

**2012 -2013 TITLE VIII
COMBINED RESEARCH AND LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM
FINAL REPORT**

Claire P. Kaiser
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of History
University of Pennsylvania

Socialist in Form, National in Content:

The Politics of Nationality in Soviet Georgia, 1938-1978

September 24, 2012 – June 6, 2013
Tbilisi, Georgia

Research Abstract: My dissertation studies nationality policies in Soviet Georgia, a republic which saw the development of a modern Georgian nation within a Soviet institutional framework. This process affected the many non-Georgian nationalities inhabiting the territory, from Abkhaz and Ossetians to Russians, Armenians, Iranians and Turks. In my project, I argue that the period under examination (1938-1978) was formative for Soviet Georgia, particularly with regard to, on the one hand, Georgian republic-level policies toward autonomous regions in Abkhazia, Ajaria and South Ossetia, and on the other, the extent of Moscow’s reach in managing the territory of Georgia. From the development and expression of a Georgian national identity through Soviet institutions to the dominance of a specifically Georgian national interest, my case study demonstrates how this process took root among multiple layers of center-periphery relations, the products of which continue to dominate the Eurasian geopolitical landscape.

Research Goals: My overall goals during the fellowship term were twofold: to conduct archival research in Tbilisi for my doctoral dissertation in history, titled “Lived Nationality: Policy and Practice in Soviet Georgia, 1945-1978”; and to achieve a research proficiency in Georgian in order to incorporate Georgian-language archival materials into my project. As I intended to collect the majority of the archival materials for my dissertation during the research term funded by Title VIII, I set ambitious research and language-learning goals to most effectively use my fellowship in Tbilisi.

Though the Soviet state was founded on principles of Marxism-Leninism, which sought ultimately to transcend national distinctions, the lived experience of the Soviet project constructed and consolidated rather than dissolved nationality among its multiethnic population.

**2012 -2013 TITLE VIII
COMBINED RESEARCH AND LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM
FINAL REPORT**

The Georgian S.S.R. serves as a case in my dissertation through which to examine how Soviet citizens inhabited national identity in the middle of the “Soviet century,” from 1945 to 1978. In the project, I argue that the case of Georgia resembles developing behavior of a nation-state within the framework of Soviet ideology and institutions: Soviet Georgians over the course of this period increasingly claimed and organized political sovereignty over their own defined territory in the name of a Georgian nation without seeking to abandon Georgia’s position in the Soviet Union. In other words, invoking the terminology of Rogers Brubaker, these four decades in Georgia saw an increased overlap in territorial/political and ethnocultural/personal modes of institutionalized nationality.¹

This process, which I refer to as “Georgification,” entailed both the official promotion of a particular Georgian national culture (in lieu of the local identities which had historically proven prevalent on the territory of Georgia) and changes in the demographic composition of the republic itself. Furthermore, this process affected not only ethnic Georgians, but also the non-Georgians who inhabited the Georgian S.S.R., whether minorities with designated territorial rights, such as Abkhaz or Ossetians; the Russians and Armenians who historically comprised Georgia’s urban populace; or the Greek, Iranian, and Turkish communities living in the republic.

Furthermore, this period saw an increasing national homogenization of the populace within Georgia. This phenomenon was most marked in the republic’s capital, Tbilisi, which, after having been historically populated by Russians, Armenians, and Jews, reached a majority Georgian population in 1975.² Thus, Soviet policies produced a “Georgian” Georgia for the first time in modern history. As Ronald Grigor Suny argues, the “re-making” of Georgian nation was the result of a 150-year project, which crystallized in the post-Stalin era.³ Soviet and Georgian identities did, indeed, coexist, but the one unintended consequence of the phenomenon in this period was the national consolidation of the republic.

Drawing from the work of anthropologists Katherine Verdery and Bruce Grant and sociologist Rogers Brubaker, my dissertation examines change in the political and intellectual discourse on nationality in the Georgian S.S.R. as well as how this discourse translated to and was informed

¹ See in particular Rogers Brubaker, *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

² Ronald Grigor Suny, *The Making of the Georgian Nation* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), 299.

³ Suny, *The Making of the Georgian Nation*, 296.

**2012 -2013 TITLE VIII
COMBINED RESEARCH AND LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM
FINAL REPORT**

by the lived experience of its citizenry across the republic.⁴ Building upon a question posed by Grant in his study of the Nivkh, an ethnic group on Sakhalin Island, my dissertation argues that emphasizing the difference between Soviet and Georgian identities eschews “the very mechanisms that enabled the Soviet administration to recruit a patriotic” Georgian “collective.”⁵ Thus, rather than speaking of identity *formation* in the Georgian S.S.R., this study investigates identity *negotiation* – between Soviet and Georgian, between that of Georgians and those non-ethnic Georgians who also inhabited the republic, between national and local, and between Soviet understandings of national identity and preexisting currents of Georgian national sentiment.

Research Activities: My research activities adhered closely to the research goals outlined in my project proposal, though my findings in each archive caused me to revise my initial projections to more effectively address my project’s themes. Furthermore, my research abilities in Georgian progressed more rapidly than I anticipated, so I was able to conduct more archival research in Georgian collections than I had initially planned.

As expected, the Ministry of Internal Affairs’ Party Archive, which contains the archive of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Georgia (fond 14), remained the primary venue for my research. Materials from this collection will comprise the foundation for my dissertation, and the research I conducted there will appear in each dissertation chapter. Because this fond is the main institutional resource for Soviet history in Georgia, the types of documents I examined there vary from meeting protocols to research reports to letters of grievance and petitions. This collection also includes extensive correspondence between Tbilisi officials and regional counterparts across Georgia (including in the autonomous regions) as well as central authorities in Moscow. I found additional materials about post-Stalin housing, architecture, and urban planning for a chapter on Tbilisi neighborhood history in the Tbilisi City and Ordzhonikidze District Committees of the Georgian Communist Party (fonds 17 and 22), also housed by the MIA Party Archive. Documents from the Party Archive’s “special folders” (fond 1) revealed eyewitness testimony and casualty numbers from the 9 March 1956 violent suppression of a demonstration against de-Stalinization, a topic that is central to my project. In addition to the Party Archive, the MIA’s Security Archive, which houses materials from the Georgian NKVD/KGB, proved a valuable resource for supplementary materials (in particular, criminal

⁴ See especially Katherine Verdery, *National Ideology under Socialism: Identity and Cultural Politics in Ceausescu’s Romania* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995); and Bruce Grant, *In the Soviet House of Culture: A Century of Perestroikas* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995).

⁵ Grant, *In the Soviet House of Culture*, 14.

**2012 -2013 TITLE VIII
COMBINED RESEARCH AND LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM
FINAL REPORT**

case files (fond 6) and resettlement lists (fond 13)) about nationally based deportations in the late Stalin era.

Though I spent much of my time in the various MIA-administered fonds, I conducted research in several other Tbilisi-based archives as well. Based on preliminary research conducted in 2011, I expected to find many useful materials at the Georgian National Archive. However, this archive proved less useful for my project than anticipated, though I did find limited materials in the Council of Ministers collection (fond 600) and the Central Statistical Administration regarding the all-Union censuses (fond 334). I had hoped to research in the collection of the Georgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs at the National Archive, but I was told that this fond remains classified. On the other hand, the Tbilisi Central Archive (under the jurisdiction of the National Archive system), where I had not initially planned to work, contained some useful material on Tbilisi urban planning and neighborhood development that will contribute to a chapter case study of Tbilisi's Saburtalo district. In particular, the Ordzhonikidze Rayon Executive Committee (fond 79) and the Main Architectural Department of the Tbilisi City Executive Committee (fond 14) contained files that complemented the Tbilisi Party-based documents I found at the MIA Party Archive.

For material about the role played by Georgian scholars in cultivating and promoting a Georgian national identity through Soviet institutions, I turned to collections in the archive of the Georgian National Academy of Sciences and the National Centre of Manuscripts. In particular, the archive of the Ivane Javakhishvili Institute of History, Archaeology, and Ethnography – the primary institution for the study of history in Soviet Georgia (fond 15) and the personal fonds of Simon Janashia (fond 9, Academy of Sciences) and Nikoloz Berdzenishvili (Manuscript Centre) contained useful biographical and personnel material as well as research drafts, correspondence, and field notes from the scholars working at the Institute. This material will provide a necessary counterpart to MIA Party Archive documents about historical publications that incited controversy among both academics and the public in 1957 and 1967 relating to the place of Abkhazia in Georgian history.

In addition to archives, the National Parliamentary Library of Georgia served as a supplementary research venue for my project. While Russian-language newspapers, periodicals, and secondary works are relatively easy to access in the United States, Georgian-language materials are frequently available only in Georgia, especially for the Soviet period. As a result, as my Georgian abilities improved, I read many secondary works directly related to my project by Georgian scholars and gathered memoirs and Soviet-era studies of relevant topics in Georgian. I

**2012 -2013 TITLE VIII
COMBINED RESEARCH AND LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM
FINAL REPORT**

also reviewed the local *Pravda* affiliates, *Zaria Vostoka* (in Russian) and *komunisti* (in Georgian), and a prominent literary and scholarly journal, *mnat'obi*, at the library.

I structured my schedule around the archives' working hours (typically 11:00am to 6:00pm). On a normal weekday, I met with my Georgian teacher from 8:30-10:30am and worked in the archive for the rest of the working day. In the evenings, in addition to doing Georgian homework and organizing my archival notes, I often attended seminars and presentations of other scholars' research. The National Parliamentary Library of Georgia was open on the weekends, so I used that time to review newspapers, periodicals, and secondary literature that I could not access in the United States (in particular, *Zaria Vostoka*, *komunisti*, and *mnat'obi*).

As noted above, I also studied Georgian through the Title VIII fellowship. For ten hours per week, I studied one-on-one with a teacher from Language School Georgia (LSGeorgia), a private language school run by Nana Shavtvaladze in Tbilisi. Previous Title VIII scholars recommended this school highly to me, and I had a similarly positive experience in my nine months of study. As a historian, I had specific, professional interests in reading archival documents and academic articles in Georgian as well as a more general desire to be able to speak Georgian in a professional setting while living in Tbilisi. I surpassed both of these goals through my LSGeorgia lessons.

LSGeorgia tailored a program and teachers to my individual needs that not only used three levels of the school's *biliki* textbooks, but also incorporated more complex grammar study to improve my Georgian abilities from a low intermediate knowledge to the ability to converse in professional settings in Georgian and use Georgian for archival and library research. Though this was not an initial goal of mine, I also developed my Georgian writings skills for the purposes of e-mail correspondence and writing academic articles. My primary teacher, Nino Sharashenidze, a professor of linguistics at Tbilisi State University, focused on advanced grammar and taught me many practical, professional applications for Georgian that were highly beneficial during my fellowship term and will continue to serve me as I write my dissertation. For example, in addition to working on grammar, she taught me how to read Soviet-era Georgian literature (by such authors as Nodar Dumbadze, Geronti Kikodze, and Guram Rcheulishvili), academic articles on Georgian history (by Nikoloz Berdzenishvili), and handwritten archival documents in Georgian. Additionally, with Nino's guidance, I wrote an academic article on Soviet historiography in the United States. This more rigorous, personally tailored program was supplemented with practical speaking and conversation lessons with Tea Ebralidze, primarily using the *biliki* textbook materials.

**2012 -2013 TITLE VIII
COMBINED RESEARCH AND LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM
FINAL REPORT**

The intensive, tailored program offered by my LSGeorgia teachers allowed me not only to improve my Georgian abilities at a faster rate than anticipated, but also to begin to incorporate Georgian materials into my archival research earlier in my fellowship term. The combination of language study and research offered by the Title VIII fellowship, in my case, proved invaluable for meeting and exceeding my research goals in Georgia.

Important Research Findings: The archival research I conducted through the Title VIII fellowship term yielded several preliminary findings, which I will discuss below within the organizational framework of my dissertation project.

The dissertation is divided into two thematic sections. The first, provisionally titled “Institutions of Nation-Building,” examines the “technologies of rule” within the Georgian S.S.R. that coalesced in the broader period surrounding the Second World War. Building upon the familiar “census, map, museum” paradigm articulated by Benedict Anderson, a “census, map, history” approach reveals not only the ways in which Soviet institutions and practices constructed nationality in Georgia, but also the active participation of Soviet Georgian academic elites in this project. In particular, I examine the significant roles in articulating and promoting a Georgian nation and national history played by a group of historians affiliated with the Ivane Javakhishvili Institute of History, Archeology, and Ethnography of the Georgian Academy of Sciences (such as Nikoloz Berdzenishvili and Simon Janashia). Research conducted at the Academy of Sciences archive and in Berdzenishvili’s personal papers at the National Centre of Manuscripts revealed both the breadth of their research agendas and their close connection to republic Party leadership (and even Stalin himself). Through projects as diverse as revising Georgian history textbooks, conducting archeological excavations of ancient Georgian sites (such as Mtskheta), and providing academic backing to a Moscow effort to “re”-claim territories in “greater” Georgia (the Kars and Ardahan provinces of Turkey) in the immediate postwar period, these scholars used Soviet organs such as the Academy of Sciences to more clearly articulate the bounds of Georgianness.

A further instrument of rule altered the ethnonational landscape of the Georgian S.S.R. in the late Stalin era: nationally based deportations within and from the republic to Central Asia. While the case of the so-called “Meskhetian Turks,” deported from southern Georgia in 1944, is well known, subsequent deportation waves in 1949 and 1951 remain little studied or understood. During my research in the Georgian MIA Security and Party Archives, I found a considerable amount of materials about one particular national operation, known as Operation VOLNA, which was carried out in June 1949 against Greeks, Turks, and Armenians (suspected former Dashnaks) living across the republic, some of whom were Soviet citizens. Through a close case study of this

**2012 -2013 TITLE VIII
COMBINED RESEARCH AND LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM
FINAL REPORT**

operation via criminal case files, resettlement and repatriation lists, internal MGB memoranda, and deportee memoirs, I can detail how this operation was carried out on the ground, its scale and purpose, and the process and challenges of repatriation. Based on my archival findings, I suggest preliminarily that the late Stalin-era national deportations in Georgia resemble earlier, prewar “national operations” that sought to anticipate the coming war with Nazi Germany; however, anticipating the next war in the unfolding Cold War climate entailed preemption against a new cast of suspected enemies along Caucasian southern and maritime borders. This process set the stage for the republic’s major turning point between 1953 and 1956 with regard to nationality and center-periphery relations.

The dissertation’s second part, provisionally titled “Popularizing the Nation: Event and Everyday Life,” examines the process by which elite definitions of nationhood and nationality were disseminated throughout and received by the broader citizenry of the Georgian S.S.R. While many historians rightly regard the Great Patriotic War as a major point of rupture in Soviet history, my research indicates that, in the case of the Georgian S.S.R., 1956 and the de-Stalinization campaigns mark the more significant turning point within the republic. In Georgia, Stalin’s death and Beria’s fall in 1953, combined with the revelations of Khrushchev’s secret speech in early 1956, initiated a new, more overt conversation about nationality within Georgia. It also marked the beginning of a more hands-off relationship vis-à-vis Moscow, provided that alleged “nationalist, anti-Soviet” expressions were kept at bay following the 9 March 1956 violent suppression of a demonstration against de-Stalinization. Throughout the republic, Georgians and others attempted to understand the national implications of de-Stalinization. One subsequent flashpoint involved discussions surrounding Pavle Ingoroqva’s *Giorgi Merchule: A Tenth-Century Georgian Writer* in 1957 and the third volume of Nikoloz Berdzenishvili’s *Collected Works* in 1967. In the former, an academic discussion of the book in the journal *mnat’obi* was followed by a vigorous academic protest from Abkhaz intellectuals and a public protest in Sukhumi over the perceived “Georgification” of Abkhaz history by Georgian scholars. A similar protest emerged over the latter in Abkhazia a decade later. These cases show the resonance of academic debates about nationality and national histories with the broader public as well as the oblast’ and republic Party leadership’s concern with managing these discourses in an evolving, post-Stalin context.

The aftermath of the 5-9 March 1956 demonstrations should be viewed as part of a broader process by which Georgians attempted to “inhabit” nationality in a Soviet idiom, figuratively and literally, after Stalin. The top-down, compensatory nationalism proffered by Moscow in 1957 and 1958 provided an official outlet for Georgian national expression through elaborate

**2012 -2013 TITLE VIII
COMBINED RESEARCH AND LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM
FINAL REPORT**

celebrations of Tbilisi’s 1,500-year anniversary and a Moscow *dekady* showcasing Georgian national culture. The *k’artlis deda* (Mother of Georgia) monument over Tbilisi in honor of the 1,500 anniversary provides one physical manifestation of this effort; the postwar development of new neighborhoods in Tbilisi demonstrates this process on a larger scale. In particular, Saburtalo, a neighborhood that developed primarily as a result of Khrushchev’s residential building boom, shifted the residential center of Tbilisi as Georgians from elsewhere in the republic migrated to the capital. Saburtalo even earned its own metro line to accommodate the rapid increase in residents. Unlike the historic, nineteenth-century Tbilisi neighborhoods inhabited largely by Armenians, Russians, Azeris, and others, Saburtalo exhibited a particular dynamism in the post-Stalin period. Through a combination of census data, Tbilisi Party and city funds, funds from Ordzhonikidze district, the Tbilisi Main Architectural Department, and conversations with long-term Saburtalo residents, I examine this neighborhood as a constitutive institution that was central to the creation of a Soviet, Georgian Tbilisi.

Two projects that spanned the tenures of multiple republican first secretaries (in particular, Kandid Charkviani, Vasil Mzhavanadze, and Eduard Shevardnadze) further illustrate efforts to define Georgianness through institutions of the Soviet state. The first, a republic Party-led effort to repatriate thousands of ethnic Georgians living in the Fereydan region of Iran (known as the “Fereydan Georgians”), entailed research expeditions and intelligence gathering via the Georgian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, shipments of Georgian literature and periodicals through GOKS (Georgian Society for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries), and propaganda activities in the 1940s, 1960s, and 1970s. In spite of these efforts, only ten families emigrated from Fereydan to the Kakheti region of Georgia in the early 1970s. However, the process by which Tbilisi authorities defined who constituted a Georgian (in the case of Fereydan, a Muslim who spoke Georgian and whose family had lived in Iran for nearly four centuries) reveals a great deal about the official bounds of Georgianness in this period. The case of Fereydan presents a striking contrast when compared to the case of Saingilo, an ethnic Georgian-populated region in Azerbaijan, in which Ingilo activists in Saingilo and Tbilisi appealed to Georgian republic authorities for protection against perceived Azerbaijani national encroachments across a similar period. While Georgian officials could and did approach the Fereydan project proactively, Saingilo remained a taboo political topic because it acknowledged grievances with a neighboring, “brotherly” Soviet republic.

My project ends in 1978 with the success of a popular movement to defend the solo status of Georgian as the republic’s official language in the revised constitution. This movement, which saw street demonstrations and a letter writing campaign, garnered First Secretary Eduard

**2012 -2013 TITLE VIII
COMBINED RESEARCH AND LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM
FINAL REPORT**

Shevardnadze's support as Georgian leaders negotiated the protested change with Moscow authorities. I focus closely on letters written by Georgians to republic leaders (found in the MIA Party Archive), which almost exclusively advocated against granting the Russian language status equal to Georgian in the republic. In the same year, several Abkhaz intellectuals initiated a large letter- and petition-writing campaign, appealing instead to all-Union authorities in Moscow for protection against perceived threats of Georgification from Tbilisi. The Abkhaz demands had previously been confined to the cultural sphere, yet by 1978 their grievances and demands took on a decidedly more political character. However, while Abkhaz writers directed their appeals toward Moscow (rather than Tbilisi), Moscow officials quickly forwarded the Abkhaz grievances to Party counterparts in Tbilisi. As was the case in 1956, 1978 presents a further re-negotiation of the social contract between Tbilisi and Moscow. However, unlike in 1956, it seems that the Georgian demands in 1978 were on Tbilisi's terms rather than Moscow's.

Policy Implications and Recommendations: As the post-Soviet climate has shown, as recently as the five-day war between Russia and Georgia over South Ossetia in August 2008, issues of local autonomy, national identity, and territorial integrity are far from dormant in Georgia. Rather, these issues form the bedrock of domestic and regional politics in Georgia and the Caucasus and often color the behavior of Georgian and Russian officials on a global stage, whether in Russian recognition of the independence of Abkhazia and South Ossetia, early Georgian attempts to thwart Russia's entry into the World Trade Organization, or the impact of the Georgian Dream coalition victory in the 2012 parliamentary elections. As a result, these issues are at the forefront of U.S. policymakers' concern and interest in Georgia and the wider region along Russia's southern flank.

In particular, my research demonstrates the significance of the late- and post-Stalin era to understanding current tensions between Tbilisi, Sukhumi, and Moscow. Though the 1992-1993 Abkhaz-Georgian War and its fallout remains the primary framework through which policymakers view this relationship, my research shows the roots of this conflict as it developed through earlier, Soviet structures. Tracing the evolving roots of Abkhaz-Georgian grievances in the mid- and late Soviet era permits U.S. policymakers to more fully understand the post-Soviet wars, continuing challenges to Georgian territorial integrity, and the current Russo-Georgian relationship.

Second, my research on national deportations, territorial ambitions, and repatriation projects points to the geopolitical significance of Georgia at the intersection of Russian, Iranian, and Turkish spheres of influence. From Soviet maneuvers in the early Cold War era to Georgian national ambitions expressed through Soviet institutions, the recent history of Georgian activity

**2012 -2013 TITLE VIII
COMBINED RESEARCH AND LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM
FINAL REPORT**

toward Turkey and Iran has relevant precursors in the Soviet period. The heavy economic and diplomatic presence of Iran and Turkey cultivated during Mikheil Saakashvili's tenure as president speak not only to the longer term cultural and geopolitical roles these actors have played in the Caucasus, but also to the ways in which Georgian officials negotiate their own geopolitical position between Turkey, Iran, Russia, and the United States. As Georgia continues to transition from a strong, highly centralized presidential system to a parliamentary system led by the Georgian Dream coalition, which has made improving relations with Russia a governing priority, the United States should build upon the deep partnerships it has built in the last decade in the realms of military cooperation, democracy and governance, and economic development in light of the shifting geopolitical alignments in the region.

Finally, the Archive Administration of the Georgian Ministry of Internal Affairs (which holds the Party and Security Archives described above) represents an admirable example of how archival openness and transparency can work successfully in the region. Local and foreign scholars have already learned a great deal since these archival holdings were re-organized and the administration professionalized in recent years. Freedom of information and governmental transparency remain important U.S. policy goals in the region, and supporting such positive examples as the MIA Archival Administration in Georgia would further this important effort.

Co-Curricular Activity: During my fellowship term, I delivered three lectures based on my research: first, I presented a portion of my research on de-Stalinization in Georgia at a conference at the Lithuanian Institute of History (Vilnius) in December; I delivered a public lecture titled "Georgia's 1956 and Soviet Nationalism" at the Caucasus Research Resource Center (CRRC)/American Councils/Association of Research Institutes in the South Caucasus (ARISC) Works-in-Progress series in December; finally, I lectured to a graduate level history course at Ilia State University (Tbilisi) on the Soviet Union in the Brezhnev era in May. I was a regular and active participant in the CRRC/ARISC/American Councils Works-in-Progress lecture series, which convened weekly to discuss foreign and local scholars' research on the region.

In addition to formally presenting my research, I met frequently with local scholars, members of the NGO community, and government officials to discuss my research. In particular, I developed productive relationships with: Giorgi Kldiashvili, Levan Avalashvili, and Davit Jishkariani (Institute for the Development of Freedom of Information); Omar Tushurashvili, Ivane Jakhua, and Dodo Baghaturia (Ministry of Internal Affairs Archival Administration); Timothy Blauvelt (American Councils/Ilia State University); Oliver Reisner (European Commission/Tbilisi State University); Tengiz Simiashvili (Telavi State University); Nino Sharashenidze (Tbilisi State

**2012 -2013 TITLE VIII
COMBINED RESEARCH AND LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM
FINAL REPORT**

University); Levan Asabashvili (Urban Reactor); Giorgi Alaverdashvili (fereidan.org); Rusiko Amirejibi; Donnacha O Beachain and Karolina O Beachain Stefanczak (Dublin City University); Vilius Ivanauskas (Lithuanian Institute of History); and representatives from the Soviet Past Research Laboratory (SovLab). I also discussed my project and experiences in Georgia with U.S. Ambassador to Georgia Richard Norland. Finally, I was interviewed about the Stalin legacy in Georgia for a Eurasianet.org short film, available <http://www.eurasianet.org/node/66800>.

Conclusions: The research and language training provided by the Title VIII fellowship program are invaluable to the success of my dissertation project. The ability to pursue advanced language training and conduct concurrently archival research is a unique and highly beneficial combination, particularly for scholars pursuing topics that require facility in languages rarely taught at the advanced level in the United States, such as Georgian. The American Councils staff in Washington was helpful in making pre-departure arrangements and responding in a timely manner to questions while I was in the field. The American Councils Tbilisi office was a tremendously helpful resource throughout my stay in Georgia.

Plans for Future Research Agenda/ Presentations and Publications: The research conducted during this fellowship term will contribute to my doctoral dissertation in Soviet history at the University of Pennsylvania. As such, my findings in Tbilisi comprise the majority of my archival research for the dissertation. I plan to conduct supplementary, short-term research in Moscow in the coming year (2014). In addition to completing the dissertation (estimated 2015-2016 academic year), I plan to present my research at the Association for the Study of Nationalities and the Association for Slavic, East European, and Eurasian Studies annual conferences. I also plan to publish one additional journal article based on research conducted in Tbilisi prior to defending the dissertation.

**2012 -2013 TITLE VIII
COMBINED RESEARCH AND LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM
FINAL REPORT**

Bibliography

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (New Edition). New York: Verso, 2006.
- Blauvelt, Timothy. "Abkhazia: Patronage and Power in the Stalin Era." *Nationalities Papers* 53:2 (May 2007): 203-232.
- _____. "Status Shift and Ethnic Mobilisation in the March 1956 Events in Georgia." *Europe-Asia Studies* 61:4 (June 2009): 651-668.
- Brubaker, Rogers. *Ethnicity Without Groups*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- _____. *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Bugai, N.G. and Gonov, A.M. *Kavkaz: narody v eshelonakh, 20-60-e gody*. Moscow: INSAN, 1998.
- Gasviani, Geronti. *k'art'veli mec'nierebi pavle ingoroqvas šxedulebebz e apxazet'isa da apxazebis šesaxeb*. Tbilisi: Mec'niereba, 2003.
- Gerber, Jürgen. *Georgien: Nationale Opposition und kommunistische Herrschaft seit 1956*. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 1997.
- Grant, Bruce. *In the Soviet House of Culture: A Century of Perestroikas*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.
- Harris, Steven E. *Communism on Tomorrow Street: Mass Housing and Everyday Life after Stalin*. Washington: Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 2013.
- Hirsch, Francine. *Empire of Nations: Ethnographic Knowledge and the Making of the Soviet Union*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005.
- Jones, Polly, ed. *The Dilemmas of De-Stalinization: Negotiating Cultural and Social Change in the Khrushchev Era*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- King, Charles. *The Ghost of Freedom: A History of the Caucasus*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Kozlov, Vladimir A. *Massovy e besporiadki v SSSR pri Khrushcheve i Brezhneve: 1953—nachalo 198—kh gg*. Moscow: ROSSPEN, 2010.

**2012 -2013 TITLE VIII
COMBINED RESEARCH AND LANGUAGE TRAINING PROGRAM
FINAL REPORT**

- Lehmann, Maike. *Eine sowjetische Nation: Nationale Sozialismusinterpretationen in Armenien seit 1945*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2012.
- Martin, Terry. *The Affirmative Action Empire: Nations and Nationalism in the Soviet Union, 1923-1939*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2001.
- Nat'melaže, Maqvala. *demograp'iuli proc'esebi sak'art'veloši XX saukunis 40-idan clebši*. Tbilisi: CIPDD, 2002.
- Nat'melaže, Maqvala and Aleksandre Daušvili. *Noveishaia istoriia Gruzii*. Tbilisi: Universal, 2010.
- Samušiam, Jaba. *ert'i ideologiuri kompaniis istoriidan: sabčot'a kavširis teritoriuli pretenziebi t'urk'isadmi 1945-1953 clebši*. Tbilisi: Artanuji, 2003.
- Shnirelman, Viktor A. *The Value of the Past: Myths, Identity, and Politics in Transcaucasia*. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology, 2001.
- Slezkine, Yuri. "The Soviet Union as a Communal Apartment, or How a Socialist State Promoted Ethnic Particularism," *Slavic Review* 53:2 (Summer 1994): 414-452.
- Smith, Anthony D. *Nationalism: Theory, Ideology, History* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Polity Press, 2010.
- Stronski, Paul. *Tashkent: Forging a Soviet City, 1930-1966*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2010.
- Suny, Ronald Grigor. *The Making of the Georgian Nation* (2nd ed.). Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994.
- _____. *The Revenge of the Past: Nationalism, Revolution, and the Collapse of the Soviet Union*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993.
- Verdery, Katherine. *National Ideology Under Socialism: Identity and Cultural Politics in Ceausescu's Romania*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991.
- Weiner, Amir. *Making Sense of War: The Second World War and the Fate of the Bolshevik Revolution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2002.
- Yurchak, Aleksei. *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.



Figure 1: Memorial plaque commemorating victims of 9 March 1956 events, Tbilisi.



Figure 2: Layers of Soviet housing architecture on Dolidze Street, Saburtalo neighborhood, Tbilisi (February 2013)



Figure 3: Graffiti depicting (L-R) Joseph Stalin, Vladimir Putin, and current Georgian Prime Minister Bidzina Ivanishvili as Soviet nesting dolls, Leselidze Street, Tbilisi (April 2013)