



AN INITIATIVE OF GEBERT RÜF STIFTUNG IN COOPERATION  
WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF FRIBOURG

18 – 19 NOVEMBER 2016, TBILISI, GEORGIA

# BRINGING THE STRANDS TOGETHER: NEW PROSPECTS FOR THE SOCIAL SCIENCES?

MULTIPLE CHALLENGES IN THE SOUTHERN CAUCASUS AND  
THE BROADER REGIONAL CONTEXT

— GEBERT RÜF STIFTUNG —  
WISSENSCHAFT.BEWEGEN

UNI  
FR  
■

UNIVERSITÉ DE FRIBOURG  
UNIVERSITÄT FREIBURG





**18 – 19 NOVEMBER 2016, TBILISI, GEORGIA**

**BRINGING THE STRANDS TOGETHER:  
NEW PROSPECTS FOR THE SOCIAL SCIENCES?**

**MULTIPLE CHALLENGES IN THE SOUTHERN CAUCASUS AND  
THE BROADER REGIONAL CONTEXT**

## CONTENT

---

<b>PROGRAMME – ASCN FINAL CONFERENCE</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>LIST OF PARTICIPANTS</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>BIOGRAPHIES – DISCUSSANTS AND SPEAKERS</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>CONFERENCE PANELS – BIOGRAPHIES AND ABSTRACTS</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>PANEL 1</b>	
<b>EUROPEANIZATION, FOREIGN POLICY, SECURITY</b>	<b>14</b>
1.1 David Aprasidze (Ilia State University) & Giorgi Gvalia (Ilia State University)	14
1.2 Lia Tsuladze (Tbilisi State University)	14
1.3 Denys Kuzmin (Odessa I. I. Mechnikov National University)	15
1.4 Lela Jamagidze (Tbilisi State University)	16
1.5 Chiara Loda (Dublin City University)	17
1.6 Kornely Kakachia (Tbilisi State University) & Alexander Markarov (Yerevan State University)	18
1.7 Sergii Glebov (Odessa I. I. Mechnikov National University)	19
1.8 Sergey Minasyan (Caucasus Institute, Yerevan)	19
1.9 Armen Ghazaryan (Military Institute after V. Sargsyan)	20
<b>PANEL 2</b>	
<b>CIVIL SOCIETY, REPRESENTATION, INCLUSION</b>	<b>22</b>
2.1 Valentina Gevorgyan (American University of Armenia) & Yevgenya Paturyan (American University of Armenia)	22
2.2 Lela Rekhviashvili (Central European University)	22
2.3 Anna Domoranska (National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine)	23
2.4 Koba Turmanidze (CRRC Georgia)	24
2.5 Siran Hovhannisyan (Yerevan State University) & Gohar Shahnazaryan (Yerevan State University)	24
2.6 Oleksii Sydorчук (National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy)	25
2.7 Maia Mestvirishvili (Tbilisi State University)	26
2.8 Denis Dafflon (University of Fribourg)	27
2.9 Lela Chakhaia (European University Institute, Florence)	27
<b>PANEL 3</b>	
<b>INFORMAL POLITICS, NETWORKS, ENTREPRENEURSHIP</b>	<b>29</b>
3.1 Giorgi Gotua (Independent Researcher) & Mikheil Svanidze (Tbilisi State University)	29
3.2 Tamar Charkviani (Ilia State University) & Nino Kakubava (Ilia State University)	29
3.3 Sofya Omarova (Oxford Brookes University)	30
3.4 Luiza Ayvazyan (Caucasus Institute)	31
3.5 Hrant Mikaelian (Caucasus Institute)	32
3.6 Yulia Antonyan (Yerevan State University) & Ketevan Khutsishvili (Tbilisi State University)	33

3.7	Kamil Wielecki (University of Warsaw)	33
3.8	Philippe Rudaz (University of Fribourg)	34
3.9	Naira Vardanyan (CRRC Armenia)	35

**PANEL 4**  
**NATION BUILDING, NATIONAL IDENTITY, NATIONALISM** **36**

4.1	Mkhitar Gabrielyan (Yerevan State University) & Ruzanna Tsaturyan (Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography)	36
4.2	Satenik Mkrtchyan (Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography)	36
4.3	Nino Gugushvili (Center for Social Sciences – CSS) & Irina Osepashvili (Center for Social Sciences – CSS)	37
4.4	Ana Kirvalidze (Ilia State University) & Nino Rcheulishvili (Ilia State University)	39
4.5	Alisa Datunashvili (Tbilisi State University)	39
4.6	Alla Marchenko (Taras Shevchenko National University, Kyiv)	40
4.7	Nino Abzianidze (University of Zurich)	41

**PANEL 5**  
**SPACES, DIVERSITY, RELIGION** **42**

5.1	Sarhat Petrosyan (National University of Architecture and Construction of Armenia)	42
5.2	Joseph Salukvadze (Tbilisi State University) & Harutyun Vermishyan (Yerevan State University)	42
5.3	David Gogishvili (Gran Sasso Science Institute)	43
5.4	Giorgi Sordia (University of Georgia)	44
5.5	Sahib Jafarov (Center for Strategic Studies, Baku)	45
5.6	Ekaterine Chitanava (Tolerance and Diversity Institute – TDI)	46
5.7	Smbat Hakobyan (Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography)	46
5.8	Kamal Gasimov (Center for Strategic Studies)	47
5.9	Kristine Margvelashvili (Center for Social Sciences – CSS)	47

**ABOUT ASCN** **49**

## PROGRAMME

### OPENING EVENT FRIDAY 18<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2016

13.30 – 14.00

14.00 – 14.30

14.30 – 16.30

16.30 – 17.00

17.00 – 19.00

19.00

REGISTRATION

WELCOME

GIGA ZEDANIA (Iliia State University), LUKAS BEGLINGER (Swiss Ambassador to Georgia), PHILIPP EGGER (Gebert RUF Foundation)

KEYNOTE SPEECH: EDWARD LUCAS: **REALPOLITIK AND THE NEW COLD WAR**

COFFEE BREAK

ROUND TABLE ON THE POLITICAL SITUATION AND ITS DYNAMICS IN GEORGIA AND ARMENIA:

MODERATOR: ROY ALLISON (University of Oxford), PARTICIPANTS: TIMOTHY BLAUVELT (Iliia State University), ALEXANDER ISKANDARYAN (Caucasus Institute), NEIL MACFARLANE (University of Oxford), NANA MACHARASHVILI (Tbilisi State University)

FOURCHETTE

### CONFERENCE SATURDAY 19<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2016

DISCUSSANTS:

09.30 – 11.00 SECTION 1

- 20 min. per presentation;
- 30 min. follow-up discussion after each block of presentations

11.00

11.30 – 13.00 SECTION 2

13.00

14.30 – 16.00 SECTION 3

16.00

16.30 – 18.00

18.00

18.50

19.00

#### PANEL 1

EUROPEANIZATION, FOREIGN POLICY, SECURITY

ROY ALLISON & ALEXANDER ISKANDARYAN

1.1 DAVID APRASIDZE & GIORGI GVALIA

Europeanization on a Rocky Ground:  
Russia and the EU in the South Caucasus

1.2 LIA TSULADZE

Georgians' Discourses on Security and Identity in  
the Context of Europeanisation

1.3 DENYS KUZMIN

Ukraine and the Challenges of EU Enlargement  
and Neighborhood Policy: Consequences for  
Ukraine and its International Role in Europe

COFFEE BREAK

1.4 LELA JAMAGIDZE

The Role of Cultural and Institutional Differences  
in Georgia-EU Economic Relations

1.5 CHIARA LODA

How is the EU Perceived in Armenia?  
An Institutional and People-Based Perspective

1.6 KORNELY KAKACHIA & ALEXANDER MARKAROV

The Impact of Identity on Foreign Policy  
Discourses in Georgia and Armenia: Detecting  
the Link

BUFFET LUNCH

1.7 SERGII GLEBOV

Ukraine's Multiple Identities as a Key Point of  
the National Strategic Culture: A Security Test  
by (Post-)Colonial Wars

1.8 SERGEY MINASYAN

Main Features of Foreign Policy of the Republic  
of Armenia

1.9 ARMEN GHAZARYAN

Institutionalization and Securitization of Migra-  
tion in South Caucasus

COFFEE BREAK

ROUND TABLE ON SOCIAL SCIENCES:

MODERATOR: NICOLAS HAYOZ (University of Fribourg), PARTICIPANTS: SILVIA SERRANO (Auvergne University), KOBA TURMANIDZE (CRRC Georgia), JONATHAN WHEATLEY (Oxford Brookes University), GIGA ZEDANIA (Iliia State University)

End of the Conference

Meeting in the lobby of Hotel Courtyard Marriott

GALA CONFERENCE DINNER Gala conference dinner at Funicular Restaurant

#### PANEL 2

CIVIL SOCIETY, REPRESENTATION, INCLUSION

TIMOTHY BLAUVELT & MAGDALENA SOLSKA

2.1 VALENTINA GEVORGYAN & YEVGENYA PATURYAN

Civic Activism as a Novel Component of Armenian  
Civil Society: New Energy and Tensions

2.2 LELA REKHVIASHVILI

Civil Society or Political Society: Where to Place  
Urban Informals – Marshrutka Drivers, Vendors  
and Parking Guards – in Liberal Conceptions  
about State Society Relations?

2.3 ANNA DOMORANSKA

Practices of Solidarity and of Helping Others in  
Post-Maidan Ukraine: Innovative Potential of a  
Society in Crisis

2.4 KOBA TURMANIDZE

What Kinds of Promises Maximize Votes?  
Evidence from a Survey Experiment in Armenia  
and Georgia

2.5 SIRAN HOVHANNISYAN & GOHAR SHAHNAZARYAN

Representation and Participation in the  
Political Parties and Political Initiatives in  
Armenia: Gender Analysis

2.6 OLEKSII SYDORCHUK

Reform that Nobody Wants:  
New Model of Party Finance Regulation in  
Ukraine

2.7 MAIA MESTVIRISHVILI

Compositional Modalities of Citizenship  
Representation Styles in Georgia

2.8 DENIS DAFFLON

Ethnic Policies in Post-Soviet States:  
How Inclusive is Georgia?

2.9 LELA CHAKHAIA

Inequalities in Educational Attainment and  
Educational Pathways of Georgian Youth

---

## PANEL 3

### INFORMAL POLITICS, NETWORKS, ENTREPRENEURSHIP

JONATHAN WHEATLEY & FRANÇOIS RUEGG

#### 3.1 GIORGI GOTUA & MIKHEIL SVANIDZE

Political Changes and Informal Politics of Center-Periphery Relations in Georgia: Two Case Studies

#### 3.2 TAMAR CHARKVIANI & NINO KAKUBAVA

Dynamics of Informality:  
Case of Georgian Police

#### 3.3 SOFYA OMAROVA

Informal Politics and Democratic Transition(s) in Azerbaijan

#### 3.4 LUIZA AYVAZIAN

Political Elites in Armenia:  
A Change of Generations

#### 3.5 HRANT MIKHAELIAN

Military Reform in Armenia:  
From Network to Corporation

#### 3.6 YULIA ANTONYAN & KETEVAN KHUTSISHVILI

«Elites»: Definitions, Identities, and Cultural Repertoires. An Anthropological Approach to Recent Transformations of Social Structure of the Armenian and Georgian Societies

#### 3.7 KAMIL WIELECKI

How to Ensure what Formal Mechanism Fail to Ensure: The Value of Informal Relations for Russian Small Entrepreneurs

#### 3.8 PHILIPPE RUDAZ

The Elusive Informal Entrepreneurs:  
Evidence from Georgia

#### 3.9 NAIRA VARDANYAN

Small and Micro Entrepreneurship in Armenia

## PANEL 4

### NATION BUILDING, NATIONAL IDENTITY, NATIONALISM

OLIVER REISNER & SILVIA SERRANO

#### 4.1 MKHITAR GABRIELIAN & RUZANNA TSATURYAN

Perceiving Nationalism as Negative:  
Lack of Compromise

#### 4.2 SATENIK MKRTCHYAN

In Search of a Foundation Myth: State-Building and Representations of the Events of 1988–91 in the Political Discourse of the Republic of Armenia

#### 4.3 NINO GUGUSHVILI & IRINA OSEPASHVILI

«We» and «Other» Dichotomy in the Context of Georgian National Identity

#### 4.4 ANA KIRVALIDZE & NINO RCHEULISHVILI

«There are 'two Stalins' on My Mind»:  
How do People Deal with Different Images of Stalin?

#### 4.5 ALISA DATUNASHVILI

Informal Nation Building in Museums:  
The Case of the Georgian National Museum

#### 4.6 ALLA MARCHENKO

On Religion and Religiosity in Politics:  
Public Declarations of Ukrainian Top-Politicians

#### 4.7 NINO ABZIANIDZE

Nationalist Discourse as a Network:  
Analyzing Nationalist Appeals in Georgian Print Media Using SNA

## PANEL 5

### SPACES, DIVERSITY, RELIGION

ALEXANDER AGADJANIAN & ANSGAR JOEDICKE

#### 5.1 SARHAT PETROSYAN

Post-Soviet Urban Landscape of Yerevan

#### 5.2 JOSEPH SALUKVADZE & HARUTYUN VERMISHYAN

Changing Socio-Spatial Patterns of Housing Development in the Post-Soviet South Caucasus: Cases of Tbilisi and Yerevan

#### 5.3 DAVID GOGISHVILI

Baku City Circuit:  
Exploring the Temporary Spaces of Exception

#### 5.4 GIORGI SORDIA

Georgia's Nation-Building Policy and Cultural Diversity

#### 5.5 SAHIB JAFAROV

The Upsurge of Religion:  
Replacement of Ethnic with Religious Identity in the Northern Regions of Azerbaijan?

#### 5.6 EKATERINE CHITANAVA

The State's Preferential Treatment of the Georgian Orthodox Church and Religious Policy towards Minorities

#### 5.7 SMBAT HAKOBYAN

Funerals in Armenia:  
Western Pattern or «National» Tradition?

#### 5.8 KAMAL GASIMOV

Fitna: The Struggle for Authority among Salafi Networks in the Post-Soviet Space

#### 5.9 KRISTINE MARGVELASHVILI

Role of Orthodox Church in the Political Process and Election in Georgia

## LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

<b>Abzianidze Nino</b> nino.abzianidze@nccr-democracy.uzh.ch	University of Zurich
<b>Agadjanian Alexander</b> grandrecit@gmail.com	Russian State University for Humanities, Moscow
<b>Allison Roy</b> roy.allison@area.ox.ac.uk	University of Oxford
<b>Antonyan Yulia</b> yuliaantonyan@ysu.am	Yerevan State University
<b>Aprasidze David</b> david_aprasidze@iliauni.edu.ge	Ilia State University
<b>Ayvazyan Luiza</b> luiza@c-i.am	Caucasus Institute
<b>Blauvelt Timothy</b> timothy.blauvelt@iliauni.edu.ge	Ilia State University
<b>Chakhaia Lela</b> lela.ch@gmail.com	European University Institute, Florence
<b>Charkviani Tamar</b> tamar_charkviani@iliauni.edu.ge	Ilia State University
<b>Chitanava Ekaterine</b> echitanava@tdi.ge	Tolerance and Diversity Institute (TDI)
<b>Dafflon Denis</b> denis_dafflon@yahoo.fr	University of Fribourg
<b>Datunashvili Alisa</b> adatunashvili@gmail.com	Tbilisi State University
<b>Dembinski Paul</b> pawel.dembinski@unifr.ch	University of Fribourg
<b>Domoranska Anna</b> anna_doma@list.ru	National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine
<b>Egger Philipp</b> philipp.egger@grstiftung.ch	Gebert Rűf Foundation
<b>Gabrielyan Mkhitar</b> mkhitar2003@yahoo.com	Yerevan State University
<b>Gasimov Kamal</b> kamal.t.gasimov@gmail.com	Center for Strategic Studies
<b>Gevorgyan Valentina</b> vgevorgyan@aua.am	American University of Armenia
<b>Ghazaryan Armen</b> aghazaryan19@gmail.com	Military Institute after V. Sargysyan
<b>Giordano Christian</b> christian.giordano@unifr.ch	University of Fribourg
<b>Glebov Sergii</b> sergglebov@gmail.com	Odessa I. I. Mechnikov National University
<b>Gogishvili David</b> david.gogishvili@gssi.infn.it	Gran Sasso Science Institute
<b>Gotua Giorgi</b> ggotua@gmail.com	Independent Researcher
<b>Gugushvili Nino</b> n.gugushvili@css.ge	Center for Social Sciences (CSS)
<b>Gvalia Giorgi</b> giorgi_gvalia@iliauni.edu.ge	Ilia State University
<b>Hakobyan Smbat</b> smbathakobyan@yahoo.com	Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography
<b>Hayoz Nicolas</b> nicolas.hayoz@unifr.ch	University of Fribourg



<b>Hovhannisyan Siran</b> siranhovhan@gmail.com	Yerevan State University
<b>Iskandaryan Alexander</b> iskand@c-i.am	Caucasus Institute
<b>Jafarov Sahib</b> sahibjafarov@gmail.com	Center for Strategic Studies, Baku
<b>Jamagidze Lela</b> ljamagidze@yahoo.com	Tbilisi State University
<b>Joedicke Ansgar</b> ansgar.joedicke@unifr.ch	University of Fribourg
<b>Kakachia Kornely</b> kakachia@gmail.com	Tbilisi State University
<b>Kakubava Nino</b> nkakubava@gmail.com	Ilia State University
<b>Khutsishvili Ketevan</b> ketevan.khutsishvili@tsu.ge	Tbilisi State University
<b>Kirvalidze Ana</b> ana.kirvalidze@iliauni.edu.ge	Ilia State University
<b>Kuzmin Denys</b> denyskuzmin@ukr.net	Odessa I. I. Mechnikov National University
<b>Loda Chiara</b> chiara.loda2@mail.dcu.ie	Dublin City University
<b>Lucas Edward</b> edwardlucas@economist.com	The Economist
<b>Lushnycky Andrej</b> andrej.lushnycky@unifr.ch	University of Fribourg
<b>MacFarlane Neil</b> neil.macfarlane@politics.ox.ac.uk	University of Oxford
<b>Macharashvili Nana</b> nanimacharashvili@gmail.com	Tbilisi State University
<b>Marchenko Alla</b> alla.marchenko82@gmail.com	Taras Shevchenko National University, Kyiv
<b>Margvelashvili Kristine</b> k.margvelashvili@css.ge	Center for Social Sciences (CSS)
<b>Markarov Alexander</b> amarkarov@ysu.am	Yerevan State University
<b>Mestvirishvili Maia</b> mmestvirishvili@gmail.com	Tbilisi State University
<b>Mikaelian Hrant</b> hrant@c-i.am	Caucasus Institute
<b>Minasyan Sergey</b> sergey@c-i.am	Caucasus Institute
<b>Mkrtchyan Satenik</b> satenik.mkrtchian@gmail.com	Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography
<b>Mollica Marcello</b> marcello.mollica@unifr.ch	University of Fribourg
<b>Omarova Sofya</b> somarova@brookes.ac.uk	Oxford Brookes University
<b>Osepashvili Irina</b> i.osepashvili@css.ge	Center for Social Sciences (CSS)
<b>Paturyan Yevgenya</b> ypaturyan@aua.am	American University of Armenia
<b>Petrosyan Sarhat</b> sarhat@urbanlab.am	National University of Architecture and Construction of Armenia

---

<b>Rcheulishvili Nino</b> nrcheulishvili@iliauni.edu.ge	Ilia State University
<b>Reisner Oliver</b> oreisner@yahoo.de	Ilia State University
<b>Rekhviashvili Lela</b> lel.rekhviashvili@gmail.com	Central European University
<b>Rudaz Philippe</b> philipperudaz@gmail.com	University of Fribourg
<b>Salukvadze Joseph</b> joseph.salukvadze@tsu.ge	Tbilisi State University
<b>Serrano Silvia</b> serrano.sil@gmail.com	Auvergne University, CERCEC
<b>Shahnazaryan Gohar</b> goarshahnazaryan@gmail.com	Yerevan State University
<b>Solska Magdalena</b> magdalena.solska@unifr.ch	University of Fribourg
<b>Sordia Giorgi</b> giorgisordia@gmail.com	University of Georgia
<b>Svanidze Mikheil</b> svanidze@gmail.com	Tbilisi State University
<b>Sydorchuk Oleksii</b> alsid@ukr.net	National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy
<b>Tsaturyan Ruzanna</b> ruzantsaturyan@yahoo.com	Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography
<b>Tsuladze Lia</b> l.tsuladze@css.ge	Tbilisi State University, CSS
<b>Turmanidze Koba</b> koba@crrccenters.org	CRRC Georgia
<b>Vardanyan Naira</b> nairavardanyans@gmail.com	CRRC Armenia
<b>Vermishyan Harutyun</b> harutyunvermishyan@ysu.am	Yerevan State University
<b>Wheatley Jonathan</b> jwheatley@brookes.ac.uk	Oxford Brookes University
<b>Wielecki Kamil</b> wielecki@al.uw.edu.pl	University of Warsaw
<b>Zedania Giga</b> giga_zedania@iliauni.edu.ge	Ilia State University

## BIOGRAPHIES – DISCUSSANTS AND SPEAKERS

### **ALEXANDER AGADJANIAN** (Russian State University for Humanities, Moscow)

Born in Moscow; graduated from the Moscow State University; received doctoral degree in modern history at the Institute of Oriental Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow; taught at the religious studies department of Arizona State University until 2002, since 2002 Professor at the Center for the Study of Religion, Russian State University for Humanities, Moscow, and at the School for Philosophy, Higher School of Economics, Moscow. Teaching courses include: Religions in the modern world; Religions of Asia (Buddhism); Religions in Soviet and post-Soviet Russia; Religions in the Caucasus. Currently, his main area of interests and research is religious developments in the post-Soviet Russia and Eurasia. Co-editor of the Russian language academic quarterly *State, Religion and Church in Russia and Worldwide*. Relevant publications: *Religion, Nation and Democracy in the South Caucasus* (co-editor and author, Routledge 2015); *Turns of Faith, Search of Meaning: Orthodox Christianity and Post-Soviet Experience* (Peter Lang, 2014); *Armenian Christianity Today: Identity Politics and Social Practices* (editor and author, Ashgate 2014); *Parish and Community in Russian Orthodoxy* (co-edited, 2011, in Russian); *Eastern Orthodoxy in a Global Age* (co-edited, 2005).

### **ROY ALLISON** (University of Oxford)

joined the School of Interdisciplinary Area Studies (SIAS) in 2011 from a Readership in International Relations at the London School of Economics. Roy was a doctoral student and an ESRC Postdoctoral Research Fellow at St. Antony's College, Oxford, a Lecturer and Senior Lecturer at the Centre for Russian and East European Studies, University of Birmingham (1987–99) and Head of the Russia and Eurasia Programme at the Royal Institute of International Affairs (Chatham House) (1993–2005). Between 2001 and 2005 he was also a Senior Research Fellow attached to the Centre for International Studies in the Department of Politics and International Relations, Oxford University. Roy has broad research interests in the international relations and foreign and security policies of Russia and Eurasia and has travelled extensively there for research projects he has directed and out of an enduring fascination for the region.

### **TIMOTHY BLAUVELT** (Ilia State University)

is Associate Professor of Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies at Ilia State University in Tbilisi, Georgia, and also Country Director in Georgia for American Councils for International Education (ACTR/ACCELS). He has published numerous articles about Russian and Soviet political history, clientelism, nationality policy and nationalism in *Ab Imperio*, *Europe-Asia Studies*, *Communist & Post-Communist Studies*, *Kritika*, *Nationalities Papers* and *War & Society*, and recently published a co-edited volume (with Jeremy Smith) entitled *Georgia after Stalin: Nationalism and Soviet Power* (London: Routledge, 2015).

### **PHILIPP EGGER** (Gebert Rűf Foundation)

is the Director / CEO of the Gebert Rűf Foundation, Zurich & Basel. Finishing his PhD in history at the University of Basel, Switzerland, in 1989 he took on the position of managing director of the programme “Early Detection in Science and Research” (FER) of the Swiss Science Council in the 1990s and editor of the magazine *FUTURA* and director of two operational foundations (education, science, interdisciplinarity) in the private and in the public university sector. He is a Dr. h.c. of Ilia State University, Tbilisi / Georgia (2015). From 1992–98, Philipp was a lecturer at the University of Basel for Interdisciplinarity, Science Communication and Foundation Governance.

Since 1998, he has been the founding director / CEO of the Swiss grant-making foundation Gebert RUF Stiftung, active in applied research and innovation (since 1998). Philipp is also a founding member of Swiss Foundations, the Association of Swiss Grantmaking Foundations (2001–15), a board / council member of several not-for-profit and profit organizations in Switzerland and abroad, initiator, author and editor of the book series *Foundation Governance*, Helbing & Lichtenhahn (since 2002), and co-author of the *Swiss Foundation Code* (editions 2004, 2009 and 2015). Additionally, he is a member of Advisory Board of the Swiss Center for Philanthropy Studies (CEPS), Basel University (since 2008), the Strategic Board of swissnex, the State Secretariat for Education, Research and Innovation (SERI), Bern (since 2008), the Advisory Board of the CFA Institute (USA) for the Investment Code of Conduct for Endowments, Foundations and Charitable Organizations (2010), and the efc (European Foundation Centre) task force “Best Practice Code” (2013/14).

**NICOLAS HAYOZ** (University of Fribourg)

is an Associate Professor of Political Science and the director of the Interdisciplinary Institute of Central and Eastern Europe at the University of Fribourg (Switzerland). He has conducted research projects and published articles on politics and state reform in Eastern Europe. His research interests include democratization studies in Eastern Europe, political sociology and political theory. Among his latest publications: *Informality in Eastern Europe* (together with Christian Giordano, 2013, Peter Lang).

**ALEXANDER ISKANDARYAN** (Caucasus Institute)

is the director and one of the founders of the CI. A world-renown political scientist, Alexander moved to Armenia in 2002 from Moscow. His areas of scientific interest include ethnopolitical conflicts, post-Communist transformations and nation-building in the former USSR in general and in the Caucasus in particular. He has published and spoken on the emergence of post-Soviet institutions, elites and identities, conducted and supervised research on conflicts, migrations, discourses, media development and cross-border integration. He has authored the chapter on Armenia in *Freedom House's Nations in Transit* for five consecutive years. He is also a popular political commentator for the media.

**ANSGAR JOEDICKE** (University of Fribourg)

is a Senior Lecturer at the University of Fribourg / Switzerland at the Department of Social Sciences. He holds a PhD in the Study of Religion (Zurich 1997). His research focuses on religion and politics. Together with Alexander Agadjanian and Evert van der Zweerde, he recently edited the volume *Religion, Nation and Democracy in the South Caucasus* (Routledge 2015). He is currently leading the SCOPES project “Religion and Soft Power. Religious Communities in the South Caucasus as Objects of External Influences” and he is working in the FP7 project ISSICEU ([www.issiceu.eu/](http://www.issiceu.eu/)) as a research team leader.

**EDWARD LUCAS** (The Economist)

is a senior editor at *The Economist*, the world's foremost newsweekly. His expertise includes energy, cyber-security, espionage, Russian foreign and security policy and the politics and economics of Eastern Europe. He is also a senior vice-president at the Center for European Policy Analysis (CEPA). In 2008 he wrote *The New Cold War*, a prescient account of Vladimir Putin's Russia. In 2011 he wrote *Deception*, an investigative account of East-West espionage. He is a strong critic of the fugitive NSA contractor Edward Snowden, and author of an e-book *The Snowden Operation*. His latest book is *Cyberphobia*. He has also contributed to books on religion and media ethics.

An experienced broadcaster, public speaker, moderator and panellist, Edward Lucas has given public lectures at Harvard, Oxford, Cambridge and other leading universities. He is a regular contributor to the BBC's Today and Newsnight programmes, and to NPR, CNN and Sky News. He is regularly cited by Foreign Policy magazine as one of the top 100 Twitterati.

For many years a foreign correspondent, he was based in Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Moscow and the Baltic states. He is currently in London, as a senior editor at The Economist, responsible for the daily news app Espresso. He also writes obituaries. His weekly syndicated column has appeared since 2005; he also writes for the Times, Daily Telegraph, Daily Mail, Foreign Policy and Standpoint.

As well as working for the Independent, the BBC and the Sunday Times, he also co-founded an English-language weekly in Tallinn, Estonia: the Baltic Independent. His undergraduate degree is from the London School of Economics and he speaks five languages – German, Russian, Polish, Czech and Lithuanian.

**NEIL MACFARLANE** (University of Oxford)

is a specialist on Russian foreign policy and the regional dynamics of the former Soviet Union, with particular reference to that region's southern tier. He is also interested in the impact of international organisations in the management and resolution of civil conflicts and also in the political and economic transitions of former communist states.

After a career in the United States and in Canada, he moved to Oxford in 1996 as the first Lester B. Pearson Professor of International Relations. From 2005 to 2010 he was Head of the Department of Politics and International Relations. From 2008 to 2010 he was Deputy Head of the Social Sciences Division at Oxford. He is currently a member of the Council of the University and serves on numerous University committees. Beyond Oxford, he was a Faculty Associate of the Geneva Centre for Security Policy from 2004 to 2010. He held a visiting appointment at the College of Europe (Bruges) in 2007 to 2008, where he taught a course on the contemporary security agenda. In the summer of 2008, he was S. Rajaratnam Professor of Strategic Studies at the Nanyang Technological University (Singapore). He was a visiting professor at the Centre for Social Sciences (Tbilisi State University, Georgia) from 2010 to 2013, and has a strong interest in higher education reform in the former Soviet Union.

He is an associate research fellow in the Russia-Eurasia Programme at Chatham House, and he chairs the board of the Center for Social Sciences, Tbilisi, Georgia.

**NANA MACHARASHVILI** (Tbilisi State University)

holds a PhD in Political Science and is Associate Professor at the Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social and Political Studies, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University. Nana Macharashvili is also head of the Master of Arts Program in Public Policy and Administration at TSU. She is the Director of TSU's Center for Interdisciplinary Programmes and Research Development. She graduated from the Manchester MA programme in Political Science at the Moscow School of Social and Economic Studies in 2002. Her research and professional interests are: public participation in public policymaking; comparative public policy; agenda-setting and formulation; public program failure; public administration in the EU and good governance, the reform process in Georgia and the former Soviet Area; the process of reconciliation after violent conflict; transitional justice – the hard choice between prosecution and restoration on past human rights abuses; she is actively involved in the training programs dedicated to public policy and public administration. She is a member of a research team of three working on a book project titled "The

Role and Limitations of Non-Governmental Policy Advocacy in Georgia: Groups and Media in Agenda-Setting”, financed by the Academic Swiss Caucasus Network (ASCN). Nana Macharashvili is the author of around 20 research articles and two monographs. Currently Nana Macharashvili is the leader and senior researcher in Georgia for the EU-funded WOSCAP (Whole of Society Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding) project through Horizon 2020.

**OLIVER REISNER** (Ilia State University)

is Professor of European and Caucasian Studies at Ilia State University (Tbilisi, Georgia). He has also worked as a project manager at the European Union Delegation to Georgia, as a human rights program manager for World Vision in Georgia on a civic integration project and he established the MA program ‘Central Asia / Caucasus’ at the Department for Central Asian Studies at the Humboldt University in Berlin. He regularly publishes on Georgia’s history and nation-building.

**FRANÇOIS RUEGG** (University of Fribourg)

is Emeritus / Honorary Professor of the Institute of Social Anthropology of the University of Fribourg (Switzerland) and Associate Professor at the University of Bucharest (Romania). After several lengthy sojourns and extensive fieldwork in Romania, ex-Yugoslavia and South-eastern Poland, he conducted his research in Vienna and defended his dissertation (doctorat d’Etat ès Lettres et Sciences Humaines) at the University of Montpellier (France).

Specializing in Eastern and Central European Studies, he has researched, taught and published on a variety of topics such as the built environment, intercultural relations, historical anthropology, social representations and the Roma / Gypsies. He has also taught at the Universities of Timisoara and Cluj in Romania, the New University of Bulgaria in Sofia as well as at Gumilev Eurasian University in Astana, Kazakhstan. His present fields of interest and research comprise social imagination / representations in intercultural relations, missionary ethnography and religious syncretism in Dobrudja (Bulgaria and Romania).

As a board member of the Academic Swiss Caucasus Net (ASCN) he was able to select and follow up research projects both in Georgia and Armenia. He is the President of Pro Ethnographica, an association whose goal is to shed light on a variety of forgotten ethnographic collections. He is also a member of the editorial Board of the series “Fribourg Studies in Social Anthropology”.

**SILVIA SERRANO** (Auvergne University)

is Associate Professor of Political Science, School of Law, Université d’Auvergne, and a researcher at the Centre d’étude des mondes russe, caucasien et centre européen at the Ecole des hautes études en sciences sociales (CERCEC, EHESS).

Her research focuses on the political sociology of the post-Soviet Caucasus. She has investigated the reshaping of political identities of the states and societies of the region. For the last five years, she has been studying the relation between religion and politics in the Caucasus, with a focus on Eastern Orthodoxy in Georgia. She has investigated the link between religion and national identification, the resources for political legitimization provided by religion and the co-production of the State and the Church and the role played by religion in social and political mobilization.

Currently, she participates in the European project “Cascade”: Exploring the Security-Democracy Nexus in the Caucasus, directed by Laure Delcour and coordinated by the Fondation Maison des Sciences de l’Homme (FMSH, Paris).

**MAGDALENA SOLSKA** (University of Fribourg)

is a post-doctoral researcher and a lecturer in political science at the Interfaculty Institute for Central and Eastern Europe, University of Fribourg. She studied in Regensburg and Norwich, and wrote her PhD at the University of Regensburg in 2013 with a comparative study on the “Systemic Crisis of Communism and the Development of Party Systems in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania”. Her research focuses on systems of government as well as political parties and party systems in the post-communist countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

**KOBA TURMANIDZE** (CRRC Georgia)

is President / CEO of CRRC-Georgia and has supervised over 30 research projects of different scope and design since joining the organization in 2007. He earned an MPA from the American University (Washington, DC) and a MA in Political Science from Central European University (Budapest, Hungary). He also holds a diploma in history from Tbilisi State University. Currently Koba is a doctoral candidate in Comparative Politics at the Central European University. In 2005 – 11 he was Assistant at Tbilisi State University, where he taught comparative politics, economies in transition, research methods and applied statistics courses at the Department of Political Science and the Center for Social Sciences. Before joining CRRC, Koba worked in several civil society organizations as well as in the civil service. His research interests include authoritarianism, regime change and voting behaviour.

**JONATHAN WHEATLEY** (Oxford Brookes University)

is a lecturer in Comparative Politics at Oxford Brookes University in the United Kingdom. Having obtained his PhD at the European University Institute in Florence, Italy, he subsequently worked as a senior researcher at the Centre for Democracy Studies Aarau (ZDA) at the University of Zurich, before moving to Oxford in September 2016. His research interests include democratization in post-communist countries, parties, party systems and political cleavages in both established and developing democracies, and the development of voting advice applications (VAAs).

**GIGA ZEDANIA** (Ilia State University)

is a professor and rector of Ilia State University. He is the author and editor of many publications dealing with, among other topics, the history of social theory, secularization, political theology, societal values and political elites in Georgia.

## CONFERENCE PANELS – BIOGRAPHIES AND ABSTRACTS

### PANEL 1:

### EUROPEANIZATION, FOREIGN POLICY, SECURITY

#### 1.1 DAVID APRASIDZE (Ilia State University) & GIORGI GVALIA (Ilia State University)

##### EUROPEANIZATION ON A ROCKY GROUND – RUSSIA AND THE EU IN THE SOUTH CAUCASUS

This research project aims to explore the impact of Russia on the EU-induced policy change in Armenia and Georgia in light of integrational competition between the EU and Russia. The research focuses on two policy areas, energy and trade, and analyses how the path of domestic reforms has been shaped by the integrational competition between Russia and the EU in the region. The policy areas are chosen based on their high relevance to the political agenda in both Armenia and Georgia. Theoretically, the study draws on the institutionalist framework, and employs rational choice institutionalism (RCI) to show how the external actors shape the preferences and material capabilities of domestic agents of change, and sociological institutionalism (SI) to indicate how the external players instrumentalize the ideational and normative tools to affect the value-driven motives of political elites in the South Caucasus. Preliminary empirical results of the study indicate a differential impact of Russia in the two South Caucasus countries. In Georgia, it has affected domestic policy change both negatively (by undermining state capacities for reform) and positively (by pushing the country's elite towards the EU). In Armenia, on the other hand, Russian impact has mostly been negative. It has hampered most of the trade reforms by blocking Armenia's integration into the EU market and abused its influence on Yerevan to prevent the diversification of energy sources. The research project further delivers an inside-out analysis of how the Russian and European influence crosses the domestic threshold and interacts with domestic actors holding power of veto over important decisions. To this end, as a first step, channels of influence used by both external actors will be specified. In a second step, we will look how certain domestic veto players monopolize and utilize their interaction with external actors to pursue their domestic agenda, which more often than not is aimed at preserving a limited access order based on a rent-seeking system both at economic and political levels.

---

**DAVID APRASIDZE** is Professor of Political Science and Deputy Rector of Ilia State University, Tbilisi. At different times he was Dean for Graduate Studies at Ilia State University, chairman of the Caucasus Institute for Peace, Democracy and Development (CIPDD), and director of the Archive of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Georgia (Soviet Security and Party Archives). He studied politics at Tbilisi State University and received his Ph.D. in political science from Hamburg University, Germany. In 2009 he was awarded a Fulbright scholarship at Duke University. His fields of research include post-Soviet transformation, foreign policy decision-making, and Georgia's political institutions.

**GIORGI GVALIA** is the Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences and Associate Professor of Political Science at Ilia State University. At different times he was the deputy dean of Ilia State University Business School and worked at the office of the National Security Council of Georgia. He studied International Relations at Tbilisi State University and earned his Ph.D. in Political Science at Ilia State University. His research interests include theories of international relations, small states in international politics, public opinion and foreign policy and Europeanization in the post-Soviet Space.

#### 1.2 LIA TSULADZE (Tbilisi State University)

##### GEORGIANS' DISCOURSES ON SECURITY AND IDENTITY IN THE CONTEXT OF EUROPEANISATION

This paper discusses Georgians' discourses on Europeanisation, focusing on two main narratives used to justify the country's European choice – those of security and identity.



For the purpose of this study we have applied qualitative research methods, particularly analysis of discourses on Europeanisation in Georgian printed and online media, in-depth interviews with the political elite and experts, and focus groups with the population of different ages residing in various regions of Georgia. The research reveals Georgians' ambivalent discourses on Europeanisation. The printed and online media operate with the following twofold narratives related to security and identity: on the one hand, EU integration is seen as a way to guard against the hegemonic ambitions of neighbouring Russia, while on the other hand it is argued that the EU is not ready to support Georgia at critical times and if its relations with Russia escalate, Georgia, like Ukraine, will have to face this threat alone. Europeanisation is seen as a means of preserving the Georgian identity, but it is also viewed as a threat to "true" Georgianness. The same concerns have been revealed in the political and popular discourses. The security narratives illustrate that despite the excessive hopes of both the political elite and experts regarding EU integration, there are major concerns about the EU's neglect of the country's security threats that result from its pro-European aspirations. Despite the political elite and experts' optimistic discourses on Georgia's "return to the European family" as a means of maintaining national identity, their narratives also reveal the concern about what impact Europeanisation might have on Georgian identity. The above concerns are especially evident in the population's discourses of security and identity. On the one hand, the EU is compared to the Soviet Union, seen as a similar threat to Georgia's sovereignty, while on the other hand, being associated with the European "elite club" and thus becoming a more notable international player is perceived as a means of preventing Russian expansionism. Concerning the identity issues, Georgians express concern about their questionable Europeanness, while they also reveal a certain anxiety about the declining national identity foreseen as an outcome of Europeanisation. Thus, despite Georgians' strong aspiration to integrate with the EU, their discourses reveal rather ambivalent attitudes to Europeanisation.

---

**LIA TSULADZE** has been an Associate Professor of Sociology, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Tbilisi State University, Georgia, since 2008. She has been directing the Programme of Applied Social Research at Center for Social (CSS) since 2012 and became a Research Director and joined the CSS Board in 2014. In 2016 she became an Executive Director at CSS. Lia is the author of more than 20 publications and two textbooks. Her current research deals with the political and popular discourses on Europeanisation in Georgia, focusing on how these discourses are performed for international vs. domestic audiences. Her former research, as part of her post-doctoral research fellowship at St. Antony's College, University of Oxford (2013–14), analysed Georgians' discourses of national identity in the context of Europeanisation. Her comparative research, carried out in 2011–12 and supported by the Volkswagen Foundation, focused on young people's perceptions of Europeanisation in the New European countries (the cases of Romania and Poland) and their borderlands (the case of Georgia).

### **1.3 DENYS KUZMIN (Odessa I. I. Mechnikov National University)**

#### **UKRAINE AND THE CHALLENGES OF EU ENLARGEMENT AND NEIGHBORHOOD POLICY: CONSEQUENCES FOR UKRAINE AND ITS INTERNATIONAL ROLE IN EUROPE**

The current international and internal political situation of Ukraine in many respects depends on the alignment of political, military strategic and economic forces in Europe. European integration, which has been developing particularly intensively over the last decade due to deep evolutionary changes in the EU, represents an essential part of the process.

The framework of the problem is closely connected to Ukraine's aspirations to participate in European integration and to enter the EU in the future, as has been declared more than once by the country's government and as reflected in official documents.

The advancement of Ukraine towards European integration relates to the whole complex of both internal and international problems. Today, mutual relations between Ukraine and the EU are mainly grounded in the Association Agreement, but transfer to a deeper stage of cooperation in the form of preparation for the commencement of negotiations regarding entering the EU remains unlikely for the foreseeable future, as the governing body of the European Commission has declared. It is proposed that Ukraine build cooperation with the EU on the grounds of bilateral relations and neighbour cooperation in the framework of limited economic integration and political cooperation. Such conditions can be explained by both the internal problems of Ukraine and developments in the EU itself.

---

**DENYS KUZMIN** is a Senior Research Fellow and European Studies programme coordinator at the Center for International Studies, Odessa National University, Assistant Professor at the Department of International Relations, Institute of Social Sciences, Odessa National University, and project coordinator of the Ukrainian partner site "BRIDGE - fostering mutual understanding and cooperation of EU with Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova and Russia" realized by the Institute for Ethnic and Regional Studies (Slovenia) and (co)financed by the EuropeAid of the European Commission. 2008 -13. Project director for the Odessa part of "Public monitoring of EU member states visa issuance policies and practices in Ukraine" in the framework of the all-Ukrainian civic consortium "Europe without Barriers" funded by the International Renaissance Foundation (IRF). 2008 -13. Project coordinator ReSET "The EU as an Emerging European Security Actor: exploring theoretical paradigms", funded by the Higher Education Support Program (HESP), Open Society Institute (OSI). 2010 -12. Contact person from Odessa National University, Fostering Sustainable and Autonomous Higher Education Systems in the Eastern Neighbouring Area (ATHENA). 2012 -15 Contact person from Odessa National University, European Neighbourhood Policy Law and Good Governance (EUNEG).

#### 1.4 **LELA JAMAGIDZE** (Tbilisi State University)

##### **THE ROLE OF CULTURAL AND INSTITUTIONAL DIFFERENCES IN GEORGIA-EU ECONOMIC RELATIONS**

Implementation of the DCFTA between Georgia and EU almost entirely removes tariff barriers on trade. As a result of further approximation it will also considerably reduce the significance of behind-the-border measures. The agreement offers Georgia tools for opening new opportunities for the greater diversification of foreign economic relations. Cultural and institutional variables are characterized by slower change than border-related barriers, therefore under free trade socio-cultural and institutional differences even appear to be strong determinants of trade and investment flows. This paper is focused on the institutional and cultural dimensions of the approximation process affecting the desired and the actual size of economic transactions between Georgia and EU member countries. To evaluate the role of cultural and institutional differences, gravitation models of trade and FDI are used. Cultural and institutional distances between Georgia and EU members are measured and their role as trade and FDI determinants are identified. The modified Kogut & Singh index of cultural distance is applied, created using GLOBE nine cultural dimension scores, while institutional distance is measured by relying on Worldwide Governance Indicators data. Conclusions are made about the role of cultural and institutional differences in the reforms undertaken towards Georgia's greater market integration with the EU. The results enable us to evaluate the degree of border permeability for trade and investment flows and show that Georgia's cultural and institutional environment affects the willingness of economic actors to develop economic ties, and thus the progress in economic convergence.

---

**LELA JAMAGIDZE** holds a PhD in Economics and is an Assistant Professor at the Department of International Economics and History of Economic Thought, Faculty of Economics and Business, Tbilisi State University. Her research interests involve issues related to: international and regional economic cooperation; transnational corporations and economic globalization; economic consequences of culture and institutions. In 2010 -11 Lela Jamagidze was a research leader of the ASCN-funded

project on the Socio-cultural Environment of International Business in Georgia. She has participated in many international scientific forums and workshops held in Georgia, Bulgaria, Ukraine, Finland, the Netherlands, Romania, Estonia, etc. In 2015 she received a research fellowship from the European University of Viadrina (Germany). She is the author of more than 30 published works, including monographs, supplementary textbooks and research articles.

## 1.5 CHIARA LODA (Dublin City University)

### HOW IS THE EU PERCEIVED IN ARMENIA? AN INSTITUTIONAL AND PEOPLE-BASED PERSPECTIVE

In recent years, notwithstanding the strong ties with Russia, the Armenian political elites have cooperated with Brussels. In addition to this development, the EU has interacted with various civil society organizations. This pattern of cooperation was not dramatically reversed by the withdrawal from the Association Agreement talks in September 2013. Notably, in December 2015, the consultations for a new form of partnership began.

This study investigates how the EU is perceived in Armenia. To this end, the institutional and the people-based dimensions must be examined separately. Additionally, in order to grasp the complexity embedded in the people dimension, three sub-categories are proposed: organised civil society (mostly composed by NGOs), issue-centred spontaneous activism and the population at large. The analysis, primarily conducted by assessing primary and secondary sources, is complemented by interviews. The main findings of this multi-level analysis are as follows: 1) due to its leverage on Armenian stakeholders, Russia has a crucial impact on Yerevan's international room for manoeuvre; 2) rather than considering the current interaction with the EU as an intermediate step to membership, the ruling elites are mostly interested in Brussels as a modernizing agent 3); the EU cooperates with organized civil society in Armenia. However, NGOs often lament issues such as a donor-led agenda. Additionally, sometimes linguistic and capabilities barriers prevent small organisations from applying for EU Grants; 4) in recent years, issue-centred protest movements, such as "Electric Yerevan" in Summer 2015, have proved their preponderance in the Armenian political landscape. Even though these groups present themselves as being domestic in their focus, some of their efforts, such as opposing corruption, are in line with the EU normative proposal; 5) the population at large seems closer to Russia than to the EU. That is mostly due to the Russian "soft-elements": widespread knowledge of the language, the popularity of the Russian pop-culture and labour-migration ties.

---

**CHIARA LODA** is currently part of the Marie Curie ITN "Post-Soviet Tensions" research network. Currently, she is writing her doctoral thesis at Dublin City University, researching the foreign policy discourse and practice of Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaijan within the framework of international relations. More precisely, she looks at the South Caucasian states as small states that, within a certain set of constraints and opportunities, pursue a consistent foreign policy agenda. As part of her research, in 2015 she lived and conducted fieldwork in the region. She has participated in numerous conferences, workshops and international events. She is also a contributor to the academic blog "Presidential Power", where she writes about Armenia and Azerbaijan ([presidential-power.com/](http://presidential-power.com/)). Before joining the network, she received both her BA (2007 - 10, 180 ECTS, summa cum laude) and MA (2010 - 2, 120 ECTS, summa cum laude) in international relations at the University of Bologna-Forlì Campus. During that time, she also attended courses as a visiting student at University College Cork, the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and the Johns Hopkins SAIS Bologna Centre. These experiences gave Chiara an opportunity to develop expertise in international relations theory, conflict and mediation studies, the Middle East, and Central Asia. Given the importance of engagement with transnational civil society, she has also volunteered in some projects and cooperated with various Italian-based groups, as well as participating in exchanges and training programs in several countries such as Turkey, Greece, Germany and Israel. These experiences are at the base of her interest in civic activism and donor-recipient dynamics.

**1.6 KORNELY KAKACHIA** (Tbilisi State University)  
**& ALEXANDER MARKAROV** (Yerevan State University)

**THE IMPACT OF IDENTITY ON FOREIGN POLICY DISCOURSES IN GEORGIA AND ARMENIA: DETECTING THE LINK**

Since the dissolution of the Soviet Union, Armenia and Georgia have found themselves in a long process of self-construction in the context of their own complex history and difficult political and security environment. Even though the two countries' foreign policy evolved enough to respond to external and internal threats with reactive elements in the first two decades of independence, they did not develop a clear vision of foreign policy. However, over time, some patterns of belonging to the larger community and also of construction of the "other" have emerged. In the case of Georgia, these patterns of belongingness have transformed into an almost irrefutable foreign policy identity. Since the Rose Revolution in 2003, Georgia's membership in the European civilization while "othering" Russia has actively emerged in foreign policy discourse. The study finds that Georgian political elites construct two types of Europe: a cultural Europe to which Georgia already belongs due to its historical ties, and a political Europe to which Georgia aspires to belong. European identity is then presented as both, blended with Georgian national identity from the cultural perspective and as a supra-national identity in a political sense. On the other hand, Georgia is engaged in a double "othering": spatial, othering Russia from the perspective of different values, and temporal, othering or disassociating itself from its own Soviet past and post-Soviet mentality. On the other hand, conceptions of friends and foes in elite discourse and public consciousness in Armenia at all levels of analysis suggest that only Russia is perceived as Armenia's ally and "best friend". External security is considered to be a core area of cooperation with Russia. Azerbaijan and Turkey are perceived as Armenia's enemies, on the basis of the Turkish-Azerbaijani blockade of Armenia, the refusal to recognize the Armenian Genocide, and the destructive policy in the Karabakh conflict settlement. In this regard, Armenia's society is more radical. Nevertheless, this "other" is not characterized by ethnic, religious and cultural dichotomous notions. Rather it is regarded as belligerent, destructive, non-democratic, bellicose, and aggressive. By employing a constructivist account of identity construction as the "self"/"other" nexus, the study unpacks the process of narrating identity in the recent history of the two countries and examines the grounds for "belongingness" as well as "alterity". The study is based on analysis of Armenian and Georgian political discourses. It comprehensively analyzes speeches and statements of the primary decision makers in foreign policy as well as strategic documents. The data is complemented with extensive field-work consisting of in-depth interviews with politicians from the legislative as well as executive branches and members of academia in the both countries.

---

**KORNELY KAKACHIA** is a Professor of Political Science at Ivane Javakishvili Tbilisi State University and director of the Tbilisi-based think tank the Georgian Institute of Politics (GIP). He previously also worked as the director of the School of Politics & International Relations at the University of Georgia (Tbilisi). His current research focuses on Georgian domestic and foreign policy, the security issues of the wider Black Sea area and comparative party politics. He has been a recipient of IREX and OSI fellowships and was a visiting fellow at Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government (2009 - 10), the Harriman Institute, Columbia University (2011) and Johns Hopkin University's School of Advanced International Studies. He is co-editor of *Georgian Foreign Policy: The Quest for Sustainable Security* (2014) and is a member of the International Studies Association (ISA) and PONARS (Program on New Approaches to Research and Security in Eurasia group), a global network of social scientists that seeks to promote scholarly work and policy engagement on transnational and comparative topics within the Eurasian space.

**ALEXANDER MARKAROV** has 15 years of leadership and excellence experience in the implementation of international higher education cooperation and a successful history of project development, administration and implementation. His professional experience includes almost two decades of research, writing, and teaching on state and society developments in the Newly Independent States and Central and Eastern Europe, with specialization in the comparative study of political transfor-

mations and institutional developments. He has published widely on these topics and taught graduate courses on post-Soviet politics in Armenia, the Czech Republic and the US.

### 1.7 **SERGI GLEBOV** (Odessa I. I. Mechnikov National University)

#### **UKRAINE'S MULTIPLE IDENTITIES AS A KEY POINT OF THE NATIONAL STRATEGIC CULTURE: A SECURITY TEST BY (POST-)COLONIAL WARS**

Both the annexation of Crimea in 2014 and a hybrid war in the Donbas since then are a quintessence of the post-imperial history of the post-Soviet space. The author points out that at its core were Russian imperial ambitions, which were expressed firstly in Transnistria and Nagorno-Karabakh, Abkhazia and South Ossetia, later on its own territory, and finally during the open aggression against sovereign Georgia and Ukraine. He insists that such bloody history of the modern armed conflicts of the last 25 years in Eastern Europe only confirms a thesis that the dissolution of the USSR did not take place immediately in December 1991; rather, this is a process all of us have been witnessing since the time of Perestroika up to the present day. The author argues that at the same time, it would be rather naïve to roughly perceive the current post-Soviet arc of instability in the North-Eastern part of the Black Sea region as the sole artificial “invention” of the Kremlin. In the Ukrainian case, to his mind, Ukraine’s political elites, steeped in corruption and personal enrichment, played along with Russian ambitions and facilitated Russian aggression by provoking the Kremlin towards open armed aggression against own its territory; and, unfortunately, the Ukrainian rulers did not learn lessons from the Russian-Georgian “five-day” war. The reason why, he concludes, is that since 1992 Ukraine has found itself in the phantom of its bifurcated self-identity within the country and in the international arena. The contribution probes deeper into the strategic Ukrainian culture by examining identity, norms and beliefs in the foreign policy of Ukraine with a special focus on the acute Trans-Atlantic Security concerns.

---

**SERGI GLEBOV** is an Associate Professor at the Department of International Relations, Leading Research Fellow at the Center for International Studies (cis-onu.com), and Dean of the School of International Relations at the Institute of Social Sciences, Odessa Mechnikov National University (ONU). He received his Ph.D. in June 2002 for his thesis entitled: “Constructing the Security and Cooperation System in the Black Sea Region and the Role of Ukraine in this Process (1990s)”. Courses currently taught: Problems of the Black Sea Region, the Foreign Policy of Russia, Contemporary European and American History (1945-), Theory of State and Law. His research and teaching interests are in the field of Ukraine’s foreign and security policy, international relations in the Black Sea-Caspian region, European and Euro-Atlantic security, Russian foreign policy, NATO-Ukraine, EU-Ukraine relations. In 2000/2001 he was a visiting scholar at the Center for European Studies, University of Exeter (Exeter, UK) and at Columbia University, Harriman Institute (New York City, USA) in 2003. He has held several individual and institutional fellowships, including from the HESP / AFP Open Society Institute (Budapest, Hungary), the Carnegie Foundation and the Jean Monnet Program. He has been involved in several TEMPUS / Erasmus+ projects in the sphere of higher education. He is the author of around 60 scientific works published in national and international editions and a speaker and presenter at numerous scientific events in Europe and USA. He is currently working on an individual monograph with the working title “The Black Sea Region: the Case for System Analysis”. He is the author and host of political programs at the Odessa Media TV-Radio Group “GLAS” (www.video.glasweb.com).

### 1.8 **SERGEY MINASYAN** (Caucasus Institute, Yerevan)

#### **MAIN FEATURES OF FOREIGN POLICY OF THE REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA**

The Republic of Armenia is a post-Soviet country that gained independence in 1991 after the collapse of the Soviet Union and has been building its own independent statehood for more than a quarter of a century. An important feature of the implementation of Armenia’s foreign policy is the concept of ‘complementarism’ – a non-official

foreign policy doctrine of Armenia enables it to maintain a balance between the country's relations with Russia and the West. Complementarism was the basis for Armenia's foreign policy that originated in 1991. The essence of this policy was an attempt to combine and maintain a balance between the interests of all international and regional powers actively involved in the South Caucasus region, but not to concentrate on some other non-alternative orientation in its foreign policy – whether 'pro-Western', 'pro-Russian' or 'pro-Iranian'.

The foreign policy of Armenia is fairly typical for a small state which has serious historical and political problems with some of its neighbours and is forced to reckon with the interests and policies of external actors. Armenia's post-Soviet and post-communist past also affects its foreign policy. Many of the peripheral (or 'buffer') states situated along the former perimeter of the Soviet Union have had to make their foreign policy choices in favour of cooperation with the West and confrontation with Russia. Armenia has chosen a different approach which tries to reconcile the seemingly contradictory interests of the Western countries and Russia.

Of course Armenia has a price to pay for its policy of 'complementarism'. It is forced to reckon with the opinion of Moscow in its economic and political-military contacts with Western countries, and some politicians in the West disapprove of Armenia's close ties with Russia, and vice versa. The image that Armenia is trying to achieve in its foreign policy is one of a predictable partner implementing a pragmatic and balanced foreign policy, taking into account the interests of the world's leading actors and the dynamics of regional politics.

---

**SERGEY MINASYAN** is the Deputy Director and Head of Political Studies Department at the Caucasus Institute in Yerevan, Armenia (since March 2006). He also has represented the Academic Swiss Caucasus Net (ASCN) in Armenia (since 2011). He holds a PhD in Military History (2002) from the Institute of History under the National Academy of Science and a Doctor of Political Science degree from the Institute for National Security Studies at the Ministry of Defense of Armenia (2013). Dr. Minasyan previously worked as an expert on military and security issues at the Institute of Political Studies under the Administration of the President of Armenia and the Institute for National Security Studies at the Ministry of Defense of Armenia. He has worked as a regional military analyst for the IHS Jane's Information Group and other research and consulting organizations. His professional record includes extensive university-level teaching and research experience in international relations and security studies in Armenia and abroad. He has published over ten monographs and reports, and dozens of academic papers and analytical pieces. The main areas of his expertise are international relations, military history and security studies, with a particular focus on the topics of conventional deterrence, regional arms control and settlement of the ethno-political conflicts in the South Caucasus.

## 1.9 ARMEN GHAZARYAN (Military Institute after V. Sargsyan)

### INSTITUTIONALIZATION AND SECURITIZATION OF MIGRATION IN SOUTH CAUCASUS

The institutionalization of migration is a rather new phenomenon for the three states of the South Caucasus (Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia). As for the first states of independence in the early 1990s, migration was not strongly regulated both because of the lack of institutional capacities and the existence of other pressing issues for the state structures of the time.

Migration studies have lately shown a clearer tendency to view the sociological and economic phenomenon that is migration in terms of politics and security. This has been a pressing narrative in the past two decades. The same process has been observed in South Caucasus states as well. All three countries have to different extents notable problems with emigration, but also some issues with immigration.

The perception of migration as a matter of national security has taken root in the three countries in recent years. Using the qualitative comparative method, I analyze the national security concepts of Azerbaijan, Armenia and Georgia and other fundamental documents that constitute the basis of their migration policies. This analysis is important to point out to what extent migration and relations with respective diasporas influence domestic and even foreign policies in the respective countries.

The work is significant as there is no comparative piece of analysis on this issue in a region which has been and is fundamentally affected by migration flows. I do not analyze the economic ramifications of migration in the South Caucasus states, except for the general guidelines, rather I concentrate on the political and security aspects of this crucial phenomenon.

---

**ARMEN GHAZARYAN** holds a PhD in Political Science, specializing in migration and security, migration policy, European migration policy and European Studies in general. He is a graduate of Yerevan State University and did his Master's in European Studies. He is also a graduate of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy in Public Policy and Administration. Armen was an ASCN fellow at the University of Fribourg 2016.

**PANEL 2:****CIVIL SOCIETY, REPRESENTATION, INCLUSION****2.1 VALENTINA GEVORGYAN (American University of Armenia)  
& YEVGENYA PATURYAN (American University of Armenia)****CIVIC ACTIVISM AS A NOVEL COMPONENT OF ARMENIAN CIVIL SOCIETY:  
NEW ENERGY AND TENSIONS**

Armenian civil society today is unquestionably more complex than ten or even five years ago. Ten years ago civil society in Armenia by and large meant NGOs. Not so today. Since 2007 a new and increasingly visible actor has entered the stage: youth-driven, social media-powered, issue-specific civic activism is a new form of protest and political participation. The so-called “civic initiatives” are loosely organised miniature social movements, mostly confined to Yerevan, but gradually gaining visibility. There have been more than 30 such initiatives in Armenia since 2007, with roughly one-quarter of those resulting in a victory for the activists. It remains to be seen whether and to what extent civic initiatives will grow in scope. The emergence of this novel component of civil society creates new internal dynamics, patterns of operation, networking and mobilizing within the civil society sphere. Both NGOs and the civic initiatives have their distinct modes of functioning, their own strengths and weaknesses. There are both cooperation and tensions between the “old” NGO sector and the “new” civic activism elements of Armenian civil society. The paper examines patterns of interaction and mutual perceptions of NGOs and civic activists, based on five case studies of activist campaigns, 30 semi-structured interviews and ten focus group discussions with activists and NGO leaders. The paper seeks to address the following research questions: (1) how do NGOs and civic activists perceive each other? (2) How do they cooperate?

---

**VALENTINA GEVORGYAN** is a Research Associate at the Turpanjian Center for Policy Analysis at the American University of Armenia. She holds a Master’s degree in Political Science and International Affairs from the same university. Her interests are in the sphere of society – state relations and democratization processes of developing countries. She is an Open Society Foundations policy initiative fellow.

**YEVGENYA PATURYAN** is the Assistant Director of the Turpanjian Center for Policy Analysis of the American University of Armenia and a faculty member of the Political Science and International Affairs Department of the same university. She holds a PhD in Political Science from Jacobs University Bremen. Her academic interests are in the sphere of civil society, volunteering, the democratization of post-communist countries and corruption.

**2.2 LELA REKHVIASHVILI (Central European University)****CIVIL SOCIETY OR POLITICAL SOCIETY:****WHERE TO PLACE URBAN INFORMALS – MARSHRUTKA DRIVERS, VENDORS AND PARKING GUARDS – IN  
LIBERAL CONCEPTIONS ABOUT STATE SOCIETY RELATIONS?**

In this paper I intend to problematize the concept of civil society and critically discuss particularly the definitions of civil society adopted in post-socialist countries. To underline the narrow and unrepresentative character of civil society definitions as well as contentious repertoires, I introduce Patra Chatterjee’s concept of political society. I suggest that existing conceptions of civil society drive researchers and practitioners to dismiss the political significance as well as constructive and subversive power of the type of state-society interactions, contentious practices and resistances that a range of social groups rely on without adopting organizational forms through which ‘civil society’ politics is recognized. Relying on Chatterjee’s arguments, I suggest that a vast array of social contentions play out outside of the civil society framework – this is to say, outside of the discourse and practice that relies on existing



legal/institutional frameworks and operates within it. In contrast to civil society, the concept of political society allows us to observe and appreciate the political relevance of a range of subversive social actions and resistance carrying transformative power. I also bring into the discussion existing concepts that critically appreciate and complement mainstream social movements literature, such as everyday resistance (Scott), quiet encroachment of the ordinary (Bayat), and insurgent citizenship (Holston). Empirically I largely draw on my recent fieldwork on the marshrutka mobility system in Bishkek, Kyrgyzstan, but also incorporate examples from my previous research on petty traders, informal parking guards, and internally displaced persons to articulate the exclusive character of the concept of civil society and propose ways to overcome the limits of liberal conceptions of state-society relations.

---

**LELA REKHVIASHVILI** is a post-doctoral researcher at the Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography. She has recently defended her doctoral dissertation entitled *Counterbalancing marketization informally: institutional reforms and informal practices in Georgia (2003 - 12)* at the Doctoral School of Political Science, Public Policy and International Relations, Central European University. In recent years she has been a visiting doctoral fellow at the Leibniz Institute for Regional Geography and a research fellow at the Center for Social Sciences. Her publications focus on urban informality, commodification of public spaces, and internal displacement. Her broad research interests include: political economy, informal economic practices, post-socialist transformation, social movements.

### 2.3 **ANNA DOMORANSKA** (National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine)

#### **PRACTICES OF SOLIDARITY AND OF HELPING OTHERS IN POST-MAIDAN UKRAINE: INNOVATIVE POTENTIAL OF A SOCIETY IN CRISIS**

The events of 2013 - 14 negatively affected the financial situation of the population of Ukraine; the percentage of citizens registering a decline in their family's financial situation has increased, specifically from 25% in 2013 to 65% in 2015. The percentage of households whose food costs range from 75 to 100% of household income has increased from 8% (2013) to 12% (2015). The percentage of households that do not have enough money even for food has increased from 2% (2013) to 6% (2015). The crisis that Ukraine now faces has become a trigger for changes, including changes in everyday life participation. To adjust to the crisis, some categories of people were largely forced to abandon their usual consumption patterns. At the end of 2015, 50% of respondents noted that they had reduced spending on health care and purchase of medicines, 53% on utilities and rent, 57% on food, 73% on transport, and 80% on leisure.

Despite the drastic drop in the living standards of the population, participation in practices of helping others and volunteer activities has become very common, which as a powerful instrument of social, cultural and economic development makes it possible to overcome the impact of the crisis, and most importantly provides a solid basis for the development of civil society. Thus, the paper considers participation in charity practices. The monitoring survey data of the Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine has been used to study the relationship between the practices and values, beliefs and attitudes. The results have shown that 57% of Ukrainians have participated in at least one of the charity practices over the past 12 months. This participation in volunteer and charity practices is associated with the fact that citizens hold democratic values and have a positive attitude to the idea of Ukraine's accession to the European Union.

---

**ANNA DOMORANSKA** is Junior Research Fellow at the Institute of Sociology of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. She completed her PhD in Sociology at the Institute of Sociology and her MA in Social Work at Kyiv Polytechnic Institute. Since 2015, Anna has been a member of the scientific board RN21: Quantitative Methods of the European Sociological Association. Anna's research interests are in the areas of social research methodology, social stratification and cultural consumption. Her PhD research focused on how to measure social stratification by developing a

set of indicators capable of explaining individual differences in social and economic practices and attitudes. In 2014, Anna received an Award for the Most Talented Young Scientist from the Parliament of Ukraine and first prize in the competition "The best young sociologist 2015". Anna's current research focuses on everyday life participation and its changes in a situation of crisis.

## 2.4 **KOBA TURMANIDZE (CRRC Georgia)**

### **WHAT KINDS OF PROMISES MAXIMIZE VOTES? EVIDENCE FROM A SURVEY EXPERIMENT IN ARMENIA AND GEORGIA**

Voters' support for political parties has waned over the past few years in the South Caucasus. At the same time, the region continues to face major problems with unemployment and poverty. This paper argues that in such a context political parties will be better off if they come up with vague, if not contradictory promises that signal solutions to the most pressing problems. To answer this question the CRRC administered a survey experiment in Tbilisi and Yerevan with 1,906 completed interviews in early 2016. We randomly split the sample into four equal groups with various information treatments about the electoral policy proposals of a hypothetical party. While the control group was told the party would improve the economic situation in the country but was not provided with any specific details, the first treatment described a policy proposal according to which the party would increase taxes and invest additional revenues in creating more jobs. The second treatment conveyed the opposite story – decrease taxes and enable private companies to create more jobs. The third contained a combination of the two proposals: lower taxes and increase state investments in the economy to promote job creation. The remaining survey questions measured respondents' issue salience, policy preferences, political efficacy, attitudes to political parties, political knowledge, and their households' economic conditions.

We ran logistic regression models to relate the type of policy proposals with reported support for the party. Most of models confirmed that voters were more likely to support the party that put forward a general promise or promised something as inconsistent as low taxes and high spending on job creation by the state compared with a party that puts forward a consistent policy position. These findings signal an accountability trap for developing democracies: the winner is expected to under-deliver due to contradictions in the original electoral promises, while voters will become even more disillusioned with politics and become further detached from political parties.

---

**KOBA TURMANIDZE** is President / CEO of CRRC-Georgia and has supervised over 30 research projects of different scope and design since joining the organization in 2007. He earned an MPA from the American University (Washington, DC) and an MA in Political Science from the Central European University (Budapest, Hungary). He also holds a diploma in history from Tbilisi State University. Currently Koba is a doctoral candidate in Comparative Politics at the Central European University. In 2005–11 he was an Assistant at Tbilisi State University, where he taught comparative politics, economies in transition, research methods and applied statistics courses in the Department of Political Science and the Center for Social Sciences. Before joining CRRC, Koba worked in several civil society organizations as well as in the civil service. His research interests include authoritarianism, regime change and voting behavior.

## 2.5 **SIRAN HOVHANNISYAN (Yerevan State University)** **& GOHAR SHAHNAZARYAN (Yerevan State University)**

### **REPRESENTATION AND PARTICIPATION IN THE POLITICAL PARTIES AND POLITICAL INITIATIVES IN ARMENIA: GENDER ANALYSIS**

Factors facilitating women's participation in political life can be analyzed from 3 theoretical perspectives: (1) a supply-side approach argues that the supply of women

necessary for political activism and participation is determined by gender socialization, which very often limits women's opportunities and choices to be involved in political life. (2) A demand-side approach stresses the issue of power and so-called rules of the political game.

The main question that the representatives of this approach are asking is whether women can attain and how they can attain political power. (3) Contextual factors refer to the cultural, social and economic context in which women's participation takes place, the division of gender roles and the expectations of men and women in a particular society. The perception of women as less strong and less competent leaders than men exists perhaps in every society. Even in the countries where women's participation in education and the labour market have made some significant progress during the past decades, women still face cultural obstacles when they try to obtain political leadership. Gender representation in political parties (PP) and political initiatives (PI) in Armenia will be presented using the abovementioned theoretical concepts. Research findings will be analyzed from the perspective of gender roles, attitudes toward leadership within PP and PI. Special attention is paid to social capital and social networks as a tool of political participation for men and women in Armenia. Data of in-depth interviews with various representatives of PP and PI make it possible to identify and analyze challenges and obstacles for the political participation and decision-making for men and women within political institutions. Finally, gender analyses of future political plans and ambitions in more institutionalized political parties and less structured and formal political initiatives will be presented.

---

**SIRAN HOVHANNISYAN** is an outreach and PR Coordinator at the Center for Gender and Leadership Studies (CGLS) of Yerevan State University (YSU) since May 2013. She also teaches at the Social Work Department of YSU Faculty of Sociology since 2014. As part of her duty in CGLS she is assisting the management and recruitment of students for Master Degree program in Women, Leadership and Development, which is the first academic Gender and Women's Studies in Armenian higher education system (started in September 2015). After graduation from Social Work Department, she worked as department assistant. During her studies Siran Hovhannisyman was actively involved in volunteer activity at Women's Resource Center NGO in Armenia (WRCA), which has resulted to her involvement as a PR person in a lecture series about women's, gender, and feminist issues in Armenia supported by Heinrich Böll Foundation in South Caucasus (Tbilisi). Since June 2016 she is involved in trainings on Gender-Responsive Budgeting and Analysis for WRCA. As for her research interests, Siran Hovhannisyman is actively studying feminist theories, gender theory and gender-related issues in Armenia, gender discourse in Armenian media, sex-selective abortions, and the very specific correlations of social work and feminist practices. She is also co-author of an article entitled "The Sex-Selective Abortions as Manifestation of Gender-Based Discrimination in Armenian Family".

**GOHAR SHAHNAZARYAN** is a Co-Founder of the Women's Resource Center NGO ([www.womenofarmenia.org](http://www.womenofarmenia.org)) in Armenia and the Director of the Yerevan State University Center for Gender and Leadership Studies ([www.y-su.am/gender](http://www.y-su.am/gender)). She holds a PhD in Sociology. Currently Ms. Shahnazaryan is an Associate Professor at the Department of Applied Sociology at YSU, and a Coordinator of the MA program Women, Leadership and Development that was launched at YSU in September 2015. In 2004, Ms. Shahnazaryan was a visiting scholar at the School of Public Affairs at Arizona State University. In 2008, 2009 and 2011 for one semester each year she was a visiting scholar at the Institute of Slavic, Eastern European and Eurasian Studies at UC Berkeley through the Open Society Institute Fellowship. She has mainly been affiliated with the Departments of Sociology and Gender Studies at the UCB during her visits. For the past ten years Ms. Shahnazaryan has coordinated a number of large-scale projects on women and gender issues (such as projects on women's leadership, development of referral mechanisms for the survivors of gender-based violence, educational projects on women's rights, women and peacebuilding, the development of feminist movement in Armenia, etc.), and participated in various international, regional and local conferences, training programmes and workshops on women's rights and gender equality. She is the author of more than fifteen articles on gender issues in Armenia.

## 2.6 OLEKSII SYDORCHUK (National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy)

### REFORM THAT NOBODY WANTS: NEW MODEL OF PARTY FINANCE REGULATION IN UKRAINE

Ukrainian parties have traditionally been heavily dependent on oligarchs' money while carefully hiding the sources of their funds from the population. This has led to distortion of the level playing field, low responsiveness on the part of the parties to the needs of their supporters, and the growth of political corruption. Lax regulation of party financing was one of the reasons behind this state of affairs, and in October 2015 the parliament finally passed a law aimed at improving regulation of party financing. The new law introduced limits on donations, provided public funding for parties which have crossed a certain threshold at the parliamentary elections, imposed comprehensive reporting requirements, endowed the newly created anticorruption agency with controlling functions, and toughened the sanctions on non-compliance. While the law was praised by international organizations, many Ukrainian parties are resistant to its successful implementation. Meanwhile, Ukrainian citizens strongly oppose public financing of parties, which complicates the government's efforts aimed at effective communication of the reform. Since the law entered into force in early 2016, its implementation has faced several setbacks, as well as some promising trends. On the one hand, the creation of the anticorruption agency was mired in controversy and significantly delayed, which led to the late launch of the new reporting system and problems with dispatching the public funds. On the other hand, several NGOs and think tanks have fostered cooperation with both the anticorruption agency and political parties and have established effective means of parallel, civic control of party finance.

While it is too early to evaluate the success of the new model of party finance regulations, its effectiveness will probably depend on fulfillment of two key conditions: the ability of the government to quickly fix all identified shortcomings and the emergence of broad consensus among key stakeholders on the necessity to embrace the implementation of reform.

---

OLEKSII SYDORCHUK is a PhD student at the Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies (Kyiv, Ukraine). He holds a Master's degree in political science obtained at the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. His areas of scientific interest include constitutional engineering, party development, and post-communist politics. He also works as a political analyst at the Ilko Kucheriv Democratic Initiatives Foundation, a Ukrainian non-governmental think tank.

## 2.7 MAIA MESTVIRISHVILI (Tbilisi State University)

### COMPOSITIONAL MODALITIES OF CITIZENSHIP REPRESENTATION STYLES IN GEORGIA

This study presents a two-dimensional model explaining the differences between civic, ethnic and cultural citizenship styles in Georgia. The first dimension is 'instrumental', comprising nationalism, strength of national identity and Orthodoxy and the second dimension is 'sentimental', which involves patriotism, in-group attitudes and collectivism / individualism. Ethnic citizenship scores highest in the instrumental dimension, followed by cultural and civic citizenship, whereas the highest score in the sentimental dimension is associated with cultural citizenship, followed by ethnic and civic citizenship styles.

The study demonstrates that people's preferences for rational over emotional judgment is one of the aspects that helps us to discriminate between ethnic, civic and cultural citizenship styles. The present study's findings contribute to the field of citizenship studies in several ways: 1. they validate the distinction between ethnic, civic and cultural citizenship representation styles, 2. they identify the constellation

of variables that explain the difference between civic, ethnic and cultural citizenship and expand the understanding of citizenship by exploring their compositional modalities in Georgia.

---

**MAIA MESTVIRISHVILI** is an Associate Professor at the Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences at Ivane Javakishvili Tbilisi State University and head of the Institute of Personality Psychology and Counselling. She got her PhD in 2004 and from 2004–13 she did her post-doctoral training at the Columbia University, UC Berkeley, the University of Leuven and the University of Fribourg. Her research and teaching interests are centered on the following areas: social aspects of self-categorization, citizenship and national identity and stigmatized identities (migrants, sexual and ethnic minorities). In her studies she uses qualitative as well as quantitative approaches, including narrative method and analyses of visual images. She is a principle investigator of research projects on citizenship representation styles (funded by the Academic Swiss Caucasus Network (ASCN), homophobic attitudes in Georgia (funded by the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI) and assessing the migration experience of migrant women (funded by Tbilisi State University).

## 2.8 DENIS DAFFLON (University of Fribourg)

### **ETHNIC POLICIES IN POST-SOVIET STATES: HOW INCLUSIVE IS GEORGIA?**

Georgia is certainly one of the states of the former Soviet Union in which the nation-building process is the most complex. The ethnic diversity which characterizes Georgia makes it in essence a multi-ethnic state. However, the debate on diversity and on the degree of inclusion of the different ethnic groups composing the Georgian nation remains extremely prevalent in the country. It particularly concerns the Armenian community of Georgia, representing approximately 7% of the country's population.

The seizure of power by Mikheil Saakashvili in 2003 was accompanied by a more inclusive discourse on the nation, thus instilling among the representatives of national minorities the hope of better opportunities in terms of political participation and economic inclusion. Simultaneously to this new civic discourse, the authorities aimed to restore their presence on the territory inhabited by ethnic minorities through both concrete and symbolic state-building measures. Thus, the state based its integration policy on strong imposition of the state language upon representatives of national minorities, hoping to strengthen their feeling of belonging to Georgia as a state.

The aim of my contribution is twofold: first, it aims to question the efficiency of the state policies in terms of integration. My hypothesis is that despite a civic and inclusive discourse on the nation, the authorities have insufficiently managed to leave behind ethnic markers. Second, my article aims to question how the identity of the Armenian community of Georgia has been affected by this new discourse. I will show that more than ten years after the Rose Revolution, a large part of the local Armenians are balanced between a strong feeling of belonging to Georgia and a remaining feeling of discrimination, thus resulting in different life strategies among the younger generation: either exit (emigration to Armenia or Russia) or loyalty (integration through learning the state language).

---

**DENIS DAFFLON** is a PhD candidate in political science at the University of Fribourg (Switzerland). His dissertation focuses on the integration of the Armenian minority in Georgia in the context of both the strengthening of the state and the redefinition of the nation following the Rose Revolution. He tries to analyse to what extent the new discourse on the nation impacted on the political and economic inclusion of the Armenian community in Georgia and to identify the structural obstacles and cultural barriers that hinder better integration. Denis Dafflon has a general interest in issues of nation, nationalism, ethnic minorities, diversity management and language issues in the former Soviet Union.

## 2.9 **LELA CHAKHAIA** (European University Institute, Florence)

### **INEQUALITIES IN EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT AND EDUCATIONAL PATHWAYS OF GEORGIAN YOUTH**

In this paper I explore how choices of educational career have been diversified for Georgian young people since the break-up of the Soviet Union. I explore a set of institutional factors affecting the choices of young people, such as the availability of different options to pursue education (particularly professional education) and the presence of barriers (such as school certification exams) that might trigger early drop-outs. At the same time, I investigate the effect of socio-economic background variables on educational attainment, and the interaction between institutional and individual factors.

Using the combination of quantitative and qualitative data analysis, I find that in the years following the break-up of the Soviet Union, the decline of professional education opportunities in fact caused an increase in absolute educational inequality as well as intergenerational inequality. End-of-study barriers for continuation are bound to disproportionately affect socially disadvantaged students.

---

**LELA CHAKHAIA** is a doctoral researcher at the Department of Social and Political Science of the European University Institute in Florence. She researches educational inequalities, social mobility and social stratification in post-Soviet countries. Before joining the EUI, at different times she worked at UNICEF Georgia, Ilia State University, and the Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia. She has served as a consultant and education expert to the World Bank, various UN agencies, Save the Children and other organizations. She has MA degrees from Harvard University and the Central European University and a BA from Tbilisi State University.

**PANEL 3:****INFORMAL POLITICS, NETWORKS, ENTREPRENEURSHIP****3.1 GIORGI GOTUA** (Independent Researcher)  
& **MIKHEIL SVANIDZE** (Tbilisi State University)**POLITICAL CHANGES AND INFORMAL POLITICS OF CENTER-PERIPHERY RELATIONS IN GEORGIA: TWO CASE STUDIES**

The fall of the Soviet Union has triggered waves of redistribution of power networks in the newly independent states. In many cases the old, newly formed or reformed local powerful groups have sought to ascertain their political position in the new system. In this paper we seek to answer the question of how local political elites in Georgia source and maintain their power at times of political change and the nature of their relationship with the political centre within independent Georgia.

We focus on two key elements of political change to track and disassemble the mechanisms of staying and/or changing power of local political players (understood on the municipal level) in Georgia. As our first case study we explored events in two municipalities with different characteristics, before and after the radical election-based change of the political regime in the country in 2012. In our second case we tracked down transformation in local political power and the response of local politically powerful figures to the overhaul of the local government system around 2014.

We generally conclude that there is a specific mutual political relationship typically at work in the centre-periphery power puzzle: while the vertical relations running from the political centre to municipal players endures, local political elites have a considerable amount of leverage. In some cases, this is sufficient for the central powers to opt for concessions, to keep the local elite as their allies, while in certain historical, political and geographical circumstances the situation is reversed and local political elites are more prone to be clients in the centralized system. In the paper we explore the conditions of possibility under which the elites retain more power as well as the opposite cases, circumstances in which they are unable to harness it.

---

**GIORGI GOTUA** is an independent researcher with vast experience in academic and applied research projects. He studied Political Science and Sociology. His research has focussed on issues related to political parties, civil society, ethnic conflicts and international development. His interest lies in the politics of development and transition. George considers himself a more qualitatively oriented researcher.

**MIKHEIL SVANIDZE** is a PhD candidate in human geography at Tbilisi State University. He has studied Sociology and Social Anthropology at Tbilisi State University and the Central European University. His research interests include political anthropology and political parties, social movements and public spaces and urbanism in post-Socialist states. Methods-wise he positions himself as an anthropologist with extensive qualitative fieldwork expertise. Currently he is working on a PhD thesis on informal public transport in Georgia.

**3.2 TAMAR CHARKVIANI** (Ilia State University)  
& **NINO KAKUBAVA** (Ilia State University)**DYNAMICS OF INFORMALITY: CASE OF GEORGIAN POLICE**

Georgia's political and institutional landscape changed substantially after the Rose Revolution. It is widely accepted that the police reform that started in 2004 was one of the most prominent and successful reforms, putting an end to corruption, rampant cronyism, and nepotism in Georgia. Building formal institutions became a priority, in order to override informal practices existent before the Rose Revolution.

This study attempts to identify types of informal institutions which have been functional in the Georgian police system in the post-Soviet period at the various stages of its development, to analyze their influence on the whole system and their correlation with the formal institutions. In light of these theories we have researched several important policy-making and decision-making cases that provide argumentative backing for our analysis and typology.

The research object for the study is the police system of different periods:

- pre-reform – the Shevardnadze period (1992 to 2003);
- post-reform – the Saakashvili period (2003 to 2012);
- the Ivanishvili / Gharibashvili period (2012 to 2015).

The empirical research was based mainly on qualitative research methods. In this research, in-depth and narrative interviews as well as document analysis are used as a major method for data collection.

However, the reforms did not end with informality and exercise of informal practices in policy-making. Using the typology of informal institutions defined by Levisky and Helmke, as well as the concept of ‘fuzzy legality’ coined by Cohn, this study demonstrates that informal institutions retained their power in state-building during President Saakashvili’s incumbency. While eradicating substitutive and competing institutions, the new government still relied on complementing institutions and ‘fuzziness’. After the elections of 2012, the new government introduced new waves of reforms, however the various cases within the police system point to the relapse of informality existent during President Shevardnadze’s time.

---

**TAMAR CHARKVIANI** holds a PhD in Sociology. She is a graduate of the Georgian State University, Faculty of Philosophy and Sociology, specialising in Sociology (BA 2003; MA 2005). She is currently a lecturer (2006–) at Ilia State University (Tbilisi, Georgia), Faculty of Arts and Sciences and a researcher (2012–) in the project “Networks of Informal Power in Georgia and Armenia” of the Academic Swiss Caucasus Net (ASCN). Since 2002 she has participated in quantitative and qualitative sociological and cross-disciplinary studies conducted in Georgia and Germany. She has been a scholar and grant receiver of a number of local and international organizations: Institute of Social Studies and Analyses (ISSA) (2002–06); Heinrich Böll Foundation (2004–05); Transnational Crime and Corruption Centre Caucasus Office (TraCCC CO) (2006); Rustaveli Foundation for Georgian Studies, Humanities and Social Sciences (2008); German Agency for Technical Organization (GTZ) (2005–09); Caucasus Institute for Peace, Democracy and Development (CIPDD) (2005–11); Georgia’s National Science Foundation (2009); Academic Swiss Caucasus Net (ASCN) (2010–11; 2012–). Her research interests include the development of governmental institutions in Georgia, formal and informal structures, and institutions and relationships in society.

**NINO KAKUBAVA** has diverse experience of working in the non-profit sector and academia. She is currently a Capacity Development Expert / Coordinator at the UNDP Fostering Regional and Local Development in Georgia. Nino has taught a Public Administration course for Bachelor’s and Master’s students at the Caucasus University and the University of Georgia since 2008. She has previously worked for various international organizations in an expert and managerial capacity. She is the author of seven publications.

### 3.3 SOFYA OMAROVA (Oxford Brookes University)

#### INFORMAL POLITICS AND DEMOCRATIC TRANSITION(S) IN AZERBAIJAN

The decay of formal institutions and their subsequent replacement by informal ones started during the late Soviet era, due to the technical incapacity of centralized economic planning and a dramatic growth of state control costs.

The crisis of state capacity became an unintended consequence of democratization. Gelman (2004) argues that under these unfortunate circumstances informal institutions, practices and norms filled the political vacuum and produced arbitrary rule in



the transitional stage. Lauth (2000) considers informal institutions as purely detrimental forces that delay democratic consolidation. However, it is impossible to understand the nature and dynamics of political formation in the post-Soviet space without properly analyzing the phenomenon of informal politics (Isaacs, 2010). Informal politics may come into existence in various forms – institutions, practices and norms, etc. Van Tatenhove and Mak (2006) define informality as a non-codified setting of daily interactions concerning policy issues in which the participation of actors, the formation of coalitions, the processes of agenda setting, decision-making and implementation are not structured by pre-existing sets of rules or formal institutions. Central to this definition are non-codified settings and non-defined rules of political games, which can be flexible and interchangeable. The predominance of informal institutions and practices in the South Caucasus could be associated with the traditional and charismatic nature of leadership in the region (Guliyev, 2005).

Similar to other authoritarian states, Azerbaijani politics is built on a combination of formal institutions and informal political practices (Abbasov, 2007; Babayeva, 2014). The presence of informal networks within authoritarian states is most clearly revealed in moments of transition, when the state's ability to monitor itself breaks down (Radnitz, 2011). This paper will deal with the issue of positive democratization in Azerbaijan using the example of the formal ASAN system of state service delivery, which replaced informal bureaucratic corruption.

---

**SOFYA OMAROVA** is a PhD candidate in Political Science at Oxford Brookes University. Her research interests are related to the study of authoritarian regimes, including their legitimation strategies and the nation-building practices in the Caucasus and the broader post-Soviet region. She received an MA degree from the Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies (Geneva) and has work experience in a number of international organizations, including the UNFPA, UNECE and IOM. Ms. Omarova is a recipient of multiple international fellowships, such as the European Commission Marie Curie Horizon 2020 Grant, the Swiss Federal Excellency Scholarship, and the OSCE Academy fellowship. Her recent research collaboration was with the British Council Researcher links on the issues of social and academic mobility in the post-Soviet countries.

### 3.4 LUIZA AYVAZYAN (Caucasus Institute)

#### POLITICAL ELITES IN ARMENIA: A CHANGE OF GENERATIONS

Informality is a developing field of political science, including in the former Soviet space. Relatively little has been published on informality in Armenia, but interest in the topic is growing. The objective of this study of Armenia's political elites conducted by the Caucasus Institute was to identify trends in informal relations within Armenian elites at various stages of post-Soviet history. We collected and studied open biographical data on major political players, including facts published in the media in the form of news, investigative reports and interviews. The pivotal part of the study was field research consisting of interviews with dozens of former and current politicians (including five former prime ministers) and with experts. We also conducted a detailed study of the political history of post-Soviet Armenia, collecting data from books and news media archives. The resulting rich factual material was then analysed on the basis of existing concepts of informality and post-Soviet politics. The CI research team created a timeline of Armenian elite politics based on the prominence of particular elite groups and the distribution of authority between the main formal and informal institutions. We identified the main elite groups of Armenia as revolutionaries (actors involved in organizing Armenia's movement for unification with Nagorno-Karabakh and for independence from the USSR), combatants (participants of the armed hostilities in Nagorno-Karabakh), businesspeople (major business operators with close ties to the political leadership), bureaucrats, former dissidents and technocrats. The issues analysed in the study include the ousting of communists from power in Armenia in the early

1990s, the governance system of Armenia in the 1990s and the 2000s, Armenia's institutions such as elections and the parliament, the ties between informal politics and informal economics, and social mobility in Armenia's elites.

---

**LUIZA AYVAZYAN** is a Researcher at the Caucasus Institute think tank in Yerevan, Armenia. She is part of the research team of Networks of Power and Informal Institutions in Armenia, a project funded by the Academic Swiss Caucasus Net (ASCN). Luiza has worked at various local and international organizations. In 2013-14 she was employed by the Transparency International Anti-Corruption Center as coordinator of a project on Promoting Transparency and Accountability in the Defense Sector in Armenia. In 2011-13 she was a Youth and Civic Programs Manager at the Armenian branch of the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI), working with youth organizations. She has also collaborated with projects of the OSCE, the European Council and the Council of Europe. Luiza holds an MA degree in International Relations (Russian-Armenian (Slavonic) University, Yerevan, Armenia) and has graduated from yearly journalism courses at the Caucasus Institute. She is currently working on her Ph.D. on Armenia's foreign policy, and studying at the Yerevan School of Political Studies.

### 3.5 **HRANT MIKAELIAN** (Caucasus Institute)

#### **MILITARY REFORM IN ARMENIA: FROM NETWORK TO CORPORATION**

As sources for the study, the Caucasus Institute research team used official biographies of leading military actors, media reports and publications on the Armenian army. Fieldwork consisted of interviews with experts, former volunteers and leading actors in the armies of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh. Theoretical concepts of informality were used to analyse the material and identify trends. There are fewer open sources on institutional development and problems of the army than there are about politics. Interviews with senior figures in the army were the key to the success of the project. All senior military actors of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh were entered into a database and categorized. We used the database to identify trends and create a timeline, which proved similar to the political timeline, indicating that the two spheres were linked. The first stage in our timeline was over by 1991: the emergence of guerrilla troops staffed with volunteers who joined the war in Nagorno-Karabakh. 1991 was when Armenia began creating a regular army. Former volunteers continued to dominate it. As the institutionalisation of the army continued, the influence of former volunteers decreased by the late 1990s; it is almost non-existent now. The current stage is characterized by the gradual introduction of civil control over the army and contract servicemen replacing conscripts in some areas.

Informal relations were present in the Armenian army from the very start, because the volunteer troops that it was built upon were operating entirely based on personal ties. Once the army became a formal institution, the informal ties lost some of their significance. However, informality persists in the army's relationship with the state and with business, e.g. in connection with the use of non-budgetary funds to maintain the army.

---

**HRANT MIKAELIAN** has worked as Researcher at the Caucasus Institute (CI) think tank in Yerevan, Armenia since 2009. He is currently part of the research team of Networks of Power and Informal Institutions in Armenia, a project funded by the Academic Swiss Caucasus Net (ASCN). He has coordinated a number of research projects at the CI, including Armenia and Armenians, Turkey and Turks in Armenian Media and The Nationalist Discourse in Armenia. Hrant has published over 20 scholarly papers, journal articles and book chapters. His spheres of scientific interest include demography, migration, public discourses, domestic politics and local self-government. For five years he has assisted the CI Director in preparing Nations in Transit reports on Armenia. Hrant holds an MA degree in Political Science from the Caucasus Institute. He is working on his PhD at the National Academy of Sciences of Armenia in the field of modern Georgian history, and studying at the Yerevan School of Political Studies.

**3.6 YULIA ANTONYAN** (Yerevan State University)  
**& KETEVAN KHUTSISHVILI** (Tbilisi State University)

**“ELITES”: DEFINITIONS, IDENTITIES, AND CULTURAL REPERTOIRES. AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL APPROACH TO RECENT TRANSFORMATIONS IN THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF ARMENIAN AND GEORGIAN SOCIETIES**

The presentation will present the book entitled *Elites and “Elites”: Transformations of Social Structures in Post-Soviet Armenia and Georgia*, which is the result of a joint Armenian-Georgian anthropological survey of the concept of “elites” in contemporary Georgia and Armenia. The survey has embraced a set of topics related to the process of the formation of new national elites in the course of the construction of the nation-states, the genealogy and typology of the new elites, mechanisms and principles of organization of power, old and new hierarchical structures, and their continuity with the cultural heritage of previous periods of history. Being both very much alike and very much distinctive from each other, Armenia and Georgia have developed social structures similar in form, yet discrepant through their inner interplay of meanings, interpretations and correlations of the parts of these structures. This study of elites, elitism and elitists involves different social (and also ethnic and religious) groups which have been affected by the process of reconfiguration of social structures. The volume consists of chapters each representing separate surveys conducted by 8 participants of the project. The topics of the chapters are organized in four parts. Part one, Elitist groups and networks, relates to social groups that are marginal and non-elitist by default, built into existing hierarchies and acquiring elitist statuses within their groups. Part two, New Economic Elites, addresses new types of power elites who build their economic wealth through power and maintain power through that economic wealth. Part three, Religion, nationalism, identity and elites, contributes to our understanding of how religion and nationalism can shape elites. And part four, Post-soviet transformations of Soviet elitism, deals with current changes in the social structures inherited from Soviet times. The chapters are preceded by the introduction, presenting the main theories forming the foundations of the research and discussing the situation related to academic discourse on elites existing in the post-Soviet space and in Armenia and Georgia in particular. The volume is one of the first attempts in the region to address anthropologically the topic under scrutiny, using ethnographical methodologies and approaches.

---

**YULIA ANTONYAN**, Associate Professor of the Department of Cultural Studies, Faculty of History at Yerevan State University. She holds a PhD (“Candidate” degree) in History and Ethnology (2007). Her research interests include the Anthropology of Religion, the Anthropology of Social Structure and Elitism. She has conducted ethnographic fieldwork among Armenians of Armenia, Georgia, Syria and Lebanon. She is the author of 38 articles in Armenian, Russian, English and Polish .

**KETEVAN KHUTSISHVILI**, Professor of Anthropology at Ivane Javakishvili Tbilisi State University, Institute of Ethnology, Faculty of Humanities. Fields of interest are ethno-cultural processes in the Caucasus, religion, ethnic identity and relations, and IDP studies. Author of 62 scientific works, including four monographs. She has conducted ethnographic fieldwork in various parts of Georgia, Caucasus and Turkey. Topics of the theses: “The dream and dream interpretation in Georgian being” (Candidate of History, 2000) and “The Influence of the Religious Factor on Ethno-Cultural Identification and Civil Integration (The Case of the Modern Georgia)” (Doctor of History, 2005).

**3.7 KAMIL WIELECKI** (University of Warsaw)

**HOW TO ENSURE WHAT FORMAL MECHANISMS FAIL TO ENSURE:  
 THE VALUE OF INFORMAL RELATIONS FOR RUSSIAN SMALL ENTREPRENEURS**

It was petty trade or small entrepreneurship in general that allowed vast amounts of people to survive the crisis faced by post-Soviet Russia. As a result of the collapse of industry, many workplaces simply vanished and millions of people virtually landed out on the street, having no other opportunity to make a living than by engaging in trade activities. The crisis of the state also consisted in the fact that it was unable to

fulfill its duties: to provide social services for the citizens, to guarantee them safety or to enforce its own laws. As a consequence, the sphere of informality around private entrepreneurial activities – already significant in late socialism – expanded vigorously in the new Russia. Informal institutions substituted the state by ensuring basic conditions for entrepreneurship. In this paper, I examine how rules of performing entrepreneurial activity are ensured in today's Russia. Despite the fact that state structures have been strengthening since the 2000s, there are still areas in which informal arrangements prevail in shaping business relations, such as trade minorities, immigrant communities, small companies based on family ties, etc. I argue that the weaker the actors are in terms of social and economic capital, the more prone they are to informality. This situation offers them some possibilities, but at the same time, however, it makes them vulnerable. The paper is based on the extensive ethnographic fieldwork I conducted among people engaged in the so-called street economy in Krasnoyarsk (Central Siberia, Russia) in 2012–13.

---

**KAMIL WIELECKI** is an anthropologist and social philosopher at the University of Warsaw, Poland. He has undertaken long-term ethnographic fieldwork research in Moldova, Kyrgyzstan and Russia. He received studentships at the Kyrgyz National University in Bishkek (2005) and the University of Vienna (2005–06). He was also a Visiting Scholar at the Higher School of Economics in Moscow (2011–12) and at the Central European University in Budapest (2013). He is the author of over twenty of scholarly and public interest articles published in Polish, Russian and English, including his monograph *Coping with Uncertainty. Petty Traders in Post-Soviet Russia* (2015). Since 2013, he has served as a secretary of the international and interdisciplinary PhD program “Searching Identity: Global Challenges, Local Traditions” run at the Faculty of Artes Liberales, University of Warsaw, where he has also been an associate professor since 2015. His areas of interest include post-socialist studies, the political economy of capitalism, globalization, and economic and philosophical anthropology.

### 3.8 PHILIPPE RUDAZ (University of Fribourg)

#### THE ELUSIVE INFORMAL ENTREPRENEURS: EVIDENCE FROM GEORGIA

This aim of this article is to examine the links between informality and entrepreneurship using a set of data on self-employment, micro-firms and small enterprises in Georgia. It examines how the different dimensions of entrepreneurship influence the transformation of informal entrepreneurs into formal ones, which is a debate of major importance for transition and developing economies. It shows first the grey areas between informality and formality in the path to full formal entrepreneurship. Micro-enterprises, which are supposed to belong to the formal economy, share some common characteristics with self-employment typical of informal sector activities. Business registration and the holding of accounting records are therefore only partial indicators of enterprises' formal organization and are not the only “exit doors” out of informality. Second, it shows that self-employment did not evolve to micro-firms and micro-firms did not grow into small enterprises. This has significant implications with regards to the potential of the informal sector for the formal one. Finally, it identifies the low level of trust in institutions as a barrier to the inclusion of the informal sector in the formal structures of the economy. Facilitating business registration through tax incentives and other measures aiming at simplifying the business environment might be necessary, but it is not sufficient to formalize enterprises.

---

**PHILIPPE RUDAZ** is an economist, with a broad interest in political economy and institutional economics, especially when related to financial sector development, private sector development and entrepreneurship. He follows and contributes to academic and policy debates on the political economy of financialization, on the links between financial sectors and the “real economy” and on private sector development and entrepreneurship in post-Soviet countries. He coordinates two the research projects “the emergence of entrepreneurship in Georgia and in Armenia” at the ASCN. He is currently Economic Affairs Officer at the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, in charge of entrepreneurship policies in the Entrepreneurship section.

### 3.9 NAIRA VARDANYAN (CRRC Armenia)

#### SMALL AND MICRO-ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN ARMENIA

Entrepreneurship is considered to be one of the most important spheres of the economy, hence increasing its share may contribute to the overall economic growth in Armenia. In this regard, a survey of 606 entrepreneurs in Yerevan and the Lori marz (which is one of the economically active regions in Armenia and is bordered by Georgia) was conducted in April 2016 to reveal the motivation of people with entrepreneurial occupations, their perceptions of the sphere and the challenges that hinder growth and development. The overall economic environment, its strong and weak administration points will be explored through evidence-based data. The focus of the analysis will be the general portrait of an entrepreneur, his/her expectations, intentions and motivations, as well as participation in state or other agency support programs on material and non-material resources (e.g capacity building training, financial literacy programs, etc.). The study stresses the relationship of entrepreneurs with formal and informal institutions, trust in institutions as one of the key factors to business activity, and entrepreneurs' perceptions of the country's tax system. A separate section will be dedicated to the factors shaping entrepreneurship in Armenia, such as laws on SMEs, economic dominance and competition with the big enterprises; dynamics of size of SMEs in the economy, sources of information businessmen use, cultural and educational background, loans and savings, etc.

SPSS 21 will be used to analyze the data, to test it through available tests and to provide correlations between the differences in perceptions between 1. the capital city and the Lori marz; 2. micro / small enterprise and self-employed entrepreneurs, etc.

---

**NAIRA VARDANYAN** is a Program Manager for Data Initiative at the Caucasus Research Resource Centre, Armenia. Prior to joining the CRRC-Armenia, Naira worked at the Caucasus Institute as a Researcher. She headed the Business Consulting and Training Center at the Business School of the Slavonic University in Armenia after working at the Armenian State Pedagogical University and the Russian State University of Tourism and Services as a lecturer in sociology. Naira also collaborated with a number of local and international organizations as a researcher, trainer and analyst. Naira has an MA degree in Sociology from the Yerevan State University (2005). She is currently working on her PhD thesis in Political Sciences at the same University. She has more than ten years of experience in conducting sociological research. Her academic publications focus on political orientation and social capital.

**PANEL 4:****NATION BUILDING, NATIONAL IDENTITY, NATIONALISM****4.1 MKHITAR GABRIELIAN (Yerevan State University)  
& RUZANNA TSATURYAN (Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography)****PERCEIVING NATIONALISM AS NEGATIVE: LACK OF COMPROMISE**

The implementation of the research project 'Daily nationalism and ethnicity in Armenia' in 2012-15 revealed the scope of the problems/misinterpretations of perceptions of nationalism in social/anthropological studies in Armenia. One of the essential results of the project was the extensive ethnographic data recorded from 3 villages in Armenia on the issue which has been archived and partly implemented in the final publication of the project *Armenianness every day: from above to below*.

The research shows that despite the possibilities of conducting field work on nationalism and ethnicity perceptions in daily life, the former Soviet-style essentialist approach when nationalism was perceived as dangerous still prevails in academic discussions. Meanwhile the concepts of 'other nationalisms' such as civic, ethnic, positive and negative are widely discussed in contemporary theoretical and methodological publications in social science in Western academic circles. The tensions on the Armenian-Azerbaijani borderline along with the April war in 2016 that led to casualties and destruction show that there are limited possibilities for broadly delivering approaches on 'alternative nationalisms'. This presentation seeks to discuss the notions outlined above to show that coping with the essentialist perceptions of nationalism is closely linked to political development and seen as a powerful tool for elites, in some cases for achieving their personal goals.

---

**MKHITAR GABRIELIAN** is a social anthropologist with a candidate degree in history. He is a senior researcher at the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography, National Academy of Sciences, Armenia, a lecturer and head of the Master's program "Ethnography" at Yerevan State University. His main research interests center on the anthropology of war and conflict, rural studies, nationalism and ethnicity. He is actively engaged in various local and international research programs. His most recent research project was 'Daily Nationalism and ethnicity in Armenia', supported by the Academic Swiss Caucasus Net, and 'Research Beyond the Ivory Tower', supported by the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUP). He is an author / co-author of 9 monographs and more than 50 scientific articles.

**RUZANNA TSATURYAN** is a research fellow at the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography, National Academy of Sciences, Armenia. Her main research interests are the scope of nationalism and ethnicity, cultural heritage, gender studies and food anthropology. One of the recent projects she has been engaged in is 'Daily Nationalism and Ethnicity in Armenia', supported by the Academic Swiss Caucasus Net. As a senior researcher she contributed the edited volume with the chapter on the ties between taste, nationalism and ethnicity. The issue of why seemingly mundane things such as food acquire such huge symbolic burdens, flatter ethnicity and nationalism, become bio-political tools of inclusion and exclusion, symbols of policy and power are discussed in her recent publications and articles. She has also held several international research fellowships on food anthropology, traditional cultural practices, gender issues and education.

**4.2 SATENIK MKRTCHYAN (Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography)****IN SEARCH OF A FOUNDATION MYTH: STATE-BUILDING AND REPRESENTATIONS OF THE EVENTS OF 1988 – 91 IN THE POLITICAL DISCOURSE OF THE REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA**

The memory of events of the late 1980s and early 1990s is important in several ways for Armenia. First, this was the period of the emergence of an independent nation-state on the ruins of the USSR. Then, it was a period in which a totalitarian system of

state socialism was replaced by an (at least in theory) democratic political system and a free market. In the case of Armenia, it was also the period when the largest popular movement in the country's history took place. Finally, it was during these years that the ethnic conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh began to unfold.

Thus, this period is of crucial importance for the newly emerged Armenian state. It has been a subject of debates and conflicting interpretations which have stressed certain aspects of the transition and have downplayed others. In our analysis of the political discourse in post-Soviet Armenia we have identified three main models of representation of the events of 1988–91: (1) the narrative of democratic struggle against a totalitarian regime; (2) the narrative of the struggle of national liberation for independent statehood; (3) the narrative of ethnic conflict with Azerbaijan. During the 1990s, Armenia's post-Soviet elites claimed the country was going through a transition to democracy, the first two narratives being most commonly promoted by the authorities. At the same time, parts of the opposition which often criticized the government from the position of ethnic nationalism emphasized the “ethno-nationalist” narrative. Since the late 1990s, when authoritarian tendencies became more obvious, the government began to gravitate toward the “ethno-nationalist” paradigm. However, the “democratic and “independentist” narratives have not disappeared; elements of these narratives continue to be used in a “ritualistic” fashion by the government, and in more assertive ways by the opposition and non-formal social movements.

---

**SATENIK MKRTCHYAN** is a research fellow at the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography NAS, RA and the Center for Civilizational and Cultural Studies at Yerevan State University. She has more than ten years of experience in program evaluation, social, policy and ethnographic research. She has published articles, chapters of volumes and online publications on ethno-national identity, textbook research, school anthropology, diaspora studies, etc. Over the years of her research experience, Dr. Mkrtchyan has been involved in more than 20 research projects across the Caucasus in cooperation with international organizations and universities, including the ASCN, the Universität Fribourg, the Universität St. Gallen, the World Bank, and the Caucasus Research Resource Center. Dr. Mkrtchyan is a recipient of prestigious research fellowships, such as the Heinrich Böll Foundation's Regional scholarship programme for social scientists, and the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI). Most recently, she successfully designed and implemented two cross-border projects for social science students under the Heinrich Böll Foundation's grant scheme. Dr. Mkrtchyan holds a Doctorate Degree in Anthropology from Tbilisi State University, a Master's degree in Ethnology from Yerevan State University and a Bachelor's Degree in Sociology from the same university. She has also spent substantial time conducting research at the Philipp University of Marburg, Marburg/Lahn (Germany), UC Berkley in the U.S., and the Center for Independent Sociological Research in St. Petersburg, Russia.

#### **4.3 NINO GUGUSHVILI (Center for Social Sciences – CSS) & IRINA OSEPASHVILI (Center for Social Sciences – CSS)**

##### **«WE» AND «OTHER» DICHOTOMY IN THE CONTEXT OF GEORGIAN NATIONAL IDENTITY**

Since the 1990s, Georgia has been undergoing political, social, economic and cultural transformations, partly resulting from its European integration process. Increasing trends of detraditionalization and individualization accompanying the globalization and Europeanization processes in turn affect the construction of national identity.

If at first glance the importance of national borders declines in the context of growing globalization, in fact the nation-state still remains a key marker for social identification. In order for national identity to be shaped, it is crucial to identify oneself with the nation, a “we-group” (in-group) separate from others (the “they-group”, the out-group). However, as alongside the increasing trends of detraditionalization

and individualization human autonomy becomes more important, the groups of various interests and values appear in the political and social arena within the nation-state itself. Some of these groups reflect the value system shared by the majority of the population, while others are perceived as opposed to common values. Accordingly, conflicts arise among them resulting in the marginalization of those that threaten the we-group's homogeneity. In this context, on the one hand our study reveals the peculiarities of Georgian national identity and the value system related to it, while on the other hand it focuses on those value-driven conflicts that cause the exclusion from the national in-group of certain groups which act in the domestic arena. The research shows that the groups that are excluded are mainly represented by ethnic, religious, and sexual minorities and immigrants.

The study is based on the secondary analysis of quantitative data, in particular the Citizenship and National Identity datasets (ISSP 2013–14), as well as qualitative research conducted in the framework of this project. In order to explain the quantitative data and gain more substantial information, focus groups were held with the population of different age groups. In addition, in-depth interviews were conducted with experts in relevant fields as well as various kinds of opinion leaders identified by the experts as influential in shaping and changing popular values. These opinion leaders include politicians and representatives of the media, the Orthodox Christian Church, the education system and the non-governmental sector. To summarize, the main findings reveal the value system on the basis of which Georgian society constructs its national identity, and those unifying and dividing values that create the image of Georgian modernity.

---

**NINO GUGUSHVILI** is a research fellow at the Center for Social Sciences (CSS), where she has been working as an intern since 2014. She holds a Bachelor's degree in psychology and a Master's degree in psychological counselling, assessment and diagnostics, from Ivane Javakishvili Tbilisi State University. In 2010–11 she was a grantee of the German student exchange program "Copernicus" and studied abroad at the Humboldt University Berlin. From 2014 to 2015 she worked at the Ministry of Defence of Georgia as a main specialist at the statistical and analytical unit of the Psychological Monitoring and Evaluation Department. Her research interests and topics include psychological uncertainty and ambiguity, psychopathology, especially personality disorders. Besides the abovementioned topics, she is interested in national identity, gender-related topics, consumer behavior and education policies.

**IRINA OSEPASHVILI** has cooperated with the Center for Social Sciences since 2012. She obtained her BA in Social Sciences, majoring in Psychology, from Tbilisi State University (2005–09) and her MA in Peace and Conflict Studies from the University of Oslo (2010–12). Her main research interests include: national identity and nationalism, values and attitudes, the nature of "othering" – stereotypes and prejudice, cultural aspects of Europeanization, civil society. She is currently involved in two ASCN-funded projects: "Georgian National Identity: Conflict and Integration" and "Performing Europeanisation – Political vis-a-vis Popular Discourses on Europeanisation in Georgia". As a researcher she has also participated in national minority-related projects such as studying the socio-economic situation of national minorities in Georgia as well as researching Georgians' attitudes towards national minorities. She has also assisted with the project "Democratization and the Nationalist Media: A Path to Civil Conflict". Together with Armenian partners Irina was involved in two projects: "Studying the perceptions about Armenia's and Georgia's policy towards each other among two states' youth" and "Armenian-Georgian Relations: Challenges and Opportunities for Bilateral Cooperation". On the basis of the those projects Irina has produced two publications: "The Role of Civil Society and People-to-people Contacts in Strengthening the Bilateral Relations", in Armenian-Georgian Relations: Challenges and Opportunities for the Bilateral Cooperation, Political Science Association of Armenia, Center of Social Sciences, Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, Yerevan, 2014; and "Georgian Youth's Stereotypes about Armenians", in The Perceptions about Armenia's and Georgia's Policy Towards Each Other among two State's Youth. Myths and Reality. Armenian-Georgian Relations: Challenges and Opportunities for the Bilateral Cooperation, Centre for Social Sciences and the Political Science Association of Armenia in cooperation with the Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, Yerevan, 2015.



**4.4 ANA KIRVALIDZE (Ilia State University)  
& NINO RCHEULISHVILI (Ilia State University)**

**«THERE ARE 'TWO STALINS' ON MY MIND»:  
HOW DO PEOPLE DEAL WITH DIFFERENT IMAGES OF STALIN?**

Scientific studies of the current decade have observed an ambiguous attitude towards Stalin in the post-Soviet space. The surveys from 2012, conducted in four post-Soviet countries, indicate that even people who acknowledge Stalin's role in repressions and the deaths of millions believe that he was a wise leader (de Waal, 2013). Respondents report to have mixed feelings towards this historical figure; they associate both respect and fear with his name and this trend remains constant through the years (Lipman et al. 2013; Levada Center 2016). The "Stalin puzzle" is considered unsolved to this day. I use qualitative data from 32 in-depth interviews and 16 focus group discussions conducted in the framework of the project "Passing or Failing the Stalin Test? Analyzing Contemporary Perceptions of Stalin in Georgia" to present a rather detailed, rich account of how people understand and relate to Stalin. The paper examines the intertwining of language and memory and discusses how it might work in favor of Stalin in everyday speech, where people are often unreflective in their language use. I adopt techniques of qualitative content analysis to identify words and attributes which are used more frequently to describe Stalin as a person and as a political leader. Those words are further analyzed in relation to each context they are found in across the interviews. I highlight some typical word combinations, phrases and elaborate narrative figures associated with Stalin. Some of them have explicitly positive meaning, while others have ambiguous connotations. Both types contribute to the formation of the image of Stalin as a charismatic and mysterious person.

---

**ANA KIRVALIDZE** works at Ilia State University as an Associate Professor of Sociology and is a leader of the ASCN-funded project: "Passing or Failing the Stalin Test? Analyzing Contemporary Perceptions in Stalin in Georgia". Since last year she has worked as a post-doctoral fellow on the issues of National identity and Collective memory at the Humboldt University of Berlin. She has published academic papers on the issue of national identity and memory in post-Soviet Georgia in the journals: Identity Studies and Nationalities Papers.

**NINO RCHEULISHVILI** is a doctoral student of Sociology at Ilia State University. Since 2012 Nino has participated in research projects and taught a research methods course at the same university. Her research interests lie at the intersection of the Sociology of Consumption, the Sociology of Knowledge and Gender Studies. In the framework of her PhD project she is currently studying the discourses of "proper cooking" enacted by culinary TV shows. Nino is part of the ASCN-funded project "Passing or Failing the Stalin Test? Analyzing Contemporary Perceptions of Stalin in Georgia".

**4.5 ALISA DATUNASHVILI (Tbilisi State University)**

**INFORMAL NATION-BUILDING IN MUSEUMS:  
THE CASE OF THE GEORGIAN NATIONAL MUSEUM**

Newly established nations, according to Anderson (1983), seem prone to inheriting the tradition of political museums from their colonial ancestors. Post-Soviet Georgia is no exception and its National Museum can be regarded as a container of the official discourse of the Georgian political elites with regards to identity formation in the country. Based mainly on ethnographic approaches, in particular participant observation, in-depth interviews with managers, guides, educators and curators and analysis of guides' narratives, the aim of this paper is to explore the way the Georgian National Museum contributes to the construction of a narrative on Georgian national identity. I will look at the museum as a space for the production, renegotiation and perpetuation of certain attributes of Georgian national identity such as homeland myths (Smith et al. 1998)

The Georgian National Museum was established in 2004 on the basis of five large museums created by the Russian empire in Georgia. Georgia's "Rose Revolution" has

meant a radical change in its conception and exhibitions, leading to a political controversy. On the one hand, the museum has, since 2004, been conceived as a place to demonstrate Georgia's modernity and rupture with the past. On the other hand, this has been perceived as a challenge, or even a threat, to Georgian traditional values and "Georgianness". Rooted in the above debate, this paper will explore the contrasting narratives about the museum and its function in the renegotiation of Georgian identity.

---

**ALISA DATUNASHVILI** gained her first Bachelor's degree in German Philology in 1999 at Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University. In 2003 she received a diploma with honors in International Economic Relations from the Georgian Humanitarian-Technical University. In March 2005 she was hired as a consultant to the General Director of the Georgian National Museum. After professional training in museum management she was promoted to head of the Collections Management and Registration Division. Work experience at the Georgian National Museum provoked her interest in further research and in 2013 she received her Master's degree with honors in Ethnology at Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University. Currently she holds the position of Manager of Collections Registration and the Management Division at the Georgian National Museum. At the same time she is a Ph.D. student at Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University's Anthropology program. Her major research interest is representations of national identities in state museums.

#### 4.6 **ALLA MARCHENKO** (Taras Shevchenko National University, Kyiv)

##### **ON RELIGION AND RELIGIOSITY IN POLITICS: PUBLIC DECLARATIONS OF UKRAINIAN TOP POLITICIANS**

This research seeks to unveil the dynamic and static aspects of the public agenda of Ukraine's top politicians related to their attachment to religion and religiosity. In particular, I will focus on the positions of the president, the prime-minister and the speaker of the parliament of Ukraine from 1991-2016, but other positions will also be included in the analysis (while selection is based on the popularity of certain personalities within a certain period of time).

Key questions of this research refer to the possible shifts in Ukraine's public agenda either to the more or less religious pole, the expansion or reduction of the Orthodox Christian vision of the religious field as a politically and socially accepted one. Sociological data (Kyiv International Institute of Sociology, Razumkov Centre, etc.) show complex tendencies in terms of both secularization and the rethinking of the role of religion among different status groups in Ukraine. However, top politicians form a special group which is influenced by and influences existing social trends.

In my analysis I will focus on public speeches of politicians on their official pages and in the media delivered on the eve of major Ukrainian secular holidays and special occasions (e.g. inaugural speeches), as well as media reports about their activities connected with religious holidays. I will use both content and critical discourse analysis to distinguish and analyze the patterns of public presentations of the attachment of Ukraine's top politicians to the religious field during different periods of the country's independence. How diverse or homogenous are these presentations and what meanings do they convey for understanding contemporary Ukraine's religious identity? Conclusions will be made in the wider context of social transformations and nation-building in Ukraine.

---

**ALLA MARCHENKO** is an Associate Professor of the Department of Methodology and Methods of Sociological Research, Faculty of Sociology, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (Kyiv, Ukraine). She is a Candidate of Sociological Sciences (equivalent to a Ph.D. in Sociology). Her current academic interests include Comparative Research, Historical Sociology, Civic Engagement in Ukraine, Jewish Heritage in Ukraine, and Hasidic Pilgrimages in Ukraine. She was a Carnegie Research Fellow at New York University (USA) in 2015-16, where she worked on the topic of the Hasidic Pilgrimages to Uman, Ukraine. She is the author of more than 30 publications and numerous conference reports.

#### 4.7 NINO ABZIANIDZE (University of Zurich)

##### **NATIONALIST DISCOURSE AS A NETWORK: ANALYZING NATIONALIST APPEALS IN GEORGIAN PRINT MEDIA USING SNA**

The literature on civil conflict has largely reached a consensus on the argument that democratization can bear risks of violent conflict among actors who have stakes in this process. While nationalist discourse in the media has been identified as a crucial factor driving the causal chain from democratization to a civil conflict, few studies analyze it in a systematic (quantitative) manner. Therefore we lack the knowledge about the constellation of actors around this rhetoric, about the relationship between actors and categories of nationalism used in their discourse and about the dynamics of this rhetoric across the democratization period. The present paper addresses this gap by proposing an innovative way of measuring the structure of nationalist discourse in media content using the method of social network analysis (SNA). The main argument is that SNA (specifically, the measures of in/out-degree centrality and structural equivalence) can provide very useful tools for identifying the structure of the nationalist discourse and its dynamics. Questions addressed include: who are the central actors pursuing exclusionary nationalist discourse; who are the central actors against whom this rhetoric is pursued; is there a certain kind of regularity in the discursive interaction between/among actors on the one hand and in the use of exclusionary categories by different actors on the other; how sharply is the us/them divide structured along ethnic lines and most importantly does this structure of the discourse changes over the course of the democratization period, and if so, how? The study is based on extensive quantitative semi-automated content analysis of the Georgian print media (1991–2013). The original codebook used in the analysis comprises a fine-grained list of actors across all the case-relevant ethnic groups allowing for the detailed study of the structure and dynamics of the nationalist discourse during democratization in Georgia.

---

**NINO ABZIANIDZE** is a doctoral student and research assistant / lecturer at the NCCR Democracy, Department of Political Science, University of Zurich. She did her BA and MA studies at Tbilisi State University. In Georgia she has taught History to primary and high school students, worked as a journalist for two English-language newspapers and participated in a number of media monitoring projects. In her PhD dissertation she deals with the question of whether increased political participation during the democratization period has led to intensified exclusionary and hostile nationalism in media content. The thesis proposes an innovative way of measuring the extent of the nationalist discourse in media content using the method of social network analysis. Nino's principle research interests include but are not limited to political communication, media research, ethnic and non-ethnic civil conflicts, nationalism, democratization and transition, content analysis, social network analysis. In 2015, supported by a grant awarded by the Swiss National Science Foundation, she spent 6 months as a visiting student at the School of Media and Communication, University of Leeds.

**PANEL 5:****SPACES, DIVERSITY, RELIGION****5.1 SARHAT PETROSYAN** (National University of Architecture and Construction of Armenia)**POST-SOVIET URBAN LANDSCAPE OF YEREVAN**

Yerevan's landscape, like most cities in the world, has changed dramatically during the last 25 years, in particular as a result of post-Soviet Armenia's socio-political shifts. Although these urban transformations were and still are largely discussed in local media, there is not enough research and writing on this process and its circumstances. This article seeks to cover some aspects of these transformations from 1991 to 2016, focussing more on urban planning and aspects of policy.

This year the Republic of Armenia celebrates the 25th anniversary of its independence. This symbolic moment is a good opportunity to look back and understand the transformation of the Armenian landscape, in particular in urbanized areas of the country. Following an invitation to curate the National Pavilion of Armenia at the 15<sup>th</sup> Venice Architecture Biennale, my proposal entitled Independent Landscape was to map this transformation and showcase it at this world-class architectural event.

Shifts in the political system from a centralized-Soviet to a democratic-open market that occurred in many areas of Eastern Europe and the post-Soviet zone were the main challenges for this process. In the case of Armenia, there were several other turning points that make the urban transformation a unique case for consideration. Another aspect of post-independence development is the "urban architecture" of Yerevan. Strongly influenced by narratives and stylistic approaches from Alexander Tamanian's Yerevan, this instance became an important aspect of the independent nation's capital that together with rapid developments in Central Yerevan in the early 2000s resulted in the current urban coil.

---

**SARHAT PETROSYAN** is the founding director of the Yerevan-based urban environmental think tank urbanlab. He holds an M.S. degree in Architecture and a Ph.D. in Urban Planning from the National University of Architecture and Construction of Armenia, where he has been an Associate Professor in the Chair of Urban Planning since 2004. He has been an elected board member of the Union of Architects of Armenia since 2011. Sarhat has been a consultant for and cooperated with several local and international organizations working in the field of landscape protection and urban development, including the Council of Europe, the European Union, the World Bank Group, the Armenian Government, the OSCE, etc. He was involved in urban activism for more than a decade, trying to enhance and improve decision-making processes by promoting inclusiveness and transparency. His fields of interest are urban design qualities and policies on urban development. He is the author of more than fifteen publications and several articles and papers.

**5.2 JOSEPH SALUKVADZE** (Tbilisi State University) & **HARUTYUN VERMISHYAN** (Yerevan State University)**CHANGING SOCIO-SPATIAL PATTERNS OF HOUSING DEVELOPMENT IN THE POST-SOVIET SOUTH CAUCASUS: CASES OF TBILISI AND YEREVAN**

The proposed paper examines the dynamics of housing development in selected cities of the South Caucasus. Housing development and housing infrastructure has been a main driver of spatial growth in most large Soviet cities, including Tbilisi and Yerevan, that have yet to deal with the housing crisis caused by rapid population, economic and spatial growth. Soviet-era housing infrastructure, despite being projected as egalitarian, was not 'created equal'. Although an overall provision of utilities, public open spaces, social facilities and other infrastructure was considered similar

and based on a standard, certain disparities have been revealed from district to district in terms of better / worse geographic location of housing units and residential estates, the quality and quantity of living space, the design and arrangement of public spaces and, sometimes, the provision of basic utilities and communal services. Transition brought immense changes both to the physical infrastructure and the social content of housing. The shift brought about by the very peculiar post-Soviet transition affected patterns of mobility, residential perceptions and attitudes towards housing infrastructure. The overwhelming process of privatization of housing along with cardinal changes in infrastructure and utility provision patterns, as well as the deregulation of building rules and de-statization of building maintenance services, resulted in the significant transformation of housing units and housing landscapes. Based on material collected from in-depth interviews, we analyze perceptions of physical changes in housing infrastructure, residential neighborhoods and the social composition of selected housing estates in Tbilisi and Yerevan. The article presents a comparative perspective on the narratives about privatization, the loss (and rebuilding) of the commune and peculiarities of infrastructural changes in the communal microcosm. The focus will be on building maintenance, provision of basic utilities, arrangement of public / collective spaces and parking facilities in transformed housing estates. Several trends and changing patterns of housing landscapes in the context of physical design (planning and building architectural solutions) and their socio-cultural composition will be examined.

---

**JOSEPH SALUKVADZE** graduated from Tbilisi State University (TSU), Faculty of Geography and Geology, as an economic geographer in 1979; he was awarded his PhD in 1985. He currently holds the positions of Vice Rector of TSU and Full Professor of Human Geography, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences. He is a Visiting Professor at the Technical University of Munich, Germany. In 1991 - 92 he was a Swedish Institute research fellow at Stockholm and Lund Universities, Sweden. In 1998 - 99 he was a Fulbright scholar at Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), USA, and from 1994 to 2007 he was a deputy team leader of the "Land Management Project" for Tbilisi, and the "Cadastre and Land Registration Project" for Georgia, financed by the German government (GIZ and KfW). As an expert on urban and land policy issues, he systematically co-operates with the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank, UN Habitat and other international agencies. Professor Salukvadze is a vice president of the Geographic Society of Georgia, a member of the Association of American Geographers (AAG) and serves on the editorial boards of 3 international scientific journals. He has published 3 monographs and more than 50 journal articles. His fields of scientific interest are urban geography and town planning, land policy and land use, cultural geography, and GIS application in social sciences.

**HARUTYUN VERMISHYAN** was born in 1983 in Yerevan. He is a candidate of sociological sciences. He has eleven years of work experience at national and international research organizations. He has been a member of Yerevan State University, Faculty of Sociology, Department of Theory and History of Sociology, since 2005. His research interests lie in the fields of the history and theory of sociology, identity research and urban sociology. Harutyun is the author of more than ten articles, two monographs and a handbook of Armenian sociology.

### 5.3 **DAVID GOGISHVILI** (Gran Sasso Science Institute)

#### **BAKU CITY CIRCUIT: EXPLORING THE TEMPORARY SPACES OF EXCEPTION**

Formula One races have become a vital part of the mega-event industry. More countries are now ready to contribute millions of dollars to guarantee the hosting rights to this Grand Prix that lasts for only three days and runs annually for a decade. Since 2016, Azerbaijan has become one such hosting nation, as the 'Baku City Circuit' has become the newest addition to the F1 calendar. Organized in the historic core of the capital city of Baku, a UNESCO World Heritage site, it has brought transformation in physical and regulatory terms by imposing intense temporary regulations to meet the criteria set by F1. The result has been severe disruption to the local population's daily practices not only in the areas of the race but also in its surroundings

for weeks on end. This has included limited access to various parts of the city that became strictly regulated for (high-spending) ticket-holders only. Via the 'Baku City Circuit' case study, the paper explores the role urban large events play in transforming a city both temporarily and in the long term. This work is based on on-site observations carried out between 15 and 22 June 2016, combined with analysis of literature on mega-events, document reviews, and interviews with local stakeholders. As one of the core events in recent years, the regulations and restrictions imposed on the city are becoming increasingly important. The paper explores these processes and their implications using Giorgio Agamben's theory on 'the state of exception'. The paper argues that this race and other similar events produce 'spaces of exception' by imposing temporary regulations tailored towards the needs of event rights holders and their financial partners, as well as local elites normalizing the exceptional procedures and converting them into ordinary practices for future events. They disregard the needs of the local population whose lifestyles are disrupted and excluded from the urban realm.

---

**DAVID GOGISHVILI** was born in Tbilisi, Georgia. He studied human geography at Tbilisi State University, Department of Human Geography, where he received both BA and MA degrees before continuing his studies at Stockholm University, where he gained a master's degree in urban and regional planning. In 2013 he joined a newly established international Ph.D. programme in Urban Studies in L'Aquila (Italy) at the Gran Sasso Science Institute. For his doctorate, David is conducting research on mega-events and the exceptional planning practices triggered by them, with particular focus on the cases of Glasgow, Baku and Tbilisi. His academic interests involve studying the role of events in urban transformations, states and spaces of exception, and forced migration. David is also involved in a research project on doctoral student perspectives on the internationalization of higher education. David has more than five years of work experience in geographic information systems and open-source mapping technologies.

#### 5.4 **GIORGI SORDIA** (University of Georgia)

##### **GEORGIA'S NATION-BUILDING POLICY AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY**

The aim of this paper is to discuss Georgia's ethnic diversity and analyze the state of minority-related politics from a nation-building perspective. Managing and accommodating cultural diversity has emerged as one of the key challenges for current Georgian statehood. Issues of national minority civil integration and enhanced participation in public life formally are some of the most important aspects of nation-building, indicating significant improvement in ethnic diversity governance and the introduction of adequate mechanisms for minority-related policy management. Moreover, the country has undertaken a number of international commitments in the field of minority policy, including signing and ratifying the Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities.

Nevertheless, this paper argues that nation-building in Georgia lacks consistency in the area of minority inclusion and participation, which have not been fully embraced by the general nation-building process. The paper identifies two factors: the Soviet legacy, which made national minorities in Georgia isolated, and Georgian ethno-nationalism of the early 1990s, which had a significant effect on the formation of post-Soviet Georgian identity. The paper concludes that the combination of these two factors has challenged the nation-building process in Georgia, which during the first years of post-Soviet independence was based on ethno-centric approaches, while recently a new form of Georgian nationalism has developed, based on religious motives.

---

**GIORGI SORDIA** holds a PhD from Tbilisi State University. He is an Associate Professor at the University of Georgia (UG) and teaches on a number of disciplines in political sciences and international relations. He is also a founder and director of the Center for the Studies of Ethnicity and Multiculturalism (CSEM). His major fields of expertise are ethnicity studies, religion and cultural diversity.

## 5.5 SAHIB JAFAROV (Center for Strategic Studies, Baku)

### THE UPSURGE OF RELIGION: REPLACEMENT OF ETHNIC WITH RELIGIOUS IDENTITY IN THE NORTHERN RE- GIONS OF AZERBAIJAN?

After the collapse of the Soviet atheistic regime, Azerbaijan, as a noteworthy example of a secular and multi-ethnic country, faced critical clashes which destabilized its development in building civic nationalism in its early independence period. Explicitly, confrontation between Armenians and Azerbaijanis, economic disaster, and the post-Soviet ideological vacuum in social and moral life triggered ethnic conflicts in various regions of the country, including the North. In particular, ethnic separatist inclination was significantly higher among the Lazgi ethnic group rather than any other. The Lezgin National Movement, “Sadval” (Unity) was the main ethno-political institutional body, targeting the establishment of a united entity over the bordering Lezgin-populated regions of the Azerbaijan Republic and the Russian Federation. The post-Soviet economic and ideological collapse and a large number of IDPs and refugees significantly encouraged foreign religious-oriented foundations to penetrate the country within a few years. Furthermore, the assertive religious policy of the Soviet regime and the post-Soviet religious ideological gap among the people caused the sudden revival of religion in the country, particularly in the North regions. Additionally, the wars in Chechnya also considerably boosted the rise of religiosity in the region. It is still a blurred question how religion / Islamic identity will motivate people living in those regions to retain the secular features and the unity of the state.

The core aim of this paper is to understand the process of replacing ethnic with religious identity and the role of the state in managing ethnic and religious issues. Moreover, the article also tackles the following areas of interest: (a) a brief background on the origin of the ethnic and religious polity in the North part of Azerbaijan; (b) a critical assessment of the efficiency of these ethnic and religious policies in the face of clashes; and (d) ethno-religious separatism and diversity management in the North. As the main source of my research, I will use mixed qualitative research methods combining document analysis of official documents – Constitution, laws, public statements and political announcements – and semi-structured interviews with people influenced by this polity. I am also planning to employ historical, sociological and political institutional frameworks to understand the religious and ethnic identity formation process in the North of Azerbaijan.

---

**SAHIB JAFAROV** has been a leading research fellow at the Center for Strategic Studies (CSS) since 2011 and is currently also a consultant to the Asian Development Bank. He has managed projects focussing on particularly politically sensitive demographic groups, such as youth, the middle class, and religious segments. Mr. Jafarov has conducted and coordinated research projects such as “Islam in Azerbaijan”, “The Salafi Movement and Their Socio-Political Claims in Azerbaijan”, “Youth Participation in Political Parties and Youth Organizations in Azerbaijan”, “The Middle Class in Azerbaijan” etc. He was previously an adjunct professor at the University of Languages. He facilitated lectures on a variety of topics, including National Security, Diplomatic Etiquette, Geopolitics etc. He also managed the “Research Council” research center for three years before working at the CSS. Sahib has diverse experience of social survey and media monitoring as head of the unit at Insight Promotions LLC. He is a graduate of the Academy of Public Administration, Baku State University, and King’s College, London.

## 5.6 EKATERINE CHITANAVA (Tolerance and Diversity Institute – TDI)

### THE STATE’S PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT OF THE GEORGIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH AND RELIGIOUS POLICY TOWARDS MINORITIES

The Georgian Orthodox Church is a dominant religious organization, enjoying financial, legal and social benefits in Georgia, while other religious minorities systematically

experience intolerant and unequal treatment. The problems that religious minority groups in Georgia are facing today stem from legislative barriers as well as the discriminatory practice of the state institutions and authorities.

While the state's religious policy is based on the strategy of obtaining political legitimacy from the dominant group, minorities are often seen from the perspective of security and control. Hence in recent years the state's policy regarding the protection of religious freedom has encouraged crimes motivated by religious hatred towards minorities and an intolerant environment in Georgia.

---

**EKATERINE CHITANAVA** is a director of the Tbilisi-based non-governmental organization Tolerance and Diversity Institute (TDI). At the TDI she has been managing different projects on advocacy of human rights, particularly religious and ethnic minorities, since 2013. From 2009 to 2011 Ms. Chitanava worked as a journalist for the Georgian weekly analytical magazine *Liberali*. From 2010 to 2012 she wrote for *Transitions Online* magazine, which focuses on political and social issues in former communist countries of Europe and Central Asia. From 2011 to 2012 she produced short documentaries about religious and ethnic minorities for the Tolerance Centre under the auspices of the Public Defender. Apart from working for the TDI, currently she writes articles for several international media outlets. Ms. Chitanava holds degrees in Social Studies from Tbilisi State University, in Journalism and Media Management from the Georgian Institute of Public Affairs (GIPA) and in Social Anthropology from Central European University (Budapest, Hungary).

## 5.7 **SMBAT HAKOBYAN** (Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography)

### **FUNERALS IN ARMENIA: WESTERN PATTERN OR «NATIONAL» TRADITION?**

During the last several years public discussion of contemporary Armenian funerals has stressed the question of the Western, global or national Armenian character of these rituals. In particular the national argument accuses the Western (European and/or American) world's influence of spoiling the "national traditions". On the other hand, modernizers opt for Western "civilized funerals" and fight against "local" ritual traditions.

The study of these discourses based on discourse analysis theory and methods supplied by Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe (Marianne Jorgensen, Louise Phillips 2002) shows that people argue with each other based on mythical notions of what should be called national or Western. Those who assert that we need to renew funeral rituals on the basis of the examples from Western countries generalize Western forms of funerals as something homogenous; they don't take into consideration various forms of funerals practiced in Western countries. This discourse shows how globalization creates an image of Western funerals based on the consumption of Western paraphernalia used in the funeral rituals presented in Hollywood films (Ritzer 2004). On the other hand, those who try to protect "national" values in the "traditional" funerals use as a basis their own experience and "ideal" forms of the rituals which they have observed during their life rather than some actually preserved ancient tradition. Mostly these people are trying to create a new form of the tradition (Hobsbawm, Ranger 1983) in opposition to the globalized funeral industry.

---

**SMBAT HAKOBYAN** graduated from Yerevan State University, Department of Ethnography and is currently a PhD student in the Institute of Archaeology and Ethnography, Department of Contemporary Anthropological Studies, where he also works as junior researcher. The topic of his dissertation is funeral ritual; in particular, he focuses on discourses concerning funerals. Beside funerals, he is also interested in religions, science theory and methodology, sociolinguists etc. He has participated in international scientific events such as summer schools, conferences, seminars and fieldwork.



## 5.8 KAMAL GASIMOV (Center for Strategic Studies)

### **FITNA: THE STRUGGLE FOR AUTHORITY AMONG SALAFI NETWORKS IN THE POST-SOVIET SPACE**

This paper focuses on social, political and theological aspects of the struggle for religious authority among post-Soviet Salafi groups (quietist / non-militant and jihadi / militant). In particular the Gramscian approach explains the theological and doctrinal disagreements as a struggle for hegemonic religious authority and influence over community. The empirical sources stem from qualitative content analysis of the debates accessible on the internet, from interviews with imams and community members, and from expert interviews.

In more detail, the paper will analyse the local and trans-national dimension of these internal conflicts and show that these conflicts are intertwined with domestic politics. Local forms of Salafism are interconnected with global Salafi transnational movements and the key centers of Salafi knowledge and power. In their struggle for religious authority, local shaikhs or “seekers of knowledge” turn to prominent Salafi scholars from Saudi Arabia, Egypt and other countries for support. Furthermore, post-Soviet Salafi leaders have become transnational cross-border shaikhs invited to preach in various cities of Russia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Ukraine and Kazakhstan. Thus, expanding their hegemony and contesting religious authority in Eurasia, post-Soviet Salafi leaders not only preach in their local languages, but also open websites in and translate their sermons into Russian, the lingua franca of the post-Soviet space. Thus the Russian language is becoming an important element in the struggle for authority. The common perception of the so-called threat of Wahabis in their local societies and secularist politics forces both groups to adapt to the local social framework.

---

**KAMAL GASIMOV** is a researcher at the Center for Strategic Studies under the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan, specializing in Islamic social movements and contemporary Islamic thought, with a focus on political theorizing. His research has concentrated on Salafism, particularly its quietist trends and their interaction with Islamists or jihadis, the transnationalization of Salafism and its connection with local (post-Soviet) actors, and Islamic legal theories. Geographically, his interests lie primarily in contemporary Islamic groups in Syria, Iraq and the Gulf countries. He is the author of 30 academic articles, two book chapters and 5 book translations. Kamal Gasimov is fluent in Russian, English, Arabic and Persian.

## 5.9 KRISTINE MARGVELASHVILI (Center for Social Sciences – CSS)

### **ROLE OF ORTHODOX CHURCH IN THE POLITICAL PROCESS AND ELECTIONS IN GEORGIA**

Following the collapse of the USSR, the Orthodox Church has been formed as a strong entity and filled the space that a weak state was not able to. Although, after the Rose Revolution of 2003, political institutions started to strengthen, they were not able to regain trust, and even today, based on the IRI poll conducted in March–April 2016, we can see that the Georgian Orthodox Church enjoys the highest level of trust among all other institutions in Georgia.

The Georgian case can be well described by the normative theory of Symphonia, which was a pattern, a sort of tradition depicting harmonious Church-state relations in the Byzantine Empire. We must agree that cultural characteristics, the mixture of European and Asian traditions and also the tangible and yet still developing political system and institutions affect the way the dominant religious power in Georgia interacts with the government and vice versa. Political parties tend to use religious affiliation to affect the electorate, although this is a taboo topic in Georgia and both parties and the Church deny existing cooperation.

This paper explores the role of the Georgian Orthodox Church in the ongoing political processes in Georgia, emphasizing the particular importance of the formal and informal channels of communication between the Church, the government and political parties, studying the influence the Church has on election results, particularly on the 2012 election, when a change of government occurred. Qualitative research methods have been used in order to describe how the political elite evaluates the influence the Church has on political processes in Georgia. Overall, 25 interviews have been conducted with political elites, representatives of major political parties and experts as well as bishops, priests and archbishops. The study is funded by the ASCN and the TTF fund of the Open Society Institute.

---

**KRISTINE MARGVELASHVILI** holds a Bachelor of Arts in Social Sciences and International Relations from Ivane Javakishvili Tbilisi State University (Tbilisi, Georgia) and an MA in Black Sea Studies from the International Hellenic University (Thessaloniki, Greece) in the framework of the Erasmus Mundus Master's scholarship. Since July 2014 Kristine has worked as a Junior Research Fellow at the Center for Social Sciences in Tbilisi, Georgia. She is a researcher and co-author of a research report on The Perceptions about Armenia's and Georgia's Policy towards Each Other among Two States' Youth. Myths and Reality funded by the Friedrich Ebert Foundation and published by the Political Science Association of Armenia. Kristina is also one of the authors of the public policy section in the Dictionary-Guidebook of Social Sciences: Psychology, Gender, Applied Statistics, Public Policy and Administration funded by the Shota Rustaveli National Sciences foundation and implemented by the CSS. She is a researcher and co-author of a policy paper on "Election Systems and National Minorities" as part of the NIMD project "Strengthening the participation of national minorities in the political life of Georgia" funded by the OSCE-HCNM. From November 2015 until July 2016 Kristina was involved in the ASCN research project on "Religion, Society and Politics" implemented by the Caucasus Institute for Peace, Democracy and Development in the framework of the Open Society Foundation's Think Tank Fund's program for Young Professionals. She wrote a paper on "The role of the Orthodox Church in the political processes and elections in Georgia", which will be presented at the final ASCN conference. Her research interests are: dynamics of interaction between political and social institutions in Georgia; foreign policy, political elites and conflict transformation in Georgia; patterns of Church-state relations in the post-Soviet space. She speaks Georgian, English, Russian and French.

## ABOUT ASCN



AN INITIATIVE OF GEBERT RÜF STIFTUNG IN COOPERATION  
WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF FRIBOURG

The ASCN is a programme aimed at promoting the social sciences and humanities in the South Caucasus (primarily Georgia and Armenia). Its different activities foster the emergence of a new generation of talented scholars. Promising junior researchers receive support through research projects, capacity-building training and scholarships. The programme emphasizes the advancement of individuals who, thanks to their ASCN experience, become better integrated into international academic networks. The ASCN programme is coordinated and operated by the Interfaculty Institute for Central and Eastern Europe (IICEE) at the University of Fribourg (Switzerland). It is initiated and supported by the Gebert Rüt Stiftung.

[www.ascn.ch](http://www.ascn.ch), [info@ascn.ch](mailto:info@ascn.ch)

### HEADQUARTERS

University of Fribourg  
Interfaculty Institute for Central and Eastern Europe (IICEE)  
Bd de Pérolles 90, Office G304  
1700 Fribourg, Switzerland  
[www.unifr.ch](http://www.unifr.ch)

- **NICOLAS HAYOZ**, Programme Director, [nicolas.hayoz@unifr.ch](mailto:nicolas.hayoz@unifr.ch)
- **TAMARA BRUNNER**, Programme Manager, [tamara.brunner@unifr.ch](mailto:tamara.brunner@unifr.ch)
- **DANIEL MUELLER**, Programme Assistant, [daniel.mueller2@unifr.ch](mailto:daniel.mueller2@unifr.ch)

### LOCAL COORDINATION UNITS

ASCN Coordination – Georgia  
Ilia State University  
3 / 5, Kakutsa Cholokashvili Ave. (Room F202)  
Tbilisi, Georgia, 0162  
<https://iliauni.edu.ge>

- **TIKO KADAGISHVILI**, Local Coordinator, [tiko\\_kadagishvili@iliauni.edu.ge](mailto:tiko_kadagishvili@iliauni.edu.ge)
- **TAMAR KUMSIASHVILI**, Local Assistant, [tamar.kumsiashvili.1@iliauni.edu.ge](mailto:tamar.kumsiashvili.1@iliauni.edu.ge)
- **GIGA ZEDANIA**, Advisor, Rector of Ilia State University, [giga\\_zedania@iliauni.edu.ge](mailto:giga_zedania@iliauni.edu.ge)

ASCN Coordination – Armenia  
Caucasus Institute  
31 / 4 Charents  
0025 Yerevan, Armenia  
<http://c-i.am>

- **SERGEY MINASYAN**, Local Coordinator, [sergey@c-i.am](mailto:sergey@c-i.am)
- **MARINA SARYAN**, Local Assistant, [marina@c-i.am](mailto:marina@c-i.am)

### SCIENTIFIC BOARD

- **ROY ALLISON**, Professor of Russian and Eurasian International Relations, School of Interdisciplinary Area Studies, University of Oxford, [roy.allison@area.ox.ac.uk](mailto:roy.allison@area.ox.ac.uk)
- **JONATHAN WHEATLEY**, Lecturer at Oxford Brookes University, [jwheatley@brookes.ac.uk](mailto:jwheatley@brookes.ac.uk)
- **GIANNI D'AMATO**, Professor, University of Neuchâtel (Switzerland), [gianni.damato@unine.ch](mailto:gianni.damato@unine.ch)
- **FRANÇOIS RUEGG**, Professor, University of Fribourg (Switzerland), [francois.ruegg@unifr.ch](mailto:francois.ruegg@unifr.ch)
- **NICOLAS HAYOZ**, Professor, University of Fribourg (Director of the ASCN programme), [nicolas.hayoz@unifr.ch](mailto:nicolas.hayoz@unifr.ch)

