

Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Department Of Sociological And Political Sciences

Laura Kutubidze

Main Social-Political Aspects of Georgian Press in 2000-2005

(Short version)

**Dissertation report
for
receiving academic degree - PH D. In Journalism**

**Report is developed in Ivane Javakhishvili
Tbilisi State University**

**Scientific instructor,
PH D. In Journalism,
Professor Marina Vekua**

Tbilisi

2009

Content:

Introduction;

I chapter – Several General Specifications for Characterization of essence of Mass Media and Georgian Mass Media;

- **About the Mass Communication and Mass Media;**
- **The General Specifications of Georgian Mass Media in Millennium;**

II chapter – Country from the Prism of Georgian Media;

- **Image of the Country;**
- **West or Russia? (problematic aspects of State orientation);**
- **Several Aspects of the Topic of External Policy ;**
- **“Informational Guarantee” of Destabilization ;**

III chapter – Elections and the Political Spectrum;

- **Elections of President, 2000 Year and Local Elections, 2002 Year;**
- **Permanent Election Regime, 2003 Year;**
- **Elections of Parliament and President, 2004 Year ;**
- **Elections in Post-revolution Adjara;**

IV chapter - “Rose Revolution” and Post-revolutionary Period;

V chapter - Georgian Mass Media on the Visit of US President George Bush to Georgia;

Conclusion;

STATE.

Introduction

The dissertation report mainly is based on printed media of 2000-2005, (newspapers – “Alia”, “Resonansi”, “24 Saati”, “Dilis Gazeti”, “Akhali Taoba”, “Kviris Palitra”, “Akhali Versia”, “Kviris Qronika”, “Georgian Times”, “Mtavari Gazeti”, “Dro”, “Droni”, “Akhali Epoqa”, “Saqartvelos Respublika”, “Khvalindeli Dge”, “Asaval-Dasavali”, “Meridiani”, “Akhali Meridiani”, “7 Dge”, “Akhali 7 Dge”, “Martali Gazeti”, “Ganaxlebuli Iveria”; Magazines – “Arili”, “Imigi”, “Sarke”, “Tbiliselebi”) and on related literature.

Our media, unfortunately, does not give an opportunity to separate sharply the **social-political** and **gutter** publications from each other, or to call some publication **authoritative, influential, academic, solid** (in this situation we mean not the professional level of any publication, but its circulation, spreading area and other parameters as well, which in general creates the public attitude towards the media).

The purpose and subject of our dissertation was not implementation of such research, but we emphasize our attention on this issue as far as we needed identify criteria for classification of the publications for analysis – according to their relation and relations and compliance to social and political topics. Social and political theme was chosen as such criteria (surely it does not concern all of them equally); As for the definition – **“the publications, which create informational “weather”**”, which we frequently use in our report, already means not all of abovementioned, more than 20 publications, but also those, which even for some period were in the first tenth of the rating and had an advantage of having influence on public with creation of proper informational picture. As **“leaders of media”** are acknowledged the newspapers having the highest ratings (in some places and correspondent context, we also mention broadcasting company “Rustavi 2”, which was the leader in the ratings of 2000-2003 years).

To define some regularity of informational picture and resonance, we referred to the information, which was highlighted by the broadcasting channels and approach of foreign media (on-line media) on the developments, which were taking place in Georgia.

As for the determination of the main social-political aspects of Georgian media in 2000-2005 years, our target was not research of these aspects; on the contrary, the priority of these aspects was emphasized in the process of analyze and research. We must underline, that this is not the complete (and perfect) picture of these aspects in media. We tried to study and find the similar directions in scientific studies conducted on the topic of modern Georgian media (first of all, we mean the dissertation).

Study of media which was covered by our dissertation area defined several main aspects, which were active during the whole period of analysis. Important is to emphasize that **struggle for authority, theme of destabilization, influence of external factors on the life of our country** (Georgia-Russia-USA), **election**

campaigns, the “Rose Revolution” and its resonance and etc are always in center of attention. We should underline, that we do not mean highlighting all social-political aspects in media, because some of the most important aspects of country’s social-political life may not become the main aspect of media and on the contrary.

We should mention that important or less important events passed through the prism of media are generally discussed in the context of the struggles for authority. In this point of view, media highlights on country, authority, president, post-Shevardnadze period, political spectrum, interrelation between chancellery-parliament, election battles and other social-political themes are in close connection with each other.

The informational reasons on the themes connected with conflict regions – Abkhazia and so called South Osetia are mostly in connection with political battles. The themes of country’s orientation and external politics also are not ensured against the tendency of politicizing and personification as well. That is why we decided to emphasize attention to the struggles for authority, which essentially determined discourse of country’s social-political situation, in the special chapter of dissertation. Also, in our report, we paid attention to the processes directed to destabilization, which, in most cases have not developed, but the preparation of informational background was actively implemented (for instance, development of the scenarios for country turn over, danger of Russian intervention to Pankisi etc).

Despite the fact, that the theme of dissertation covers almost 5,5 years and analysis created on the basis of 20 newspapers we are far from the demand to create complete and chronological picture. Our goal was to collect those aspects, which from our point of view describe not only tendencies of media, but also the tendencies and developments taking place in country.

I chapter

Several General Specifications for Characterization of Essence of Mass Media and Georgian Mass Media

About the Mass Communication and Mass Media

For the formation of nature, specific and functions of modern media, it is important to comprehend its essence not only in context of theory of mass communications, but, also in context of paradigms of postindustrial/postmodernist epoch. It is important to comprehend how the virtual reality has altered the materialistic reality; how the connection between the defined components of marketing and communications systems has been changed – Mostly, the demand on products now depends not on importance or necessity, but on demand which is stimulating by marketing communications.

In our opinion, the approach on omnipotence of mass communications in globalization period is gradually becoming mythical. Despite the fact, that investigation of the essence of mass communications is beyond of our competence and boundaries of the topic of our dissertation, the righteousness of analyzing the media of given period significantly depends on peculiarity of modern information space and on the possibilities of media. So, we will try to review shortly those fundamental features, which help us to understand the nature and functions of modern media and explain as well as analyze ongoing processes of our reality.

While defining the function of press, we tried to recollect traditional approaches, and also younger definitions. If the first approach concedes the press as a part of mass information and journalism system, according to the approach the press is a part of a means of mass communication. It is true that concept “mass” is designated in both definitions and the concept “information” is a fundament of the concept “communication”, but some investigators see a sharp boundary between them, some of them consider that these two concepts are identical or almost identical. (38; 31; 37)

”In most cases media, mass media, the means of mass information and means of mass communications are used as a parallel concepts”, - this phrase is highlighted in the book of R. Surguladze and E. Iber “Mass communication”, where are summarized the main concepts of mass communications modern theory, - **“the term “means of mass communications” expresses the social functions of modern press, radio and television better**, but also important is that **concept “journalism” is much similar to the concept “the means of mass information”**. (In general we will be completely logical if **recognize that concept “means of mass communications” is more general and common, while concept “means of mass information” is this main part, which should spread the information periodically and operatively.**” (30, page 21)

“How the Journalism differs from other forms of communication and what are the initial basics of journalism” – Representatives of US leading media means and leading specialists of journalism decided to clear out this issue on the meeting at Harvard club, in June 1997 **“The problem is, that journalism is mixed in a larger world of communications.** We must try to isolate journalism from this great world again”, - the professor of Columbian University James Carey has summarized the discussion with these words. (10, pages 11-12)

In his dissertation – “For The Genesis Of Georgian Journalism”, journalist Paata Nacvlshvili explains the idea of Marshal Mcklue’s famous formula – **“The Medium is the Message”**: “The medium, which means the mean of communication, is the message itself (message, story, content) in the point, which determines and expresses the principles of social organization in a concrete period of time and appears as a generator of personal and social perception. The change of sensitive balance takes place independently from content, accordingly to the change of one mean of communication with another. So this famous formula of Mcklue can be understood in the following way: **“The mean of mass information is information itself”**. According to this formula, we can say that **the most important is not what kind of information do we receive, but who,**

where, how, and with which mean of communication is this information sent to us. And simpler we can say, that **form is a content.**” (22, page 19.)

To explain the idea and influence of communications means, Mckluen says: **“The influence of communications means is becoming stronger and more intensive because another mean of communication is given as additional “content”,** (For example, the content of movie is novel, play or opera). (19, page 22).

From our point of view analyzing of this postulate, is very important not only for explanation of complicated and interresistant nature of media, mass communication and mass information, but also for definition of its functions and essence. We will let ourselves to concretize Mckluen’s significant “formula” in the connection with media in the following way – Same as an advertisement, entertainment industry and so on, so the journalism (with its deviations) is the content of mass communication means.

“Mix of journalism in a larger world of communications”, admitting the entertainment as a main function of means of mass information and other similar conclusions and ideas (we tried to use the part of this conclusions in our work) are easy to explain and they do not seem illogical any more; Because on this background it is more correct to analyze in which stage of development is Georgian press now, and accordingly analyze its development perspectives.

In parallel with the strengthened opinion about the total influence of mass communications on society and on individual, scientists (sociologists, psychologists, philosophers, cult urologists...) direct attestation to opposite process, to the appearance of **demasification’s tendency** of mass communications (and to strengthening this tendency in future).

The famous American sociologist and futurologist (and what is important – the journalist) Elvin Tofler entitles one of the chapters in his work as “Third Wave”– **“The demasification of means of mass information”**. Tofler forms the signs, provokes and dangers of new, third wave super industrial civilization (first wave is agrarian civilization, second is industrial civilization). This civilization radically substitutes the common images and standards, which the mass information of industrial civilization has instilled into the mass consciousness. For instance, **videogames not only destroys the massive of teleauditory, but teaches millions of people how to play with T.V., how to “answer” it and how to have an influence on it. This is a kind of exercise, which prepares us for living in e-world. In this process person, who was the passive receiver of information becomes the dispatcher of information and manipulates with T.V.**

Video gives a chance to be the creator of his own production and of his own “images” to every user. So, **the traditional mass auditory of powerful television is getting thinner and demasificated.** (35, page 22-26).

More than twenty years have passed after Tofler’s “Third Wave”. The means of mass information are still remaining on the leading positions, but computerization and internet are really deepening their demasification step by step.

In the middle of nineteenth century Balzac has wrote: “**Journalism is a religion of modern society**” “... **We, the real followers of god - Mephistopheles, have leased painting of society mentality ...**” (2). Practically, with this ironical phrase, Balzac formed that main function of journalism/mass media, which has not lost its actuality during the last one and a half century, but was being transformed in creating, directing and manipulating with the opinion of society.

In the definitions of mass media functions, the postulate, that media must be serving society, is common in every point of view. European court for the defense of human rights ascertained, that the freedom of press needs special protection in order to have an opportunity to play “the important role of **society guard**” and “to spread the information containing the interests of society”. (16, page 164)

The director of worldwide association of journalist investigations, ruling the information department, Tatiana Repkova, in the definition of the functions of media to concrete the role of “guardian dog” in the following way: “The press, which is called the forth authority, **is considered to be the guardian of legislative, executive authorities and justice** (accordingly – to be the guardian of parliament, government and court) **and to expose any occasion of using authority unfair**”. (29, page 7-8).

French media expert, Clod-Jean Bertran defines six functions of media:

- **Supervision** (The function of media is searching for information, filtering, analyzing, interpreting and then spreading it on the language which everyone can understand. More concretely, in the interval between elections, media must guard the activities of three political branches of authority - legislative, executive and justice ;
- **Guaranteeing the social communications** (Media is a public forum for debates);
- **Supplying world news;**
- **Spreading the culture;**
- **Entertainment;**
- **Selling** (Media is a main mean of spreading advertisements). (5, page 23-25)

We will shortly mention the role of mass media in government communications. “In the German model of executive authority communication with the society” one of the chapters is entitled as “**Ruling in the conditions of modern media**”, which means that, media is not discussed in a context of government communication, but in contrast with it – as government communication is discussed in the context of media: “Every public event in the world is treated by media, this is why the **participants of policy are trying to fit in media construction and rules political truth**”. (34, page 10). The function of media in the formation of public opinion is also defined here: “... **Media** forms the symbolical environment of political units and communication: **builds political reality**, which is equally, eminent as for citizens, so for political units and gets into everyday contact with politics. Main interest of politicians, bureaucrats, spokesman is to **study each other with the help of**

media...media makes standards, according to which the citizens evaluate political units”. (34, pages 11-12).

We will finish this attempt of general review of the essence of mass media with one more explanation of the phenomenon of its influence. Famous French thinker Jean Bodriard, known as “Guru of postmodern”, writes in his first book “The System Of Things” (first published in 1968), that “the specific logic” of media influence is identical to the influence of advertisement and calls it the logic/phenomenon of “Santa Claus”: We believe not in a quality of advertised goods, but in an advertisement, which tries to persuade us. It is not advertisement’s rhetorical or informational discussion about the quality of goods that has decisive influence on consumers. Individual is sensitive to that covert motive of given care and protection, which “others” give for assuring and wining him over. **The real effectiveness of advertisement/media** comes from this approach– this logic is not only the logic of inspiration and reflex, but even **stricter logic of faith and regression.** (6.)

In our opinion, in this context “regression” doesn’t mean “back drift”, it has a meaning which, in science of style, designates the oppose structure of words: this means that we buy the advertised goods not because the advertisement has persuaded us into its quality, but because we believe in an advertisement which tries to assure us”. We can say the same about the influence of media. We use and trust its product – information - not because we undoubtedly believe in every information it gives us, but because we believe in media, “which tries to assure us”.

It seems to be paradox, that in the situation, when consumer does not believe in advertisement and knows about its insidious character, he/she anyway buys the advertised goods. And more this, advertisement gives him the desire to buy the goods, which, very often, is neither needful, nor necessary or accessible for him. There is no qualitative difference between advertisement and media – they criticize it, don’t trust to it, they know that mostly the information depends on subjective interpretations and not on the facts describing the events/occurrences, but despite all the abovementioned, people not only use the product of mass media, but consciously or unconsciously, they even subordinate the “reality” which is modeled by information engineering and they are actually taking part in creating this “reality” also themselves.

On the one hand, **the sense of security safety** (10; 6), which is caused by the sense of owning the information and, on the other hand, **the factor of authoritative opinion’s influence and witnessing other’s opinion** (8), **creates the needed environment for creating the mood of belief to media in individual and masses.** The concept of so called authoritative, influential media is confirming the same idea: People need authoritative confirmation/negation/correction of their ideas and opinions, or considering other’s ideas and opinions.

This approach can be used to understand and illustrate how the Georgian media and reality coincides with the abovementioned highlighting and how it differs from the western practice.

The General Specifications of Georgian Mass Media in Millennium

In this part of dissertation we will try to show, which role was determined to Georgian mass media in transitional period, how was it developing in compliance of the imposed function; what main characteristics had the media of in millennium and during the period of “Rose Revolution”, what kind of clichés and stereotypes was has media created during this period; Which parameters determine freedom and independence of media in general and from this standpoint, what distinguishes and resembles well developed democratic systems and Georgian reality.

Quality of freedom of media is considered as a barometer of democracy in development level in the country; this is why foreign observers and Georgian experts consider the existence of free media to be one of the most important indexes which shows the process of developing democracy in Georgia. Here we should underline, that concept “free media” was used and is used in this way up to now as an equal concept of “freedom of speech”.

The first step of releasing the speech from propagandistic press, dictate and censorship of parties and/or authority was successfully passed by Georgian media. But this first stage had to be followed by stages of receiving financial and editorial independence, stage of feeling more responsibility which is coming in parallel with freedom, stage of establishment of professional standards etc. i.e. those stages which bear the vital importance and without which the concept “freedom media” is just a formality.

In survey on development of civil society in Georgia, political expert Gia Nodia uses the definition “independent media”. It should be underlined that this definition (taking into account a real meaning of it) does not really suits Georgian media and it is clear even from the media analyze presented in dissertation. But it shows the difference between Georgian media of soviet and post soviet periods and, it appears that evaluations of Georgian and foreign experts re based on such approach.

Gia Nodia underlines: “discussing the level of Georgian democracy comparably successful development during the last 10-15 years, in most cases development of the third sector and media was taken as a good example of this success. On the other hand, after the Rose Revolution concerns became stronger because as it appeared **the revolution caused not development of democracy but it’s weakening i.e. weakening of pluralism in media and decreasing activities and role of third section.** (24, page 48)

Indeed, in the period after “Rose Revolution”, development of Georgian media was somehow hindered. The “Rose Revolution”, declaring the country was entering the higher phase of democracy development and establishment of western values, had to be promoting and supporting of this process. But in contrast to it, weakening of pluralism, on which Gia Nodia is directing his attention, was much more noticeable on the example of broadcasting media. As for **printed media** (despite closing of some popular newspaper like “Dilis

Gazeti”, “Akhali Epoqa”, “Mtavari Gazeti”, “Khvalindeli Dge” after the “Rose Revolution”) **variety and the positions was preserved there in comparison with the broadcasting channels.**

So, development of media which is analyzed can be divided into the periods “before and after of the Rose Revolution” should be underlined that such division into two parts will not be only conditional. Journalist Ia Antadze, (whose analytical publications are notable in Georgian media), defines important difference, which is expressed with the change of authority, owners of media means and journalist’s relationships: “Several years before the revolution and also during the period of the revolution, **owner of media** was interested in showing a real image of weakened government which was buried in corruption and **demanding the truth and only truth from the journalists.** In result journalists, in cooperation with the owner of media have established a team, aggressively attacking the government. **If we imagine the triangle with its top up, the government was situated exactly on this top, media owners and journalists were “strengthened” side by side in two ground corners and attacked Shevardnadze and his environment with united forces.**

After the revolution the triangle turned over and its top went down. **Media owner and authority appeared side by side in two upper corners and unprotected journalist turned down in the top. This two great force – media owner and authority, have been united in one team – lay on the shoulders of journalists as a heavy load”.** (1, page 15).

*

In his book “Reality of Media” (“DIE REALITÄT DER MASSEN MEDIEN”), the famous German sociologist Niklas Luhmann mentions, that media “**“highlights and broadcasts considerations of events completely like the events themselves”**. Media spreads not exact or incorrect facts as real notifications, which must be renewed continually to hide the falseness. But the information broadcasted as news is considered to be reality. Luhmann enumerates the criteria which are used to convert the information into news: Information must be new; conflicts are always preferred; the most important is breaking the norms, which, with the interpretation of media, usually looks like a scandal etc. (18)

Sociologist Iago Kachkachishvili pays attention to interpretative character of Georgian media. He says, that comparing the news programs to each other assures us in legitimacy of postmodern paradigm – **“The reality does not exist originally. It looks like it is interpreted.** And as there are a lot of interpretations, the reality is also different...**Reality is scattered in interpretation”.** (15) But as far as sociology is based on assumption of objective reality (even empirical, which means time-spatial) Iago Kachkachishvili continues the discussion this way: “so we can talk about **the adequate and inadequate interpretations of reality”**.”

Even the superficial comparison of the newspaper “Saqartvelos Respublica” and other newspapers like “Alia”, “Akhali Versia”, “Resonance”, “Akhali Taoba”, “Georgian Times” etc. confirms this opinion. In 2000-2003, the image made by the newspaper “Saqartvelos Respublica” is so diametrically different from other

newspapers, that it is hard to believe that this is description of the reality of the same country. **Picture created by the newspaper “Saqartvelos Respublica” with soviet inertia, gives the feeling of stability and immobility**, with the message – “Everything is ok!” the most important is “not have a destabilisation”; the picture created by other newspapers, despite their differences, aggravates the mood of continual destabilization and nihilism. So it is almost impossible to define which interpretation of media is adequate or inadequate to reality.

During this period, the same picture of relations was between the “interpretative realities” created by broadcasting companies “Pirveli Arkhi” and “Rustavi 2”. The comparison of this two media means is important also because of other reasons. In the first part of dissertation we have mentioned the Mckluen’s famous formula – “Medium is the message”. Broadcasting company “Rustavi 2” – same as medium/mean, on the one hand, wasn’t superlative to TV channel “Pirveli Arkhi” (medium/mean) with its communicative responsibilities (We mean frequency, financing, material and technical base, personnel...), But **“Rustavi 2”, as a mean of media, originally was a kind of message, code, which had an influence not only on current processes and on the mood of society, but also on other media means.**

Here we should also mention shortly distinguished and exclusive role of the broadcasting company “Rustavi 2”. Even in 2000, analysis of media showed the same scheme: “Rustavi 2” was implementing the function of emphasizing society opinions; The announcement of news program “Kurierer at 9”, which was exactly forced, charged politically and emotionally, gave the tone also to other information weather maker means of media (First of all to newspapers “Resonance” and “Alia”); “Gamis Kurieri” (at 11 o’clock), with the effect of protecting the pluralism, was professionally developing the main tones. Background for establishment of needed mood was created not only by daytime news but also other programs as well as the strategic design of the channel.

Philosopher Zaza Phiralishvili, who writes about the media’s role in the occurrences of 2003, deeply analyzes the former factors of appearance of “new political actor’s niche” (which occupied the broadcasting company “Rustavi 2”) in Georgian political space: **For society of transitional period** it is typical “to feel of hunger provoked by quickly changeable situation and complicated social conditions, which makes **the ordinal human totally dependent on the functioning of e-media...** Powerful is the temptation of hyperbolizing of the role of e-media as an instrument of ruling the mood of society... Society becomes entirely dependent not only on the information sent by media, but also on the interpretation of this information”. (26, page 172)

Zaza Phiralishvili perfectly explains, **how the broadcasting company “Rustavi 2” became not only the important media but also political actor:** The leaders of this channel had a knowledge about the strategy of informational war; “With the aggressive tone, with professional use of the system of sign and important adventurism for journalism they gradually reached **the position of superior creators of public opinion**”. (Pages 174-175)

After the “Rose Revolution”, the distinguished representatives of Georgian nongovernmental organizations, with the initiative of US Agency of International Development (USAID), met each other in Bakuriani to discuss condition of Georgian state, society, third sector and future. In their estimations of Georgian media, the words “censorship”, “limitation of media”, “weakening” and etc. were highlighted. About the “Broadcasting Channel of Winner People” it is said: **“The channel “Rustavi 2” is silent, because there are a lot of prudent arrangements.”** (33, page 36)

And truly, media and mostly broadcasting channels became unusually tolerant towards the new government. As we have already mentioned, after the “Rose Revolution”, directions of TV channels and printed media separated perceptibly: The military inspiration of television calmed down and the sight came to the front. As far as possible, printed media could preserve the function of estimating and analyzing the current occurrences. In general, in post revolution period, image of media as being superior was thoroughly weakened.

Exactly eight months after the “Rose Revolution” publication **“The requiem of media in post evolution Georgia”** was published in newspaper “Resonance”. The main point of the article is clear from the title. Expert of cultural differences Lela Iakobishvili forms it in the following way: “There is a complete confusion in our informational space; **at one glance vivid media**, knowing how to “create” news and “other” (different from itself version) opinion in the society, today, from my point of view, **is paralyzed**. There was an impression that **two spheres in Georgian social organism – politics and journalism could preserve its vivid charge**, frequently in infantile, more often hysterical way, but could preserve. **These two spheres were interested in each other and were not interested in anything else – not in any other aspects of social life**. These were two spaces of authority orientated on each other, existed side by side ... **Today media-space has disconnected with social organism and left the country dependent on the belief of politics, so it became its lifeless arm”**. (39)

This, at the first glance, sharp estimation, punctually expresses the main characteristics – the primate of politics - of Georgian society life and Georgian media; **tendency of politicizing** is the common characteristic of broadcasting and printed media, but, in contrast with printed media, with this point of view, TV channels became more inert in post revolution period. Probably the estimation of Lela Iakobishvili, first of all, related to TV channels, but printed media also was not able to preserve its dynamism and actuality characterized it in the period “before revolution”.

One more important tendency is formed in this estimation – the neglecting of other aspects of **social life** except the political battles. If we are more concrete, it does not mean political debates, showing the healthy political competition and political spectrum, but **making the government battles the central theme**, and not only before and after elections, when this direction is important in media.

“Printed media is near to authority, on the upper part of the divisor line which exists between society and the government”, - says journalist Ia Antadze in 2000, in the interview with the newspaper “Dilis Gazeti” (This

newspaper played a lot of attention to discussions about bad and good sides of Georgian media and to sharing democratic experiences), - “When one branch, part or group of the government is opposed to another, it uses its friendship with different media segments to crash the opponents. Exactly this causes the discredit of press...I’m sorry that **nobody cares about ordinary people. Look at the first page of any newspaper and if you find the picture of ordinary human, I will say that I was wrong**”. (46).

In the research of the expert summarizing development of democracy development in Georgia, the author of the article “Mass Media” Marina Musxelashvili concludes, that printed media, as a product of the consumer, “**is directed almost only to politics and never depicts problems of the reader...**This method of approach, on the one hand, depicts **the sharply elitistic character of political space**, on the other hand, **emphasizes the alienation between population and political class, limits ability of the society to comprehend the provocations it faces**”.

We should mention that orientation of printed media on politics does not mean that it shows this sphere comprehensively or polygonal; as we have already mentioned, **for the most part printed media depicts not the authority’s interests, but the interests of the battle for authority**. Ia Antadze’s tone about the **engagement of the printed media** is also concentrated on this issue. Should be underlined that this quotation also contains the same discuss as the interview of Lela Iakobishvili – **No other aspects of social life, only opposition of the government**. In general, Georgian printed media successfully manipulates with the opinion of society instead of defending and guarding its interests: “**A lot of destruction ideas are highlighted by printed media**. In this process journalists play one of the main roles, “Can not be stated that it happens emotionally”, - mentions journalist Ia Antadze in the same interview. (Newspaper “Dilis Gazeti”, July 10). Discussion of the role of printed media in strengthening the destructional ideas, as well as in **initiating of destabilisational processes** - will be prolonged in one of the following parts of dissertation.

Inclination to politisizing is also observed in so called yellow media, like “**yellowness**” of newspapers and **magazines admitted to be the social-political publications** is also noticeable – captivation for “sensations” and “scandals” and, what is the most important, ignoring the written or “unwritten” rules, social norms and norms of journalistic ethics.

To refer to the estimation of writer Naira Gelashvili: “... If in the west only distinct social stratum reads yellow media, concretely: The part of society completely teared away from cultural-intelectual world, such “stratums” are not noticeable in our society. Our society is less squemish towards the dirty streets, as well towards the “**dirty media**”: Intelligent part of the society reads low-grade newspapers like people who have finished two grades of school or less. (51)

II chapter

Country from the Prism of Georgian Mass Media

Image of the Country

In the beginning of millennium, Georgian media leaders highlight the country as a “not formed country”, “dangerous country”, “as though country”, country which “is out of the service area”. We can not say that media and journalists had to be blamed for such attitude. This was a logical result – the post soviet country released from the membership of Soviet Union which was ruined in result of successful information wars, and media, which previously being under ideological dictate and censorship was not ready for reacting adequately on the requirements and influence of modern information market.

Declaring of independence of Georgia was often mentioned as rehabilitation of state system in media of 90s. But this concept did not correspond to the reality, because of a long time distance from state system, which was historically built and maintained in other countries. In 1994 Akaki Baqradze highlighted, that **Georgian people “appeared to be completely unprepared for independent and freedom”**. (4, page 391)

The cataclysms followed development of state system made society, which was not prepared for such processes, to doubt around future possibilities. Psychological influence of media created the proper background for it. In our opinion, in parallel with other factors, this was resulted in the most important “descendant of the past” – by the inert ion of soviet ideology – that existence is the basis and the consciousness is superstructure; following this logic, state consciousness can be formed on the background of strengthening of the state institutional, economical and other fields. It is natural, that the powerful state makes a solid base for statehood mentality. But, on the other hand, people captured by hoplessness, nihilism and complex of inferiority are not able to form the powerful state. The Russian researcher of media Sergei Korkonosenko writes that according to the founders of new “science of sciences” – information technologies, **“The being directs consciousness much less in comparison with consciousness, which directs the world in form and with support of information”**. (17, page 74)

One of the most actual topics of 80-90’s years of XX century Georgian media – discussions on national ideology, appears also in media of the period of millennium, but this time it is marginal, what means that gradually concept of “nationality” experienced devaluation. There is an impression, that leaders of Georgian media, especially in the period of 2000-2001, somehow paved the way for perceiving the “imported ideas”. For instance, in the publications of newspapers “Resonance” and “Alia”, the concepts – “state”, “national” are consciously ignored, but still if you find it, it will undoubtedly be in negative context. Georgia is viewed as a country, which despite its positive geopolitical situation, neither in past, nor in future, as well as currently, has not to have any reliable perspective. This tendency is noticeable everywhere – on politics, religion, national

properties or culture and the following approach is developed– that nationality is an index of backwardness and provincialism and prevents development of democracy in the country. The result of such attitude of media towards the country is that the concept on “not formed country” becomes common for reader and viewer and consciously or unconsciously determines the adequate reaction.

Conditionally **the pres of this period can be divided into three directions:**

From one side, the newspapers “**Alia**”, “**Resonance**”, “**Akhali Versia**” create clichés – Georgia – not formed, dangerous country, Pankisi –den of terrorism, Shevardnadze – Miloshevich, red president, Shevardnadze’s supporters – retrograde people, Jvania’s team – reformers;

The newspapers “Asaval-Dasavali”, “Dro”, “Meotkhe”, “Martali Gazeti” – Consider reformers as emissaries of west and discuss danger of masons rules and origin/background of Jvania-Saakashvili;

The newspapers “**Dilis Gazeti**”, “**Kviris Palitra**”, “**Akhali Taoba**”, “**Meridiani**”/”**Akhali Meridiani**”, “**Droni**”, “**Ganakhlebuli Iveria**” try to activate national consciousness and state thinking preserving traditional values.

Despite the quantitative advantage, the above mentioned newspapers and other publications are not able to change informational influence of the newspapers “Alia” and “Resonance”, because of several important factors: In parallel with extended geographical spreading area, daily circulation and rating of the newspapers, they are acting with defined informational strategy, what was already underlined by us discussing example of broadcasting company “Rustavi 2”. (In 2001, as a result of Georgian media market research conducted by company “Nikkolo M”, newspapers “Alia”, “Resonance” and “Akhali Versia” are the leaders in the rating according to the following criteria: trust of the readers and the newspapers, becoming as a source of information most often; also newspapers “Alia”, “Resonance” and “Kviris Palitra” have the most extended spreading area.)

The long term process of disordering national and state consciousness was mostly directed to youth - the serial “Dardubala” (broadcasting company “Rustavi 2”), “The Notes of Editor on Duty” - newspaper “Resonance”, publications of “Alia”, which were at the same time kindling the religious nihilism and religious extremism, these are the means, which were used for abovementioned purposes. The main messages of media, which creating the general informational “weather” – the permanent danger of destabilization, highlighting the negative tones in every sphere of social life, non stop blaming elder and middle generation for living in soviet period (at the same time ignoring the fact that these generations were not able choose the place and period of time they live), State discrediting informational campaign etc.

If we review even “The Notes of Editor on Duty” – newspaper “Resonance”, from this point of view, we notice that in this tiny “visit card” of the newspaper, a huge aggressive charge and irreconcilability towards existing system, rule, traditions, to elder generation etc. is accumulated there. Attention should be paid also to the

linguistic style – black humor together with slang, fits well to taste and mood of teenagers and youth. Emotions highlighted in the “Notes” are strengthened with caricatures of the main “hero” – the President:

- **“Georgia is a concentration camp”** – (Newspaper “Resonance”, February 26, 2001).
- **“The country of schoolchildren having a poor performance”** – newspaper “Resonance” punishment of the red President, leader of schoolchildren having a poor performance. (Newspaper “Resonance”, April 6, 2001).
- **“There was Georgia here”** – photomontage – the photo portrait of the President lying over Georgian map. (Newspaper “Resonance”, April 18, 2001).
- **“It is hard to find even one human in Georgian government!”** – caricature – The President in the center standing on big picked bone – primitive man with amulet of hammer-sickle. (Newspaper “Resonance”, April 14, 2001) etc.

The second stream of publications highlights heavy conditions existing in the country with strengthening of “imported ideas” and national nihilism and, straightforwardly or obliquely, connects this process to “western mannered” young politicians, so called reformers: **“The naked Americanism serves disordering of Georgian national state basics. The emissaries of Citizens Union of Georgia, having a status of a leader, are doing the same”**. (53).

The third stream of publications draws public attention to the importance of forming state thinking (From this point of view the most consecutives are the newspapers “Dilis Gazeti” and “Ganaxlebuli Iveria”). It is noticeable, that in this kind of publications, are analyzed the reasons which cause nihilism and suspect for Georgian state system, thus trying to identify the background which can be used as a basic for the nation psychological balance.

Though at this period (2000-2001) Georgia was considered to be a country oriented on western values and on building democracy, in media we hardly meet a publication, which explains the content of democratic development, problems of transitional democracy, real problems of Georgia as a country etc.

In most cases “democracy” is mentioned in general context, or in the occasion of humiliating of the word “freedom” or “human’s rights”. Of course, sometimes we meet also some exceptions. For instance, publication from the newspaper “Akhali Taoba” – **“When Democracy will be developed in Georgia?”** author, journalist Lado Mkervalishvili leads the discussion professionally and instead of usual subjective-emotional attitude of Georgian media, shows the pragmatic view of the development: “There are completely different problems and goals facing our country. These problems and goals can be formulated with one word – to survive. When these problems are solved, no barriers for establishing of democracy will occur any more. Georgian nation has always been democrat with its mentality and psychology and this is not a new fruit for us... **democracy will be developed in Georgia when economy is revived, society will be unified and national self-conscious will be increased**. Democracy does not flourish in poverty”. (57).

Beginning the US program of “Training and Equipping” in Georgia in 2002, **noticeably deviated attitude of to optimistic direction** and accordingly, decreased aggression, informational excitement, softened the negative tones directed towards the President and country itself. In this period the sarcastic caricatures with “main hero” – “the President” were not printed on the first pages of the newspaper “Resonance”, the enthusiasm of “The Notes of the Editor in Duty”, which was very insulting for state and president, also changed. We may say that from this point of view newspaper “Resonance” is a kind of indicator, according to which we can discuss the main change taking place in our country. **“The Program of Training and Equipping must not derange”** – that is how the leading journalist of the newspaper “Resonance” Eliso Chapidze entitles her publication, where she sharply expresses her journalistic position and, practically, calls readers as well as colleagues for **state unity**. (45)

Change of tone of the newspaper “Resonance” and other publications were conditioned by one more circumstance – **In the period after 2001 October-November events** (period when Zurab Jvania resigned from the post of parliamentary leader), **the factor of monopolization of the media, creating main informational “weather” was evidently weakened** and, accordingly, the force creating negative image of state and the President Shevardnadze was also weakened. For strengthening this conclusion, we will refer to the opinion of the representative of nongovernmental sector, philosopher Gigi Tevzadze (from his book: “Georgia: Return of Power”) **“Jvania also needed base for liberal democracy”, which means the “evident supporting” of nongovernmental sector and media for drawing up his own scheme of power”**. (33, page 20).

In the beginning of this chapter, speaking on “not formed country”, we consciously did not pay attention to **Russian factor**, because this (except the objective factor) is a kind of cliché, which the media always appeals to in case of almost all troubles. We will not refer to Georgian or Russian media interpretations, but to analytical material – **“Political Situation in Georgia”**, which was uploaded to the internet-site **“The National Laboratory of External Politics”** Russia, August of 2002.

In one of the chapters – **“Characterization Georgia and Interests of Russia”** Georgia is represented in the following way: “In American and Russian media, Georgia is characterized as **“a not formed country”**. Georgia is not able to ensure its unity and security itself and always needs external help... As a result of state weakness of this country, **even such a routine procedure as local regional elections is for Russia**, causes hand-to-hand fights, shooting, mass meetings and **creates a danger of situation destabilization in the country”**. In this chapter was not explained what was meant under the “Russian interest”, but it is seems it is already clear.* (28).

* *Above mentioned laboratory was established in 2002; the president of the organization is a famous expert of political sciences Gleb Pavlovski. As it seems, laboratory considered Georgian factor to be one of the first external-political factor and studied and fundamentally analyzed almost every important problems internal and external policy of the country.*

Opinion of the US former ambassador in NATO, Robert Hanter on Georgia is diametrically different from the position of Russian experts. According to Robert Hanter, **“Georgia is not a not formed country and even will never become such”**. According to its advance, he considers Georgia to be in the top of three or four post soviet countries, as for **Eduard Shevardnadze, he is considered to be the most democratic leader between other post soviet leaders.** (49)

These are the main informational tones, which represent image of Georgia in media during the period before “Rose Revolution”. For comparison, it is interesting how Georgia of this period is formulated in the evaluations made by different experts. Expert of political sciences Gia Nodia (In his report – “Two Experiments of Creating Democracy in Georgia: summarizing path of the duration of fifteen years”) considers Georgia to be one of those countries, which have made a few steps towards democracy and stopped somewhere in the middle of the path, in “grey zone”; The perspective of its future is hesitating between three scenarios: Serious direction to the path of democracy; Going back to the authoritarian system; Staying for a long time in the same confusion. (23, page 38)

As we have already mentioned in the first part of this dissertation, “Rose Revolution” finalized leading position of media in the country, but helped to acquire new function for the country – new image of Georgia started to be formed with the help of media. **Georgia**, first of all, is associated to **recognizable country**. Country, which needed a lot of constraint to fix its existence, became an object of international attention. We consider not only the loud informational causes (resonance of “Rose Revolution”, events which took place in Adjara and so on), but the business approach and interest of International Society.

Here we want to refer to three informational causes:

On the background of highlighting international conference of Donors supporting Georgia, held under auspices of European Union in June 2004, in Brussel, Georgia was highlighted figured in media as a country, **which is already perceived by Europe as not only geographically, but also ideologically and as a cultural neighbor**; As a country, which is interesting for foreigner partners, transparent and competent.

After Ukrainian “Orange Revolution” of November-December, 2004, appears a parallel with the “Rose Revolution” and media reasonably discusses the meaning of “export of Georgian revolution”. The main characteristics of Georgia: country with weak and disputed regions becomes an example of democratic development and stability for the whole region and post soviet countries.

In May 2005, visit of US President George Bush in Tbilisi was a very positive informational cause **for positioning image Georgia positively** in media. We will specially pay attention to the resonance of George Bush’s visit in media in the following parts of our dissertation; Here we would like to underline one more nuance – The “Rose Revolution” had a positive influence not only on the external image of Georgia, but also changed internal attitudes towards the country – attitude from nihilism to optimism. It is worth to notice, that

according to the criteria of optimism, Georgia is on the second place between 65 countries of the world - public opinion poll, conducted by “Gorbi” – “Gelap International” end of 2004 (59).

West or Russia?

(The Aspects of State Orientation Problems in Media)

On the first stage of Georgia independence, (beginning of 90's), there was a sharp discussion in Georgian media, led by the newspaper “Mamuli” on direction of orientation, model of State system and economic strategy which Georgia had to choose, to be formed as a really independent country.

During the first years after declaring of independence, despite the difference in approaches, **neutrality of Georgia** was declared as a general ideal direction (if it can be called so) by media, despite of the fact that time and place this idea was unreal; despite the fact that later Georgia officially expressed its aspiration for the integration to Euro Atlantic area, the topic of neutrality gradually appeared in media, but not with the journalistic or editorial initiative. Mainly these messages were related to the periods of election campaigns or were used for “covering the topic” that Georgia was really directed to NATO”.

As soon as Georgia was acknowledged by international community, appeared dilemma – West or Russia?! Here it should be mentioned, that during the years, when this topic is raised while discussing the external priorities or by another reasons, media highlights are mostly directed to this two poles apart. In the survey – “Political Landscape of Georgia” (according to the situation of with 2005's), which was created with the support of **OSCE** democratic institutes and the office of human rights, the general vectors the external policy of post soviet Georgia was characterized in the following way: **“Despite of internal political conflicts, after getting of independence, the general directions of external policy of Georgia became invariable.** Zviad Gamsaxurdia practically did not have a time to determine and realize international policy directions ... As for Eduard Shevardnadze and Micheal Saakashvili, **the main priority** for both of them was **the political and economic support from United States and Europe**, international standards and close cooperation with international institutes; **and a main goal to become a member of NATO and European Union.”** (27, page 40).

From the period when our analysis start (2000 year), external priority of Georgia – Western vector was already defined, but the influence of Russian factor was still very strong in media (as well as in social-political life of country), primacy of Russia is still noticeable even when some try to ignore it; In relation with Russia Georgian media uses clichés and stereotypes; One of the most important cliché is **“double Russia”**, what appeared in conversations during the years when discussing relations with Russia, almost never are met in the last period

Georgian media (It was substituted with the conclusion, that double Russia does not exist); Instead of this, the cliché – Russia in the **“image of enemy”** stayed invariable. (It seems to be paradox, but great Should be mentioned, that highlighting the negative attitude towards Russia is based not on Russia phobia (except rare exceptions), but on the highlight about its imperialist content. Also, mostly, strengthening anti Russian campaign in Georgian media is a call back from Russian anti Georgian hysteria in media. From the other side negative highlighting of Russian topic in Georgian media creates a call back in Russia, but misbalance of such informational war is evident. After the “Rose Revolution”, increasing of Georgian international resonance somehow neutralized this misbalance. From our point of view, with purposeful informational strategy, Georgian Government was able to substitute status of Russia, as a “third side” in existing territorial conflicts of Georgia and directly named it as a second side/member, instigator of conflicts and conqueror. Despite this, **in concept paper on of security of Georgia, which was adopted in 2005, Russia, together with Azerbaijan and Armenia is defined as a partner country and not as an enemy** (USA, Ukrain and Turkey are named as strategic partners). (27, page 45).

Proportionally to the increasing chances of Georgia in direction of integration with west, the tension between Georgia and Russia was aggravating. The perspective of Georgia’s membership in Euro structures and in NATO, the “program of training and equipping”, the oil pipeline - Bakho-Tbilisi-Jeihan, the gas-pipe-line of Shah-Deniz, from the beginning Shevardnadze’s and than Saakashvili’s western highlights transferred the Russia-Georgian relations into the situation like a “Cold War”.

In media, while highlighting external priorities the main tendency - politicizing and personification of the topic and depicting it as personal/clan oppositions appears. On this background is lost the main sense of the problem and concrete target (absence or bad understanding of the target) becomes to be visible.

In 2000-2001 emotions on the topic of “North or West” is mainly concentrated in media around Eduard Shevardnadze and on the other hand, around so called “Reformers” (“Moqalaqeta Kavshiri” (“Citizen’s Union”) representatives of yang sub organization). On the picture created by media led the main informational “weather”, policy of Georgia is highlighted in the following way: the President, his environment (symbolically – chancellery) – retrogrades, oriented to Russia; Personally the President Eduard Shevardnadze – deviated sometimes to one side, sometimes to another, sometimes “playing” between this two poles; So called “Reformers”, practically the yang wing of (“Moqalaqeta Kavshiri” (“Citizen’s Union”) – “Westerns”, Zurab Jvania – pro western leader; Acknowledged **“Russia oriented”**– Aslan Abashidze (meaning political party “Agordzineba” (“Revival”), socialists with the leadership of Vaktang Rcheulishvili, communists with the leadership of Panteleimon Giorgadze, the vice speaker of parliament Vahtang Goguadze...

In the same period (Spring of 2000), **media highlights the tendency that Georgia is becoming the battle field of Russia-US “struggle” for the influence in the region.**

We will specially underline one of the publications published in the newspaper “Resonance”, which is about the “sufficiently unenviable statement” of Ian Bremer, director of European and Asian researching program in the Institute of World Policy. Referring to the statement: “According to Bremer, in the beginning of post soviet epoch, America was trying to weaken historical influence of Russia in Caucasus because due to low prices on energy resources existing in the region, but, “then **Washington** was not able to determine, direction of their **new, hegemonial external policy...**” Several projects, for instance, **Bakho-Tbilisi-Jeihan, is directed towards weakening influence of Russia, but such protest loses its power today...** As for the perspective of **membership in NATO of Georgia and Azerbaijan**, according to Professor Ian Bremer, **there is no even future opportunity for that**”. (Newspaper “Resonance”, May 14, 2000).

Point of view of the Profession Bremer may be more actual now, because the perspective of integration to NATO and strengthening geostrategic importance of Georgia in the region with the help of Baku-Tbilisi-Jeihan, appeared to be more separated from reality, than we could suspect in that period (According to the versions highlighted in media, integration of Georgia from the beginning in NATO and than in European Union was forecasted for 2008-2010).

In context of Russia-USA struggle for the influence in the region, it will be worthwhile to remind conception of the famous American expert of political sciences Samuel Hanthingtone on **the determination of balance between Russia and West**, according to which both sides must come to an agreement on principal equality and to the **influence spheres**:

“Practically it means that Russia will consent to the expansion of European Union and NATO, to the integration of Christian countries from Central and East Europe, and from the other side the West takes a duty not to expand NATO towards the east – if Ukrain does not split into two states”. According to Hanthingtone, for preserving the power of western civilization, USA and European countries must be interested in recognizing Russia as a core state of orthodox world, which has a legal interests connected with defence of its south borders. (13). As we see in one of the following parts (“Georgian Media on The Visit Of US President George Bush to Georgia”) of this disertation, striving of West/USA for expanding its influence spheres went out of this area; Essentially, this was a result of the cataclysms, which happened in our country after declaration of the orientation to the West.

After December 2001, above mentioned “scheme” (of the external orientation of politicaql elite) has been tranformed not very significantly, but from one point of view, sharply in general in media. This transformation, at the first glance, was not very sharp, but, from our point of view was essential ; After Zurab Jvania’s resignation from the post of the leader of the parliament, the external orientation of young “Reformers” became the topic for media, which was more intencively descussed when before; Their “Western orientation” still is highlighted in media publications, but in paralell mentioning of their “Russian connections” are getting also more intensive.

For instance, newspaper “Droni” gives a sign about this change: **“... Americans declare, their support to the reforms and not to the “reformers”**. (Newspaper “Droni”, December 8, 2001); Newspaper “Akhali Meridiani” straightforwardly blames reformers: **“Jvania-Saakashvili-Merabishvili’s team was given the mission to stimulate civil confrontation in Georgia”**. (Newspaper “Akhali Meridiani”, December 14, 2001).

Experts of political sciences also give a sign about the “double standard” of “Repormatorebi” (“Reformers”): “They always play in both directions –West and Russia”, - Ramaz Sakvarelidze says in an interview with newspaper “Kviris Palitra”. (Newspaper “Kviris Palitra”, Summarizing publication of 2001, December 24, 2001). Based on such approaches, newspaper “Kviris Palitra” forms the formula, **that Russian interest in Georgia is being financed with American money**.

Several Aspects of the Topic of External Policy

In the research – “Political Landscape of Georgia” (2005 year), conducted with the support of OBSE democratic institutes and the office of human rights, the general vectors of external policy development for post soviet Georgia are characterized in the following way: **“After receiving of independence, despite the internal political conflicts, the general directions of Georgia’s external policy are unchangeable**. Zviad Gamsaxurdia practically did not have a time to determine and realize international policy... As for Eduard Shevardnadze and Michael Saakashvili, **the main priorities** for both of them were **the political and economic support from the United States of America and Europe**, international standards and close cooperation with international institutes; **the main goal is to become a member of NATO and European Union.”** (27, page 40).

Straight proportionally to the increasing of chances of Georgia of integration with the west, the tension between Georgia and Russia was aggravating. Perspective of the membership of Georgia in Euro structures and in NATO, the “program of training and equipping”, the oil pipeline of Bakho-Tbilisi-Jeihan, the gas pipeline of Shah-Deniz, at first Shevardnadze’s and than Saakashvili’s West oriented highlights transferred Russia-Georgian relations into the situation like a “Cold War”.

Pankisi gorge and Chechnian “militants” were one of the main reasons for extremely tensing Russia-Georgian relations. In the beginning of 2001, Russian media, which paved fundamental ideological way for the probability of beginning the military operations on the territory of our country using the reason of the liquidation of Chechenian “militants” in Pankisi (Georgian media was also effectively used for that), laid Georgia in informational siege.

In Russian media, especially in such publications, as “Trud” and “Krasnaia Zvezda”, Russian generals, representatives of Russian Duma, state officials of high officials are straightforwardly talking not only about the

problem of destroying “terrorist’s nest” in Pankisi, but also about long term target – that Georgia may become the “second Chechnya”.

In the publication of Rusudan Nikuradze (independent correspondent of the newspaper “Droni” in Moscow) this situation is described in the following way – “Why Russia “locked” terrorists in Pankisi gorge?” “According to Russian sources, Putin is going to destroy militants on spring and this operation will be executed on Georgian territory. What can save Georgia from unavoidable war?”

If we believe in Russian mass information electronic means, **“visa regime will be abolished, if Georgia allows Russia to destroy terrorists on Georgian territory...”** Representative of the President of Russia in south federal district, Victor Kazancev declares: **“Currently on the territory of Georgia there are 3000 terrorists and the fight against them will be finished in winter”**, - writes Rusudan Nikuradze in abovementioned article. (Newspaper “Droni”, January 11, 2001).

In parallel, to those days, publications prepared on the basis of foreign media, **which highlight the interest of West regarding Georgia. “Georgia is the main ally of United States and West in this unstable region”**, - publication in “Wall Street Journal”. (63).

In the conditions of Russia-Georgian extremely tense relations, **the meeting the presidents of these two countries was especially important**, which, at last, took place on 30th of November, 2001. Estimating of the results of this meeting was radically controversially evaluated by officials and other means of media.

According to the assessments in the newspaper “Saqartvelos Respublika”, **“the cool relations” between “Georgia and Russia” entered the new phase, we hope, the phase of becoming warmer...** This is beginning of return. This is something like a new stage, but when the contract of Georgia and Russia is ready and we sign it, building of new relation will start”. (61).

President Eduard Shevardnadze highlighted his meeting with Putin as **“the phase of great change in cooperation between Georgia and Russia”**. Result of the abovementioned message was a statement of the President made on the conference of “Moqalaqeta Kavshiri” (“Citizen’s Union”): **“Nobody can change our neighbor; we should be neighbors of Russia!”**

Independent broadcasting channels and printed media were not able to share the optimism of the President and officials of Georgia. According to assessments of newspapers “Resonance”, “Axali Versia” and “Alia”, **voyage in Moscow was not successful**. “The meeting of Shevardnadze and Putin ended with the victory of Russia’s young president. President of Georgia, who visited Russia after bombing Georgia by Russian aircrafts, was blamed on patronizing the terrorists and narcobarons”, - highlighted newspaper “Axali Versia”. (48)

On that background, very constructive seems the publication of the correspondent of the newspaper “Droni” from Moscow, which was finalized in the following way: “Despite the public debates of Putin and Shevardnadze, **Russian investigators mention, that “Georgia survived from real confrontation with Russia”**”. (58)

The meeting of Putin-Shevardnaze was taken into account by the Minister of Foreign Affairs, **Irakli Menagarishvili** when evaluating 2001 he **declared that one of the main results of the year was regulation of the relations with Russia and fixing possible negative developments** (Broadcasting companies “1st Arkhi”, “9th Arkhi”, the news programmes, January 4-6, 2002).

Period from 2001 to 2002 was a transitional stage from keeping the balance between West and East (with more or less success) time came to choose one direction. **In spring of 2002 United States started implementation of the program of “training and equipping” for the military forces of Georgia. In November 2002 on summit of NATO in Prague, Georgia officially declared the wish to become a member of NATO.**

After this period, the processes of **Georgia-Russian relation are almost never discussed without connection to America.** If in last years, the highlights of politicians, generally of society and accordingly of journalists were characterized with two extreme directions – Russia or West, this tendency gradually substituted with interrelation – **Georgia between the interests of USA and Russia.**

External highlights in Georgian and foreign media after the “Rose Revolution”, can be summarized in the following way: **The cold war can be started between Russia and USA because of Georgia; Russia does not want to have a conflict with USA because of Georgia; USA also will not tense the situation with Russia because of this reason; Both, Washington and Moscow are interested to avoid the sink in chaos and destabilization in Georgia; Interest of USA in Georgia is development of democracy, interest of Russia is interest etc.**

Interests of Russia appeared even in the most critical situation in Georgia: “While rapid consultations, when only two hours were left before changing the authority in Georgia, Ivanov emphasized his attention to the importance of the frame agreement between two countries”, - highlighted newspaper “Mtavari Gazeti”. (Newspaper “Mtavari Gazeti”, November 25, 2003). In media the following approach is highlighted: when sending Minister of Foreign Affairs Igor Ivanovich in Georgia, **Russia fixed its importance in Georgia, which means that it showed the fact that nothing happens in this country without participation of Russia.** This was the most important **message, directed at the same time to Georgia and to West as well.**

After the “Rose Revolution”, the highlights related to **Europe** are strengthened in external priorities. **“Georgia will be neither pro Russian, nor pro American, Georgia will be pro Georgian and pro European”,** - has declared the President of Georgia Michael Saakashvili on the meeting during his first tour in Strasburg (Newspaper “Mtavari Gazeti”, January 29, 2004); and when giving a speech on the winter session of European Union’s Parliament Assembly, he formed the external vector of Georgia’s new authority this way: **“Nowadays our only ambition is to become a plenipotentiary member of European Union... during long time Georgia has good relations with USA... We also have relations and partnership with Russia... I am consent to improve the relation with Russia, have a friendship with Russia...”** (Newspaper “24 Saati”, January 29, 2004).

Media paid attention to the sharp change of external highlights and explained **“pro Europe” direction of the new Government to be a kind of diplomatic game, which will help not to annoy northern neighbor with the direct orientation of American.** President Saakashvili’s special attitude towards Russia is really noticeable in media: It is sharply mentioned, that Saakashvili gave the priority of his first visit to Russia and not to USA. Prudence towards Russia is noticeable when highlighting Istanbul’s NATO summit (June 2004), which is very important for Georgia.

The press wrote about summit, that – **NATO is still the priority for Georgia.** However, **due to the factor of Russia, the principle of “move fast but slowly”** is more acceptable. Obviously, the “information restraint” is caused by this.

Michael Saakashvili’s visit in Russia, which Russian media called not only successful, but also **epochal**, aimed: beginning relations from the “blank page” (**“Putin and Saakashvili are not Responsible for the Actions of their Predecessors”**); Neutralizing Russia’s irritation regarding Georgia’s relations with the West (Saakashvili: **“None of the country is able to compete with Russia – Georgian relationships”**; **“Georgia is not a place of confrontation between USA and Russia”**); Solving the economic relationships (Saakashvili: **“Georgian Brands should be back on Russian Market”**); Having influence on Russian society’s point of view (Saakashvili: **“Georgia’s Image in Russia is extremely spoiled and our main goal is to change public attitude in relations with this issue”**) etc. Media specially mentioned, that the President of Georgia emphasized orientation to Europe also during this visit and highlighted the wish of **integration to Europe together with Russia**; media also highlighted, that visit in Russia is a **part of his successful “PR”**, with which president is trying to hide some defect of new government. (Newspapers “Dilis Gazeti”, “Resonance”, “24 Saati”, “Mtavari Gazeti”, February 11-13, 2004).

For emphasising the new external political course of new authority, very important was Michael Saakashvili’s visit in France and innovation - **Appointment of French’s citizen Salome Zurbashvili as a Foreign Minister.** **“Europe is our future, but America helps us to self-determine ourselves”.**

2004’s March press also confirms that **the amplitude of these relationships depends not only on America-Europe but the point of balance is determined by Russia.** Moreover, Saakashvili’s visit in France first of all is seen from this point of view – as **the bridge to settle the relationships with Russia that is not in contrast to the US interests but meets them.**

“The main foreign direction of the country will be the integration in the European Union and regulation of relationships with Russia”, - Mentioned newspaper “Mtavari Gazeti” – **“The President does not conceal that he hurries to warm the relationship with Russia** and he trusts this mission to be accomplished by the diplomat of the country the government of which has the good relationship with the official Moscow. **It is clear then that one of the principal issues of the face-to-face conversation between Shiraque and Saakahhvili had been the relationship with Russia.”** (Newspaper “Mtavari Gazeti”, March 10, 2004). Newspaper “Dilis

Gazeti” wrote: “According to Michael Saakashvili’s statement he got the guarantees from Shiraque that **France would help us in the integration process with Europe**; The appointment of Salome Zurabishvili - experienced diplomat, descendant of the prominent representatives of the first emigration- in the post of Foreign Minister gives him hope that the foreign direction of the country will be successful.

According to Salome Zurabishvili “it is a gift from France to Georgia; France is ready to participate in building of new Georgia.” (Newspaper “Dilis Gazeti”, March 12, 2004).

March press is also worth paying attention from one more point of view – the recent popular concept of **Euro Atlantic Integration is becoming specific**. New shades of Euro Union and NATO start to appear in relation to Georgia. Euro Union has not considered Georgia separately as the candidate of its membership until lately; Georgia, within the frames of the whole South Caucasus region, was not in favorable situation. After the Rose Revolution the conservative Euro Union changes its position towards Georgia and does not exclude its involvement in the initiation of “wide Europe.” It is the further objective and hard to achieve, though. Experts assume that joining NATO might be more realistic for Georgia.

“On the coast of Abkhazia NATO Military Fleet will start patrolling”. – reported newspaper “Resonance,” March 11. According to American General James Jones, NATO’s aim is to eliminate the action of extremist organizations and criminal groups. The newspaper connects this fact with Michael Saakashvili’s statement – that he will be absolutely controlling the Black Sea area by the end of the year. In the opinion of Georgian political experts, by this **NATO wants to demonstrate its forces on the Black Sea, to affect psychologically, to try Russia’s influence and reaction. The purpose is the attempt to reduce this influence.**

As far as the Russian reaction regarding NATO is concerned, its demonstration took place by the end of March due to joining NATO some of the post socialist countries (Bulgaria, Romania, Slovenia, and Slovakia) and post Soviet Baltic countries. The fact of joining these countries to NATO was strongly resisted by Russia at one time and it was perceived painfully by its military and political elite. According to the information by American newspaper “Daily News,” Russian generals are threatening Americans by dropping their planes if they appear in Baltic countries; Zhirinovsky and Ragozin declared to “Lenta-Ru” agency that if NATO continues its expansion with such speed they will come in an inevitable military conflict with Russia. Ukrainian information web-portal informs that Russians are particularly worried about the fact that NATO plans to build radar observation base in Latvia. (Newspaper “Resonance”, March 30, 2004)

During the visit of the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Salome Zurabishvili to Moscow, position of official Tbilisi that **Russia should free the military centers on the territory of Georgia in three years**– was highlighted for the first time. It partially cleared away the doubt, as if the positive meddling in Batumi’s crisis by Russia’s Military Council’s secretary Igor Ivanovich happened in return for leaving there Russian military centers. On the background of existing danger of terrorism, experienced Georgian diplomat found a new definition for Russian military centers – **“Sights of terrorists”**. Military centers became the main issue while discussing the

project of the frame agreement – Russia required the obligation of Georgia not to dispose the military centers of other countries after taking Russian military forces away. Salome Zurabishvili declared that Georgia is not going to dispose the military forces of any other country on the territory of Georgia, but the fame agreements is not a document in which such statements should be made. (Newspapers “Mtavari Gazeti”, “Dilis Gazeti”, May 8, 2004).

“Landing of Millionaires to Georgia”, “Russian Expedition or Russian Expansion”, “Russia’s Friendly Hand or Economic Expansion”, “Russian Mercy or Imperialistic Purposes”, “Which Russian is more Dangerous – with Money or without?”, “Russian Business Pays Contribution to Russian Politics”, “Transparent Game between Georgia and Russia” – these titles perfectly underline the common attitude of media towards Georgia-Russian business-forum. **“Several million dollars investments “arrived” by this airplane to Georgia. How much from this amount will be invested in Georgia? It depends on Georgian side”**, - declared the Minister of Economic Development **German Grep** as soon leaved the airplane. (Newspaper “24 Saati, May 28, 2004). Media highlights that **Grep** is **“one of the architects of economical aggression of the Kremlin”**. Business-forum and lately activated Russian factor gives media a basis for discussing **“new reality”**: Seems **America does not have anything opposite of Russian capital coming to Georgia, but Washington has an acute reaction on every tendency, which, in their opinion, will prevent building of oil pipeline and especially gas pipeline, which should pass the territory of Georgia.**

Statement of the President Saakashvili, that strategic gas pipelines and ports will not be privatized is considered in the same context. But he had not excluded participation of “Gazprom” in the project of gas pipeline – with creation of joint stock enterprises where Russia can have a share, but not the control package. (Media of the period, May 29-31, 2004).

Based on the highlights of international information means, Georgian media mentions that peaceful finalization of revolutions of November and May, which happened in Georgia was reached due to the agreement between two great countries in the world – Russia and USA.

After the second part of 2004, theme of **NATO** becomes more active in media, but again in close connection with Russia.

The association of public opinion and marketing research “Gorbi” has been researching the tendencies of Georgia to become member of NATO for about several years. It is noteworthy that according to the data of the research conducted by Gorbi in 2004, in comparison with the previous years, a much bigger part of people polled - **76%, is for the idea of Georgia becoming a member of the North Atlantic Alliance** (2000 respondents took part in the research throughout whole Georgia). The political scientist Kakha Kenkadze considers realistic the fact that in 2-4 years Georgia will become the NATO member as far as Georgia is at the point of intersection of three future grand initiatives (Program – partnership for peace, the dialogue of the Mediterranean Sea, Istanbul’s Co-operation initiative). (Newspaper “Resonance”, June 23, 2004).

NATO issue in the press is accompanied with the emphasis of Russia's tense relationship towards this issue. Despite the fact that the Georgian delegation returned from Brussels with a billion euro aid, the statement of the Minister of Defense of Georgia Giorgi Baramidze towards the donor countries that **Georgia is ready to allow NATO troops on its territory** became the main focus of attention. Such statement was illogical itself at the background of radically different position declared continuously by the president of Georgia and the minister of foreign affairs. Accordingly, the media also faced difficulties in explaining this. According to the expert of political sciences Paata Zakareishvili, the minister's statement does not have that much impact as the president's. Secondly – **deteriorating relationships with Russia is not worthy for the USA. Furthermore, from the strategic point of view location of bases in Georgia will not be beneficial and it is absolutely satisfying for Turkey.** (Newspaper "Resonance", June 19, 2004).

In the same period, after a long-term pause consultations on military issues have been renewed between Russia and Georgia. Tbilisi offers Moscow to open a Russian-Georgian anti-terrorism center in Georgia instead of military bases. As military experts assume, **Chechen-Ingush events force Russia to open a joint functioning anti-terrorism center.**

The Russian minister of defense Sergei Ivanov declares that the establishment of the anti-terrorism center is not connected with the process of the liquidation of bases. (However, it was Russia's idea to establish such a center).

In order to succeed in military negotiations with Russia the Georgian government is ready to officially verify that it is not going to locate the bases of a foreign country on the territory of the country. During her visit to Moscow in May, the Minister of Foreign affairs of Georgia Salome Zurbishvili declared that Georgia was not going to locate the base of any country on its territory. However, the framework agreement is not the document to place such statements in it. This time it considers appropriate **to include this position in the framework agreement.** (Newspaper "Sakartvelos Respublika", "Mtavari gazeti", June 23, 2004). Furthermore, the government of Georgia considers impossible signing the framework agreement between Georgia and Russia until the issue of moving away the Russian bases is settled.

Before Istanbul's NATO summit **Russia starts "bargaining" with the bases; the minister of defence gives a "favorable" sum necessary for moving away the bases – 300 mln. Dollars, instead of 500 mln.** According to newspaper "Resonance", the whole number of Russian militaries and citizens of Georgia employed at the two bases left in Georgia - in Akhalkalaki and Batumi, is approximately 5000. In the opinion of a military expert Irakli Aladashvili, 300 million dollars necessary for their withdrawal is an exaggerated number. Furthermore, a vast majority of military servicemen is local population who got the citizenship of Russia and if they seize to operate in Georgia in case of the withdrawal of bases, the government of Georgia will take care of them. (Newspaper "Resonance", June 23, 2004).

A special communiqué was adopted at the NATO summit, which mentions that withdrawal of Russian bases from Georgia and Moldova creates conditions for the ratification of “the agreement on usual armament in Europe”. The Foreign Minister of Russia Sergey Lavrov tries to ignore the demands of the alliance. According to him, “ratification of the agreement is not legally connected with the process of withdrawing the bases. However, the Russian diplomat also mentions that “in case of the good will the issue can be settled quickly.” It is not concealed in the Russian State Duma that the **good will means saying no to the integration into NATO on behalf of Georgia**”. (Newspaper “Mtavari Gazeti”, June 29, 2004). Georgia did not refuse the way towards NATO. **The military part of Georgia’s individual partnership program has been approved at the Summit** (the political part of the program has to be approved until the end of July and the program implementation will start in September); It has already been notified officially that in August NATO Secretary General Hop Skhepper would visit Georgia.

The president of Georgia met the president of the USA face to face at the summit, where according to the press, they talked about the withdrawal of the bases. After the meeting of George Bush and Michael Saakashvili, the journalists were informed that the joint communiqué of NATO member countries calls Russia to accelerate the process of the withdrawal of military bases from Georgia and Moldova, i.e. comply with the agreement achieved at the OSCE summit, as the part of the agreement on ordinary armament in Europe. Furthermore, **Georgia and, more generally, the Caucasus are given in the communiqué as strategically important region for NATO.**

The head of Russia’s foreign ministry considers such attitude of NATO incorrect and blames the alliance in becoming more active in the direction of Russia: “This organization appropriates new states and strengthens its forces more at the Russian border. **NATO does not give account to the interests of Russia and makes one-sided decisions**” – declared the Foreign Minister of Russia **Lavrov and left the summit as the protest sign** not even signing the document on renewing and focusing the Euro-Atlantic partnership.

In response to Lavrov’s demarche the president of Georgia declared that the conflicts in Caucasus are made by Russia and he hopes that President Putin will realistically approach these issues. (Newspaper “Khvalindeli dge”, “24 Saati”, June 30, 2004). Those realistic reasons and motivation, because of which the president of Russia, despite numerous invitations, evaded participation in the Summit, were viewed clearly in this context.

It is interesting that the electronic publication “Regnum” in the article **“The Russian Demarche in Istanbul”** notes that the **president of Georgia managed to discharge the tense situation after Lavrov’s demarche.** Although he stated that Russia was significantly conditioning the start of conflicts. However, he also noted that “nowadays relationships between Russia and Georgia would continue to exist by the principle of cooperation and good neighborhood.” According to “Regnum”, after this Lavrov stated that his leaving of the meeting hall was not dictated politically. Michael Saakashvili stated even before the official opening of the summit that **“finally evading talking about conflicts had to become the matter of the past”** and he intended to inform the

NATO member countries about conflicts. In the publications about the summit we come across the piece of information that **the USA tries to activate the role of Europe in the process of settling the conflicts in the Caucasus.**

According to the analysts, there are two ways – **either Caucasus becomes the base of cooperation between the west and Russia, or it is the zone of the clash of interests of Russia and the USA** (and not only them!). There is also an opinion in the press that strong and kindly disposed Georgia will solve a number of problems for Russia in the southern part automatically; though with troubles, **the Kremlin is aware of the fact that strong Georgia will be beneficial for Russia itself.** (Newspapers “Khvalindeli Dge”, “Mtavari Gazeti”, June 29, 2004).

When commenting the results of the summit, the expert of political sciences Ramaz Sakvarelidze expresses his deep concern about **the location of conflicts** according to which **NATO and Georgia stand on one side and Russia on the other.** This may cause troubles both in the direction of Abkhazia as well as Osetia. (Newspaper “Resonance”, June 30, 2004). The response of Russian media at the Istanbul summit can be an illustration of this – irritation not only because of the issue of the bases, but also with the face-to-face dialogue of Bush and Saakashvili and the fact that when taking the photo as envisaged by the protocol, George Bush intentionally stood beside the Georgian colleagues.

The statement of the secretary of the security council of the Russian Federation Igor Ivanov that **“the change of authorities in Georgia and then in Adjara was neither the rose nor velvet revolution, is the “merit” of Istanbul summit. This was a forceful change of the authorities and in both cases it is the merit of Russia to avoid the bloodshed”.** (Newspaper “Mtavari Gazeti”, July 1, 2004).

The NATO summit in Istanbul is regarded by the Georgian press as **the success of Georgian diplomacy;** “The Morning Newspaper” wrote that president **Saakashvili invaded Turkey with media technologies** and he is fully proficient in the technologies of the new epoch.

According to the assessment of president Saakashvili, **“A completely new stage is starting for Georgia. We needed time, we needed patience”; “NATO is the ticket to enter the European Union”.** (Newspapers “Dilis Gazeti”, “24 Saati”, “Mtavari Gazeti”, July 1, 2004).

We would hereby note that it was important to be in Istanbul for President Saakashvili who was invited at the summit in the form of a guest from the point of view **of deepening relations with Turkey.** According to the press, the government of Turkey demonstrated exceptional relationship towards Georgia. Michael Saakashvili was given a festive meeting by one of the municipalities with roses and the concert. On his behalf, Saakashvili stated in the interview with the French “Le Monde” that **Europe had to evaluate merits of Turkey and religious factor did not have to have impact on this evaluation. In case Turkey becomes the member of the European Union, Georgia will follow automatically.** When being in Istanbul, the president of Georgia had an official meeting with the President of Turkey Akhmed Nejep Sezer. It had been decided to send a 100-

men Turkish delegation of businessmen to Georgia in August. The business forum between Georgia and Turkey will be held under the aegis of economic cooperation; The Turkish prime minister will also visit Georgia. (Newspaper “Sakartvelos Respublika”, June 29, 2004).

While analyzing the theme of NATO’s summit, the following opinion attracted attention in newspaper “Axali Versia”: “Not only Russia, but also USA is seeking the basis in Caucasus and East. According to one part of Georgian experts, the **western plan** is already elaborated with **involvement Phereidan Georgian in this process**. According to unconfirmed information, Georgian government has already given its consent about involvement of Phereidanian Georgians in this process. With this purpose, Georgian side will begin special ideological work in Phereidan. **“Laz population, which lives in Turkey, is also discussed as a base for America”**. (Newspaper “Axali Versia”, June 28, 2004).

In the same newspaper, publication on the voyage of the President **Saakashvili to Iran**, this approach is highlighted in the title: **“Western Interests in Phereidan”, “America is looking for Political Base in Iran”**. We read: “In “Governmental lobbies” there are some talks, that **Georgia is lobbying western interests in Iran**. This is on making a kind of military-political bridgehead in Phereidan, which America will use for fight against Islam fundamentalism. In this plan Georgia is given a function of main ideologist”.

Expert of political sciences Ramaz Sakvarelidze mentions that **“it is difficult to find a country in Caucasus, which has an equal relations with Iran, Turkey, America and Russia**, taking into account these facts Georgia can easily take a role of the creator of **political balance**” (Newspaper “Axali Versia”, July 9, 2004).

This version does not seem groundless, if we take into consideration the fact that, before NATO’s summit Georgian broadcasting companies (TV companys “Mze”, “Imedi”, “Rustavi 2”) broadcasted new films on population of Phereidanian and Laze. It is also worth to mentioning, that the visit of Michael Saakashvili in Phereidan created strong emotional background and this visit was not delayed despite the events developed in Tskhinvali region in August.

Informal meeting of Saakashvili and Putin in Moscow was the logical continuation of NATO’s summit. According to media, meeting lasted longer than it was planned. Saakashvili was trying to convince Putin, that NATO’s military centers will not be established in Georgia that he will “Russian military forces will have all normal conditions to leave Georgia” and that Russia can cooperate with Georgia in the Antiterrorist Centre. Seems he could partially assure Putin, because, according to Saakashvili’s statement, **the Kremlin is consent to simplify the visa regime for Georgia’s citizens**. At the same time the President of Russia declares, that he is ready to discuss concrete suggestions of Georgia on regulation of conflicts (Tskhinvali); that the Military Councils of Russia and Georgia will begin to start making the practical steps towards creation of joint Antiterrorist Centre.

In the publications of media it is not defined concretely, weather presidents have agreed about Russia’s absolute non-interference in Tskhinvali’s conflict, but Michael Saakashvili declares, that **“Putin is positive and Osetia**

should not have a hope that Russia participates in their relations with Georgia”. In the interview with the newspaper “Isvestia” he says, that there are more important issues in relations between two countries, than “South Osetia”. Saakashvili shows to KoKoiti regime, that Tskhinvali region is not such a strategically important for Russia, so the Kremlin will not spoil relations with West for South Osetia.

All the above mentioned makes us to conclude, that:

It can't be said that after the “Rose Revolution”, the picture of Georgian-Russian-USA relationships has substantially changed **in terms of information**. However, the change is still clearly visible; the traditional “Russian factor” is still there. **The psychological and information image of the omnipotence of Russia gradually changes the direction – the key to the problems in Georgia no longer lies only in Russia;** Besides the fact that not only Georgia but also the West definitely takes into account the Russian factor, on its behalf, **Russia also has to take into consideration the factor of the state interest of Georgia and personally Michael Saakashvili.** The president of Georgia, on the one hand, allows himself “to give a name” to the attitude of Russia towards Georgia (for example, his speech at the Istanbul Summit). On the other hand, he spreads the message that he always counts on **pragmatic policy of president Putin**, a constructive dialogue and friendship with him. **Putin is basically shown in the positive context, with the image of a realistic politician.** A typical example of “old mentality”, in our opinion, can be the phrase said by a Russian parliament member to Georgian journalists: **“Our Vova handed Abkhazia and South Osetia to your Bush”.** (Newspaper “24 Saati”, June 11).

We refer to this phrase to underline one tendency – the hope of regulating conflicts through the “arrangement” between Russia and USA is really noticeable in media (before the events of 2004's August).

Economic factor moves forward to balance Georgia-Russian confrontation and Georgia-US partnership, which, according to picture created in media, is beneficial for all three sides and for Europe as well.

Activation of pro Europe direction after the “Rose Revolution”, was not only the message serving for neutralization of irritation of Russia (mostly created due to the direction of Georgia to NATO), but also it highlights the strong interest of Europe towards Georgia.

“Informational Guarantee” of Destabilization

Entitling this chapter this way was not our purpose; Certainly, we do not mean, that destabilization processes were initiated by the desire and fantasy of press; But, on every concrete stage, the tendency of making the informatinal background for destabilization and, not very seldom, initiation of sevrsal processes are emphasized while analyzing the press.

The dynamics of destabilization in 2000-2002 created such Picture:

- I circle – 2000 – began from choosing president Eduard Shevardnadze, with the government's discreditation campaign and continued till “autumn destabilization” – the November-December's “electric bunt”;
- II circle – 2001 – the danger of beginning Russia's military operation in Pankisi and the expectation of destabilization continued till the “autumn destabilization” – so called “November Revolution”;
- III circle – 2002 – on the background of Pankisi's permanent danger and Russia's aggression – again the informational preparations for “autumn destabilization”.

During these years, the scripts of destabilization developed with almost same dramatic composition – “active vulcano” – Pankisi, Abkhazia, Kodor and the permanent informational agitation of Russia's danger; “reserved versions” – Samegrelo, Samegrelo-Zemo Svaneti, demonstrations under the reason of expressing social dissatisfaction and defending democracy, together with the activity of non-governmental organizations and proper informational maintenance...

The stereotype, formed by the information weather maker media – that **Georgia is not formed country**, and that **Georgia is dangerous country** – created the common background to destabilization processes.

In 2003, in posterior period of “Rose Revolution”, aprior was created the background, that the elections in Georgia would inevitably be falsified and people had to come out in the streets”; “It is easy to lead people out in the streets, but it is hard to lead them in... The population led out in 1991 is still out”, - declared the former State Minister and the leader of “Qristian-Demokratiuli Kavshiri” (“Christian-Democratic Union”) Vaja Lortkipanidze, (Newspaper “Akhali Versia”, June 2, 2003).

In June, **the visit of James Backer to Georgia, importantly changed the development of processes in Georgian political reality**. After several close meeting with president and the leaders of oppositional parties, it became well-known, that Backer brought in Georgia the American scheme of holding parliament elections. As printed media mentioned, **“Backer's visit wrecked the opposition's plan for destabilization”** and his visit once more proved, America's main purpose in Georgia is the **creation of stable country**.

The sharp emotional charge accumulated in press and the expectation of destabilization often play the role of “signal shot”.

“We must be waiting for social explosion during the year”, - newspaper “Resonansi” concretizes the date of destabilization a year before and therewith, on the first page, affirms this prognosis with titles – **“Shevardnadze is leading us to social explosion”** (Newspaper “Resonansi”, May 22, 2000); **“There will be bunt in autumn”** (Newspaper “Akhali Taoba”, May 31, 2000); **“A lot of demonstrations were held last week, not very groundless doubt is caused, that this is profitable for someone”** (newspaper “Droni”, May 2, 2000). In newspaper articles and in telecompany “Rustavi 2's” programmes, the words “impeachment”, “Yugoslavia's example” and etc are figured.

To disguise the script of “revolutional attack” and not to abolish the image of “democratic country”, parliament

activates the theme of the new model of country's arrangement. But the development of this theme helps the destabilization, because **the inevitability of establishing parliament republic** is explained by the supporters of this idea and mass media, with **the crisis of presidential ruling**, and more than that, with its overgrowing into dictatorship.

In November, two factors – winter and electric crisis connected each other and destabilization reached the pick point. Again, the diligence of mass media (especially of telecompany “Rustavi 2” and newspapers- “Alia” and “Resonansi”) for tensing the crisis's dynamics, attracts attention. The organizers and participants of the meeting started in Tbilisi, were firmly maintaining, that these demonstrations do not have political character, and in printed media's publications such phrases are appeared: **“Armed excesses”, “The request of government's resignation”, “Dispersal of parliament”, “Darkened Tbilisi is getting ready for revolution”, “One step is left till the revolution” and the magic phrase – “The country turn over?!”** (Newspapers “Alia”, “Resonansi”, November 13-23, 2000).

It is important, that even those newspapers, which publications are not of provocative character, are less interested in that trying social and economical background provoking that situation and mostly, they are elucidating – **“for whom is destabilization in Georgia profitable?”** Important is newspaper “Dilis Gazeti's” publication, in which various versions, as a respond on that question are transfered: parliament's member **Elene Tevdoradze** supports the version of blaming authority; Parliament member **Giorgi Targamadze** **blames the both branches of authority for “ruled destabilization”**; Irina **Sarishvili-Chanturia** blames all those forces, and first of all **“Moqalaqeta Kavshiri” (“Citizens's Union”)**, which “ after Shevardnadze has left the politics, will not be able to come in the head of authority by elections”; Parliament member, philosopher **Michael Naneishvili** makes highlight on Russia: “No matter how much opposed are the groups wishing destabilization, behind them, evidently or secretly, **stands Russia...** this is not supposition, I simply know, that it is true”; The leader of “Respublikelebi” (“Republicans”) **Davit Berdzenishvili** predicts **the overthrow of authority:** “Kartagen must be ruined!” (47)

Press's resonance on the events of 2001's autumn, which was followed by the resignation of Head of the Parliament and Government, witnesses, Russia was not excluded from the “autorship of this script”. Especially because, that doubtfully coincided with each other the blaming Georgia for terrorism, bombing Kodori and Pankisi, wave of numerous meetings in Tbilisi, with the activity of students (at first requiring the press's freedom), which overgrew in political speeches requiring the resignation of president and government.

“If Chechenian militaries have got in Abjhazia from Georgia, this means, that it was maintained by Russians, along with Georgia's authority”, - declared parliament member Koba Davitashvili in the interview with newspaper “Akhali Taoba” (Newspaper “Akhali Taoba”, October 10, 2001).

Leaning on Russian on-line media, newspaper “Akhali Meridiani” was developing the version of Russian provocation: “It is important, that on several Russian Internet sites, information about bombing Kodori,

appeared an hour before fulfilling the air attack. It is worth foreseeing, that the Internet portals of “Ru” are strictly controlled by Russia’s special-service. therefore, **this was preliminarily planned provocation. Russia has already set in motion the old methods of informational war**”. (52).

In Georgian printed media of 2001’s November-December, we often meet the “fragments” from one of the following “Russian script” of changing Georgia’s authority and it gets a kind of collective shape in newspaper “Akhali Versia”, whichs title of publication (**“Who was acting according to Russian script – Targamadze-Patarkacishvili or Jvania-Saakashvili?”**) includes two presumable versions, and the main purpose figures in the lid of stuff: “According to politolog’s common opinion (publication leans on the opinions of politologs – Levan Berdzenishvili, Givi Bolotashvili, Ramaz Klimiashvili, Gia Nodia – L.K.), **day by day Shevardnadze is getting more and more inadmissible for Russian political elite and that is why, the anti-Shevardnadze hysteria is begining in Russian means of information.** It is not excluded, that in the high echelons of Russia, the script of changing Georgia’s authority is being written”.(55)

According to above mentioned publication, the **first version** is following: **the events developed in Abkhazia and Kodor in the end of September, were addressed not to returning abkhazia, but to changing the authority in Georgia according Russian script;** One of the regions of Abkhazia would have been captured by Chechnian Terrorists and the Internal Miniser of that time, Kakha Targamadze would have been declared as the hero of this victory. He would have been the ruler of the country as well. Herewith, Russia was trying to remove the Chechnians from Pankisi, establish them in Abkhazia and “catch two rabbits at the same time” with such action.

According to **second version, the velvet revolution was being planned in Georgia. Behind the student’s demonstrations, with Russia’s directive, stood Jvania-Saakashvili’s team.** For “rescuing” Shevardnadze, Russia would have played the role of “kind fairy” and, in return for this service, it would have moved Georgia on Russian orbit.

We will call for the analytic stuff of “National Laboratory Of External Politics” – “Political situation in Georgia”, in which it is mentioned: **“2001’s events showed, that “Akhalgazrda Repormatorebi” (“Young Reformers”) can mobilize the mass and provoke the scaled crisis,** but they can not take an authority and preserve the control on situation. In the end of 2001 it was opposition, who had to compromise. (28).

When Georgian press was elucidating, who arranged the 2001’s crisis called “November’s Revolution”, Russian analysts do not even rise a question about this issue, they concretely name the “addressee” - **“Akhalgazrda Repormatorebi” (“Young Reformers”)**.

The analyze of press, at the first glance, gives the possibility to make paradoxical conclusion: **despite the accusations directed towards Russia, in initiating the destabilizational processes, several Georgian publications are identical to Russian publications.** We mean not the coincidence of facts with each other, but the highlight, the provocative character of stuff, for instance, newspaper “Akhali Versia” highlights Pankisi’s

theme more provocatively, than Russian media does. There is an impression, that this newspaper is created specially for that.

The analyze of press shows, that destabilization processes were not “ruled only from the outside”; Internal political forces also successfully used this maneuver in the struggles for authority, which, summarily, seriously damaged Russia-Georgia’s relations and weakened Georgia.

III chapter

Elections and the Political Spectrum

Elections of President, 2000 Year and Local Elections, 2002 Year

American experts of political sciences, the authors of the book “American Democracy” (Quenet Janda, Jephry M. Berry, Jerry Goldman), think, that during the democratic elections, **“main function of mass information means is transferring the information from public to the government,** mainly on the basis of public opinion study”. (Quenet Janda, Jephry M. Berry, Jerry Goldman, “American Democracy”, page 151).

It can be mentioned, that Georgian media dealt with the problem of “delivering the information from public” (but study of public opinion was not used as a basis of this information) more adequately in the first years of declared independence (till the middle of 90’s of past century), when periodical publications spontaneously, but with maximum diversification highlighted positions of political party and approaches of opinion leaders, which, frequently, were categorically controversial.

In our opinion, that time, the printed media rescued from censorship and dedication, made **an atmosphere of some kind of “natural pluralism”**, when main problems of country and not important issues were discussed with equal polemical whim and emotionality. After the second part of 90’s and especially after 2000 year, media became the arm for the struggle for authority even more than it was before. From this point of view, **it more successfully plays the role of instrument for delivering the proper messages to the society, for initiating the proper processes, than it fulfills the communicational function of the mediator between society and the government.**

In our analyzing period, two - presidential, two - parliamentary and one elections of local government were held in Georgia. Also very important is “post Aslanian” Adjara’s High Council’s elections as it was conducting first time without the hegemony of Adjara’s ruling party “Agordzineba” (“Revival”), and more than that, without its participation, and in the conditions of rather real competition. So we thought it would be advisable to emphasize our attention shortly to these elections as well.

In contrast with the parliamentary elections of 1999, the interest towards the presidential elections of 2000 year weakened in media; it is noticeable, that even on the background of two important presidential candidates – Aslan Abashidze and Jumber Patiashvili – Shevardnadze is considered to be the candidate having no alternative. It is interesting, that in contrast with 1999's parliamentary elections, when the "image of enemy" was made from "Agordzineba" ("Revival"), this time, media publications are concentrated mostly on Jumber Patiashvili, who is also highlighted in scandalous context.

In his report – "Election Processes in Georgia", Davit Usuphashvili and Gia Nodia are mentioning, that **"2000's presidential elections may be considered to be the worst elections in history of Georgia: Local, as well as foreign experts have mentioned, that the level of voter's activity was noticeably low and very often the bulletins were thrown to box illegally.** (25, page 26).

More important is that as soon as election campaign was over, media and broadcasting company "Rustavi 2" started highlighting not only fact of adulteration of elections' results, but aggressively attacked the President (mostly newspapers "Alia" and "Resonance") what was for some pint a reason for creation of this dissertation. According to the formulation of broadcasting company "Rustavi 2", **"80% of votes were collected from empty electoral boxes"**. (Broadcasting Company "Rustavi 2", program "Post Scriptum", May 6, 2000). Seems, the high results (Eduard Shevardnadze won this lections with 79,3%, his main competitor, Jumber Patiashvili got 16,7% of votes) received on the background of the inertness of voters and active use of so called administrative resources, became the reason aggressive attack of media on the President Sevardnadze. Newspaper "Alia" predicted, that **"Regime of Shevardnadze will be called authoritarian and totalitarian, where politicians are chased... History will show that political terror was raging in Shevardnadze's epoch"**. (Newspaper "Alia", April 11-12, 2000).

"Political earthquake" – in this way were named political events developed in the period before local elections of 2002 year in media. Tension, which was developed before elections broached the weak points, logically finalized the process of sharp opposition in "Moqalaqeta Kavshiri" ("Citizen's Union") and separation of so called "reformers" from the ruling party. **"Electoral bunker", "The exhibition of underwears in the parliament", "Political insanitary", "Political corruption", "Political farce"** – such messages were highlighted by media on the scandalous assembly of the Parliament of Georgia of May 8.

In contrast from the previous elections, when the "starting condition" of the parties were discussed on the background of primacy of the party "Moqalaqeta Kavshiri" ("Citizen's Union"), now **"Moqalaqeta Kavshiri" became the most scandalous topic of local elections ("Citizen's Union") itself:** Their separation into **"Mamaladzists"** and **"Zurists"**, the raged struggle between them at the access of central electoral committee, justice etc. In the publications describing this process, the central electoral committee was figured in negative context more and more often.

According to general evaluation of media, **elections of May 2nd were kind of a test establishing the readiness of political spectrum also for the post Shevardnadze period.** This time, in contrast with last elections, media in parallel with electoral battles, **paid attention also to the electorate.**

In elections, in **Tbilisi won “Nacionaluri Modzraoba” (“National Movement”) and “Leiboristuli Partia” (“Labor party”),** which were competing with each other in “especially sharp critic of the government”, in most **regions,** better results were received by **“Axali Memarjveneebi” (“The new Rights”),** which were the main opponents of “Nacionaluri Modzraoba” (“National Movement”) and Jvania’s team, and, accordingly, were considered to be the covert support of the president”. (Gia Nodia, “The Summation of 15 Years Path”, page 50). The low results of ruling party “Moqalaqeta Kavshiri” (“Citizen’s Union”) (From which Jvania’s team separated a little before elections) were predictable, but still, only 2% of the votes were received in Tbilisi, (and less than 2% in the whole country), despite the pessimistic predictions, this fact was shocking.

According to expert of political sciences Gia Nodia, these elections have become **“the first examination of new disposition of the power”,** and after elections, appointing the State Minister, Avtandil Jorbenadze as a leader of “Moqalaqeta Kavshiri” (“Citizen’s Union”) meant the attempt of reconstructing this party – **“nomenclature” union consolidated around authority”.** (23, pages 50-51).

From our point of view, analyzing by media of electrons campaign itself, its nearest and long term results, political, social, psychological and other aspects, what was done right after elections process was completed shows that media and society have entered qualitatively new stage of development. After elections newspaper “Khvalindeli Dge” emphasized the topic of **“privatization of electorate”,** newspapers – “Akhali Epoqa” and “Droni” interested in the **process of elections in regions** (As usual, when highlighting local elections, media was mainly bordered with the current processes in the capital).

Special attention should be paid to the results of public opinion polls published in media. When comparing the data published in may to the data of the February of current year, the most noticeable is **increase of the rating of party “Nacionaluri Modzraoba” (“National Movement”) - in three months from 2,3% to 10,3%.** According Merab Phachulia, head of Public Opinion Poll and Marketing Association “Gorbi” **“PR technologies impressively developed** and step by step we face the situation, which western countries were familiar with ten years ago”. (54)

Local elections of 2002 year were distinguished from every other election processes conducted before, because the election campaign and its highlighting in media were accompanied with intensive public opinion polls data and using of simple electoral technologies. If until this period in media there was a kind of amorphous attitude towards the topic of ”PR”, now it was mentioned in rather adequate context and more frequently. Here should also be mentioned that PR Company “Nikkolo M” has become a main target of politicians and journalists. One part of the society was thinking that all these processes were ruled from the chancellery (by Shevardnadze), against Saakashvili and others (newspaper “Akhali Taoba”, April 5, 2002), others were proving the opposite –

that “Nikkolo M” actively contributed to the success of Saakashvili, that the battles of local elections were developed according to the scenario, which was elaborated by the company”. (newspaper “Akhali Taoba”, June 6, 2002). Giorgi Gambashidze, head representative office of “Nikkolo M” mentioned: **“every political party should concentrate their efforts on preparing of society for elections”**. (Newspaper “Saqartvelos Respublika”, May 30, 2002).

New for such processes in Georgia was also that while discussing elections results, **media has paid attention to the form and content of advertising campaigns and their inconvenience with the requirements of Georgian legislation**. (Magazine “Imigi”, number 4, 2002). Even more, problem of inconveniences and gaps in legislation framework on political advertising was highlighted several times and in different publications by media.

Permanent Election Regime, 2003 Year

2003 election period was drastically different from the previous parliamentary elections, since it was a sort of rehearsal for the Presidential Elections of 2005, the process of preparing bridgehead for “Georgia without Shevardnadze”.

We did not entitle this chapter – **“Permanent election regime”** – accidentally; Actually, election preparations by political contestants and outline of election disposition started in the beginning of the year; And for the whole year the country’s life was led as one whole election campaign; Accordingly, mass media was also turned to such regime.

14 parties and 7 election blocs were fighting for victory in Georgia’s parliament, but 7-8 of them were considered to be the real candidates for victory.

Dividing political spectrum into position and opposition was more paradoxical during these elections, than during the previous ones. It will be enough to say, that in print media Nino Burjanadze’s candidacy (who really became the leader of particular opposition bloc (since opposition did not manage to unite) “Burjanadze-Democratebi” (“Burjanadze-Democrats”) was considered to be the possible leader of the united opposition. She led the election campaign till the end in her capacity of the Parliament Chairperson and when strictly criticizing the government, she was forgetting the fact, that she was the second person of the country. The election campaign of the government bloc (the main force of which was former ruling party “Moqalaqeta Kavshiri” (“Citizen’s Union”) was actually led (also from the high level position) by its leader, State Minister Avtandil Jorbenadze.

Three oppositional parties, which came out leading in pre-election ratings, were all originally breakaway factions of the formerly ruling party “Moqalaqeta Kavshiri” (“Citizen’s Union”):

The “**Saakashvili-Nacionaluri Modzraoba**” (“**Saakashvili-National Movement**”) – stood for the last elections under the umbrella of the “Moqalaqeta Kavshiri” (“Citizen’s Union”), led by former Justice Minister **Micheal Saakashvili**, who was then Head of Tbilisi City Administration.

The bloc “**Burjanadze-Demokratebi**” (“**Burjanadze- Democrats**”) – led by the Parliament Chairperson **Nino Burjanadze** and former Parliament Chairperson, the leader of former ruling party **Zurab Zhvania**.

The “**Akhali Memarjveneebi**” (“**New Rights**”) - led by former businessman **David Gamkrelidze** and **Levan Gachechiladze** stood for the last elections under the umbrella of the “Moqalaqeta Kavshiri” (“Citizen’s Union”).

Rather old “**Leiboristuli partia**” (“**Labour Party**”) (with constant leader Shalva Natelashvili), which was leading in election ratings as well, didn’t not consider the above mentioned political forces to be opposition and continually blamed them for being in alliance with the government.

The “**Agordzineba**” (“Revival”) (“The Union Of Democratic Revival”) (The main competitor of the “Moqalaqeta Kavshiri” (“Citizen’s Union”) previously) - other opposition forces considered this party to be the government party, since it was the ruling party of the Autonomous Republic of Adjara. The “**Agordzineba**” (“Revival”) considered itself to be real opposition party.

So called **governmental bloc** – “**For New Georgia**”, consisted of several contestants, among which were the parties created in the first years of independence, with relevant authority in the past: “Erovnul-Demokratiuli Partia” (LDP) (“National-Democratic Party” (NDP), “Qristian-Demokratiuli Kavshiri” (“Christian-Democratic Union”), “Mcvaneta Partia” (“Green Party”); Also, former ruling party – “Moqalaqeta Kavshiri” (“Citizen’s Union”), socialist party and other subjects.

The unification of the opposition, while strongly desired in society, was made impossible by the personal ambition of above mentioned leaders, almost all of whom (except Levan Gachechiladze) aspired openly or secretly to become the President of Georgia. (It turned out, that after years Gachechiladze also became inspired by this ambition).

Hence, all political parties were identified with their leaders and not their political programs.

Personal factor was the **determinative for electoral choice** this time as well. From this point of view the most distinguished fact is the development of Nino Burjanadze’s strategic (election) image in a rather short period of time, print media paid particular attention to the above. “**Burjanadze as a political product is made by Zhvania and Shevardnadze**, - wrote magazine “Sarke” – “**Political organization, which did not have a chance to overcome 7% threshold, became the favorite during the pre-election marathon after confluence with Burjanadze**”. (Nino Metreveli, “Burjanadze is made by Zhvania and Shevardnadze”, magazine “Sarke”, October 15-20, 2003).

Bringing Nino Burjanadze to the political stage and Zurab Zhvania staying in shadow is explained in print media mostly by the fact, that Zhvania does not have charisma, therefore he can not be compared with

Saakashvili (having a high rating) in this respect as well. It should be mentioned, that along with his charismatic personality, **Saakashvili, as a political leader, first of all is associated with the hero fighting against corruption**, with reforms (especially the judiciary reform), radical changes and etc.

“Sociological war”, “making ratings”, “manipulating with ratings” – such concepts in media’s vocabulary meant, that in these elections sociological surveys had become to some extent means of manipulation. Print media wrote, that the discrepancy between the results of pre-election polls and the actual election results, would become a major reason for destabilization of the situation.

The point of view, according to which **the activation of technologies had an influence on the formation of the electoral landscape and increased the voter’s readiness for the choice**, is also remarkable in media. The opinion of the PR company “Nikkolo M” leader Giorgi Gambashidze is noteworthy, according to him “today **the electorate is already established** and the time of “whirligigs” in Georgia has gone”. In his opinion, unlike previous elections, the President’s particular support towards the government bloc is not noticeable. The President has achieved the main goal – **the electoral desire for participating in elections is increased**. (TV company “Imedi”, programme “Archevani”, October 3, 2003).

In the first part of the dissertation we emphasized the factor of media, which has paved the way for “velvet” transition in post Shevardnadze epoch, later for “the special role of TV called “victorious television” - “Rustavi 2” in the “Rose Revolution” etc. To illustrate the media’s influence on the electoral choice, we will refer to the opinion of one of the influential and successful political consultants of modern America, Dick Morris. He mentions that “nowadays **Americans** are the **electorate** consisting of **informational addicts**”, **the high level of awareness helps them to form their own political opinions**. Accordingly, Americans become more and more independent politically and a huge part of electorate – 40 percent, the people, who are not the supporters of either of the two main political parties (Republicans and Democrats – L.K), do not vote for their programs. (21, pages 11-14). Dick Morris considers the factor of electorate’s independence to be the index of America’s democracy.

“Democracy – this is election, and with the election we are trying to ascertain in which direction must the development of the country go”, - Leshek Balcerovich mentions in his book – “State In Transitive Period”. (3, page 12).

As we can observe, the election and the factor of voter’s independence is the one of the most important criterion for determination of country’s democracy level. In this light the role of media which influences electoral choice is especially important. We have not highlighted this topic accidentally. In our opinion the **“Rose Revolution”**, with which the permanent election regime of 2003 was over, originally was **“political technology product”**. Therefore we decided to fix our attention to (in this direction) less explored highlights in print media, than to election battles, the demonstrations of “Kmara”, “American election recipe” (the wording of print media), which James Baker has brought to Georgia (the print media of July 7-9, 2003) and etc.

*

Election is Georgia's test for Democracy – this attitude towards the parliamentary election is most evident in print media. Experts (and Western experts as well) agree that no elections held in a post-Soviet country had caused stronger international interest. The high number of observers, over 2,000, proved the above stated opinion. **Senator John McCain**, who visited Georgia in October declared, that America's aim is the fair elections to be held in Georgia: **“Georgia is a symbol of freedom for Americans and it will be good if it stays the same after elections as well”**. He mentioned, that **“America does not have its candidate in these elections”**. It is noteworthy to refer to McCain's words: **“If country asks others to protect its freedom, it loses its freedom”**. (Newspaper “Mtavari Gazeti”, October 6, 2003).

According to **Mark Mullen**, director of the National Democratic Institute, **“the fate of the elections is in the hands of Georgia's citizens”**. He considered that all parties, in one way or another, should take responsibility for holding fair elections.

The unrest following the presidential elections in Azerbaijan also affected the international community's attitude. It was widely assumed in Georgia that **international community would not be as lenient towards Georgia as it had been in Azerbaijan**. This assumption was proven right as **Jaap de Hoop Scheffer**, Chairman-in-Office of the OSCE, declared **Europe's intent to strictly supervise the election process in Georgia, which will then demonstrate the future of Georgia's ambition to be fully integrated in Euro Atlantic Space**. (Newspaper “Mtavari Gazeti”, October 22, 2003) In parallels, analysts were not forgetting Russia's factor (In the context – “Georgia- crossroad of Russia-America's interests”). Fears that Russia would utilize the election process to further the destabilization of Georgia were also rife before the elections.

Just as had happened in Azerbaijan, the opposition made statements in the pre-election period that the **falsification of the elections was almost inevitable**. Once results were being generated, **public demonstration that carried a potential of civil unrest also became all but inevitable**. The events in Azerbaijan also led to an expectation of unrest following Georgia's elections.

As elections are approaching, alarming titles are becoming more common for print media: **“Is the bloodshed planned between displaced persons and local population In Zugdidi?”**; **“The elections can be disrupted in Vani”** (newspaper “Resonansi”, October 23, 2003), **“Shevardnadze is preparing Baku's script to those dissatisfied with falsification of elections”**; **“There will be no electricity on election day”** (newspaper “Khvalindeli Dge”, October 23, 2003), **“Opposition is psychologically preparing the population go to the streets after elections”**; **“Pre-election campaign is gaining criminal character”** (newspaper “Akhali Taoba”, October 24, 2003), **“Pre-election disagreement is becoming harsher in Lagodekhi”** (newspaper “24 Saati”, October 24, 2003) and etc.

Most controversy surrounded the voters' registration lists, with the government, the opposition, the Central Election Commission and NGOs all accusing each other of falsifying the lists. However, opinion polls were also an important destabilizing factor in the election campaign. The discrepancy between the results of pre-election polls and the actual election results, as expected, became a major reason for protest after the election.

The preliminary official results showed the Governmental "For New Georgia" bloc leading with over 24% of the vote, followed by the "Nacionaluri Modzraoba" ("National Movement") with 22%, the "Leiboristuli Partia" ("Labor Party") with 13%, the "Burjanadze-Democratebi" ("Burjanadze-Democrats") with close to 9%, and the "Akhali Memarjveneebi" ("New Rights") barely over the 7% threshold. While these results showed ca. 70% of the votes going to the opposition, they were also fiercely contested, as parallel tabulations and exit polls had all shown the "Nacionaluri Modzraoba" ("National Movement") over six percentage points ahead of the Governmental Bloc. Both official and independent results were most disappointing for the "Burjanadze-Democratebi" ("Burjanadze-Democrats"), whose rating prior to the elections had varied between first and second place.

International observers showed little leniency while assessing the elections. Mr. **Bruce George**, special coordinator of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office, noted that "these elections have, regrettably, been insufficient to enhance the credibility of either the electoral or the democratic process". The president of US's International Republic Institute Geoge Philson emphasized attention to the problems which came in gradually on election day: The lists of the voters, incompetence of election administration, usage of administrative resources, non existence of political party's ideology. (TV company "Rustavi 2", November 3, 2003).

The escalation of tension was caused by the entry of the data from Adjara autonomous republic in the Central Election Commission, according to which the preliminary results of elections were turned upside-down – "Agordzineba" ("Revival") had outrun the government bloc and "Nacionaluri Modzraoba" ("National Movement") and moved to the first place. Probably this was the result of "grandfathers" (Shevardnadze-Abashidze) one more arrangement – next maneuver for preserving authority.

The situation became extremely tense not only in the capital, but in regions as well. In Tbilisi, the lines of demonstrators grouped in front of Parliament were increasing with geometric progression. The voices of demonstrators shouting – "Misha!", "Misha!" – indicated to the primate of "Nacionalebi's" ("Nationals") supporters, and "resign!" addressed to Eduard Shevardnadze indicated that all the dissatisfactions – political, social and personal, were accumulated in the request of president's resignation.

On November 14 the situation was further developed– thousands of people gathered in the capital, mostly the supporters of "Nacionaluri Modzraoba" ("National Movement") and "Burjanadze-Democratebi" ("Burjanadze- Democrats"); During the whole period of demonstrations the youth movement "Kmara" was most active and radical (print media connected its funding with Soros)...

The rallies by several thousands of protesters aimed at **“determining Georgia’s fate”**, became the object of interest for the world society through “CNN”, “BBC”, “Euronews” and other means of information. Actually, these manifestations played the role of the rehearsal for the “Rose Revolution” taking into consideration their scale, organization level, peaceful character, peaceful dispersal. In print media, this event was evaluated as indicator for the fact that at that stage Georgian civil society had “passed an examination”. (The print media of November 15, 2003); As for the assessments and importance of the “Rose Revolution”, this topic is developed in the next part of the dissertation – “The Rose Revolution” And The Post-revolutionary Period”.

Elections of Parliament and President, 2004 Year

“2004 presidential and parliamentary elections were part of the post revolutionary period... **The political choice of citizens was revealed during the “Rose Revolution”**. Most of international organizations considered elections to be exemplary, but it is better when the sin is disclosed – **there was nothing to chose at that time, since the opposition opinion disappears during the revolutionary euphoria**”, - mentions Maia Toradze in her dissertation “Modern press and the problem of elections (journalistic aspects)”. (36, page 46).

Although we agree with the aforementioned opinion, we will still pay attention to the coverage of 2004 elections, given that the publications, highlights and details related to this topic complete the general picture of post revolutionary situation coverage in printed media and demonstrates, **that “the “Rose Revolution” has not significantly changed the main reference point for Georgia’s political life and press – the primacy of the struggle for the authority**, through dominance of personalities .

Despite the fact, that during the “Rose Revolution” and, especially in its last days, the image, function and importance of Micheal Saakashvili as a revolution leader was emphasized, immediately on the second day after the revolution different versions were developed in the press in respect of potential presidential candidates; Certainly Micheal Saakashvili is referred to, but Nino Burjanadze is also mentioned. For instance, the newspaper “Khvalindeli Dge” wrote, that “supposedly, for the majority of political forces existing in Georgia Nino Burjanadze would be the more or less acceptable presidential candidate”. **She will be favored, because she is considered to be less radical than Saakashvili**”. (Newspaper “Khvalindeli Dge”, November 26, 2003).

When discussing presidential dignities of Micheal Saakashvili, **his charismatic personality, reluctance to alternatives, courage, emotionality** (Let’s recall Vakhushti Kotetishvili’s well-known words – **“We, Georgians, are emotional people and we are electing the emotional president”**), **infantilism, “the image created by America”** used to be emphasized...

In the days following the revolution weakening of the level of Micheal Saakashvili’s radicalism and aggression along with his ambition was clearly visible in print media. From this point of view, he is presented in the

newspaper “24 Saati”, issues dated 24-25 November, in the most beneficial way, (his effective photo, on which he looks balanced and calm, captures attention): It is worthwhile to mention, that in one of the publications Saakashvili gives a high estimation to ex-president: **“Shevardnadze is a grand person”**; **“the President was acting with dignity”**. (Newspaper “24 Saati”, December 24, 2003) (It can be stated without any exaggeration, that after that, before becoming a president and while being a president, Micheal Saakashvili was categorically denying Eduard Shevardnadze’s person, was mentioning him only in sharply negative context and when beginning some new initiative the words – “for the first time in Georgia...” – were sharply figured in his lexis). In connection with presidential elections print media develops the idea, that the existence of almost **joky candidates** does not make a good background for Saakashvili. The only candidate, which is considered to be rather important concurrent, is **Temur Shashiashvili**. In the beginning of election campaign, in his T.V. speeches and newspaper interviews, Temur Shashiashvili sharply mentioned, that every opposition and aggressive talk must be over in country; **Country needs academic tone and calmness**. He declares, that he does not approve the existence of such powerful presidential institute; Gamsakhurdia could not carry on such power, neither could Shevardnadze, famous as the politician of worldwide importance. If becoming a president, he is going to **destroy super centralized system**. (TV company “Rustavi 2”, TV company “Iberia”, December 15, 2003).

We will pay attention to the several highlights connected with Temur Shashiashvili: There was a version in print media that, his election campaign might be financed by Boris Berezovski and the Russian oligarch’s last scandalous visit in Tbilisi might be connected to him as well. (Newspaper “Akhali Epoqa”, December 5, 2003); **Aslan Abashidze** had to compromise and find the common language with Temur Shashiashvili **to defeat Michael Saakashvili in Adjara through Shashiashvili**; Or to come out of the situation through Shashiashvili and **find the reason for opening polling stations in Adjara**; (Newspaper “Akhali Versia”, November 24, 2003).

The pathos of presidential elections – “Everyone to elections” and actual absence of alternative presidential contenders reminded media elections of the Soviet period, while preliminary results (and the final, as well) showed close similarity with Zviad Gamsakhurdia’s and Eduard Shevardnadze’s elections, who were elected with “absolute superiority”. On the other hand, the following motivation appears in the press – “This superiority determined peoples’ hope and willingness for the changes; besides, a 96% victory is a manifestation of the last hope of electorate”.

What is the president expected for from the society? The journalist and media-expert Ia Antadze has formulated the most compact answer to this question. She distinguishes **three groups of population: the first group** (possibly the most numerous) – expect material **well-being of their families** from the 4th of January; **the second group** – do not connect personal prosperity with elections; they expect team responsibility of the

government and consistent actions of Georgian Nation; **the third group** – casts doubts on the government and considers, that expectations for the elections exceed the leaders' possibilities.

That means, that **one** part of the society expects from the election **Presidential heroism**, **another part** – **right actions from the governmental team**, and the **third part** – **legitimizing of the government with the help of civilians**. Ia Antadze draws attention to the fact, that in the election on the 4th of January, **the least is the quantity of those citizens, who expect nothing from the election**. That is a **new responsibility of the new government** to the country and people. (41)

*

The attitude of Party spectrum to Presidential elections and prospective Parliamentary elections entailed its post-revolutionary condition – scattered, at a loss and without clear-cut positions! **Opposition** concept, which was relative even before the revolution, became more indistinct. The pre-revolutionary period nominates – “Nacionalebi” (“Nationals”) and “Burjanadze-Democratebi” (“Burjanadze-Democrats”) now are representing governmental power, accordingly the process of mastering the released oppositional “niche” began.

Behind the opposition status it is automatically implied: Having one of the highest ratings during the previous years – the **“Leiboristebi” (“Labor Party”)**, which had boycotted the elections and the Leader of which declares, that he will always be in opposition of Zhvania and Saakashvili (though according to media the most part of his electorate had moved to the revolutionaries) is meant under this status.

“Agordzineba” (“Revival”), which was on the second place in gaining mandates (next to “Moqalaqeta Kavshiri” (“Citizen’s Union”), in the Parliament of 1999 and considered itself as a real opposition (against the background of opposition of the Center and the Region), have skillfully come over to the new government's side – abandoned boycott two hours before closing the polling stations and have not, yet, appealed against the date of the Parliamentary elections or conditions of their implementation; So, “Agordzineba” (“Revival”) is not considered as opposition in the media.

One more Party, who had passed the 7% threshold for the parliamentary elections of November 2, – **“Akhali Memarjveneebi” (“New Rights”)** has begun stating its positions in the media and does not exclude joining up in the right wing, opposition coalition for the Parliamentary elections.

One could say, that **“Mrecvelebi” (“Industrialists”)** have the most unprepossessing look among other Parties in the post-revolutionary period. Here and there in the press, has appeared information about their possible joining up with “Akhali Memarjveneebi” (“New Rights”).

After moving Rcheulishvili from the camp of **“Socialistebi” (“Socialist Party”)** into “passive”, Irakli Mindeli and Zaqaria Qucnashvili have become active; they do not exclude **coordination with left-wing**, but it is undefined, which Parties are meant in the unification, as the “Leiboristebi” (“Labor Party”) is categorically denying any joining up.

As for **National Democratic Party and Traditionalists**, which are referred to the new opposition, they strengthened their status of oppositionist by boycotting the elections; **Akaki Asatiani compared inauguration of Saakashvili to choosing the “tribe leader”**.

The party **“Tavisufleba” (“Freedom”)** formed after the “Rose Revolution” was a novelty in Georgian political spectrum, which caught the attention due to its leader **Konstantine (Koko) Gamsakhurdia**. Print media mentioned, that the names and surnames of party members were not famous, however, the appearance of Zviad Gamsakhurdia’s son in the political field would provoke a certain **sentimentality** in the electorate and thus enable the party to gather **“Zviadist” electorate’s votes**. In print media we can observe the perception of Koko Gamsakhurdia as Georgia’s **“spiritual president”**, as a “symbol” and not as a “political leader”; as **one of the “heroes” of upcoming presidential elections**, who might become a **“serious concurrent for Sorosians”** and etc. According to politician’s assessments, **he arrived late**; He had not participated in anything at all, it was possible to express something while being in emigration. He **does not have any distinct message**; The press ombudsman of newspaper “24 Saati”, Nodar Ladaraia mentioned sarcastically, that **Gamsakhurdia has neither his own name and surname, nor his own appearance**.

Lots of points of views are developed in the media concerning the post revolutionary situation of the opposition and Party spectrum, but the matter is identical – **revolution has “abolished functions” of these concepts; revolution transferred the opposition into the nameless and faceless force; revolution has aged rapidly the political generation; opposition cannot unite; Parties are waiting for mistakes of the new government**.

There is an opinion in the press that **weakness of opposition, moreover, its nonexistence, is a dangerous tendency**; there must be a constructive opposition in the country, which will not allow the government to make mistakes and to relax. The politicians and experts do not exclude, that if the opposition does not unite and strengthen, the **government** will possibly create **artificial opposition**; there is a hint that the **kernel of the opposition may be established between the victorious forces** – artificially or by itself.

Discussions in the media about the composition of future Parliament lead to the same condition – **in the paper it will be single-party Parliament, actually – two-party**, provided the opposition parties cannot unite; Such configuration is possible: the **main force – the block of “Nacionalebi” (“Nationals”) and “Burjanadze-Demokratebi” (“Burjanadze-Democrats”)**, the **second** (in size) force – **“Agordzineba” (“Revival”)** (if the situation does not change radically until the election), the **third** – those parties, which will manage to unite. (It is supposed that the forecasted picture will not change even in case of the “Leiboristebi” (“Labor Party”) participation in the elections).

Foreign experts and foreign media accentuate the **danger of single-party** Parliament, too. “There exists one more danger in today’s Georgia – the **opposition** has actually **disappeared** after the November revolution...there **is serious danger of the future Parliament being single-party** – not to mention 9-10%, usually gained by Aslan Abashidze. **Elected by 85% of population President is annoying, but bearable. But**

the parliament, where everything is being decided by one force is, very dangerous!” (Radio “BBC”, newspaper “Khvalindeli Dge”, January 9, 2004).

The Head of the Council of Europe Monitoring Group **Matias Yorshi** declares that **“a strong government must have a strong opposition”**. (Newspaper “Dilis Gazeti “, January 7, 2004). One can find information in the media that **USA is interested in the existence of the opposition in Georgia and is going to apportion about two millions for that**.

As print media mentions, **the three month voluntary moratorium** on the criticism of the new government (which was more remarkable on television than in newspapers) was over; In print media, rather sharp assessments are expressed about the fact, that actually, **the party and the leader are the same, even the title of the newspaper, distributed before elections, is “Saakashvili”**. (Newspaper “Alia”, March 23, 2004); The following **was considered as a shortcoming of Saakashvili’s** politics: the fact, that unlike November elections, in March **the whole election campaign turned only around Saakashvili**. (Newspaper “Akhali Versia”, March 29, 2004); the fact that the half population of Georgia was fighting for **“Nacionaluri Modzraoba” (“National Movement”)** to come to power was also considered ... And today they are acting based on the same principle – **No one but “national” next to us!”** (Newspaper “Resonansi”, March 22, 2004) and etc.

As for the assessments of parliamentary elections in print media, we will refer to one mini-digest:

- **European observers** evaluated elections as having come close to European standards; the leader of Council of Europe Parliamentary Assembly delegation **Matias Yorshi** called elections **Georgian Paradox**, given that **elections**, on one hand, are **hopeful, the result** (one-party parliament) is **preoccupying**. (Newspaper “Dilis Gazeti”, March 30, 2004).
- **“A great cleansing in the Georgian political landscape – its final liberation from the ghosts and wastes of the past”**. (Newspaper “24 Saati”, March 29, 2004).
- **“Opposition was scarified to citizen’s vendetta”**; 28th of March – the new point of departure in Georgian politics, **the new political spectrum is emerging**. (Newspaper “Mtavari Gazeti”, March 30, 2004).
- **Opposition** has lost due to the fact that it **can not choose the leader**; Until it does not have a leader, it will not become a headache for the government; **The side on which Saakashvili-Zhvania’s team stands – whether the opposition side or the government one - is always strong**. (Newspaper “Alia”, March 30, 2004).
- Koba Davitashvili, Member of the Parliament: The democratic revolution has resulted in this **antidemocratic situation** and we got something **medieval between Russia and Turkmenistan**. (Newspaper “Resonansi”, March 30, 2004).

- Lela Iakobishvili, expert in culture: It seems **disastrous** to me, **that 95% of the population think in the same way...** the euphoria of having been elected with high percentage, destroyed both “Moqalaqeta Kavshiri” (“Citizen’s Union”) and Zviadists. (Newspaper “Dilis Gazeti”, March 29, 2004).

Contrary to existing forecasts, the government triangle managed to preserve unity. However, in print media we can observe opinions, that similar to the past experience related to the parliamentary lists, this time, the reason for disagreement between them might be the issue of distribution of parliamentary committees; especially given the fact that there are so-called prestigious committees and committees which are not prestigious. Over the last years, the majority of prestigious committees were controlled by Zhvania’s team.

Elections in Post-revolution Adjara

In the press of the period after “Rose Revolution” opinions were developed intensively that the competition for gaining the power in Adjara would have become “a reason for schism” between the “Nacionaluri Modzraoba” (“National Movement”) and the “Respublikelebi” (“Republicans”) and accordingly would have become the reason of demolishing Governmental majority.

The opinion is outlined in the press that **Adjarian voters do not know what they elect, as the Georgian Parliament could not manage to adopt the constitutional amendment project concerning the Adjara status.** By radical evaluation, the elections are illegal as they are going to elect the organ authorization of which is not stated yet. In parallel, such opinion is developed as well – main thing is that the legal organ is elected and not appointed.

Serious dissatisfaction about the status of Adjara and the elections in the Parliament were expressed mainly by the fraction “Memarjvene Opozicia” (“The Rights Opposition”) (not regarding the active opposition of Koba Davitashvili and Zviad Dzidziguri). **Davit Gamkhrelidze** thinks that by the **June 20th elections the wish of the Government was practically formed and the legitimacy was naded over the State Council** which had functioned temporarily before the elections.

Parliament Chair **Nino Burjanadze** calls the independent participation of the “**Resspublikelebi**” (“**Republicans**”) in the Supreme Council’s elections a mistake, as the “Nacionalebi” (“Nationals”) and “Respublikelebi” (“Republicans”) had been fighting for establishing democracy in Adjara together and this uniting should have been maintained.

Nodar Grigalashvili attacked “Respublikelebi” (“Republicans”) most strongly from the parliamentary majority: **“Because of the political ambitions Berdzenishvili and his followers tried to create the second political centre in Adjara... Creating several centres in the state is hostility, which will turn to harm the country.”** (Newspaper “Mtavari Gazeti”, June 22, 2004)

The results of the elections in Adjara have become the reason for four of the **“Respublikelei’s” (“Republican”) Party’s 6 members in the Parliament majority to break away** (Levan Berdzenishvili even stepped down from his position as chair of the committee.) We “Respublikelebi” (“Republicans”) are not the ones who can be guided by others as they wish, **we always be against the restriction of democratic space**; I would like to hope that whatever happened in Adjara was only the initiation of low rank new nomenclature. – stated “Respublikelebi’s” (“Republicans”) member Ivliane Khaindrava commenting on the results of the elections. (Newspaper “Kviris Palitra”, June 28, 2004).

While assessing the results of the elections in the press we come across the opinions that it was the first democratic elections in Adjara (Newspaper “Mtavari Gazeti” put this evaluation as the first page notice: **“The First Democratic Elections After Abashidze”**); Besides, the critical pathos is outlined directly in the headlines: **“Adjarian elections on the ground of beating and controversy between the “Nacionalebi” (“Nationals”) and “Respublikelebi” (“Republicans”),” “In what way is the “Nacionaluri Modzraoba” (“National Movement”) similar to the “Moqalaqeta Kavshiri” (“Citizen’s Union”)?”** (Newspaper “Resonance”, June 21, 2004); **“Adjara: Elections accompanied by beating”** (Newspaper “Akhali Taoba”, June 21, 2004); **“Election results will increase the political tension”** (Newspaper “Dilis Gazeti”, June 21, 2004); **“Down with Aslan, Long Live Misha!”** (Newspaper “Akhali Versia”, June 21, 2004); **“Nationals overdid overexerted.”** (Newspaper “Khvalindeli Dghe”, June 22, 2004)

The press focuses on the **factor of Michael Saakashvili** personally in the straightforward victory by “Nacionaluri Modzraoba” (“National Movement”) in the elections. (not regarding 2 seats won by “Respublikelebi” (“Republicans”)); On one hand, we take into consideration the following evaluations: rather than to focus on the party or independent candidates **“the main direction of Adjarian people tended to Georgian President Saakashvili, love to whom is particularly felt in Adjara.”** (Newspaper “24 Saati”, June 21, 2004); **“Adjara voted for the sake of President”** (Newspaper “Mtavari Gazeti”, July 1, 2004); Political scientist Soso Tsintsadze: **“At present Michael Saakashvili is so popular that to be against him means to commit a hara-kiri. No matter who won, he would conduct Saakashvili’s course as the people consider this way favourable for them.”** (Newspaper “Saqartvelos Respublika”, June 23, 2004)

On the other hand, the press underlines **President’s personal activation in the pre-elections campaign**, particularly the fact that governmental high officials participated in the elections as the sides and not as the providers of the elections. Political scientist of newspaper “Resonance” points to the threat that **the “Nacionaluri Modzraoba” (“National Movement”) might resemble the “Moqalaqeta Kavshiri” (“Citizen’s Union”) soon**; that the failure of Zviad Gamsakhurdia was caused by the similar “temporal supporters”_large number of which are in the ruling party now. (Newspaper “Resonance”, June 21, 2004).

“While struggling against Abashidze’s remnants new government of Adjara gained the image of new collective dictator against its will Adarian people speak about the new government with the same modesty and

diffidence as they used to speak about Abashidze's government. Like they could not protest illegal activities of the old government, they close their eyes on the new unlawful things. Therefore, by replacing additions sum is not changed." – writes newspaper "Akhali Taoba". (Newspaper "Akhali Taoba", June 21, 2004).

Adjarian elections can be summoned with the help of the same periodical evaluation like this: **People in Adjara supported President and the only thing they demand from the new government instead is not to get new Aslan Abashidze and "Aghordzineba" ("Revival")**. (Newspaper "Mtavari Gazeti", July 1, 2004).

IV chapter

"Rose Revolution" and Post-revolutionary Period

(Media Highlights)

The name of this chapter is conditional, as the concept "The Rose Revolution" does not only express the event which has happened on November 23, 2003. It is followed by accompanying processes. "The Rose Revolution" is considered to be a reference point for them. They are directly or indirectly united in this concept.

"Georgian government had been changed in peaceful, but unconstitutional way on November 23, 2003... This episode of governmental changes in Georgia had been named as "The Rose Revolution". **The most part of Georgian population and international commonwealth have considered "The Rose Revolution" as an important occurrence which indicated to turning Georgia to democratic values**" – such was the evaluation, given to "The Rose Revolution" By famous representative of the third sector Gia Nodia in his summary report "Development of Civil Society in Georgia: achievements and challenges". (24, page 17).

Though "The Rose Revolution" developed in the spirit of unprecedented mobilization of population, its strong desire for changing Shevardnadze's government and lofty ideals of extirpating the corruption, but a clear picture has revealed with time with the help of media: it was a model, designed according to the planned development of modern world's global processes and choosing Georgia for its realization was not occasional.

"21st century has its requirements and temps. The process of Mass-Democratization – **the process of export of mass democratization and its global implantation** – has to involve the whole planet in order to harmonize free and restricted world and universal safety has to be settled", - Apollon Silagadze in newspaper "24 Saati". The author states very interestingly and compactly the regularity of this process and the fact of choosing Georgia as a "model country", as well as the criteria, which defined the "starting country". He analyzes the balance of benefits and losses, post-Revolutionary contradictions between country's internal and foreign priorities, global and local goals; to save the revolution, its success and the necessity of bringing into unison the post-Revolutionary construction (but not destruction):

“We found ourselves in the avant-garde of the processes... **if not the revolution we would be not only passive, but as well inert participants of the development of global processes...** we would not have international authority, which greatly surpasses our possibilities, which are defined by our area and number of population. **We would not have international function – small nations rarely have the chance of having it.**”
(62)

Exactly this role has conditioned transforming and positioning the image of Georgian State outside the country (first of all and successfully) and inside the Georgia (with less success). In the media of that period, as well as in the articles and books of subsequent period, the common point of view is that the main factor which has conditioned “The Rose Revolution”, along with all possible causes and results, was the **belief and expectation of changes**.

Philosopher Zaza Phiralishvili’s “Reflection” of the processes, which have developed in the Autumn, 2003, given in “Theatrical Dialectics in Georgian Politics” are interesting in this point of view. “In pure culturological point of view it does not matter who and with what purpose made a political show of eternal renovation, or whether it was made at all, as well as it does not matter whether this revolutionary carnival had real results. The main thing is that despite the tragedies, disappointments and loose of territories, which they have undergone during the years; despite the malicious attempt of politicians to use people’s naïve and strong faith that things may change for better, our people have not lost the infantile idealism, which is necessary for living on the earth. In the opinion of Zaza Phiralishvili the third political establishment has “**symbolized the hidden expectation for renovation**”, while common people have trusted them, as well as they had trusted to two their predecessors – Zviad Gamsakhurdia and Eduard Shevardnadze. (26, pages 186-187).

The media picture of 2000-2003 years, given in previous chapters of the dissertation, shows how the new political generation was preparing for the post-Shevardnadze period, how the NGO’s and media paved the way for “velvety” passage from Shevardnadze’s period to the post one. We have mentioned above what factors have caused in Georgia’s adequacy for performing at least one unpretentious role in the dramaturgy of new world order.

Besides, if we focus the full of complicated cataclysms way, which has passed Georgia from the post-Soviet period (especially from the middle 90th) to nowadays, we can say that the preparation works of “The Rose Revolution” have included almost all branches of being and consciousness of our country. (Probably the assignation of grants for learning “lamentations” directly or indirectly served the same purpose – apprehending the nuances of our ethno-psychic).

Besides, the informational war held by Russian media for initiating the destabilizing processes in Georgia and for creating and establishing the image of “Abandoned Country” for it, finally made an appropriate background for creating motivation for radical changes. Present dissertation includes the factual material, affirming that this factor was one of the determinative for “The Rose Revolution”.

We are not the first to suggest that “The Rose Revolution” was realized by modern standards of strategic technologies. Though great number of publications was published on this theme, this process deserves to be fundamentally studied and analyzed by the specialists of appropriate fields.

The researcher of TV-media, and commonly mass media Eldar Iberi, in his publication “Television and Government” (Lessons of “The Rose Revolution”), retrospectively reconstitutes development of this process in “virtual reality” against the background of theoretical aspects of ‘media-direction’ of “The Rose Revolution”. Accordingly, his conclusions deserve consideration not only for studying the role of television. According to E.Iberi, “Because of its geopolitical situation the country became an object of latent conflict (or transaction) of world’s superstates and it greatly influences upon all social, political and economical events. Political processes are mostly financed and directed from outside. **Newest political technologies of mass consciousness are coming from outside and are successfully realized in Georgian reality.**” (14, page 38.)

In A.Silagadze’s above-mentioned article “The Rose Revolution” is considered as one of the best ways of involving Georgia into the “Global processes of development”; Eldar Iberi underlines “foreign guidance” of political processes. Jaba Devdariani’s article “Influence of International Aid upon Georgia” is interesting in this point of view. (This article has been fulfilled within the framework of summary expert project of main tendencies of democracy formation and development in Georgia. It represents agreed point of view of the author and the group of experts and practitioners). “**The modern criticism of development and democracy is based on two main arguments. According to the first of them supporting the development is continuation of colonial mentality; its aim is spreading the example of Western democracy to “undeveloped” world.** It is based on blind copying of catholic and protestant values and processes. According to some authors, as supporting development (and democracy) is hangover of colonial mentality, it serves suppression of national elite by Western dominions. This **argument**, which is much like the theory of dependence, is an important part of **anti-global logic** for today. **Georgian radical political and social societies are also often talking about the aid being too “pro-Western”.** (11, page 31-32).

The second form of the criticism, - emphasizes Jaba Devdariani, - is based on the professionals who have the experience in realizing aid programs. According to them “**Donors like artificially putting the realities of some countries into acceptable for them frames and they cannot, or do not want to critically evaluate influence of their programs on the interior politics of those countries.**” (page 32).

Though, the project “Development of Democracy in Georgia” includes the period until 2003, but as we have noted “The Rose Revolution” was not a spontaneous act and the **quality of development and help of democracy** in Georgia have significantly defined its results. Besides, appraisals and conclusions given in Jaba Devdariani’s article, there is some key to incompatible points of views (as well as real results), which were and are developing regarding “The Rose Revolution”, till today.

Suppression of National elite by Western dominions, i.e. “hangover of colonial mentality”, highlighted by Jaba Devdariani, may be a reflection of the view of famous American political scientist Samuel Huntington (His book “The Clash Of Civilizations”, published in 1993, has become especially topical after terrorist act of September 11). Huntington considers: West is unique but not universal; imperialism is logical result of universalism; it’s time for the West to get free from the illusion of universalism; faith belief in universalism of the West is not only fallacious and immoral, but it is also dangerous; modernization and development do not request and must not condition westernization (vice versa, it has provoked revival); the main responsibility of western leaders is protection and renovation of unique signs of western civilization, but not transformation other civilizations into western style. The most powerful western country the USA is responsible for it first of all; Government employees can successfully change the reality in case if they recognize it and understand it; American elite conceives the realities too slowly; multi-civilization integration plans, supported by Bush’s (Senior Bush – L.K.) and Clinton’s administrations, were either unreasonable, or have caused unforeseen economical and political results... (13).

Milton Friedman (His book “Capitalism and Freedom”, written in the fifty’s of 20th century is considered as a classical book of Liberal world-view) considers the dictatorship of international, above-national monopolies as dangerous for freedom, as the State dictatorship. **Liberalism fights with any limitations for freedom – State, corporative or above-national.** Though, **conditional freedom** of speech, conscience and free hand is **protected** in conditions of above-national dictatorship, but under certain conditions and with certain limitations. Overcoming them will entail great risk. Unlimited power is concentrated in international corporations – in the centers of capital. They are using all means for manipulating the society. They possess mass media, they are influencing courts and State departments, nothing happens on the markets without their active participation... (12)

In the last chapter of the dissertation (resonance of President Bush’s visit in the media) we see that the key word in President Bush’s speech is the word “Freedom”.

It was not accidental to connect the abovementioned standpoint with “The Rose Revolution”. Events preceding and following confirm that “export” of democracy, liberalism and freedom is possible in case if the State and society acknowledge not only the possible results (as positive, so negative) but regularity of these processes and the amplitude of appropriate action – put among its inevitability and our possibilities. The example of media confirms, that such perception of the processes may exist as exception, but mostly the following them problems are described superficial and simply, with mentioning “Globalization”, “Masons”, “Soros”, “Black PR” or creation of “External Enemy”.

*

Analyzing of the process, which was ended by “Rose Revolution” by media often is full with controversial assessments.

First of all, should be emphasized those **objective and subjective reasons**, which were the fundamentals of revolution. As for the occasion, it was determined even long before the elections – **the adulteration of elections by authority and the humiliation of elector’s civil rights**.

The main reason, which became the basic of revolution, is emphasized in media: **this is almost pathological hatred towards Eduard Shevardnadze**, hope and a faith, and the only fact, that he will not be in the government, will be good for country. This reason gathered every factor – social, political and private.

The aspiration for the idea, **that winners are not judged** was emphasized immediately after the revolution, but in parallel began discussions on the **legislation aspects** of the government change.

How developments of 23 November can be called?

The revolution was called as **velvety revolution without blood**:

“Rose Revolution” (newspaper “24 Saati”, November 24, 2003); **“Revolution with roses and without blood and thorns”**, **“Velvety Revolution”**, **“Peaceful Revolution”** (newspaper “Resonance”, November 24, 2003); **“Revolution without blood”** (newspaper “Akhali Versia”, November 24, 2003); **“Rose revolution without thorns”** (newspaper “Kviris Palitra”, November 24, 2003); **“Cultural Revolution”** (newspaper “Mtavari Gazeti”, November 24, 2003).

According to very interesting statement of **Tina Khidasheli** (president of young lawyer’s association): “The revolution which happened today is called **“Revolution without blood”** in juridical and in every other language”. (Newspaper “Resonance”, November 24, 2003).

Messages, highlighting that this process can not be called as “velvet” are more and more often appearing in media. This process can be more called as a “turn over”, which means the changing of authority by force:

The newspaper “Georgian Times” highlights that this process is **“Turn over of country”** and emphasizes fact of financing of US state department’s Armenian lobby aiming to turn Armenia as a first rate country in Caucasus. (December 27, 2003).

After several days, in the same newspaper appeared the message – **“military turn over”**- in which actively were participating the internal military forces of the country. In the same edition of this newspaper, **PR expert** Dimitry Moniava says, “for the moment new **authority** is more **virtual**, than “real”. (newspaper “Georgian Times”, December 4, 2003).

Turn over of the country, was called as “revolution” to justify a lot of legislation abolishment – we see such a message in the newspaper “Akhali Taoba”. (December 6, 2003).

The most radical estimation among the politicians belongs to Shalva Natelashvili; The leader of “Labor Party” thinks that “Rose Revolution” was an **usurpation of authority** and emphasizes role of Soros, globalist’s forces, the Russia’s territorial interests, the oil pipeline of Bakho-Jeihan... (newspaper “Dilis Gazeti”, December 26, 2003); The estimations of representatives of “Agordzineba” (“Revival”) are also sharp. For example, Cotle Bakuria thinks that **this “revolution” was planed in chancellery**, it was a change of old Shevardnadze with

young Shevardnadze. (newspaper “Georgian Times”, December 4, 2003). The leader of Christian-democratic union Vaja Lortqifanidze thinks that **there is a danger of dictatorship in the country**. (newspaper “Akhali Taoba”, November 26, 2003).

The former chairman of constitutional court, the member of justice council Avtandil Demetrashvili says: “Country is in a **justice labyrinth** and it is hard, but possible to get out of there. The problem is in definition of legitimacy our government is... **Declaring of taking over presidential duties by Nino Burjanadze before the president refused from his duties, was not legit**. (Magazine “Sarke”, December 3, 2003)

“Now **country still have a chance to go back to constitutional route**”, - writes newspaper “Dilis Gazeti”(December 8, 2003) and this message is not an exception in media. It means that media recognizes that the situation in the country is unconstitutional, but admits it as a “beginning” of post Shevardnadze period.

At the same time, the message, that **Georgian people were the main heroes of revolution and the main result was their unification, avoiding the danger of splitting them**, was dominated in press. First of all, the “main revolutionist” Michael Saakashvili emphatically mentions this factor: “... **The main hero is neither Saakashvili, nor Shevardnadze. Heroes are people, which made the history with their own hands yesterday**”. (newspaper “24 Saati”, November 24, 2003)

In estimation of political sciences expert Kakha Kacitadze: “**Georgian nation has compiled... The main creator of the processes was Georgian nation itself**”. (newspaper “Mtavari Gazeti”, November 24, 2003).

According to other exerts people were moving together not because of love to any politician, but because of an extreme embarrassment... It is important that development have passed without blood. If even one man had died, this fact would have been followed by the “chained reaction” and we would have been fallen into the civil war. It is important that society did not lose their unity, because resistance was not between people, but between people and the government. (Professors of History Merab Vachnadze and Vahtang Guruli, newspaper “Mtavari Gazeti”, November 25, 2003)

Taking into account the fact of mass meetings and activeness of Georgian people, expert of political sciences Soso Tsintsadze attracts attention to **the danger of transformation of total trust of people**, in some other feeling in case new government, is not able to fulfill and meet the expectations and intentions, what was given to Georgian population. (newspaper “Resonance”, December 6, 2003)

It is worthwhile to mention that despite the differentiation of approaches highlighted by popular foreign media means (which are also reprinted by Georgian press), in general **the processes that happened in Georgia were positively evaluated by European Union, Euro Parliament and US State Department, which fixed their supportive position to the new Government of country**. But, in diplomatic comments and some hidden evaluations, the following message is dominated – **Georgia has one more (the second) chance to be formed as a democratic country in case fair elections**; promised foreign support also depends on this factor.

Georgian, as well as foreign media highly evaluate unanimity and involvement of society in the

Matias Iorsh, who visited Georgia before elections of November 2nd highlighted that Georgia can be excluded from European Council in case of non fair elections. On 18th of December, Iorsh, who was in Georgia as a leader of European Council's parliament delegation, highlighted on conference, that it would be unfair to demand all the duties from new government, which European Council requested on February, 2004 (This was the last date for fulfilling the duties – L.K.) and that European Council will demand fulfillment of the duties in new terms.

Matia Iorsh's statement on coming presidential elections, which also seems to be expressing the position of European Council, is also very interesting: **“The elections planned in Georgia will not be perfect. There will be a lot of mistakes and omissions, but we have to distinguish the omission from adulteration.** The most important is that the intention of representatives of Georgian Government is firm – the elections must be fair and all the infringers and adulterers must be found and punished”. (newspaper “Mtavari Gazeti”, December 9, 2003) It means that European Council has practically supported the government which came in power after “Rose Revolution” and gave a chance and some kind of privileges almost without any terms for the legitimating the revolutionary process.

Despite the fact that “Triumvirate” came to the Government in result of the revolution is represented by politicians well known to the public as an active members of the governing party, “Mokalaketa kavshiri” (“Citizen's Union”) (Michael Saakashvili, Zurab Zhvania, Nino Burjanadze) which had been strengthened on political proscenium a long before, the euphoria of revolution granted them with strong power and some halo, qualitatively different from the power and halo that is granted to the government, which is coming in result of ordinary elections.

Media is unusually forgiving towards the new government. In our opinion it is caused by several substantial factors: Maybe at the moment media has exhausted its “negative resources”, which were directed towards the previous government and which have successfully implemented their mission of favorable background for the revolution; Maybe, in the process of formation, government in itself deserved a “time out”; And also maybe another reason was that establishing and ruling an informational sphere is greatly concerned with the political force, which came in authority in Georgia after the “Rose Revolution”. In spite of this, one might say, that the media, in contrast to the political spectrum, has not found itself in euphoria and managed to get to the core of the political conjuncture.

Once again we mention here that broadcasting media, first of all the “Television of triumphant people, “Rustavi 2”, has changed so diametrically after November 23rd that, in a short time it was called “government's television”; The information and position of every TV broadcasting channel became so similar, that it was possible to distinguish them only according the logo. In contrast with the broadcasting channels, printed media really was able to keep a distance from the interests of government.

It is evident that substantial for Georgian politics, and accordingly for the media, tendency of personifying has not changed after the revolution; Main theme of the previous period - resignation of Shevardnadze has changed for the theme of Saakashvili coming to power.

Actually, in the media of the period from December 2003 to January 2004 it is difficult to find newspaper, which does not highlights the opinions on the personality of Michael Saakashvili and a new government. The expectations of changes connected with the new government are strongly dominated in media of the above-mentioned period.

It is interesting, that despite of revolutionary euphoria, the criticism towards Michael Saakashvili - the hero of revolution and young president of Georgia – is highlighted in media: **“the first steps of not consecrated, yet, President gave cause for doubts and unpleasant associations with the past”**. **“Saakashvili makes almost the same announcements for the outer world, as his predecessor”**. (newspapers “24 Saati”, “Akhali Versia”, January 19, 2004).

Publication in newspaper “Alia” – “Following in Eduard Shevardnadze's footsteps” - draws parallel and points out the danger of personal leadership of Michael Saakashvili: “Yesterday, on the TV channel “Imedi”, for the first time Michael Saakashvili admitted that he is not going to share power with anybody...- There will not be any dividing of power. There will be only the delegating of the functions. People have chosen me and all pivotal matters in the country must be decided by the President. He has to decide what is important”. There is nothing of the kind in the handbook of democracy. It requires conformity to the law. It looks like our new President is not going to follow the democracy. Gamsakhurdia told once such phrase, and his regime was christened as “provincial fascism”; Shevardnadze has not told anything like that. He used to talk in the name of people, but his style of heading was christened as dictatorship and he had been resigned“, (newspaper “Alia”, January 10, 2004).

While discussing the theme of Michael Saakashvili’s presidential authority a political scientist Soso Tsintsadze draws parallels, but in other context: “Beginning from the 5th of January, an old American constitutional principle will come into effect in Georgia – personally the President is responsible for every decision made by the government. The first two Presidents had another opinion regarding this fundamental principle. Gamsakhurdia declared that he was not responsible for the activities of “Union of Young Power Engineering Specialist” and “Tent Women”. In the same way Shevardnadze waved aside, when he was asked about his nearest surroundings”. (newspaper “Resonance”, January 9, 2004).

Referring to the historical analogues of ancient Rome, USA and Great Britain, Soso Tsintsadze evolves an idea, that “Michael Saakashvili is not just a winner of ordinary elections; he is a triumpher, in the true sense of the word. And the triumphers always have to bear a heavy cross, and in most cases alone.

Georgian Mass Media on the Visit of US President George Bush to Georgia

Purpose and the importance of US President George Bush visit to Georgia shall be analyzed in relation to the following main directions:

- in relation to Georgia
- in relation to the region
- in relation to the new geopolitical reality

We would like to review media highlighting the visit of George Bush in relation to Georgia, nevertheless it needs to be underlined that **this visit is viewed by Media as the visit of the US president in Eastern Europe, which is considered as a start of transformation of the region, as a formation of the new Middle East (Near East) region, shifting of western political values and institutions to the East** and fulfillment of other long-term strategic goals.

Under the new geopolitical reality experts consider a **strong “geopolitical wall” (that shall become a border between the NATO and the Russian Federation) to be constructed by the West from the Baltic region towards the Caucasus and from the Caucasus towards the Central Asia; Georgia has the role of the milestone in this geopolitical axis.** According to the experts President Bush deliberately visited the countries located on the above-mentioned axis including Georgia to demonstrate how important this country is nowadays. The publication of “Washington Times” confirms our last idea. This is a publication, which newspaper “Resonance” testifies for estimating the visit of US President: “The Bush’s visit in Republic of Caucasus means that he remembers Georgia. **This interest is conditioned by strategic logic: Georgia and Chechnya has one frontier and the conduct, which connects the Caspian oil layers to world markets, is located on it. The strategic location of Georgia makes this little country the component of foreign energy policy of the USA**”. (Newspaper “Resonance”, May 12, 2005).

While discussing the goal of the visit the **Georgian press puts very specific accents on the global political aspects**, in particular on the constriction of Russian influence in the region and on use of Georgia as a base against Iran. Georgian military experts mark that on one hand Georgia’s contribution in Iran-American relations is not insignificant, but on the other hand, this role must not be exaggerated. It is interesting that for Washington Georgia appears much more interesting **from the political point of view**, than from the military point of view. According to the formulation offered by press, the USA needs Georgia **“for establishing peaceful relationships with Iran”**.

To refer to the media of the periods before and after US president’s visit, they are characterized by **primacy of emotional attitudes**, though the period before the visit was more cheerful (despite that it sounds very

paradoxical), comparing with the period after the visit. This can be explained by the same emotional factor: Georgian society (this is evident from the pre-visit period informational source) was hoping that the visit of George Bush would immediately solve all main problems existing in the country.

Post visit coverage was more brief and superficial than it was expected to be in the information market of Georgia (comparing with the coverage by the media on concrete and personal conflicts in the governmental structures of Georgia). On the one hand the above mentioned coverage was mainly dedicated to the verbal and nonverbal messages related to the President Bush, such as: “Georgians drew Bush in cultural shock”, “He was overmuch keen on our Khinkali and on our hospitality in general”, “Nobody has even seen Bush like this!” and on the other hand, the coverage was of characterized with selfish ends, such as: “let’s see what will he do in return”.

By the way, Georgians special interest to the president of America became as a very interesting topic for foreign media, but not only in context of Georgian cuisine’s and culture’s estimation: **“Bush was full of enthusiasm, because Georgian meeting was very different from the protest actions, with which people met him in different countries”**, - wrote the newspaper “Gardian” leaning on the agency “Associated Press”. (Newspaper “Alia”, May 10, 2005).

As for the expert’s estimations, first of all, **the exclusive interview of Zbigniew Brzezinski** for newspaper “24 saati” is worth marking. His ideas not only make clear the meaning of Bush’s visit Georgia and the meaning of his speeches, but somehow fulfills it and, in our opinion, contains not less important messages than Bush’s: **“The most important change that happened is an arrival of new generation in authority.** The new political leaders are less products of soviet period, than their previous ones. But this happened one and half years ago. **And now it is important to demonstrate the fact with the creation of well established system with the practical policy and show that democracy is an actual reality in Georgia.** Georgia’s new democracy must assure the international society that it can solve the problems left after the Soviet Union. Reminders of the past, such as separatism, must not be described as a normal fact. In this context, Georgia must **assure International Society, that the democracy, which is built in the country is firm, that it is not based only on the emotions, but on law according system, which is firm by the constitution.** Georgian authority must show, that its decisions in internal and external policy, leans on mature and is full of responsibility, that it is deliberate policy and not decisions, worked out on emotional, sharp and radical gestures”. (Newspaper “24 Saati”, May 17, 2005).

The estimation of Columbian University’s professor and foreign relationship counsel’s main expert **Stiven Sestanovich** is also very important: “I think that **Georgia showed one of the most important political, social and intellectual dynamics**, which took place in former soviet republics.... **It is very hard for little country to preserve geopolitical meaning for the United States of America, if it does not have democratic values.** Our relationship with Georgia showed that, even when you are little country, if you have same values and have same

point of view, you are the equal in rights partner of the United States of America”. (Newspaper “24 Saati”, May 24, 2005).

Pay attention to the equal idea of Zbigniew Brzezinski and Stiven Sestanovich – **Georgia, with the way of practical politics, must demonstrate the fact, that democracy in Georgia is an actual reality; It must try not to expose in danger the democracy with the concentration of power; must show to the International Society, that the democracy, which is built in the country is firm** - It can solve the problems left after the Soviet Union (for instance, the problem of separatism). It is very hard for little country **to preserve geopolitical meaning for the United States of America.**

Let us recall that even before the “Rose Revolution”, parliamentary elections of 2003 year, media was actively highlighted the common approach of Georgian and foreign politicians, that **Georgia’s capital is democracy, and nobody will forgive humiliation of democratic values to this country, in contrast with Azerbaijan.**

It would be also timely to recall that on Eurasian “Grand Chessboard” of Brzezinsky, next to the **main geostrategic figures (France, Germany, Russia, China and India) there are also mentioned Ukraine, Azerbaijan, South Korea, Turkey and Iraq as “principally important geopolitical centers”** (As Zbigniew Brzezinski says, the countries of such great importance as Great Britain, Japan and Indonesia are not in this qualification). (7, page 56)

If we connect with each other, from one side:

Transformation of the region, as a formation of the new Middle East (Near East) region, shifting of western political values and institutions to the East and fulfillment of the other long-term strategic goals; Salvation of problem - “geopolitical wall” (that shall become a border between the NATO and the Russian Federation) to be constructed by the West from the Baltic region towards the Caucasus and from the Caucasus towards the Central Asia;

and from the other side, the messages that were highlighted by president Bush in Tbilisi:

“Hopeful changes - from Baghdad to Beirut and Beirut to Bishkek... Freedom is advancing from the Black sea to the Caspian, and to the Persian Gulf and beyond. They have been inspired by your example and they take hope in your success... Seeds in Georgian soil will flower across the globe”.

And if we add the formula of Stiven Sestanovich, that **“It is very hard for little country to preserve geopolitical meaning for the United States of America, if it does not have democratic values”**, we will recollect not only the meaning of Georg Bush’s European tour and his visit’s aim in Georgia, but the role and the function, that “Rose Revolution” has defined to Georgia. But we sharply mention **that this is not the function given by “Chessboard”, but a function gained with the role of “democratic country”**. By the way, the only **postulate** that stays unchangeable during the last years in Georgian media is the fact, that **Georgia’s capital is democracy.**

Against the background of this general picture, to our opinion, it is extremely important to summarize the press according to **the words and messages**, highlighted in the speeches of the President Bush.

Principal messages:

- *You are the leaders!*
- *Georgia is a beacon of the region*
- *The “Rose revolution” was powerful moment in the modern history*
- *Georgia is the sovereign and independent country*
- *your most important contribution is your own example*
- *your country is one of the serious allies of America*
- *You are building democratic society*
- *In this new Georgia, The rule of law will prevail, and freedom will be the birthright of every citizen*
- *You choose free future and support other nations to do the same*
- *building a free society is the job of generations*
- *It took 15 years of struggle before liberty and justice fully took root in this country*
- *Hopeful changes from Baghdad to Beirut and Beirut to Bishkek*
- *Freedom is advancing from the Black sea to the Caspian, and to the Persian Gulf and beyond. they have been inspired by your example and they take hope in your success*
- *Seeds in Georgian soil will flower across the globe*
- *free societies are peaceful societies*
- *As Free nations, Georgia and America have huge responsibility*
- *Our duties begin in global struggle for liberty*
- *The great Georgian patriot Zurab Zhvania became a great leader of the global democratic revolution*
- *Georgia’s leaders know that peaceful resolution of conflict is essential to the integration into the transatlantic community*
- *The territorial integrity and sovereignty must be respected by all nations*
- *We have transatlantic friends in Georgia and will always help in the implementation of tasks*
- *You have friends in America*
- *In building of free and democratic country, the American people will always stand with you!*

(Speech of President Georg Bush, Tbilisi, Freedom Square, published in the newspaper “24 Saati”, May 15, 2005, Speech at the briefing of parliament in the newspaper “Saqartvelos Respublika”, May 11, 2005).

Terms used in the speeches of the President Bush and the President Saakashvili.

Key Words	
Georg Bush	Michael Saakashvili
Freedom, free - 30	Freedom, free - 20
Georgia, Georgian - 28	Georgia, Georgian - 43
America, Americans - 9	America, Americans - 18
Democracy - 8	Democracy - 11
Peace, peaceful - 8	Peace, peaceful - 3
Revolution, revolutionary - 5	Revolution, revolutionary - 1
Independency - 4	Independency - 1
NATO - 4	NATO - 3
Responsibility - 3	Responsibility - 3
History, historical - 3	History, historical - 8
Friendship, friend - 3	Friendship, friend - 4
“Rose revolution” - 2	“Rose revolution” - 2
Abkhazia, South Ossetia - 1	Abkhazia, South Ossetia - 3
Territorial integrity - 1	Territorial integrity - 2
Resolution of conflicts - 1	Resolution of conflicts - 1
Future - 2	Future - 4

As we see, notion “freedom” takes important place in the speeches of the both presidents, the word “**democracy**” is used more rarely in comparison with that “**freedom**”. In addition, the word “freedom”, especially in the speech of the US President, is associated with the word “**peace**” (“**Free societies are peaceful societies**”). President Bush uses the word “freedom” and not the word “democracy” as the visit card of his country.

Both Presidents mentioned the word “**responsibility**” only three times, but in a very important context. The president of the United States of America, places Georgia next to the US “**in the global struggle for the freedom**” and exposes almost the same status from the point of view of responsibility to it: “**As free countries, the US and Georgia have huge responsibility and we will complete our tasks together**”.

It is interesting that the US President mentions **Georgia** and Georgians more often (28 times) than the President of Georgia (i.e. the host, if we do not mention other factors) mentions **“the US”** (18 times).

In his editorial article about the results of president Bush’s visit, the editor-in-chief of “Resonance” Lasha Tugushi, leans on the messages of US President’s speeches: **“Responsibility is the most important word and the most actual for Georgia”**. The crucial is the role, which US president Bush defined to Georgia after the “Rose Revolution”: **to help the process of transformation in big region**: “The democratic processes, that took place in Georgia, will help the process of transformation in Central Asia”. **Georgia also has great responsibility for those citizens, who live in Georgia**”. (Newspaper “Resonance”, May 11, 2005).

In this article, Lasha Tugushi offers very interesting information on solution of conflicts (It is also very interesting, that the processes developed afterwards, confirmed this approach): “Our source, who was present to the meeting of president Saakashvili and president Bush, said, that **on the closed meeting president Bush directly said, that he friendly advices us as to solve the problems of territorial integrity only in peaceful manner and that he will not support the military operations. He said these words now to make everything clear for future. He also added that they will inevitably help us to solve the conflicts. That will be really practicable, but peaceful support**”. (Newspaper “Resonance”, May 11, 2005).

As we already noticed, emotions exceed in the evaluation of the speech of George Bush and we hardly see any reasonable analyze of his judgments, there is some feeling of shortage in the media regarding the position of the US President on the territorial integrity of Georgia.

From our point of view, in connection with Abkhazia and Ossetia, not only the US president’s, but also Georgia’s president’s speeches contain very interesting messages:

“Despite of the success of the Rose Revolution, **there are places in our country where Georgians are left without freedom**”; **“We must end the isolation of our citizens in the regions of Abkhazia and Tskinali, they must have equal opportunities to develop in democracy and in conditions of freedom”**”.

As we see, motivation of the president of Georgia is **freedom** and not, for instance, reestablishment of historic justice. (By the way, he charged history with the big role in his speech, but not in the context of lost territories).

The word **“freedom”** has the following scheme in the speech of George Bush: struggle **for freedom**, started in 1989 was ended with dignity in 2003; as the result, Georgia, as independent and free country, is the beacon for the region. In building **free** and democratic country, US will support Georgia and Georgia will not be left alone on this way.

According to the US President, **free** societies mean peaceful societies. As we already mentioned above, President Bush names Georgia as the ally in the global struggle **for freedom**.

Logically, summary of Bush’s and Saakashvili’s messages is following:

“If while building true freedom” seeds in Georgian soil will flower across the globe, it is logical that those Georgians who lost their freedom, must regain that **“with the right given by God”**”.

Visit of US president repealed the negative charge of media, which was addressed to the Government during the period of April-May and helped the concentration of positive mood around it. But the situation sharply changed in June and the confrontational attitude towards the government sharpened again. Not only from this point of view, but also in general, visit of George Bush was kind a bound for post “Rose Revolution” media (so, as for country, government and society), which finished the period of revolutionary excitement on high spirits. Political parties and civil sector left without any function during one and a half year (Of course we do not mean here the ruling party – “Nacionaluri Modzraoba” (“National Movement”) revived and gradually switched to the regime of opposition to the government.

Conclusion

Topics of our studies and research were the main social-political aspects and highlights emphasized by **press and creation of informational analogue of correspondent period**. How this analogue in was coming to compliance with social-political situation of that time in Georgia? Referring to the book of Gigi Tevzadze's ("Georgia – Return Of Power") **democracy** of in Georgia of the times of Eduard Shevardnadze **was "simulated"**, and **"free media"**, together with non-governmental organizations, **was the agent confirming this simulation** (Gigi Tevzadze, "Georgia – Return Of Power", page 40), we should say, that media (as well as printed media) successfully played the role of the "screen" of democracy.

On the other hand, result of our research gives us an opportunity to conclude, that in existing reality, with existing possibilities, Georgian media was able to create rather adequate media picture of social-political processes which were developed in the period covered by our analysis (2000-2005). The methods, ways, forms, professional level and other issues of creating this picture were in accordance with the standards of modern media on the same level as the quality of "transitive democracy" in Georgia is in accordance with the requests of already developed democracy.

The main social-political aspects, which were priorities for media during the period covered by the analysis, are given in the content of dissertation and we will not repeat them; Also, we tried to make the proper conclusions in each part of dissertation; The most important and general conclusions on press of 2000-2005 years can be formed in the following way:

- **Despite increased quantity, the media of the period covered by analysis was not creating the pluralistic picture of social-political life of the country; From numerous publications mostly 3-5 publications were fulfilling the function of "public opinion generator" (especially in 2000-2003);**
- **Transition of the first stage of speech's liberation into the next stage of combining the responsibility with freedom, the symptoms of expressing country's interest are noticeable in printed media after 2002, when Georgia makes a statement about the desire of joining NATO, when, with the support of US, the program of training and equipping" is begun implementing in Georgia and etc.**
- **Media covered by our analyzing period is distinguished with the high degree of politizing and the tendency of personification; Most part of publications have some characteristics of "yellow press" (accordingly for scandals and "sensations"); Taking this factor into account, printed media mostly pays attention not to socially actual themes, but to the themes leaning on "lobbies' information" and "reliable sources"; highlighted are interpretations made by printed media and not the verified facts;**
- **Almost every important aspect of country's social-political life is discussed in the context of the struggle for authority and personal oppositions; Orientation on persons does not mean, that printed media pays attention to broad representatives of society; Printed media pays attention only to distinct**

category of governmental representatives, politicians, so called famous faces and opinion leaders, which were created by media itself.

- **Frequently, it is hard to define not only the information validity but source of the information, because printed media often refers to “experts’ opinion”, behind of which, in some cases can be hidden position of journalist or media means. As for the experts, here we can also notice two extreme sides– either they address to one and the same expert for commenting on almost every theme and issue (for instance Ramaz Sakvarelidze, Gia Nodia, Soso Cincadze, Paata Zaqareishvili, Ramaz Klimiashvili etc); Or specialists of different fields, which are represented in the rage of expert; As social-political aspects have a priority, accordingly, experts appear in printed media almost every day commenting not only ongoing processes, but also any political or scandalous phrase.**

It can be underlined, that in the post “Rose Revolution” period (2003-2003), media was able to fulfill the function of increasing society’s civil activity, striving for western orientation successfully enough; Probably, it created more than enough illusion to itself and to society, that public is “well informed” about political life of country (including details and lobbies gossips), when this was the “top of the iceberg” and the most processes of social-political life in our country, were going on in underground. Printed media made society to move faster than the processes are developed and accordingly played very important role in “Rose Revolution”.

At the same time, as we have mentioned in the first chapter of the dissertation, the process the formation of Georgian media was somehow braked in the period after the “Rose Revolution”; Except the censorship and self-censorship (which is more evident in relation to the broadcasting media), we mean the lowering of professional level; This can be explained with changing the occupation sphere by professional journalists and, what is the most important, with the fact that media (especially printed media) was not considered to be the actor of such importance, as it was in the period before the “Rose Revolution”.

Up to this moment civil society in Georgia has not reached yet the condition, to “make” media to highlight the interest of the society. Herewith, unfavorable for media business environment, stimulates drawing of social-political and so called yellow press near, or mix them completely.

So, it will be unfair to impose media with the whole responsibility for high degree of politizing, for not being able to fulfill the function a “guard” for society, passing by the aspect of social life of the country. We should not try to make illusion like journalists are able to ignore the interests of customer/employer or editorial office is able to ignore the interests of the owner.

Democracy, first of all is a freedom of choice. From our point of view Georgian media will move into the new stage of development, as soon as the environment of healthy competition and pluralism is created in the country and the possibility to make choice is given not only to media user, but also to media means and journalists.

STATE

1. Antadze, Ia, "Life in a Rye Field: The War Is Over, Be Afraid of Peace", magazine "Solidaroba", the periodical publication of public protector of Georgia, number 3(24), 2008
2. Balzak, Onore De, "Shagreen's Leather", Selected stories, Publishing house "Soviet Georgia", Tbilisi, 1973
3. Balcerovich, Leshek, "State In Transitive Period", Tbilisi, 2002
4. Baqradze, Akaki, "Disapproved Way", Publishing house "Sarangi", Tbilisi, 1995
5. Bertrane, claud-Jean, "Media Ethics And The Systems Of interresponsibility", Tbilisi, 2004
6. Bodrijard, Jan, "System of Things"; <http://yanko.lib.ru/books/philosoph/ baudrillard-le-systeme-des-objets.htm>
7. Brzezinski, Zbigniew, "The Grand Chessboard", Publishing house "International Relationships", Moscow, 2003
8. Chaldin, Robert, "The Psychology Of Influence", fifth international publication, Publishing House "Peter", Sainckt-Peterburg, 2001
9. "Communications of executive authority with society", the Georgian UN association, Tbilisi, 2001
10. Covach Bill, Rosenstill, Tom, "The Elements Of Journalism", Publishing house "Impress", Tbilisi, 2006
11. Devdariani, Jaba, "Influence of International Aid on Georgia", "Development of Democracy in Georgia", number 11, Tbilisi, 2003
12. Friedman, Milton, "Capitalism and Freedom", Publishing House "Sezani", Tbilisi, 2002
13. Huntington, Samuel P. "The Clash of Civilizations"; <http://history.club.fatih.edu.tr/103%20Huntington%20Clash%20of%20Civilizations%20full%20text.htm>
14. Iberi, Eldar, "Television and Government" (Lessons of "The Rose Revolution"), "topics of TV-Radio-journalism", VII, Publishing House of TSU, Tbilisi, 2005
15. Kachkachishvili, Iago, radio "Tavisupleba", "The Diaries of Liberty", October 31, 2007 <http://www.tavisupleba.org/programs/diaries/2007/11/20071104173646.asp>.
16. Koliver, Sandra, "Comparative Analysis of Media Legislation in Europe and other Democratic Countries" Article 19; <http://www.medialaw.ru/article10/5/3.htm>
17. Korkonosenko, S. "Mesics of Media", Handbook "Aspects of Media", Moscow, 2004
18. Luman, Niklas, "Relity of Media"; <http://strana-oz.ru/?numid=13&article=621>
19. Mcluen, Marshal, "Understanding Media", Moscow-Jukovski, 2003
20. Mcluen, Marshal, "Medium Is The Message", the issues of TV-Radio journalism, VI, Publishing house of Tbilisi University, Tbilisi, 2003

21. Morris, Dick, “The New Prince, Machiavelli Updated For The Twenty-First Century”, Renaissance Books, Los Angeles, 1999
22. Nacvlishvili, Paata, “For the Genesis of Georgian Journalism”, dissertation for receiving PH D. The library of Georgian Polytechnic State University, Tbilisi, 2009
23. Nodia, Gia, “Two Experiments of Creating Democracy in Georgia: Summarizing the path of the duration of fifteen years”, “Building Democracy in Georgia”, number 1, Tbilisi, 2003
24. Nodia, Gia, “The development of civil society in Georgia: achievements and provocations”, Tbilisi, 2005
25. Usuphashvili, Davit, Nodia, Gia, “Election Processes in Georgia”, “Forming Democracy In Georgia”, number 4, Tbilisi, 2003
26. Phiralishvili, Zaza, “Theatrical Dialectics in Georgian Politics”, Tbilisi, 2007
27. “Political Landscape of Georgia”, coordinate editors Gia Nodia and Alvaro Pinto Scoltbah, Tbilisi, 2006
28. “Political situation in Georgia” National laboratory of Internal Policy, August 16, 2002; <http://www.nlvp.ru/laboratory>
29. Repkova, Tatiana, “New time: the creation of professional newspaper in the conditions of not fulfilled democracy”, Tbilisi, 2006
30. Surguladze, R. Iber, E. “Mass Communications”, Tbilisi, 2003
31. Svitich L. “Profession of Journalist”, hand book, Aspect Press, Moscow, 2003
32. Tevzadze, Gigi, “Georgia: Return of Power”, the publishing house of Bakur Sulakauri, Tbilisi, 2003,
33. “The Strategy of Third Sector’s Development in New Environment”, publisher – The Caucasian institute of peace, democracy and development, Tbilisi, 2004,
34. “The communications of executive authority with society”, the Georgian UN association, Tbilisi, 2001
35. Tofler, Elvin, “Third Wave”; http://www.gumer.info/bibliotek_Buks/Culture/Toffler/_07.php
36. Toradze, Maia, dissertation “Modern press and the problem of elections (journalistic aspects)”, the National Library of the Parliament of Georgia, Tbilisi, 2005
37. Vekua, Marina, “The Principles Of Journalism ”, Tbilisi, 2005
38. Voroshilov, V. “Journalism”, hand book, Sankt-Petersburg, 2001

PERIODIC

39. Abulashvili, Ia, “Requiem for Media in Post revolution Georgia”, newspaper “Resonance”, June 23, 2004
40. Antadze, Ia, “What is going on in press’s preserves”, newspaper “Dilis Gazeti”, July 10, 2000
41. Antadze, Ia, “What is the president expected for from the society?”, newspaper “Akhali Versia”, January 5, 2004
42. “Akhali Meridiani”, “Jvania-Saakashvili-Merabishvili’s Team is Stimulating Civil Confrontation”, newspaper “Akhali Meridiani”, December 14-17, 2001
43. Bush, Georg, Speech given in Tbilisi, newspaper “Saqartvelos Respublika”, May 11, 2005
44. Bush, Georg, Speech given in Tbilisi, newspaper “24 Saati”, May 15, 2005
45. Chapidze, Eliso, “The Program of Training and Equipping must not derange”, newspaper “Resonance”, July 20, 2002
46. “Dilis Gazeti”, “What is going on in press’s preserves”, interview with journalist Ia Antadze, newspaper “Dilis Gazeti”, July 10, 2000
47. “Dilis Gazeti”, “For whom is destabilization in Georgia profitable?”, newspaper “Dilis Gazeti”, November 20, 2000
48. Imerlishvili, Nino, “The Young President of Russia Publicly Oppressed Our “Grandfather”, newspaper “Axali Versia”, December 3, 2001
49. Interview with Robert Hanter, newspaper “24 Saati”, July 2, 2002
50. Interview with Lela Iakobishvili, “Requiem for Media in Post revolution Georgia”, newspaper “Resonance”, June 23, 2004
51. Interview with Naira Gelashvili, newspaper “Akhali Epoqa”, July 7-14, 2000
52. Khurcidze, Mamuka, “Russia’s Georgiophobic demarches excludes every kind of compromise”, newspaper “Akhali Meridiani”, October 12, 2001
53. Kirtadze, Nestan, “Someone does not want Georgian state system to develop”, newspaper “Martali Gazeti”, number 5, August, 2000
54. Kvitashvili, Giorgi, “Natelashvili will win the elections in Tbilisi”, newspaper “Akhali Taoba”, May 20, 2002
55. Loladze, Nino, “Who was actino according to Russian script – Targamadze-Patarkacishvili or Jvania-Saakashvili?”, “Akhali Versia”, November 26, 2001
56. Metreveli, Nino, “Burjanadze is made by Zhvania and Shevardnadze”, magazine “Sarke”, October 15-20, 2003

57. Mkervalishvili, Lado, "When Democracy will be developed in Georgia?" newspaper "Akhali Taoba", May 19, 2000
58. Nikuradze, Rusudan, "There was a Joke in Russia" that Shevardnadze had to be Ashamed to go back Home", newspaper "Droni", December 4, 2001
59. Phachulia, Merab, "According to the Criteria of Optimism, Georgia is on the Second Place in the World", newspaper "Resonance", January 17, 2005
60. "Rustavi 2", program "Post Scriptum", Broadcasting Company "Rustavi 2", May 6, 2000
61. Saneblidze, Ramas, "Georgia-Russian Relation Enter The New Phase", newspaper "Saqartvelos Respublika", December 2, 2001
62. Silagadze, Apollon, "If not the Revolution", newspaper "24 Saati", April 13, 2005
63. "Wall Street Journal", "Russia's Great Constraint on Georgia", newspaper "Droni", January 13, 2001