue, and Tsereteli's unwillingness to subordinate his art to political ends cost him his friends.²⁷ The way in which that commitment would be manifested, whether in practical application of the principles of reform or in alliance with the fledgling revolutionary opposition, deeply divided the Georgian intelligentsia from the emancipation to the revolution.

Returning to Georgia the tergdaleulni arrived just as the process of peasant emancipation was being extended to Transcaucasia. In general, these young noblemen favored a liberal and generous emancipation and were disappointed both by the attitudes of the majority of the nobility and the final settlement granted by the government. But their energies were turned away from specifically political and economic activity to the field of culture and

education, to journalism and literature. Despite the first stirrings of romantic literature and the promotion of a Georgian drama by Vorontsov, the actual achievements of the literate elite were still quite meager by the 1860s. The Soviet historian Sh. Chkhetia laments: "In Georgia up to the 1860s, i.e., in the course of almost three-quarters of a century, not more than 160-180 books had been printed in the Georgian language;...in Georgia in all that time not one [permanent] Georgian theater had existed;...in Georgia in that time not one Georgian cultural and scientific institution had been founded;...in all of Georgia up to the 1860s only three Georgian printing presses had existed, and the number of printing presses with Georgian typeface never exceeded two."²⁸ Clearly not even the Georgians themselves yet valued their own literature; not enough interested readers could be found to support a modest press for very long. According to the early Marxist historian and activist, Filip Makharadze, the Georgian language "gradually lost significance in the eyes of Georgians themselves since knowing only their own language Georgians could not enter state or public service."²⁹

Central to the question of ethnic identity in Transcaucasia was the use of language. While Armenians had a distinct brand of Christianity and a separate church with its head at holy Echmiadzin, the Georgians were religiously merged with the Russian Orthodox Church. In terms of social estates Georgian nobles and peasants were roughly equivalent to Russians of the same order, though ethnicity and culture, acceptance and prejudice, always colored social relations and influenced political advancement. But language, the knowledge of Georgian and the degree of fluency in Russian, was a key determinant of social and political mobility and the degree of identity with one's own people or the dominant nationality. From 1868 Georgian held a clearly inferior position to Russian, not only in popular attitudes or the views of

officials, but in the law as well. The teaching of Russian was henceforth required in all schools in the empire, while Georgian was no longer considered a required subject of study. Beginning in the 1870s only private schools taught courses in Georgian, usually on the primary level, with Russian given as a special course. When a student reached middle school the courses were taught in Russian with Georgian given as a separate course. As the result of state policy and legal discriminations the percentage of schools which taught a local Caucasian language steadily declined and those which taught all subjects in Russian increased. ³⁰ As early as 1860 Niko Nikoladze discerned this tendency in his first published article entitled "Do We Need the Georgian Language?"

This painful question was addressed to the readers of the first influential and long-lived Georgian journal, tsiskari ("Dawn"), which appeared briefly in 1852-1853 under the editorship of the playwright Georgii Eristavi (1811-1864) and enjoyed a longer run (1857-1875) under Ivan Kereselidze (1829-1883). In its pages the younger Georgian writers engaged in the debate over serfdom then dividing Russian society, and a passionate attack on serfdom appeared from the pen of Daniel Chonkadze (1830-1860), the novel suramis tsikhe ("Surami Fortress"). Yet in 1860 only 180 subscribers could be found to support the journal, and through the decade there was little improvement and occasionally considerable losses. tsiskari, propped up by the generous subsidies of Alexander Orbeliani, generally reflected the views of the conservative "fathers" and used an archaic Georgian (sashualo) based on the medieval language of the Church (maghali). The "sons," led by Iliá Chavchavadze, began a campaign for the use of the Georgian vernacular (dabali) in published prose and poetry. Up to this time the language of ordinary people was thought appropriate only for the comedies of Giorgi Eristavi and other writers for the

theater. In April 1861 Chavchavadze published his article on Prince Revaz Eristavi's translation of Kozlov's "Bezumna" ("Madwoman") in tsiskari and, thus, opened a long feud with the older generation. Chavchavadze's suggestions were rather modest, an orthographic and stylistic reform, but the conservatives were incensed by the attempt to reduce the elevated language of Georgian literature to the level of the spoken language of the people. Similar struggles over the archaic literary language of the upper classes and the Church and the "democratic" reform of the written language were then dividing the Armenian intelligentsia and had stirred hostilities a generation earlier among Russian writers. The debate became heated and took on political overtones when Chavchavadze answered Grigol Orbeliani's "pasukhi shvilita" ("Answer to the Sons") with his "pasukhis pasukhi" ("Answer to the Answer"), which contained the harsh indictment: "chveni kveqana, mkvdari tkvengana, tkvenebr chinebze ar gagvitsvlia....liberaloba, patriotoba salamdzhav sitqvad ar gagvikhdia..." ("Our country, killed by you, did not sell itself for ranks as you did....Liberalism and patriotism, we have not turned into curse words...") From Petersburg Akaki Tsereteli, Giorgi Tsereteli, and Kiril Lordkipanidze wrote in support of Chavchavadze, signing their letters "tergdaleuli", and emphasized that the real Georgian was the peasant; his language was the essence of the national language.

No longer able to work together with the "fathers" the tergdaleulni issued their own periodicals. The first, sakartvelos moambe ("Georgia's Herald"), was edited by Chavchavadze, **and though it lasted only one year** the twelve issues of this literary journal were enormously influential. Years later Prince Giorgi Tumanov remembered its impact:

I speak of 1863 when the journal of I. Gr. Chavchavadze, Georgian Herald (sakartvelos moambe), began to come out. This

was a time of general awakening. This was a time of great hopes. The men of the Sixties -- realists and materialists in principle -- actually woke up the best feelings of mankind. Even I, a child of eight, was interested in the journal. From Chavchavadze's journal I first learned of the existence of Belinskii, Dobroliubov, Proudhon, and Bastiat. But they were little understood by me, and my sympathies were more attracted by Victor Hugo (his novel Les Miserables was published) and by the editor himself. Here for the first time appeared the novels of Chavchavadze, Tale of a Poor Man and Katsia adamiani?, his best poetry, filled with civic feeling, his "Kako" and his critical-humorous articles, "Conversation of Spiridon and Tadeoz." ³¹

With pages of tsiskari closed to him Chavchavadze published his own and his friends' articles, as well as translations of authors and theorists considered progressive. The ideas of Chernyshevskii, then in prison, were popularized by the tergdaleulni, but their hopes for governmental reform or the crystalization of a revolutionary opposition to tsarism were dashed when tsarist troops crushed the Polish insurrection of 1863. The age of reform quickly came to an end, and years of pessimism stretched into the next decade.

The intellectual awakening in the 1860s had a profound effect on the Georgian intelligentsia. The ideas of the so-called Russian "enlighteners" (prosvetiteli), particularly Chernyshevskii and Dobroliubov, were as much appeals to emotion and calls to action as they were intellectual stimulants. Dobroliubov's condemnation of Oblomovism was not only an indictment of Russia's

social conditions but an attack on passivity, inaction, hypocrisy, and the idle mouthing of humanistic sentiments. For young Russians, Georgians, Armenians, and others in the empire their recently acquired education and privileged social position demanded some kind of moral accounting, a payment of the debt they owed to society and the people. For some this sense of debt could be reconciled in state service, but for many others the autocratic state was perceived as the enemy of the people and that debt could only be repaid in service to the people. Thus, for a significant group in the Russia-educated Georgian intelligentsia, intellectual enlightenment not only changed their perceptions of reality but reforged their life ambitions. And a small number of them turned toward the embryonic revolutionary movement.

The awakening of cultural and intellectual life in Georgia pulled the Georgian educated elite out of parochial concerns into the larger European political sphere. But the attraction of western ideas and joint political action with the Russian intelligentsia proved divisive to the Caucasians. In the late 1860s the original tergdaleulni ceased to constitute a united group. Chavchavadze became a mirovoi posrednik after the peasant emancipation and worked in Dusheti in Tiflis province until 1874 as a mirovoi sud'ia (justice of the peace). His interests turned toward ethnography and he was one of the first Georgians to study local dialects and to collect folk poetry and music. Politically he became more conservative and dedicated himself to his work in the Georgian Nobles' Bank and the Society for the Spread of the Georgian Language. Liberals like Giorgi Tumanov later regretted this move to the right: Chavchavadze "was wordy, rhetorical, and principally archaic, if one can so express it. His defense of the customs, the fundamentals of old Georgian life, produced an impression of reactionary sympathies. The progressive who had earlier castigated in his best poetic and

prose works the old serf-owning system had somehow turned now into an apologist for the old ways."³²

Niko Nikoladze, on the other hand, embarked on a different political odyssey. After leaving Petersburg he went to study in Western Europe and became the first Georgian to receive a doctorate (in law) from a European university. Through Paul Lafargue Nikoladze met Karl Marx, who asked the impressive Georgian to become the representative of the International in Transcaucasia. Nikoladze declined the offer. His views at the time were more in tune with the homegrown radicals Chernyshevskii and Dobroliubov whom he had met in Petersburg. While in Europe he also became acquainted with Alexander Herzen. Nikoladze briefly collaborated on Kolokol in 1865, but he soon broke in disappointment with the "gentry revolutionary" when Herzen attempted a reconciliation with the tsarist government through an open letter to the Emperor. Not content with the range of political options, Nikoladze threw himself into his studies.

While Nikoladze was finishing his doctorate in Europe, some of his closest associates founded the newspaper droeba ("Times") in Tiflis. Giorgi Tsereteli (1842-1900) and Petr Umikashvili formed a group which declared itself "New Youth" (akhali akhalqazrdoba). More radical than most of the tergdaleulni from which they had arisen, this group and its supporters were later referred to as the meore dasi or "second generation" of the Georgian intelligentsia. Stimulated by the revival of political activity among Russian intellectuals, the Tiflis literati used the pages of droeba to introduce their readers to the ideas of progressive liberal thinkers like John Stuart Mill and "utopian socialists" like Robert Owen, Saint-Simon, Charles Fourier, Pierre Proudhon, and Louis Blanc. Rather than advocating a particular solution to Georgia's backwardness, the meore dasi was searching widely for a program, ranging from a state-regulated capitalism to various

forms of "association" and collectivism.³³ While they were committed to bringing the fruits of European culture and learning to Georgia, they were at the same time wary of importing an unfettered free market system. As in Russia so in Georgia most intellectuals rejected an unqualified defense of capitalism as it was then developing in the West, preferring some means of ameliorating the struggle between capital and labor through state regulation or "association."³⁴

The meore dasi were the first group of Georgian intellectuals to become involved primarily in the urban and economic life of Georgia. They responded to the new economic and political forces in European life, centered in the great cities, and worked to keep the Georgians from being pushed aside by the Russians and Armenians who dominated their cities. Journalism, urban politics, and business were areas in which men like Nikoladze, Giorgi Tsereteli, and Sergei Meskhi operated with a confidence and energy unseen in earlier generations. In the fall of 1875 Nikoladze returned to Tiflis and began to publish widely in the press associated with the meore dasi — droeba, soplis gazet ("Rural Newspaper"), krabuli ("Collection"), and Tiflisskii vestnik ("Tiflis Herald"). He put forth a full program of municipal reform for Tiflis and revived a forgotten idea for a Noble Land Bank. Despite resistance from influential aristocrats, Nikoladze was able to persuade enough nobles to pool their resources to capitalize the bank at a meager 170,000 rubles.³⁵ Ilia Chavchavadze agreed to head the bank. Nikoladze, however soon had a falling out with Chavchavadze and opposed the direction in which he took the bank. Nikoladze hoped that the bank would take on a program of agrarian improvement, investment in new productive techniques, and sale of land to peasants so that the farms would remain in the hands of Georgians. But Chavchavadze used the bank's profits to establish schools and cultural institutions. A heated and personal debate over the bank's activities sharply divided the

Georgian noble intelligentsia, forcing Chavchavadze to leave the editorial board of droeba and found his own newspaper iveria (1877-1906). As Nikoladze moved toward orthodox liberalism and advocacy of capitalist development for Georgia, Chavchavadze worked to prevent the further decline of the Georgian nobility and to revive interest in Georgian culture. He used his base at the noble bank to promote his own view of Georgia's future. Chavchavadze, known at the time as the "Georgian Gambetta," presided at the public meetings of the bank's shareholders which were referred to as the "gruzinskii parlament" ("the Georgian parliament"). The once-united Georgian intelligentsia was deeply fractured by the late 1870s. Three major political tendencies had appeared and would dominate Georgian social life until the century's end. On the right was the nostalgic nationalism of the Georgian gentry led by Ilia Chavchavadze. In the center was the reformist liberalism of Niko Nikoladze and Giorgii Tsereteli. And on the left was the emerging revolutionary movement, first influenced by Russian populism and later by Marxism.

Against the background of developing capitalism, the growing power of the Armenian bourgeoisie, and the steady fall of the Georgian nobility, the newspaper iveria and its editor Chavchavadze preached an anti-capitalist, anti-socialist program. The former radical, author of a poem celebrating the Paris Commune, turned after 1877 toward loyalty to the Russian throne, orthodox religiosity, and efforts to shore up the falling fortunes of his own estate. Both the liberals and the socialists spoke of the division of society into competing classes, but Chavchavadze and his followers tried to revive the notion of a single, unified, harmonious Georgian society free from class conflict. At all costs capitalism with its fellow traveller

the proletariat should not be encouraged in Georgia:

The general sickness of which I want to speak here is a terrible sickness. This sickness has spread all over Europe.... This horrible and debilitating sickness chews up, spits out, and corrupts their living corpses; it forces them to lose their human face and turns man into animal. This disease carries the name 'proletariat.' Proletariat means workers without land, without property, or, as we say here, paupers....

Even our kinto has property: the tabakhi on which he lays his fruit, a little money with which he can buy fruit, and his silver belt. All this is his property, and if you add to this his energy he is more or less satisfied. We have no proletariat, but we will have one if our peasants do not buy their land in time. And if before this factories are built here, the peasants, incensed that their earnings will go to others, will leave house and land and go to the city to work in the factory....We need nothing if our youth is industrious enough to give a hand to the peasant in the form of the organization of banks and consumer organizations.³⁶

Chavchavadze, Akaki Tsereteli, and others articulated the traditional idea of the Georgian nobility that in their society there had never been serious antagonisms between estates, that the nobility and the peasantry had lived in harmony, and that the ideas of the socialists were destroying the natural bridge which had always existed between lord and serf.

Chavchavadze's social program was founded on preservation of Georgia as an agricultural society with a landed majority. Peasants were to own the

land eventually, but at the present time the payment of one-quarter of the harvest as rent to noble landlords seemed to him a fair system. He advocated more democratic election of peasant officials and the elimination of police intervention into peasant affairs. Through his bank the nobility was to be aided to keep their land and prevent further penetration of Armenian capital into the countryside. His cultural program was aimed at reversing the erosion of Georgian traditions and language, and under the leadership of iveria a Georgian cultural revival became evident. In 1879 the Society for the Spread of Literacy among Georgians was founded by Iakov Gogebashvili (1840-1912), a tireless campaigner for education in Georgian and the author of the widely-used textbook deda ena ("Mother Tongue").³⁷ That same year the first permanent Georgian dramatic troop was formed, and in 1885 the first chorus for Georgian folk songs was founded by Lado Agniashvili. The Czech conductor Joseph Ratali was invited to Tiflis to assist in this ethnomusicological endeavor, and in 1886 the first concert was held in Tiflis. Through the 1880s Georgian literature experienced a renaissance with the appearance in print of works by neo-romantic writers like Aleksandre Kazbegi (1848-1893) and Vazha-Pshavela (Luki Pavlovich Razikashvili, 1861-1915), men who celebrated the free spirit of the Georgian mountaineers. The older generation of Georgian letters -- Chavchavadze, Akaki Tsereteli, Dmitri Kipiani -- energetically intervened in public affairs to promote Georgian schooling and protest the denigration of the Georgian language.³⁸

The revival of Georgian national feeling in the last third of the nineteenth century paralleled developments among the Armenians. Inspired by the successes of Russian arms against the Ottoman Turks in 1877-1878, both the Armenians and the Georgians dared to hope that their brethren living in eastern Anatolia might be liberated from Muslim rule.

In contrast to gentry nationalism, Caucasian liberalism was based in a respect for the experience of western Europe and the successes of industrial capitalism. Rejecting revolution and dedicated to reform, the liberals depended on the goodwill of the state for the implementation of their program. While they were critical of bureaucratic autocracy, the liberals were anxious not to antagonize Russian authority. At the same time they opposed all forms of national chauvinism and promoted cooperation between the nationalities of Transcaucasia. For liberal reformers like Nikoladze the Georgian nobility no longer had any historical role to play. The future lay in the new institutions of local government and business, and he encouraged young people to enter the zemstva, city government, the railroad and other businesses where practical intelligence could influence the condition of the mass of people. "In my opinion," he wrote, "the task of liberating the country involves the acquisition by the intelligentsia of sufficient power for that inevitable moment when the government, under the blows of Europe, will again find itself in as helpless a position as it fell into after Sevastopol."³⁹ Nikoladze took his own advice and went for a time to work in Petersburg for a private railroad company. There he tried to convince the narodniki to give up terrorism so that the government would end its repressive policies and take up reform.

The appeal of this liberal, reformist approach was limited to a small number of urban Georgians, the Armenian progressives around Grigor Artsruni's Mshak ("Cultivator"), and those men from the "third element" working in city government. It never affected the lower classes or the great bulk of the nobility. By the late 1870s the liberal Tiflisskii vestnik managed to build up its circulation to 3300. Later this anti-nationalist, anti-autocratic, cosmopolitan, procapitalist liberalism was the hallmark of the influential Tiflis daily Novoe obozrenie ("New Review"), which called for a renewal of reforms — increased municipal self-government, the introduction of courts,

religious and ethnic tolerance, and the end to racism and chauvinism.

Despite their narrow social base, the liberals achieved notable successes in local government. Liberal reformers, led by A.S. **Matinov**, P.A. Izmailov, and A.A. Tamamshev, introduced a program of municipal improvement in the Tiflis дума. These young intellectuals turned to an Armenian businessman, I. E. Pitoev, in order to gain access to the merchants who dominated the assembly. Pitoev organized a "party" which met periodically in his apartment to discuss plans for Tiflis. His influence was paramount, and, as one contemporary put it, the statement "Isai wants it" had a "magic effect" on the others in the group. Such private meetings of дума deputies were unheard of in the Russia of Alexander II, and according to the memoirist Tumanov, "thanks to the circle of Is. Eg. Pitoev, private conferences of deputies received the right of citizenship here twenty years earlier than in other cities of Russia."⁴⁰

At the end of 1878, the Pitoev-Izmailov party won the elections to the дума, and when the deputies met to choose their mayor bitter differences divided the new members from older members. While the new deputies voted for the Armenian Bebutov, older deputies split their votes between the incumbent mayor, the Georgian noble Dmitri Kipiani, and the Armenian M.E. Alikhanov. After much maneuvering an Armenian businessman, A. Korganov, was chosen, but he declined to serve and A.S. **Matinov** (1843-1909) was finally elected.⁴¹ The victory of the Pitoev-Izmailov party brought ethnic considerations into дума politics, though they were still muted. Martinov served as mayor of Tiflis until 1890, but the most influential дума member was party leader P.A. Izmailov, the vigorous spokesman for a new water system, bridges, a city hall, and other renovations for the city. This party was

responsible for turning Tiflis, or at least part of it, into a modern European city, but its critics condemned the reformers for the "one-sided bourgeois direction of this party." Like the *duma* which it led, the reform party largely represented the rich Armenian community and the small number of liberal intellectuals.

While liberals like Nikoladze had abandoned their youthful radicalism and turned from revolutionary politics to reform, a new generation of young noblemen responded in the 1870s to the contradictory messages of the Russian Enlightenment by turning toward populism. In secret circles in their gimnazia and seminaries young Georgians read the prohibited works of Belinskii, Pisarev, Dobroliubov, and Chernyshevskii, while disregarding their own native writers. As early as 1865 the editors of Kolokol had reported that several gimnazia students in Tiflis had been arrested for membership in a secret society, Molodaia Gruzia i Molodaia Armenia ("Young Georgia and Young Armenia"). By 1869 a clandestine library had been established in Tiflis, and seminarians found the home of their teacher, Iakov Gogebashvili, a haven for forbidden discussions of art and politics. One student who frequented those discussions later claimed that "his house was for the Georgian intelligentsia what Stankevich's home had been for Russian writers."⁴² Students at the seminary were close to the editors of mnatobi ("Luminary") (1869-1872) who expressed socialist views, and themselves put out their own handwritten journal, shroma ("Labor"), until March 1871. In general a new liveliness was experienced by young Georgian intellectuals, and in this stimulating climate they were attracted both by the radical political message of Russian populists and a sense of their own responsibility to their own people.

At one extreme, farthest from the Georgian "patriots" (mamulishvilebi), were a few Georgian populists who linked their fate directly to that of the Russian revolutionary movement of the 1870s. Men like I.S. Jabadari (Dzhabadari) and Shio Davitashvili saw no contradiction between their commitment to Russian populism and the cause of Georgian liberation. When the patriots complained that Georgia's few educated people should all work for the motherland, Davitashvili answered: "Georgia is closely tied to Russia. The Georgian people can be freed only if the political order in Russia is destroyed. Consequently the Georgian youth are helping the cause of the Russian revolution, and in this way they serve not only the Russian people but the interests of Georgia."⁴³ Jabadari was even more abrupt in his dismissal of a separate Georgian movement:

We entered the arena of political activity not as Georgians but as members of the whole Russian revolutionary family. Russian youth was closer to us than the narrowly nationalistic Georgian, Armenian, and other Caucasian....We decided to work in Russia hand in hand with Russians, deeply convinced that if sometime it is decreed that we are victorious in Russia then at the same time we will be victorious in the Caucasus; having won freedom for the Russian people we win it for the peoples of the Caucasus at the same time....Not separatism but working together was our slogan.⁴⁴

The first generation of Georgian populists came from the same social and educational milieu as the patriots and the meore dasi but their affections were turned toward the larger world outside Georgia. When Jabadari and his friends organized a library for poorer students, they provided them with the works of Louis Blanc, J.S.Mill, Herzen, and Victor Hugo. They

read with deep interest the published accounts of the Paris Commune and followed closely the trial of Nechaev. From Petersburg they were able to obtain books by Lassale, the novel Emma and Lucinda by Schweitzer, and Marx's Capital. This first socialist circle in Georgia (1871-1872) spent much of its energy circulating literature to students, though it had some contact with workers and artisans.⁴⁵ It dissolved after a year's existence when its leading members left for Petersburg and Zurich.

The Petersburg experience of Jabadari and his closest comrades was different from that of the tergdaleulni in that it drew them further away from Georgian politics instead of inspiring them to return and work in their homeland. "In Petersburg," Jabadari remembered, "I immediately fall in among young people who spoke, dreamt, and raved only about the people."⁴⁶ When he met his old friends from Tiflis, he found their meetings much less interesting than those of the Russians.⁴⁷ When the Russian students were reading Petr Lavrov's emigre newspaper Vpered ("Forward") and dividing into Lavrovist and Bakuninist camps, however, Jabadari found these debates and divisions fruitless. When his fellow students decided to "go to the people" he left Russia to continue his studies in Zurich and Paris. There he found colonies of Georgian students attempting to sort out their political alternatives. In Zurich a largely Georgian circle known as ugeli ("Yoke") had been formed by Niko Nikoladze. Not revolutionary in its tactics, ugeli was a forum for reports on Georgian and general European history, politics, literature, and economics. (A similar group was formed by the Armenians in Zurich, and P. Izmailov and a certain Abelian acted as deputies of that society to the Georgian counterpart.) In Paris Nikoladze was publishing a Georgian newspaper, drosha ("Banner"), which advocated a federation of all

Caucasian peoples on the basis of economic equality of all citizens."⁴⁸

Jabadari was unimpressed by the idea of federation or the emphasis on the political struggle which he found among the emigres. Like the populists with whom he had been studying he advocated a joint movement with the Russians and a full social revolution.

In August 1874 Nikoladze organized a congress of Caucasian university students studying abroad in Geneva and invited Jabadari and Chikoidze, then living in Paris, to discuss alliance strategy. The main question at the congress was whether to support Nikoladze's notion of a federative republic of Caucasia or to join the all-Russian social revolutionary movement. Jabadari, along with Domgat from Daghestan, Tsitsianov, Chelokaev, Eliozov, Chikoidze, and a few others, found themselves in the minority. The majority proposed Switzerland as a model of what a Russian federal state should be in the future.⁴⁹ This congress marks another decisive bifurcation in the Georgian liberation movement. The more moderate men of the 1860s -- Nikoladze, Georgi Tsereteli, Sergei Meskhi, and others--were dedicated to a struggle for a Caucasian solution to Georgia's future, to a political struggle with tsarism which would institutionalize legal restraints on the autocratic power, and to a separation of their efforts from those of the more radical social revolutionaries. The populists, on the other hand, -- Jabadari, Tsitsianov, Zdanovich, and the others -- were determined to link the various national liberation movements into one common social revolutionary struggle against tsarism and capitalism.

Given their strategy it was appropriate that Jabadari and his comrades soon joined forces with a small group of Russian women, the so-called "Frichi," who had refused to obey their government's command to return home in 1873. United by their opposition to Jacobin centralism, they decided to form a revolutionary party. The "All-Russian Social Revolutionary

Organization," founded in 1875, included the Georgian born Georgii Zdanovich (1855-1917), Aleksandre Tsitsianov, and Mikhail Chikoidze, as well as the Russian women from Zurich: Sofia Bardin, Olga Liubatovich, Lydia Figner, and others. It operated as a Bakuninist call for a few months until April 1875 when Jabardari, Chikoidze, and seven others were arrested. Held in prison for almost two years, they were finally tried in the famous Trial of the Fifty in February 1877, one of a series of mass trials designed by the Russian government to discredit the revolutionary movement. When his lawyer pointed out to him that most of the male defendants at the trial were Georgians, Jabardari seemed genuinely surprised. Ethnicity had never played a very important role in his mental world.

For all the prominence of Georgians in the Russian populist movement, the movement had very little impact within Georgia itself. A few Tiflis seminarians, led by David Kezeli, met together in 1872-1873 to read revolutionary literature. The sons of rural priests and deacons, they were influenced by Pisarev and called themselves "nihilists." When the police arrested them, they found among their books the incriminating works of Darwin, Mill, and Chernyshevskii.⁵⁰ More substantial than the Kezeli circle were the efforts of Ignatii Ioseliani, Mikhail Kipiani, and Isidor Kikodze in 1875-1876, who planned a long campaign in Georgia educating and propagandizing the peasantry to prepare them for a coordinated insurrection to be timed with the outbreak of war. Overestimating the volatility of the peasantry, the populists believed their organizational tasks would be relatively simple. Visiting from St. Petersburg, Zdanovich met with Kipiani and the others, listened to the local news of revolts in Svaneti and Abkhazeti, and reported back to his comrades that "the Caucasus is on a war footing."⁵¹ Organizations were formed in Tiflis and Kutaisi, and their

members received the simple literature prepared for the peasants -- books like The Clever Mechanic and The Tale of Four Brothers -- and translated them into Georgian. They also distributed Russian revolutionary newspapers such as Vpered ("Forward"), Rabotnik ("Worker"), and Samarskii golod ("Samara Hunger"). Their efforts had some success in Tiflis, where they had about two hundred sympathizers, but much less in Kutaisi, where only about thirty people showed any interest before arrests dispersed the populists in 1876.⁵² The government became concerned as peasants in some parts of western Georgian appeared to be influenced by populist rhetoric, particularly by the notion that the land was indisputably theirs and that no one had the right to use their labor. One official wrote to the Emperor directly:

It is impossible not to notice that in the last ten years there has often appeared in Zugdidi district a tendency of the peasants not to fulfill their obligations to the landlords....From conversations with peasants I have come to the conclusion that they are motivated by the theory that they have a right to landlord property, [a theory] which has filtered down to them from an alien milieu. Many peasants express themselves on this subject in the identical expressions of the social revolutionary propagandists who were discovered in Kutaisi and Tiflis provinces in April and May of this year (1876)....The peasant population is easily affected by these teachings which correspond to their real interests. They now have adopted the notion that he who works the land should have the exclusive right to ownership.

The natural consequence of this situation is the refusal to pay the landlord or the treasury for use of the land.⁵³

In the 1880s a new generation of Georgian populists appeared, but unlike the noble revolutionaries of the 1870s the men of the eighties were raznochintsi, peasants, poor clergymen, and meshchane from the towns. They directed their propaganda to students and the artisanal workers in the towns. The Tiflis seminary was a center of populist activity, and the student Gola Chitadze was instrumental in organizing a student circle (Is. Ramishvili, Lagiashvili, Uznadze, Menabde, Maglakelikze, and Moseshvili) and a union of journeymen. The circle considered itself close to Narodnaia volia, the terrorist wing of the populist movement. A small committee of narodnovol'tsy also existed in the city, made up of three Armenians (Grigor Ter Grigorian, Abraham Dastakian, and Tamara Adamian) and three Georgians (Vasili Sul Khanov, Vasili Rukhiladze, and Anna Sul Khanova), but in 1882 the Armenians split off to form their own circle, dedicated, as they put it, to the "undefended claims of the unfortunate Armenian people."⁵⁴ Several members of the Executive Committee of Narodnaia volia, Korba and Degaev, formed a military organization in Tiflis, but after Degaev was recruited by the police as a secret agent he returned to Tiflis and exposed his former comrades. On March 2, 1883, officers of the Sixteenth Grenadier Mingrelian Regiment and other members of the organization were arrested.

For two years (1881-1883) newspapers expressing populist ideas were published legally in Georgian. Both imedi ("Hope") in Tiflis, and its sister paper shroma ("Labor") in Kutaisi condemned the assassination of Alexander II and couched their revolutionary sentiments, though many contributors favored a revolution and belonged to secret circles. imedi polemicized with Chavchavadze's iveria, condemning his narrow patriotism and the "nationalization"

of the liberation movement. In an article, "Broken Dreams," the populist Chrelashvili charged that Chavchavadze did not understand that the solution to the national question depended on the resolution of the social question.⁵⁵ Another prominent populist propagandist, Anton Purtseladze (1839-1913), complained that iveria conceived of the land problem as one of underdeveloped agricultural technology, as an agronomic problem, whereas it should properly be seen as a social problem, as the result of the noble landlords' ownership of too much of the land. While iveria opposed taking the land from the nobility, the populists argued in favor of expropriation in favor of the peasants and common ownership of the land fund. In opposition to the liberals, the populists opposed private ownership of the land, hoped to introduce communal ownership in the Caucasus, and proposed an equal right to use land and the full right of each producer to the product of his labor.

Although both the liberals and the populists were deeply concerned with Georgia's economic and social problems, they tended to neglect specifically ethnic aspects of the situation. When the hopes of the Great Reforms turned into the frustration of impotence in face of tsarist conservatism, much antagonism which was rooted in social discontent was manifested in nationalist form. Searching for some explanation of their difficulties, some target on which to fix blame, Georgians often focused on the Armenians of the towns or on Russian officials. With the Georgian nobility rapidly losing its prime position in the social order, Georgians of every level experienced a sense of political powerlessness and fear that all would be lost to the rapacious Armenians. This distorted national consciousness was stimulated by the intellectual reactionaries and chauvinist officials who thrived in Caucasia during the reign of Alexander III.

The growth of Russian nationalism both within the government bureaucracy and the population affected the administration of the ethnic periphery of the empire. In the 1880s-1890s a series of laws imposed new restrictions on the Jews, reduced the autonomy of Finland, and reversed the long-standing policy of permitting the Armenian church to run its own schools. One of the first actions of Alexander III affecting Transcaucasia was the abolition of the office of the Viceroy and the Caucasian Committee in Petersburg. Whereas the Viceroys had been independent of the various ministries in the capital and could report directly to the tsar, in the administrative system introduced in January 1883 the governor-general was required to report routinely through the bureaucracy. Henceforth the Caucasus lost its special status as a viceroyalty and was reduced to equal footing with other regions of the empire.

The slowly maturing national consciousness of Georgians clashed with the revival of Russian chauvinism, and the governors of the Caucasus attempted both to repress, or at least contain, expressions of nationalism, while at the same time diverting Georgian hostilities away from the government and against the Armenians. Nationality was made a consideration in recruitment of state officials. Georgian language studies were further discouraged, even in the Tiflis Seminary where a harsh Russianizing regime was installed. The very word "Gruzija" ("Georgia" in Russian) was prohibited in print.

The harsh police rule imposed by the government effectively contained the revolutionary populists by the mid-1880s. Only the Chitadze circle continued to function in Tiflis, carrying on propaganda among urban workers. Suddenly and dramatically the political tranquility which had deceptively marked the first decade of the new reign was shattered when a student of the

Seminary, Iosif Lagiev (Laghiashvili), fatally stabbed the Russian rector, Pavi Chudetskii. The seminary had long been a center of student political activity, and, according to a police report, the Russian priests had lost all authority over the Georgian students by the end of the 1870s. Tiflis newspapers continually attacked the seminary administration, thus legitimizing the students' own protests. One young firebrand, Silvestr Jibladze, had earlier slapped the rector and been sentenced to two years in a disciplinary battallion.⁵⁶ Apparently the seminary radicals had decided to avenge Jibladze's treatment with the assassination of the rector.⁵⁷ Infuriated by this assault on an official of the Orthodox Church, the Russian Exarch of Georgia anathematized Georgia for this murder, and about sixty students were expelled from the seminary.⁵⁸ The aging patriot Dmitri Kipiani, then the Marshall of the Kutaisi Nobility, wrote an angry letter to the Exarch, demanding that he leave Georgia immediately.⁵⁹ The government retaliated by exiling Kipiani to Stavropol. There he was mysteriously murdered the following year. It was widely believed that he had been killed by tsarist agents, and his funeral became a massive demonstration against the Russian government. As the eighties came to a close, social revolutionary and ethnic concerns were gradually merging, and a new stage of political opposition to tsarism was about to open.

The growing anxiety of Georgians for their future in a Russifying, modernizing autocratic empire found its way into the politics of the Tiflis City дума. Georgians had not participated actively in municipal affairs until the 1890s, and in the дума elections of 1883 and 1887 there had been no intense battles along ethnic or party lines. But in November 1890 the Georgian Noble Land Bank formed a political opposition to the ruling Armenian party and managed to find considerable support in the electors of the "first rank," the richest men in the city who opposed the reforms of the дума

leadership. The "second rank" split between the two parties, and the "third" gave enough support to the opposition to have a дума elected which was divided between the old ruling party and the new opposition. The re-elected mayor, A.S. Matinov, was forced by the opposition to step down, and Prince N.V. Argutinskii-Dolgorukov was chosen in his stead. Still the дума was dominated by the Armenian bourgeoisie who held an absolute majority of the seventy-two дума deputies, forty of whom were Armenian and only twenty Georgian.⁶⁰

Ethnic conflicts in the дума heightened in the next few years. In 1892 the municipal counter-reform of Alexander III raised the property qualification for дума electors and eliminated the division of the electorate into ranks. This legal maneuver simply strengthened the hold of the wealthiest men in the cities over the dumas, and in Tiflis this meant the even more complete hold of the Armenians over the дума. When the city board put forth its list of seventy-seven candidates in 1893, only ten were Russian, seven Georgian, and two German; the rest were Armenian.⁶¹ A Georgian opposition reformed, and the liberal newspaper Novoe obozrenie supported its claims to representation, though it was critical of its use of nationalist rhetoric and its disorganization. This time the opposition was easily beaten; the party of Matinov and Izmailov remained dominant in the дума; and the disgruntled Georgians refused to take their seats in the дума because their representation did not reflect their real weight in the city.⁶²

Both the socio-economic structure of Tiflis and the partiality of tsarist legislation to the men of great property prevented Georgians from participating in the government of the city which had been their national capital since classical times. The revival of Georgian culture and national consciousness among the intelligentsia notwithstanding, the real economic and political weight of Georgians in their own country had steadily been

undermined by the Armenian bourgeoisie and Russian officialdom. Neither tsarist reforms, liberal politics, nor capitalist economics had provided avenues for the advancement of the declining nobility, the emerging intelligentsia, or the peasants forced from their villages into the slums of the towns. Georgian nationalism in its gentry variant was too narrowly concerned with the problems and aspirations of the traditional landed elite to appeal effectively to the Georgian masses. By the early 1890s Georgian society was undergoing a fundamental transformation under the pressures of capitalist industrialization, but none of the ideological alternatives of the past decade — liberalism, populism, or gentry nationalism — seemed to provide the mass of Georgians with a way out of their political predicament.

The Georgians of the last decades of the nineteenth century experienced a contradictory process of social formation. On the one hand, Georgians were being progressively integrated into a developing economy; their traditional isolation in the village was ending, and they were becoming part of the urban world of the industrial age. The increased closeness of the Georgians to other nationalities and to their fellow Georgians contributed to their developing national consciousness and the emergence of the first political movements. But, on the other hand, the effects of the breakup of traditional seigneurial society, with the concomitant decline of the landed nobility, the penetration of the new market economy, with the rise of the Armenian bourgeoisie, and the new and brutal isolation of lower-class Georgians in the poorest sections of the cities rendered the nationalist ideal of a unified and harmonious social order without class conflict a wistful dream. By the 1890s a Georgian working class, made up of peasants forced off the land into workshops, factories, and refineries in Tiflis and Batumi, represented a new force to be reckoned with, one almost completely ignored by the nationalists and populists and neglected by the liberals.

Early in the 1890s a small group of Russian-educated intellectuals returned to Georgia from the north, bringing with them an alternative vision of Georgia's future. Noi Zhordania, Filip Makharadze, and others had become acquainted with Russian Marxism while studying in Warsaw, and in late 1892 Zhordania organized the first conference of Georgian Marxists in Zestafoni. From these humble beginnings the Georgian Marxists, soon known as the mesame dasi ("third generation"), developed an intellectual critique of the embryonic capitalist society then emerging in Georgia and proposed a program of activity to overthrow the autocratic monarchy and permit the free development of a democratic society leading eventually to socialism. By 1895 the Marxists had taken over the illustrated journal vali ("Trace") and soon became the most powerful intellectual movement among Georgians. As worker organization and strike activity accelerated in the last half of the decade, the Marxists linked their ideological struggle with practical work in factories and workshops. By the early twentieth century Marxism provided an analysis and political strategy to both workers in Tiflis, Batumi, Kutaisi, and elsewhere as well as to the rebellious peasants of western Georgia. By 1905 the Marxists, now adherents of the Menshevik form of Social Democracy, were the de facto leaders of a massive national liberation movement, the dimensions of which had not been seen any where else in the Russian Empire.

The phenomenal success of Marxism and the failure of other political ideologies in the 1890s are closely connected to the particular way in which capitalism and political reform developed in Georgia. Despite the demographic decline in Tiflis of the Armenians and the rise of Russians and Georgians, the new relationship among the three ethnic groups was not reflected in shifts of economic and political power. Georgians remained

at the bottom of the economic ladder and nearly totally outside the political arena. The traditional Georgian leaders, the gentry, failed to exercise leadership in the city by the last quarter of the century, and their form of nationalism had no relevance for the workers. The new class of Georgian workers was strategically located in the heart of economic and political power, brought together in large workshops and factories by the process of industrialization. Given the right conditions and leadership this class could make its weight felt much more potently than peasants scattered in isolated villages. The Marxists provided an ideology which placed workers at the center of the historical moment, an ideology which recognized the advent of capitalism and rejected nostalgia about the agrarian past, but one which, unlike liberalism, did not stop with a celebration of market society or a rationalization of the power of propertied men, but rather proposed that the contradictory nature of bourgeois society contained the potential for its eventual overthrow. In Marxism Georgians had a non-nationalist ideology which at one and the same time was a weapon against their ethnic enemies, against Russian autocracy and the Armenian bourgeoisie. Georgia, in the view of the Marxists, could only be returned to the Georgians when revolution eliminated the dual domination of Russian officialdom and Armenian industrialists. This would require, first, a political revolution and, later, a socialist revolution. To those Georgians who had entered the cities in poverty and remained at the bottom of urban society the Marxists made their supra-national appeal. To the Georgian working class separated by language, culture, wealth and power from the Armenian bourgeoisie the Marxists exposed a stark world of capitalist exploitation and ethnic domination which they claimed could be overcome by creating a national liberation movement based on class war.

Ronald Grigor Suny
Oberlin College

FOOTNOTES

1. droeba, 1876, no. 48; I.G. Antelava, E.A. Ordzhonikidze, and E.V. Khoshtaria, K voprosu o genezise i razvitii kapitalizma v sel'skom khoziaistve i promyshlennosti Gruzii (Tbilisi, 1967), p. 66n.
2. For differing views on the agrarian crisis in the Russian Empire in the late nineteenth century, see James Y. Simms, Jr., "The Crisis in Russian Agriculture at the End of the Nineteenth Century: A Different View," Slavic Review, XXXVI, 3 (September 1977), pp. 377-398; G.M. Hamburg, "The Crisis in Russian Agriculture: A Comment," ibid., XXXVII, 3 (September 1978), pp. 481-486; Simms, "On Missing the Point: A Rejoinder," ibid., pp. 487-490; and Hamburg, "The Russian Nobility on the Eve of the 1905 Revolution," The Russian Review, XXXVIII, 3 (July 1979), pp. 323-338.
3. Antelava, et.al., p. 66.
4. Filip Makharadze, Gruziia v deviatnadsatom stoletii. Kratkii istoricheskii ocherk (Tiflis, 1933), p. 69.
5. A one-day census of Tiflis, held on March 25, 1876, revealed that of the 104,024 inhabitants of the city: 37,610 (36.1%) were Armenian; 30,813 (29.6%) were Russian; 22,156 (21.3%) were Georgian; and 13,445 (12.9%) were Germans, Persians, Tatars, Greeks, Jews, and others. Putevoditel' po Tiflisu (Tiflis, 1896), p. 39/
6. Makharadze, p. 69.
7. For more on the Tiflis Armenians in the first half of the nineteenth century, see my article: "Russian Rule and Caucasian Society, 1801-1856: The Georgian Nobility and the Armenian Bourgeoisie," Nationalities Papers, VII, 1 (Spring 1979), pp. 53-78.
8. Sh. K. Chkhetia, Tbilisi v XIX stoletii (1865-1869) (Tbilisi, 1942), pp. 208-209.
9. M. A. Adonts, Ekonomicheskoe razvitie Vostochnoi Armenii v XIX veke (Erevan, 1957), p. 524.
10. E. V. Khoshtaria, Ocherki sotsial'no-ekonomicheskoi istorii Gruzii: Promyshlennost', goroda, rabochii klass (XIX v. - nachalo XX v.) (Tbilisi, 1974), p. 165.
11. Ibid., pp. 165-166.
12. The principal area to which foreign capital was attracted was the extractive industries — copper, manganese, and oil in Baku, refineries in Batumi. The single area where native Georgian nobles were able to penetrate the world of capitalist production was in the manganese industry where they outnumbered all other ethnic groups. (Khoshtaria, p. 166)

13. S. Maksimov, Ruskiia gory i kavkazskie qortsy (n.p., 1873), p. 56.
14. P. I. Kovalevskii, Kavkaz: I (St. Petersburg, 1914), p. 234.
15. Oliver Wardrop, The Kingdom of Georgia; notes of travel in a land of women, wine, and song; to which are appended historical, literary and political sketches, specimens of the national music, and a compendious bibliography (London, 1888), pp. 13-14.
16. Semen Esadze, Istoricheskaiia zapiska ob upravlenii Kavkazom, II (Tiflis, 1907), pp. 42-43.
17. Kolokol, no. 204, September 15, 1865.
18. Chkhetia, p. 327.
19. Iu. Kacharava, A. Kikvidze, P. Ratiani, and A. Surguladze, Istoriia Gruzii, II (Tbilisi, 1973), p. 28.
20. Chkhetia, p. 277.
21. Walter Hanchett, "Tsarist Statutory Regulation of Municipal Government in the Nineteenth Century," in Michael F. Hamm (ed.), The City in Russian History (Lexington, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1976), pp. 102-107; Esadze, II, pp. 72-73. Kutaisi and Batumi did not receive municipal self-government until 1888, Sukhumi and Poti until 1892, and Gori, Dusheti, Akhaltsikhe, Akhalkalaki, Signaghi, and Telavi until 1894. (Kacharava, et.al., p. 29)
22. For a theoretical discussion of the role of social communication in the formation of nationality and nationalism, see Karl Deutsch, Nationalism and Social Communication: An Inquiry into the Foundations of Nationality (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1953).
23. As the literary critic Georgii Dzhibladze put it: "The lyrical poetry of Besiki, Guramishvili, David the Rector, Tsaritsa Ketevan and others, the Wisdom of Falsehoods of Sukhan-Saba Orbeliani — all these represented something very closely related to the creations of the Romantics." Romantiki i realisty v oruzinskoii literature XIX veke (Tbilisi, 1963), p. 29/
24. Niko Nikoladze, "Vospominaniia o shestidesiatikh godakh," Katorqa i ssylka, no. 33 (1927), p. 29.
25. Ibid., p. 34.
26. Ibid., p. 45.
27. Akaki Tsereteli, Perezhitoe (Moscow, 1950), pp. 140-144.
28. Chkhetia, p. 335.
29. Makharadze, p. 90.
30. Russkaia shkola, 1901, no. 1, p. 76.

31. G. M. Tumanov, Kharakteristiki i vospominania. Zametki kavkazskogo khronikera, I (Tiflis, 1900), pp. 178-179.
32. Ibid., p. 170.
33. The newspaper sold between 400-500 copies in the 1860s, principally in Tiflis; indeed early in the 1870s the only subscriber to droeba in Gori was the Nobles' Club. (Chkhetia, p. 348)
34. See, for example, G. A. Tarkhan-Mouravi's article, "The Causes of Our Poverty," droeba, nos 6, 8 (1870); G. Megrelishvili, Gruzinskaia obshchestvenno-ekonomicheskaiia mysl' vtoroi poloviny XIX veka i nachala XX veka, I, part II (Tbilisi, 1961), pp. 126-140.
35. V. S. Bakhtadze, Ocherki po istorii gruzinskoii obshchestvenno-ekonomicheskoi mysl' (60-90 gody XIX stoletia) (Tbilisi, 1960), p. 81.
36. "Movement of the Working People in Western Europe and Thoughts about our People," iveria, no. 41 (1877); Bakhtadze, p. 54.
37. Tumanov, III (Tiflis, 1907), p. 174.
38. Bakhtadze, p. 161.
39. Niko Nikoladze, "Osvobozhdenie N. G. Chernyshevskogo," Byloe, I, 9 (September 1906), p. 244.
40. Tumanov, II (Tiflis, 1905), p. 110.
41. Ibid., pp. 91-92; Kacharava, et.al., p. 29.
42. S. Z. Mgaloblishvili, Vospominania o moei zhizni. Nezabyvaemye vstrechi (Tbilisi, 1974), p. 55.
43. Megrelishvili, I (Tbilisi, 1960), pp. 460-461.
44. I. S. Dzhabadari, "Protsess 50-ti. (Vserossiiskaia Sotsial'no-Revoliutsionnaia Organizatsiia) 1874-1877 g.g.," Byloe, II, 9 (21) (September 1907), pp. 185-186.
45. P. V. Gugushvili, Karl Marks v gruzinskoii publitsistike i obshchestvennosti do 1898 goda (Tbilisi, 1963), pp. 149-151.
46. Dzhabadari, 8 (20) (August 1907), p. 9.
47. Ibid., 8 (20) (August 1907), p. 11.
48. Gugushvili, p. 103.
49. Dzhabadari, 9 (21), pp. 177-178
50. Megrelishvili, I (1960), pp. 428-435; M. Zhakov, S. Sef, G. Khachapuridze, Istoriia klassovoi bor'by v Zakavkaz'ii: sbornik statei (Tiflis, 1930), pp. 80, 82.

51. E. Korol'chuk, "Pis'ma G. F. Zdanovicha," Krasnyi arkhiv, 1 (20) (1927), p. 189.
52. Zhakov, et.al., pp. 37-39.
53. I. G. Antelava, Gosudarstvennye krest'iane Gruzii v XIX veke, II: Poreformennyi period (1864-1900 gg.) (Tbilisi, 1962), p. 146n.
54. Louise Nalbandian, The Armenian Revolutionary Movement: The Development of Armenian Political Parties Through the Nineteenth Century (Berkeley-Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1963), p. 137.
55. imedi, no. 3 (1882).
56. Zhakov, et.al., pp. 87-92.
57. Condemned to death, his sentence was commuted to twenty years. He was sent to Siberia but later escaped to the United States where he became a citizen. [P. Makharadze, "rogor gavkhdi maksisti. (chemi mogonebata erti gverdi)," revoliutsiis matiane, 1 (March 1923), p. 73]
58. Ibid., p. 74.
59. Ibid., p. 73.
60. For accounts of these elections, see Novoe obozrenie, no. 2366, November 5, 1890; no. 2378, November 17, 1890; no. 3132, February 2, 1893; no. 3155, February 28, 1893; no. 3167, March 12, 1893.
61. Novoe obozrenie, no. 3218, May 6, 1893.
62. When Argutinskii-Dolgorukov retired as mayor in September, Izmailov himself was chosen (62-8) to become mayor of Tiflis, the first mayor from the "third element." Izmailov was politically a liberal but was able to work with the bureaucracy. He was interested in developing the samodeiatel'nost' of urban society and was responsible in his years of power and influence for building the theater, trolley lines, schools, hospitals, and introducing insurance programs for the city. (Tumanov, I, pp. 94-95)