

Authors

Krzysztof Gurba
Alexander Chiaureli
Jan Meisel Dobrzański
Aleksander Kostka
Sylwia Kowalik
Hanna Krzyżowska
Grzegorz Lewicki
Giorgi Meladze
Katarzyna Pabian
Dominik Skorupa
Maria Stepan
Monika Zbieg
Joanna Żeber



ISBN 83-60117-41-1



9 788360 117415



CIVIL CAUCASUS

Edited by
Krzysztof Gurba

CIVIL CAUCASUS

edited by Krzysztof Gurba

Kraków 2007

Authors

Krzysztof Gurba (editor, Ch. 1, 4, 9, 10),
Alexander Chiaureli (Ch. 7b),
Jan Meisel Dobrzański, (Ch. 3a, 11a),
Aleksander Kostka (Ch. 5, 6c),
Sylwia Kowalik (Ch. 6c),
Hanna Krzyżowska (Ch. 5),
Grzegorz Lewicki (Ch. 3b),
Giorgi Meladze (Ch. 8),
Katarzyna Pabian (Ch. 5),
Dominik Skorupa (Ch. 3c),
Maria Stepan (Ch. 7a),
Monika Zbieg, (Ch. 2, 6a),
Joanna Żeber (Ch. 6b)



Project 'Civil Caucasus' was conducted by the Institute for Research on Civilizations with financial support of Polish Aid Programme of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland in 2006.

Cover and layout: © FALL

ISBN 978-83-60117-41-1

CONTENT

1. INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT GOALS	4
2. HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL BACKGROUND	4
3. PROBLEM ANALYSIS	6
a) Impact of the international community on the process of the formation of civil society in Georgia	6
b) Fear and generation shift as keys to understanding sociopolitical perspectives of contemporary Georgia	16
c) The situation of ethnic minorities in Georgia following independence	21
4. „CIVIL CAUCASUS” PROJECT – STUDY TRIPS	24
a) Schedule in Georgia	24
b) Schedule in Poland	25
5. PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH ON CIVIL SOCIETY IN DEMOCRACY AMONG YOUNG GEORGIANS	26
a) Introduction and problem statement:	26
b) Methods	26
c) Analysis	27
d) Conclusion	30
6. WORKSHOPS AND CASE-STUDIES ON CIVIL SOCIETY DEVELOPMENT IN GEORGIA	32
a) Informal education as a method of researching civil society	32
b) Georgian civil society in eyes of young Georgians	33
c) The Karadjala report	35
7. “ROOTS” WORKSHOP	38
a) Description and rules	38
b) Civil society in Poland – Alex’s Group report	39
8. PROSPECTIVE ANALYSIS	41
9. PARTNER NETWORK – DATABASE	44
10. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	48
a) Coordinators	48
b) Key partners	51
c) Polish study group in Georgia	51
d) Georgian visitors to Poland	51
e) Essay competition participants	52
f) Volunteers	52
11. APPENDICES	53
a) Essay Competition – Set of instructions (English)	53
b) Essay Competition – Set of instructions (Georgian)	55

1. INTRODUCTION AND PROJECT GOALS

The 'Civil Caucasus' project was an outcome of a study entitled 'Following the trails of the Velvet Revolutions: Ukraine, Serbia and Georgia' conducted by the Institute for Research on Civilizations in 2005. This research was aimed at getting a better and more in-depth understanding of the processes of democratisation taking place in those countries.

In our opinion a well developed civil society is a vital element of a smoothly running and effective democracy. The goal of the project 'Civil Caucasus' was to support the youth in Georgia in building a strong civil society within their country. South Ossetia and Abkhazia have been excluded from our study for reasons of personal safety.

The project was divided into 3 parts. The first was an essay contest for students on the development of civil society in Georgia. Nominees attended a series of workshops and seminars on the issue of civil society which took place between 21.11 and 02.12.2006 in Tbilisi and Telavi. The workshops were prepared by members of the Institute for Research on Civilizations. During its stay in Georgia the Institute carried out surveys and in-depth interviews with Georgian citizens to obtain data for further research.

For the second part of the project, 8 competition winners and 2 Georgian NGO members visited Poland from 04.12 to 12.12.2006 for meetings with members of various Polish NGO's and to participate in various workshops and seminars.

The last part of 'Civil Caucasus' was a final conference held on 12.12.2006 in Krakow, Poland to present the research results of the Institute.

The complete results of the project are published in this summarizing report on the development of civil society in contemporary Georgia with a forecast on its future perspectives and list of actual and potential partners for further development of cooperation.

The project was conducted by the Institute for Research on Civilizations (Krakow Branch) from the Tischner European University with Georgian partners: Liberty Institute in Tbilisi and Tbilisi State University.

2. HISTORICAL AND SOCIAL BACKGROUND

In 2003 the whole world learned of the bloodless revolution in Georgia and many students of global politics watched the remarkable events unfold with interest. In spite of internal conflict and civil war, Georgian society united and instead of guns carried red roses. The Rose revolution signalled the start of the liberation process from the post Soviet regime in neighbouring countries. Governmental change can be effected via democratic means but in the Cau5

casus it has always been inextricably linked with violence, civil war and lawlessness. Society did not waste its opportunity to be involved in the struggle to attain independence and the basic rights of citizenship.

Civil society in Georgia did not follow the pattern dictated by a grounding in Western values and customs. Every nation has its own form of civil society which is firmly rooted in its culture and history and Georgia is beginning to establish itself after the benign dictatorship of Edward Shevardnadze. It boasts a free press, the right to free association, a functioning opposition and a democratic constitution. This growth of an active civil society is undoubtedly due to Western investment in the country.

The government of President Saakashvili has played a prominent role in establishing the foundations of this movement through its governmental reform program. A fully democratic Georgia is a considerable task and will take many years to achieve. In order to establish a healthy democracy in a post-Soviet country, where true freedom is very often an unknown, the assistance of Western governments in terms of governmental change and reform is essential.

Representatives of the civil society, who gained influence during the peaceful progress of the revolution, favour a pro American, pro Western foreign policy. Despite many changes, many remain: the continuing issue of ethnic minorities, the fight against corruption, reforms of the educational and tax systems as well as revitalising the economy and financial sectors. Without these, a stable civil society can not be established.

Georgian identity is constructed from a confluence of different cultures and religions having fallen under the control of Iran, Turkey and Russia throughout the ages. As a result, the population of Georgia is multicultural and follow different faiths. In Tbilisi there are around 90 different nationalities and ethnic groups who constitute 30% of the cities population, following their own culture and traditions. The most significant minorities are: Armenians; Russians; Kurds; Ossetians; Greeks; Azeris; Ukrainians and Jews.¹ Georgia is a largely agricultural country, although increasing urbanization is changing this. A decline in the economic situation has led to an increase in unemployment and a corresponding fall in the standard of living for the average Georgian.

The pro-Western stance of the government has led to a backlash from some sections of society in terms of cultural and national identity as well as traditional Georgian customs. Despite a large number of vital reforms, a section of Georgian society remains discontented and unhappy with the policies of Mikhail Saakashvili.² The main problem in Georgia is widespread corruption, a legacy of the previous regime, which results in Georgia ranking 130th of 159 countries

¹ Parzymies Dorota, *Życie codzienne w Tbilisi*, Wyd. Dialog, Warszawa 2004

² Ibid.

in terms of corruption, putting them in the same league as the Democratic Republic of Congo, Kyrgyzstan and Cambodia. The issue of media freedom is also not fully resolved, with Georgia being placed 99th of 167 nations.

Georgia is but a short step from true democracy. The development of such a democracy is different to those in the West, given the values and obstacles unique to Georgia. A fully active and developed society depend on the financial and organisational help of the West. Without a fully democratic government it must be said that Georgia cannot negotiate the rocky road of transformation alone.

In 2005, the example of the Rose revolution and the subsequent societal developments furnished the Institute for Research on Civilizations with the opportunity to organize the study visit entitled .Following the trails of the Velvet Revolutions: Ukraine, Serbia and Georgia.. The chance to interview the initiators, students and prominent governmental and societal figures supplied inspirational data for analysis. As a result, a documentary film for TVP 3, a published report and 3 B.A. theses (defended in 2006) were produced by the Tischner European University. From a number of conversations during the stay in Georgia and as a result considerable correspondence with Georgian partners, a fledgling civil society has emerged and there has been a growth in the respect for human rights.

3. PROBLEM ANALYSIS

a) Impact of the international community on the process of the formation of civil society in Georgia

Georgia is a unique country – proud, with enduring traditions and a heavy burden of history. The events of recent years transformed it from a marginal post-soviet country into a key political player in the region; a leader of democratic change; a successful developer of civil society. All this was achieved thanks to vast help from abroad, which is the main focus of this paper.

Some very important aspects of the influence, which the international community has had on democratic transition in Georgia, are for example the attitude of all interested parties, positive and negative experiences and objectives, which are to be achieved by everyone in time to come. Following this overly simplistic division, this essay is divided into three parts, mainly: a description of the current situation, the ideal situation in the future and a more realistic prognosis. This kind of division could be the grounds for improving the efficiency of international policy towards Georgia and increasing the pace of democratic transition in the country.

This report has been written based on various meetings with Georgian officials, members of NGOs (national and international) and on scientific

research, conducted in Tbilisi and Telavi. Thanks to a wide range of interviewees it was possible to gather very complex socio-economic information on democratic transition in Georgia.

Commonly, the Georgian Rose Revolution of 2003 is considered to be a success story, an example for other countries struggling with democratic transition. This is one of the most important reasons for which the development of civil society in the Caucasus is so important for other democratic states – Georgia must not fail. Otherwise, Western countries would face more difficulties in shaping a worldwide system of security since they are left with barely any examples of successful democratic transition. The problem is that the current situation in Tbilisi is not as bright as many would like it to be.

Current situation

The presence of international NGOs' in Georgia has a long tradition but this does not equate with good experiences. It is related to events which took place in the regions of Abkhazia and Southern Osetia in mid-1990s. The separatist aspirations of both regions ushered in a civil war, which prompted international intervention. Ever since the UN annually makes at least two resolutions concerning the blue berets residing in the region – UNOMIG (United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia) and Georgia in general. Apart from the UN, there are also other international organizations present in the region, with OSCE and the Council of Europe being the most notable.

Apart from international organizations focused on politics, there are also many that deal with humanitarian aid, i.e. Human Rights Watch (HRW), International Helsinki Federation for Human Rights (IHF-HR) or the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC). However, since the end of the civil war, they have not been as active in the region as they used to be.

It was not until 2003 that the scale and quality of foreign interest in Georgia's situation changed. Thanks to the Rose Revolution and the collapse of Eduard Shevardnadze's government it was possible to intensify cooperation between Georgia and other democratic countries. One of the most important tasks of the new president, Michail Saakashwili, was to encourage grass-roots civil activity and the creation of local NGOs. It is estimated that there are around 2000 of them currently operating around the country.

This attitude does not come from anywhere. The Rose Revolution itself would not have been possible without the help of NGOs from abroad. George Soros financially supported Khmara, the most powerful and influential organization in the opposition to Shevardnadze's regime. The Liberty Institute, an institute of legal monitoring, which could be described as Khmara's offspring, is one of the most notable sources of employees for public administration in Georgia.

Coming back to the main topic, it has to be said that after the collapse of Shevardnadze's regime Georgia succeeded in gaining credibility and sympa-

thy in the international community, particularly in Washington. Along with the political support of the United States came financial support of many development-aid funds. Consequently, the whole democratic world, following the example of the USA, assisted Georgia as well. As a result of this and the determination of the new government, the situation in Tbilisi changed for the better in a very short period of time.

Following this chain of events, which is very often the story presented by Georgian officials, it should be presumed that the future mutual cooperation of the international community and Georgia faces no difficulties whatsoever. Due to the vast financial support of the West, the situation is healthy and can only improve – civil society develops rapidly and it is only a matter of time before Georgia becomes a stable democracy. The problem is that this description does not have much in common with the reality.

Based on general observations derived from informal conversations, Georgia seems to be an idyllic country – beautiful landscapes, wide opportunities, a determination to achieve success. But when it comes to conducting solid research it turns out that Georgians are masters of public relations and they know how to polish their image. In fact, using black and white terms, the description of Georgia above has little or nothing to do with the reality.

The process of democratisation and the development of civil society face many difficulties. The unstable political situation in the country and uncertainty about the future are the most crucial factors, which determine foreign cooperation with Georgians. Problems that could be observed are of two origins: exogenic (objective) and endogenic (cultural).

In reference to the first category, it seems that Georgia will soon have to face one crucial problem – a widening gap between Tbilisi and the rest of the country. The capital attracts young people, who do not want to spend their whole lives in misery and poverty. It is extremely hard to measure migration since there is no sociological data concerning the whole population of Georgia (more details later on). Fortunately, local governments are aware of this tendency and are trying to reverse it.

However, it does not change the fact that paradoxically most initiatives aimed at helping regions bring more benefits to the capital. They are being coordinated and run from Tbilisi because the money, know-how and institutions are accumulated there. Hence, in a natural way, all foreign organizations operating in Georgia are forced to cooperate with the network of business, politics and connections of the capital. Since there is no natural counterweight, no other political or industrial center, this situation leads to long-term corruption and further aggravates the problem.

It has been mentioned before that there is no data concerning Georgian society. The very last public census took place during the period of the Soviet Union. Since there is no other source of knowledge concerning the current

state of society it is still being used nowadays, which results in such basic problems as estimating the exact size of the population. Some sources say Georgia has 3,5 million inhabitants, others say that the number rises to around 4,5 million, which makes a big difference.

Consequently, when using data which may differ so significantly from the reality, one has to guess what unemployment or average wages really are. And since it is impossible to foresee any impact on the society, it is practically impossible to develop and run efficient public policy. This results in hit-and-miss decisions, which is unacceptable to any foreign organizations, which are forced to run their projects according to very strict procedures. This leads to a situation, where most foreign NGOs decide to work in spheres which are known best, which usually means they do not need that much care.

Because of this one question arises: how could anyone spend any money on grants since it is virtually impossible to check whether they were spent in the right way?

Here, instead of finding a clear answer, there appears another problem. Most money is being spent not because of the actual impact they make but because one wants to spend them this way. This is particularly evident in the way the USA sponsors Georgia – without expecting any exact change, having faith that money eventually has to make a change for better. This could well be understood as buying the political support of the Georgian government, which is not an entirely false statement. However, it has much further reaching consequences.

According to sociological theory, giving something for free could, and very often does, have worse effects than not granting any help at all. This is because giving something without expecting anything in return leads to corruption and encourages passivity. It is not hard to imagine what a country, which so far was sponsored from abroad would look like, when the flow of foreign money is over – it does not know how to manage itself. The EU does not give out money but America – the most significant sponsor – simply spoils Georgians, which could have terrible effects in the future.

The second category of problems – endogenic – is a result of regional culture. When referring to this sphere it has to be remembered that Georgia is a specific mixture of xenophobia, egocentrism and nationalism, which could cause some serious problems in terms of cooperation with international organizations. First of all, Georgians show a clear tendency to dominate others, they lack humility and find it really hard to listen to criticism or the opinions of others. Persuading them to do anything requires a lot of effort and a lot of time, and even this does not guarantee success.

Instead of logical arguments, Georgians are more eager to listen to someone they know and like – interpersonal bonds are valued more than wisdom. It could be well understood by Poles, who have similar traditions, but it could

cause some serious problems to other nationalities, e.g. from Scandinavia. A combination of individualism and Georgian "macho culture" – an overwhelming, competitive patriarchal society – is a notable obstacle to mutual cooperation between Georgians and the rest of the world. Without a good relationship with decision-making elites it is virtually impossible to convince Georgians to follow a certain action or policy.

Another thing is dealing with a national tendency to "build castles on sand" – as Poles say. Virtually everything in Georgia has to be or is the best, the biggest and happen immediately – Georgians do not have any distance to reality. There is no policy-making, no calm, balanced and long-term approach to change. There is too much chaos and spontaneity; decisions are being made based on very short-term forecasts, which do not make any real impact on reality. A lack of patience and great aspirations combined with the Georgian character and pride is a tremendous obstacle to the development of civil society and cooperation with international organizations.

Even though there are many problems, all of them could be solved. The only condition is that Georgia become the subject of complex and coordinated actions that meet the actual social demand. The next part of the paper gives some ideas of what these actions could be.

The ideal situation

There is no doubt that the smooth development of civil society and democracy in Georgia requires help from abroad. In order to achieve a desirable effect, all efforts have to be coordinated and aimed in the right direction. Having analyzed the current situation it is time to discuss what actions the international community should undertake in order to accelerate the process. Based on the previous chapter, actions are divided between those facing exogenic and endogenic problems.

The first category refers mainly to the framework of international organizations' activity in Georgia. The first thing that should change is the system of one-year mandates, which are the basis for the presence of most government agencies in the country. This is because Georgia, requiring a lot of help from abroad, is in greater need for long-term stability. The foreign presence in the country should be guaranteed for a longer period of time for mutual benefit. On one hand, it gives Georgia the very important assurance that they are serious partners, who are not going to be abandoned if anything goes wrong. On the other, it enables international organizations to impose crucial changes, primarily because it enables a completely different way of budgeting. This is a crucial problem for all development agencies who, unable to spend their money according to real long-term needs, suffer from reduced efficiency. In this respect, providing Georgia with smaller but more certain money and help would become much more effective than more generous help given on a year-to-year basis.

Another issue is the decentralization of help. Foreigners must not focus only on Tbilisi but on other regions of the country as well. It is crucial to establish a network of cooperation with local NGOs that bypasses the capital. It would lead to great savings both in time and money, being a motivation for more efficient employment as well.

Of course Georgia's provinces require a lot of money, but there are certain areas, which should be sponsored in particular. It would be highly recommendable to establish a system of preference loans aiming at particular social groups (i.e. women) or to educate local communities. Once again, it is crucial to make this help as stable and long-term as possible so it does not become a one off boost of finance (it would probably be spent on infrastructure, which does not cause any significant social change in the region but could actually increase the pace of migration). It is vital to act in the sphere of culture, ideas, habits and motivations of local communities for it is the true backbone of socio-economic development. Every penny should be spent on initiatives that lead to the abandonment of the old mentality – a mixture of clan society and the communist approach to reality – which do not match the reality of the 21st century ideals of the free market and globalization. Georgians do not have to approve and follow these processes, but certainly they must understand them well.

Another aspect of decentralization, apart from regional, is institutional. Foreign help should not focus only on big, national organizations – as it does now – but primarily on smaller, niche NGOs. These organizations not only are the very core of civil society development, they specialize in certain area and guarantee efficiency. Besides, Georgians themselves are a bit annoyed with posh experts from abroad, who speak ex catedra about general change. It seems that much better effects could be achieved when acting on a narrower scale, focusing on the most simple, every-day issues. It would attract more Georgians, promote activity and help create new elites, all of which are most crucial factors of the development of civil-society.

This factor is a link between exogenous and endogenous. Considering regional culture it is extremely important to approach events in Georgia with a healthy dose of distance. It has been said before that the international community should be demanding, however it should not be harsh. International organizations dealing with development of civil society in Georgia should remember that the starting line of this process was set at a very low level. As a result, it would not be advisable to expect Georgians to meet the highest standards of democratic conduct.

Operating in Georgia requires a lot of flexibility, which means putting flexibility and realism in front of idealism. Focusing merely on the future situation instead of the current one could be counterproductive. Instead it would be better to focus on achievable goals and work step by step to achieve

them. This kind of attitude, as it has been proven in practice, has the best results. As it does not guarantee change, it does not deter local decision makers with over exaggerated demands and idealism .

In order to deal with other endogenic problems, the international community should share democratic experiences, best practice and political culture. The best way to do this is to introduce system of international exchange. Georgians desperately need interaction with the world – without such things it is foolish to expect them to think and act in certain ways, which could be generally described as democratic. Furthermore, Georgians exhibit a clear tendency to study abroad and gather international experience and it would be foolish to squander such enthusiasm.

An exchange system of university students would have a positive impact on many areas of everyday Georgian life. First, it would create an opportunity to educate local leaders according to the highest western standards, creating leaders able to act in the complex international community, so called ‘natural born winners’. This would help to stimulate economic growth, which is commonly perceived as a crucial factor in determining the development of democracy.

Secondly, and even more importantly, people educated in the West would become national leaders, which would have a tremendous impact on the process of civil society development in Georgia. These men and women – the core of local elites – thinking and acting according to certain standards, would become beacons of democracy for other people, enabling more profound social change. Aside from this, since they were educated abroad and are familiar with certain standards and procedures, it would drive better cooperation with international organizations operating in the region. In conclusion, the policy of exchange brings nothing but benefits.

This general description of certain actions that the international community should undertake in order to promote „democratic values” and civil society is – it has to be made clear – utopian. It is only a guideline, particularly necessary nowadays, when Georgia seems to be getting off the path towards democracy. The following section of the essay is dedicated to a more practical implementation of advice mentioned above and a description of a realistic future for Georgia.

Realistic perspectives for the future

There is a certain gap between an idealistic course of events and realistic perspectives. A number of dangerous trends have been described before, however they have to be put in a certain context in order to understand where Georgia is actually heading. First of all, one has to understand the general geopolitical situation of Georgia, since it is not without relevance to the development of civil society.

It has been mentioned above that there is a clear link between the pace of financial development and civil society growth – democracy works better in wealthier states as it is not so vulnerable to radicalism. This poses a major threat to Georgia, which is a poor agricultural country with barely any industry or services. What is more, it is no secret that Georgia is facing problems with international trade, particularly from Russia.

The natural reaction of a country facing such problems is a rise in extremism and dissatisfaction, which eventually leads to a change of government. Even though a shift to anti-democratic, pro-Russian policy is unlikely (Moscow has lost Georgia in the sphere of ideology, culture, history and politics; whole generations openly hate Russians), it is not inconceivable in the long term. Even now, at the peak of anti-Russian sentiment in Georgia, there are rumors that the pro-Kremlin ex-leader of the separatist Abkhaz region, Aslan Abashidze, is planning to come back from exile and revive his political career. History knows many examples of political comebacks of once hated men, who made it to become adored leaders.

Such a scenario is not possible now because of the strong political position of Michail Saakashvili both in and outside of the country, which practically guarantees him re-election and a long lasting reign. However Saakashvili's position, which works as a stabilizer at the moment, could cause some problems in the future.

First of all, who will come after Saakashvili? Georgian politics is totally dominated by this politician; there are no other distinct leaders so it is very hard to nominate his possible successor. It has to be remembered that after the Rose Revolution the average Georgian politician's age does not exceed 30 – politics and the majority of the political elite are very confident men with great aspirations, all brought up in a competitive, macho culture. As a result, Georgia is a place of constant political struggle in the political elites, members of which are trying to gain the best strategic position for the future. Obviously, it affects the quality of the present government, which is very often driven by personal sympathies and particular interests. In the longer perspective, when Saakashvili is no longer in power, these tensions could divide the Rose Revolution governing block, causing a major political shift.

Secondly, it seems that despite public statements, Saakashvili's policy concerning civil society's development is counterproductive in many aspects. It is commonly known that after the Rose Revolution of 2003 there was a significant decline in the freedom of the Georgian media. Furthermore, proposed amendments to the constitution, even if on paper apparently desirable, could practically lead to the democratic devolution of Georgia, with the judiciary system being particularly at risk. Moreover, it is no secret that justice is always on the president's side since, with courts and prosecutors being very loyal to the administration. The example of the school of judges typifies the

situation: the only institution responsible for the training of new judges is run by the president's brother. All these factors have to be taken into consideration.

Another problem which has to be mentioned is the evident difficulty in information flow. First, society is not being informed about the current administration's policy in an appropriate way. Only a small percentage of citizens knows what is going on in national politics while the rest demonstrate a terrifying passivity in the search for information. Secondly, in Georgia there is virtually no political debate – there are no talk shows, no public political debates, interviews with politicians happen very rarely. All sides theoretically interested in the process of information flow – the government, media, NGOs – do not seem to be overly preoccupied with the tendencies mentioned above, which leads to their consolidation.

All the negative trends described above should not be a surprise to anyone for they are a natural consequence of the transition from “institutional state” to “civil state”, which is accompanied with a temporary vacuum in the public sphere. The free space, which is created by the retreat of institutions from controlling certain areas of human activity, theoretically should be filled with civil society movements. However, if this does not happen, if the society is still passive, then institutions come back to previously abandoned positions, with accompanying corruption and deviation.

Even though Georgians have made significant progress in forming a civil society, it seems that their effort was insufficient to complete the process of bringing the state back to citizens. After the events of 2003 society seems to have returned to its previous passivity. Old habits did not disappear; the country is still governed by old clan relations instead of public law etc. This situation means that the international community should take greater responsibility for the course of events in Georgia, for its return to the path of democratization.

Referring to previous demographical observations, it has to be mentioned that international organizations seem to discover that there is something more in Georgia than Tbilisi, which bodes well for the future – even though still much more could be done in this area. Balancing the country is crucial in every possible way, since it is the only path towards a fully developed democracy.

International cooperation with provinces, as well as with the capital, requires a lot of effort, patience and a positive approach. These conditions are not always met and it seems that they will not be for a long time. For example, most foreign organizations work in offices from 9 to 5; preach instead of advising, and lack personal contact with Georgian decision-makers. In the meantime, it would have been much better if agency officials made friends with Georgians – this is what the regional culture requires. This has to be understood in order to improve mutual relations.

Another thing that has to be mentioned is the policy of international exchange, which is not being developed in the way it should be. For example, it turns out that Polish universities compete against each other instead of cooperating. It is enough to describe the situation at Tbilisi State University, which used to cooperate with the University of Lodz, which was later substituted by the University of Warsaw, which now faces the regional “expansion” of Adam Mickiewicz University of Poznan.

It would have been much wiser and profitable if there were one framework for international exchange programmes (i.e. coordinated by Polish Foreign Ministry) that would be the basis for the work of universities operating in the region. It would also allow the pooling of money for scientific research in Georgia, the creation of an improved exchange offer and becoming a more reliable partner for Georgians. In the meantime, most universities’ efforts are futile and counterproductive.

In conclusion, when considering all trends mentioned before, it is really hard to call Georgia a success story of democratic transition – there is still much to be done, both on behalf of Georgians and the international community. However, it cannot be said with all certainty that even then Georgia is destined to achieve success.

Despite this uncertainty, democratic states must not cease their efforts to maximize the chances of a successful transition in Georgia. There is much that could be improved without increasing the efforts both in time and money, mainly the coordination of activity. There should be one precise strategy for the region, set to achieve the most important goals. Political and military support for the country, when it is not accompanied with demands of change in the sphere of ideology, values and ways of political conduct, could have terrible implications for the development of civil society in the long term.

In closing, Georgia needs support from abroad in order to build democracy and civil society. It has to be remembered that true help is not only about giving but also expecting and criticizing as well. To make things more complicated, transforming Georgia to democracy would require finding a balance between idealistic harshness and realistic elasticity, for otherwise any cooperation with Georgians does not seem to have much sense.

Certainly, cooperation of international organizations and Tbilisi is difficult, but in the meantime seems promising and offers exciting prospects for the future. If the West understood Georgians and learned how to talk to them, it would be a partial success. The remainder consists of a coordinated policy between international organizations focused on long-term strategic objectives. As the first part requires time, the other could be implemented immediately – for the mutual benefit of Georgia and the other democratic states of the world.

b) Fear and generation shift as keys to understanding sociopolitical perspectives of contemporary Georgia

The understanding of the political tool of fear is crucial if one wants to grasp the nature of social and psychological problems that the non-violent revolutionaries in Georgia had to cope with. A *homo sovieticus* syndrome³, which feeds on fear, has lasted long after the official collapse of the USSR; its persistence has successfully prevented the emergence of civil society. The fear of state authority was an overwhelming, integral element of so called “bloc culture”⁴ which was created in USSR-dependent countries and was directly proportional to the years spent in the imposed isolation from the West, during which local cultures were suppressed and controlled by the communist regime. In spite of the direct fear rate being decreased after the demise of Stalin, the fear itself persisted in the communist bloc and continued to be a powerful political tool used willingly by the nomenklatura. As Gustaw Herling-Grudziński, a prisoner of Soviet labor camps and the author of “Another World” puts it: “Fear is a crucial emotion when it comes to the persistence of a totalitarian regime. When I am tracing history of ideology, I realize how great a role was attributed to the physical fear; or the fear that one’s wife or children will be hurt. Communism is constructed on the basis of fear. I do not believe in any ketmans⁵, I deeply believe that communism lasted and at the certain time experienced some successes exclusively thanks to fear”.

I. The generation shift as a key to the political shift

It is worth noticing that *homo sovieticus* seems to have caused relatively less cultural damage in Poland in comparison to other communist countries. Poles, who throughout history became used to the decades long struggle for regaining sovereignty, managed to create a specific ethos which helped them to symbolically contest the hostile reality. This ethos, which was dubbed the “Solidarity ethos” by Father Tischner, afforded Polish society the drive to overcome the fear as well as a basis for psychological and cultural unity, which certainly made the subsequent democratic shift easier to conduct. Jacek Kaczmarski, the most famous Polish bard of those times, used to sing about “an armor” or a “spring pulling from the hideout” which will prevent the society from being submerged into the national “hopeless persistence”, ulti-

³ The term refers to the unwritten rules and codes of behavior characteristic for communism regime that root deeply into human mind; they are mental models driving human activity that are very resistant to change.

⁴ Piotr Sztompka, *Trust – a sociological theory*, Cambridge University Press (1999); Chapter 8.

⁵ “Ketman” refers to the activity of non-revealing one’s true intentions and convictions and putting aside one’s moral principles in case of suppression and coercion in order to survive and prevail later on.

mately leading to inertia and the abandonment of plans aimed at achieving sovereignty. The cultivation of this kind of rhetoric managed to prevent the majority of Polish society from delaying the democratic shift by inertia.

In Georgia, however, this hopeless persistence lasted long after the formal collapse of Soviet Union. Georgia does not have strong traditions of fighting for sovereignty and it has not created an influential social ethos, which could oppose communism. Many factors may be considered when one wants to trace the origins of this state of affairs: in this report the most important is the issue of the shift of generations. *Homo sovieticus* syndrome has successfully erased the willingness to fight for the future among older generations of Georgians. It is striking to notice that whereas in East-Central Europe revolutions took the form of wide-ranged social movements, in Georgia it was the younger generation that was responsible for its execution. The younger generation of people in their twenties, devoid of homo sovieticus and dreaming about Western individualism had to grow up and the situation in the region had to stabilize in order to make the elite of this generation speak out. Young Georgian students who had studied abroad and were supported by international funds eventually returned to their country and, on the verge of the new millennium, filled with hope, started the preparation of revolution⁶.

The main key to success was always the fight with fear. Georgian activists reported that the fear of being expelled from school or university or fired from ones job was a major factor they had to cope with. They were warned by the older generation not to change anything as things can only get worse. The older generation represented the so called “presentist orientation”⁷, which made people concentrate on persistence and deprived them of any hope for positive change and long-range political plan. As any reasonable observer could notice, this lack of willingness to act derived not from the belief in the already-rotten socialistic ideals, but from the conformism and/or dramatic life circumstances. In exchange for being politically silent, one could hope to lead one’s life without any suppression by the regime. A potential possibility of being punished stimulated self-censorship, which was rooted deeply in the society.

II. The summary of the three-step revolutionary method

Those who were submitted to inertia could not be relied on. The revolutionary plan had to be based on the participation of youth, who showed a strong motivation for fighting for the future of a country in which they planned to spend the rest of their lives. Before they could act however, they had to

⁶ Among the most important organizations financing non-violent revolutionists are American Open Society Institute, National Endowment for Democracy, Freedom House and international Republican Institute.

⁷ P. Sztompka, op. cit

overcome fear, gain self-confidence and be ensured that their success was only a matter of time. This step was necessary, because fear in communist countries can be compared to the mythical snake Uroborus – it is feeding on itself, maintaining a vicious circle of existence. The dream of social change, although it smolders in the hearts of many, is successfully extinguished by the fear of pain and eventual failure. The impossibility of an individual to overcome the fear stimulates its collective duration. In order to encourage an individual, the feeling of dispersion in the mass had to be created. If Georgians wanted to succeed they had to create a physical crowd, quite literally.

The fine art of creating the crowd from nothing is described in revolutionary handbooks, the basis of which constituted “From dictatorship to democracy” by Gene Sharp, a founder of the Albert Einstein Institution, which promotes the use of non-violent actions. The doctrine of non-violence (*ahinsa* in Sanskrit) was also used in Georgia.

(1) The first actions in Georgia were low-risk activities: e.g. wearing clothes in an extraordinary way by youth made the mood public to those who were informed about the issue. Many non-political gatherings were used for training purposes. The goal was simple: to gather people with pro-democratic aspirations, who in spite of being together could remain undercover. Thanks to it they became used to public participation. Our interviewees reported that at the very beginning there were only a few activists, but they had to create the impression that there were thousands of them. To cause this effect, during only one night they visited main Georgian cities to spray and poster the walls and streets with their logos and slogans. The aim of this action, called “let them see us” was to make the people hear about the revolutionaries, no matter the context. Even if the state-controlled media were referring to them in a very negative way, their presence was acknowledged in the social consciousness and allowed the subsequent change of the image to a more positive one. This indeed happened: the revolutionaries used the television to gain popularity; its share in the media market in Georgia is 98%, with only 2% of Georgians reading newspaper.

(2) After the TV media effect waned, the revolutionaries started to organize gatherings, which were not strictly political, but generated self-confidence and deprived them of the fear of acting in public. They organized, for example, a gathering which voiced popular dissatisfaction with the national football teams loss to Russia, using the slogan “say ‘enough’ to lost matches with Russia”. The word ‘enough’ is also the English word for the revolutionary group ‘Khmara!’ and thus subtly raised the profile of the organization. They also used sociotechniques to cheat the eye and make the crowd of only a few dozen people seem bigger by marching through the most crowded cities only to disappear in the corner to come back in different clothes, or they were carrying with themselves the banners of institutions and organizations alleg-

edly supporting them, which were in fact not involved. As the passers-by acknowledged the familiar institution or were intrigued enough to participate in the gathering, they were contributing, often unconsciously, to the success of the revolutionaries. As an individual acknowledges the feeling of self-dispersion in the crowd, the effect widely described by many sociologists occurs: the feeling of unity and power is created, and fear is diminished.

(3) While the self-confidence of the youth was hardening, more courageous actions were started. More explicitly political gatherings, always with a humorous undertone⁸, were recognized by the police (organizing the public funeral of the communist government during the day of its presentation of the programme or the public happening in which everybody could have their picture taken next to a big poster showing the government flushed down the toilet) and resulted in captions. If arrested, young people were very kind and peaceful in order not to give the police any pretext to use violence. They were cared for by groups consisting of their family members, friends and young lawyers, who monitored the duration of their imprisonment and haunted police stations with kind words, flowers, questions about the imprisoned; they were undertaking any non-violent action which could result in setting the arrested ones free. Police officers, who had young children themselves and who were sometimes personally against the regime, were easier to be influenced.

Although everybody could become a revolutionary, the very top of the hierarchical pyramid remained secret. The first revolutionary sphere had a public character: the executive committees devoid of fear of being arrested and persecuted created the image of themselves as the members of some very powerful organization. The second sphere, responsible for planning and supplying, remained secret. The slogan “democracy when planning, dictatorship when taking action” encapsulates perfectly the strategy of the revolutionist think-tank, the members of which (often affiliated with opposition parties) in many cases did not know one another personally, in order to maximize the security and minimize the possibility of failure.

III. Analysis: Perspectives of successful generation

After success was achieved and Saakashvili won the election, the young generation received its reward: in contemporary Georgia many ministers are in their mid-twenties. However, this is not mainly because of their contribution to the revolutionary success but because Saakashvili’s administration, keen to break with communism totally, lacks qualified officials. Most of the

⁸ When one compare the use of humor during the struggle with communism in Poland and Georgia it is visible that the former used it only to symbolically contest the reality (e.g. so called “Pink Alternative”), whereas the latter used it as a direct basis for political action.

experienced politicians and experts were previously involved in the communist apparatus and thus could not be trusted. Hence, the new administration is based on young people, well educated, but lacking tacit knowledge and practical experience. Some analogies to contemporary Poland occur⁹. In Georgia, however, there are also additional problems with political shift from post-communism to democracy.

(1) The first is of a geopolitical type: in Georgia, a non-EU country, the adequate training for officials are both more expensive and less available due to the lack of relevant infrastructure, e. g. lack of educated and experienced experts who can serve as teachers, who have to come from abroad.

(2) Secondly, the cultural peculiarity of the region translates into some informal codes of behaviour among individuals. As within the mountain society of the Georgian region one can notice the remnants of a clan structure, with strong personal ties between family members, co-dependence and mutual support, one can assume that the new elite will be biased when it comes to human resources; in other words, it may prefer more the relevance of family ties instead of professional experience and personal capabilities, when selecting its staff. This may have a negative impact on the democratization process by slowing down the rate of professionalisation and stimulating corruptive behaviour.

(3) Thirdly, the psychological impact of a rapid advance in the social hierarchy should not be underestimated. The young people in their twenties, who suddenly became the most important people in their state may have already set for themselves a very high level of political aspirations for the future. As a consequence, they may be prone to be involved in harsh political struggles for power, more intense than the ones that would have been expected in the case of their gradual and slow hierarchical advancement. The occurrence of this phenomenon may implicate the division of the future political scene in Georgia less ideologically and more privately: in accordance with the personal interests of contemporary youth. As the post-communists have been marginalized, their political actions so far seem to have a local character, the abovementioned scenario should be taken into consideration, especially, that Georgian revolutionists through their actions successfully overcame political fear and hardened their characters. They are also self-confident, very strongly motivated and more and more fond of the arcana of informal political gambling.

⁹ As one can notice, a similar cause is the source of the structural deficiency in experienced officials in Poland, where the anti-communistic government lacks officials. This is because during after-communism period anti-communists have been marginalized in favour of post-communists who allied through time with the so called "laic left" (the worldview of which was represented most widely by "Gazeta Wyborcza" daily).

c) The situation of ethnic minorities in Georgia following independence

After the dissolution of the Soviet Union, minorities constituted 30%¹⁰ of Georgia's population and stemming mainly from the Azeri, Armenian and Abkhazian groups.

Tbilisi, the capital city, has always been proud of its multiculturalism. It is worth noting that after Georgia gained its independence for a short period of time after the First World War the most common answer about ones identity was: I am Tbilisian. This was followed by: and Georgian of (for example) Armenian heritage. In those days Georgia was still a very young country and therefore ethnicity was not a major problem. Almost a hundred years later, the answer to this question was different: I am an Armenian living in Georgia. This example clearly shows a shift in the Georgian mindset and it also illustrates how national identity is constructed in contemporary Georgia.

In the last 16 years the number of Georgian citizens who do not think of themselves as Georgians has decreased to 17%. Research conducted in 2002 revealed that more than half of Georgia's population lives below the poverty line¹¹. However, poverty can not be seen as the only reason why minority representatives have decided to leave Georgia. The most recent history of the Republic shows that playing the nationalism card in an instable country provides great opportunities to gain political support. The reason behind the civil war in 1991 was Zviada Gamasahurdii, the nationalist first president of an independent Georgia, and his slogan: 'Georgia for Georgians'. To this day, 300,000 refugees await their chance to return and 15% of Georgia's territory does not accept the authority of Tbilisi. The latest expert analysis suggest that the chances for a breakthrough in negotiations with the South Ossetian and Abkhazian separatists are slim at best. Due to the existence of independent semi-states within Georgia's territory, Georgians are rather suspicious of any organisation that wants to represent a minority and stand up for its rights. The current government is trying to change this situation. They have had time to come down after the Rose Revolution and with help from international agencies are trying to unify Georgia once again with regard to minority rights. The most significant problem here is to somehow unite both these issues. One problem will be that reconstructing Georgia's national identity and building a new, modern country might cause a rapid deterioration in relations with Russia. Another obstacle is the issue of integrating minorities with different cultures, which speak different languages. For example 55% of the inhabitants of the region of Samtskhe – Javakheti are Armenian and 45.5% of the enclave of Klemo-Kartli are Azeri.

¹⁰ According to research from 1989: 29,9% <http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?l=1&id=4517> (17/12/2006)

¹¹ <http://www.polishaid.gov.pl/Gruzja,17.html> (17/12/2006)

This problem is clearly visible in the case of Samtskhe-Javakheti, which borders Turkey and Armenia and is situated on a plateau. The region is practically completely isolated from the rest of the world and any representatives from the authorities rarely function there. The reason for this isolation lies not only in the disastrous state of the local infrastructure. In some places the percentage of Armenians is above 90% – in Ninotsminda it is 98% and 94,3% in Akhalkalaki¹². They do not speak Georgian or do they use the official alphabet – this cuts them off from any type of Georgian media and their access to administrative decisions is severely limited. Thus they get their information from Armenian and Russian media and both countries have a rather unfavourable attitude towards Georgia. The consequence of such a situation is that those minorities are not aware of the problems the young republic is struggling with. Moreover, those people are completely excluded both from the country's administration and mainstream society. Travel to the rest of Georgia is severely hampered by the previously mentioned parlous state of the local infrastructure¹³. Another issue is the lack of a centralised register of Georgia's citizens. This results in the government not being sure about the number of citizens in the country and those living in the region of Samtskhe-Javakheti lack basic health care and social security¹⁴. Furthermore, an upsurge in tension between Georgian settlers driven out of Abkhazia and the locals is causing more and more problems. As part of a government program, the authorities are buying land for those seeking repatriation; already 220 families have been housed and the government intends to settle another 1500 families. The conflict between them is escalating and acts of violence occur frequently and with greater regularity. Fatalities have occurred, most recently and frequently in the Tsalka region where the colonisation has acquired a mass character. This causes Armenians living in the separatist Abkhazia to claim that their living conditions are on a much higher level than those parts of Georgia that are under the auspices of the government in Tbilisi. This results in Armenians leaving Samtskhe-Javakheti – almost 20% of the Armenian minority has left the region since 1989. The opinions of those Armenians who stay behind has radicalised and chances are that an uprising may occur if the government does not accept their demands to establish an autonomous body that would guarantee the rights of the Armenian minority. However, Tbilisi has not agreed to make any concession even after the conflict in Abkhazia when the government did not approve of the temporary 'blue' documents issued by the United Nations, because, in their opinion, the only valid

¹² <http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?l=1&id=4517> (17/12/2006)

¹³ Art 22 of the Georgian Constitution guarantees its citizens free movement within Georgia (www.mfa.gov.ge/files/37_57_318646_constitutiont.pdf – 09.03.2007)

¹⁴ Art. 38 of the Georgian Constitution states that every citizen has the right to health insurance (ibidem)

passport is a Georgian passport. The consequence of such a hard line is that Abkhazia has been using passports issued by the Russian Federation, who once again showed that it is an important player in Georgia's internal affairs.

A conflict of a similar nature arose in another border region – Kwemo-Kartli, which lies north-east of Tbilisi and borders Samstkhe-Javakheti. However, the Azeri minority which makes up about 45% of the total population in the region, limited its demands to greater participation in local government and their demands are first and foremost of an economic nature. The crucial issue is the ownership of agricultural land. The Azeri were omitted during the denationalisation of land, most of which fell into the hands of the local authorities. This has caused a specific type of neo-feudalism, with those who used to work on the sovkhoz's (mostly Azeri) falling into a complete dependence on the new land owners. The economic division in Kwemo-Kartli runs down ethnic lines – the land is in Georgian hands and is farmed by the Azeri living in the region.

The official reaction to the most commonly raised objections in both regions is to try to pacify the situation. The first step, undertaken in collaboration with OSCE, is to give those citizens who do not speak Georgian improved access to information. The news is translated and broadcast half an hour later than the main news (which is in Georgian) in the regions of Kwemo-Kartli and Samstkhe-Javakheti. This is part of a program whose main objective is to eliminate the language barrier, the biggest obstacle in the reunification of Georgia. The question that remains is whether the Georgian government will be able to come up with such a compromise that will allow candidates to take university exams in a language other than Georgian. Also, the question remains as to what will happen to local authorities where the percentage of the non Georgian speaking population exceeds 30%? Minority representatives do not trust the government's projects after the brutal treatment of Adjara, where a completely new administration was implemented and, in the opinion of the Ajars, does not represent their interests in Tbilisi during conflicts of interests and its autonomy functions only on paper.

This is a significant problem and the ratification of further protocols obliging Georgia to respect minority rights, when those rights will not be put into effect, will only result in further tension and the escalation of existing conflicts. This will not help build a democratic country for which the protection of its weak citizens is a vital issue.

4. „CIVIL CAUCASUS” PROJECT – STUDY TRIPS

a) Schedule in Georgia

21st November (Tuesday)

Departure to Tbilisi

22nd November (Wednesday)

Arrival, accommodation in the Diplomat Hotel

Announcement of the results of the essay competition (The Liberty Institute)

Press conference

First workshop with Group 1

23rd November (Thursday)

Workshop with Group 1

Sociological researches

Meeting with president’s representative

Meeting with representative of prison administration in Georgia

24th November (Friday)

Workshop with Group 1

Visit to Media Council

Visit to Mckheta

25th November (Saturday)

Departure to Telavi in Kakheti, accommodation

Workshop with Group 2

Preparation for the sociological researches

26th November (Sunday)

Workshop with Group 2

Sociological researches

Visit to Ikalto, Shuamta, Alaverdi

27th November (Monday)

Workshop with Group 2

Sociological researches

Visit to Gremi and Tsinandali

28th November (Tuesday)

Meeting with rector Gigi Tevzadze in Ilia Chavchavadze State University

Meeting with Mzia Todua, Giorgi Ghmabashidze in Coalition of Non-Governmental Organizations of Georgia

Workshop with Group 3

Preparation to the sociological researches

29th November (Wednesday)

Meeting with consul Zbigniew Wiktorowicz in Polish Embassy

Meeting with Head of Human Dimension Office OSCE Guillaume Siemienski

Meeting in Public Television with Khatuna Kveselva, Nikoloz Lomidze, Tatia Julakidze

Workshop with Group 3

Sociological researches

30th November (Thursday)

Meeting with Head of Department and Dean of Tbilisi State University: Giorgi Gogsadze, Giorgi Salukvadze

Meeting with Polonia in Georgia (prof. Maria Filina)

Meeting in Primary School 146 with director and Polish teacher Marina Urbanowicz

Workshop with Group 3

Sociological researches

1st December (Friday)

Sociological researches – summarizing meeting

Conclusion workshop in the Liberty Institute

Meeting with the winners of competition departing to Poland

2nd December (Saturday)

Arrival to Poland

b) Schedule in Poland

4th December (Monday)

Arrival, accommodation

5th December (Tuesday)

Study visit to the Salesian Missionary Voluntary Group (with Monika Zbieg)
Civil society workshop (with Monika Zbieg, Joanna Żeber, Hanna Krzyżowska)

6th December (Wednesday)

„Roots Project” – introduction (Maria Stepan)
Study visit to Wiosna Association (with Monika Zbieg)
„Roots Project” in groups (with Katarzyna Zawada, Maria Stepan)

7th December (Thursday)

„Roots Project” in groups (with Katarzyna Zawada, Jan Meisel-Dobrzański)
Multimedia presentations – workshop with computer programs

8th December (Friday)

Study visit to Radwanowice: therapy workshops in Brother Albert Foundation and the Foundation „Mimo wszystko” (with Joanna Sobańska)
Meeting with students self-government at Tischner European University, presentation of students electoral campaign (with Katarzyna Pabian)

9th December (Saturday)

Voluntary work with Price Waterhouse Cooper in the Foundation Finestra (with Monika Zbieg)
Study visit to Voluntary Center of Tischner European University, preparation to Santa Claus evening for orphan children (with Małgorzata Budzanowska-Drzewiecka)

10th December (Sunday)

Visit to the German Nazi Concentration Camp Auschwitz (with Dominik Skorupa, Katarzyna Zawada, Monika Zbieg)
Workshop and discussion with Polish students (with Maria Weymeyr)

11th December (Monday)

Study visit to Niepołomice, meeting with city mayor Stanislaw Kracik (with Katarzyna Zawada)
Meeting with members of the Law Library Association
Sport integration afternoon (with Aleksander Kostka, Monika Zbieg)
Workshops in Jerzmanowice (with Hanna Krzyżowska, Dominik Skorupa, Jan Meisel-Dobrzański)

12th December (Tuesday)

Summarizing seminar at Tischner European University
Group presentation of „Roots Project” results
Presentation of workshops in Georgia
Presentation of social research results
Prospective discussion and conclusions

5. PUBLIC OPINION RESEARCH ON CIVIL SOCIETY IN DEMOCRACY AMONG YOUNG GEORGIANS

a) Introduction and problem statement:

The aim of the research conducted during the Institute for Research on Civilizations excursion to Georgia was to explore the opinions of young Georgians on civil society and democracy. However, due to several problems that have occurred during our research this report is in no means finished (those problems will be reviewed in the following chapter). We would like this study to be perceived as a set of guidelines for those who might want to explore the subject in the future rather than as a completed study. Last year's experience taught us that we must modify the methodology used in such a way that would allow the avoidance of such a situation in which the research could be conducted only among English speaking students; we wanted the participants to be from a variety of backgrounds.

b) Methods

We decided to conduct 10 in-depth interviews, as this method would be most adequate to our needs and it allows having one interviewer to talk to one respondent. This is extremely useful when the discussed topic is either controversial or very personal, or both, and when the respondent is asked about his or her motives, opinions and future plans. In order to obtain as much relevant data as possible we prepared a questionnaire with a list of topics and issues that would be discussed during the interviews. The interview survey questionnaire was written in English and then translated into Georgian.

We interviewed a total of 10 respondents, both male and female, aged 19 to 24 who study social sciences at Georgian universities.

Last year's research showed us how difficult it is to find a representative group in which everyone would have a fluent command of English. Therefore we decided that this year we would conduct the research in Georgian and that the interviewers would be the respondent's peers. In-depth interviews afford the chance to discuss controversial and personal topics, however, in order to acquire the information we wanted a pleasant atmosphere of genuine understanding was needed throughout the interview. Due to the linguistic barrier and cultural differences we felt that in order to create such a favorable atmosphere the interviews had to be conducted in the responder's native language and thus the interviewers should be Georgian students.

Thanks to that we managed to lessen the gap between the interviewer and the respondent; however, as multiple translations were needed the chance of errors unfortunately rose.

The interview's survey questionnaire was written in English and translated into Georgian. The interviews were conducted in Georgian by students

of social sciences at the University of Tbilisi. Each interview was recorded and a brief summary of it was prepared in English by the interviewers, which then was translated into Polish.

Although in-depth interviews have a survey questionnaire they still need the interviewer to be an active participant. Typically this is method that is partially steered. Even though we instructed the interviewers on how to carry out the interview, we cannot be certain that they were conducted properly.

The questions in the questionnaire were not standardized, they were open and it was the interviewer who decided in which order they were asked. Prompting questions could also be found in the questionnaire and the interviewers asked additional questions when they thought the topic was interesting. However, what surprised us was the fact how few additional questions were asked to gain a greater insight in the issues.

c) Analysis

The interviews were transcribed in Georgian and translated into English. While translating the interviewers left out those fragments which in their opinion were irrelevant. Due to our limited possibilities such a course of action had to be undertaken and was absolutely necessary. Therefore our analysis is largely based on the interview summaries. The conclusion has been written by one of the members of the Liberty Institute in Tbilisi and was translated into Polish. This may have caused certain alterations between what the respondent wanted to convey and what has been written down.

Even if statistical data is presented in this report our study it is in no means a quantitative study. Due to the lack of major data in our research its findings cannot be made applicable to Tbilisian students or Georgians in general. The gathered data is purely qualitative and its analysis is merely an introduction to the exploration of the outlook of a defined group of people.

The questionnaire we have prepared included questions that covered a wide spectrum of topics and raised the issue of democracy and civil society. This gave the respondents the chance to speak about matters important to them. It also allowed us to construct an analysis based upon a set of categories which emerged from the interviews. Those categories are loosely related to the questions asked and were constructed after confronting our assumptions and our opinions about the mood of the Georgian public with the views and statements we have encountered during the interviews. The main categories originate from the topics discussed with the Georgians and were stated as important for them. As established in our methodology the categories were established after the interviews were conducted rather than before them. This is one of the basic postulates of Barney Glaser's and Anselm Strauss' Grounded Theory according to which one starts ones research from a position of knowing nothing. This allows one to both avoid any pre-suppositions that

might arise with the research and it also allows the construction of a set of categories based upon what was said by our respondents. Our research is in this sense a recording of the respondent's opinions rather than an objective analysis of the Tbilisi students behavior.

The results of our interviews were quite unexpected; the evaluation of Georgian democracy surprised us especially. Our respondents were not as enthusiastic as we might have expected them to be based upon media coverage. Perchance this is due to the difference between the objective reality and the respondent's lifeworld.

1. The Perception of Democracy¹⁵

This category is both the most important one as well as the most surprising. To be perfectly honest we did not expect that emphasizing the skin-deepness of Georgian democracy would have a dominating role in our respondents' opinions. They often pointed out that Western opinion about Georgia and its democratic reforms are largely exaggerated and they do not reflect the situation in the country truthfully. The democracy was often depicted a façade hiding the authorities true face which has not changed much since Shevardnadze's resignation or even the downfall of the communism regime. Our respondents could not understand our overly optimistic (in their opinion) approach to Georgia's democracy and our blind worship of the recent 'Rose Revolution' was completely incomprehensible for them. It was often stressed that Georgia has not yet taken the right course and is therefore still possibly subject to change, both in the good as well as bad direction. Examples of such an opinion:

You should not be asking about democracy in Georgia at all. We are just pretending that we are following the path of democracy, but in reality we are not. There is no such thing as freedom of speech or anything like that over here.

I cannot call Georgia a democratic country even though it is commonly perceived as such.

2. Skepticism towards the authority's actions

A sequential problem of the lack of confidence in the government is the lack of faith in the possibility of improving the country's situation. Only 2 of the 8 respondents took part in the last elections. All of them (including those who voted) are highly skeptical of democratic institutions. A lack of trust and

¹⁵ This category was created as 4 students had a similar approach to this subject. They underlined the skin-deepness of the Georgian democracy and they spoke of problems directly linked to this. Of course, there were also students who actually appreciated the new authorities; however, those opinions were so hesitant that they cannot counterbalance the critical voices. We expected that especially among students the support of the current government will be more significant.

insecurity were most commonly voiced. Some of our respondents strongly emphasized that they did not vote because it does not make any sense as the authorities will not fulfill their pre-electoral promises and they will not represent the citizens interests. On the other hand those of our respondents who did not voice such an opinion about voting were not entirely sure whether the course Georgia has recently taken is the right one. Underneath are some answers from the most skeptical to the most insecure:

Those who are in power right now definitely think only about themselves

They all have similar programmes, they all promise some good things but in the end they don't keep their promises

As it isn't important about who I will vote for, the leading power still has the chairmanship and my vote is not worth much.

I believe that I am not yet able to change anything in the country

I do not see any party nor leader who while forming a democracy has helped me to achieve my goals.

I do not believe that voting nowadays is something important. It does not matter whether you vote or not.

We are all responsible for what is happening to a certain degree. However, all the important decisions are made at the top.

As a citizen I should feel a certain degree of responsibility but in the current circumstances I cannot be responsible for anything. I cannot be responsible for something I do not take part in.

There are moments when they discuss the matters of people, but usually they are only interested in their own business and work according to it.

I cannot say what I feel, but a tendency that the government is more interested in people's matters can be seen.

In my opinion the county is more democratic than 2-3 years ago. During Shevardnadze it was less democratic.

We assume that this difference between Georgian's opinions and what we admire so much in the West can result from the Georgian mentality of which a large part is to have distrust in anything that has something to do with the state. Of course, this is not only a Georgian characteristic, it is typical for all the nations that have been under the Soviet occupation. The same can be observed in Poland, even though the country was not a Soviet republic. The so called homo sovieticus is a person who accentuates the division into 'us' and 'them', the government and the nation. It is a person who always negates

everything that did not come from the 'us', something that is seen as coming from the profane world (*profanum*). We suspect that this feature of the Georgian mentality has a crucial impact on their distrust of the government or, as called by one of our respondent: those at the top.

Corruption

It should be stated that in general corruption was condemned by our respondents. Being asked about whether they have personally encountered corruption the most common answer was no, however, such cases of law breaking are known from media coverage. Corruption was often understood very broadly, therefore when asked to define it our respondents often mentioned nepotism and tax fraud. The Georgians response to the questions concerning corruption was rather neutral. Only once did we encounter a very strong condemnation of such actions.

I react negatively but this does not turn into any negative actions

At my university it happens quite often that a professor will give you a mark for money.

Some justified corruption indicates the low salaries in Georgia. However, consent for corruption is given only in situations where such a solution seems to be the only one possible and, moreover, it does not lead to enrichment but it allows the individual to lead a decent life.

My professor, who is a senior lecturer, earns only 36 Lari so I am not surprised that he takes money in order to make a living. The state must provide such favorable conditions that the taking of bribes will no longer be necessary as it is now.

Generally speaking and, similarly to Poland, small bribes are something that is normal and is not seen as embarrassing. We suspect that the reasons for such an attitude might be similar to the reasons for distrusting the authorities – giving a bribe might be seen as a way of 'deceiving the system'. There is nothing wrong with such behavior as it does not do any harm to regular citizens but it harms 'them' – those in power. Therefore taking the bus and not buying a ticket or handing a small amount of money to the ticket-inspector is not perceived as morally wrong behaviour and is generally approved.

People are used it, they still prefer to have a chance to avoid a penalty even if they have to give a bribe.

d) Conclusion

What we have decided to put in our conclusion is mainly directed as a sort of hint or advice to those researchers who will undertake more extended research on similar subjects.

Even though having analyzed the gathered data we did not discover anything extraordinary we became convinced, once again, that our perception of the world depends on the time and place the observer finds himself or herself. Once again we observed the difference between the 'lifeworld' of those living 'there' and the image we have that was largely created by the Western media which has become an oracle of some sorts to us. This is the first important issue that comes to our minds when trying to summarize our analysis in a few sentences.

The second issue we see as important is the impact of the old, though still fresh, Soviet mentality. It still plays a role in constructing the world in such categories that absolutely rule out the possibility of having a civil society. However, we do not mean to state that this element is the main reason for a specific type of thinking, nevertheless it is still noticeable and it still influences people's lives, including the lives of the young generation.

Appendix

1.1.1 Questionnaire on the attitude towards democracy and citizenship

Read the questions and choose **one** answer for each of them. There are no right or wrong answers – we just want to know your honest opinion and facts about your life. The questionnaire is anonymous.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Society

1. Do you belong to a non-governmental organization? Do you participate in civic activities (for e.g.: non-governmental organizations, voluntary work)?
Do you know any NGO's or voluntary organizations?
Do you have an idea about the purpose of the existence of such organizations?
In what way can help be provided by those organizations?
2. Have you ever undertaken something together with the members of your local society without support from the governmental structures?
3. What does 'corruption' mean?
What do you understand under the notion of corruption?
Have you witnessed someone giving a bribe?
How do people tend to react when they witness bribery?
4. What do you understand by 'democracy'?

6. WORKSHOPS AND CASE-STUDIES ON CIVIL SOCIETY DEVELOPMENT IN GEORGIA

a) Informal education as a method of researching civil society

The whole world heard about Georgia after its bloodless revolution in 2003 and the key international political players kept a close eye on those extraordinary events. The authoritarian system was fought by the Georgians in a manner unique to the post-Communist world order.. The people carried roses instead of arms and, despite the countries internal conflict, the nation still united to overthrow the incumbent government and the Rose Revolution gave rise to other independence movements in other Post-Soviet states.

What took place in Georgia is very interesting in terms of social research and therefore the Institute for Research on Civilizations decided to undertake the trip entitled: 'Following the trail of the Velvet Revolutions through the Ukraine, Serbia and Georgia 2005'

Interviews conducted with the instigators and participants of the Rose Revolution combined with interviews with government spokesmen and civil society representatives provided the data for the authors licentiate thesis 'The Phenomenon of forming civil society in Georgia during Mikheil Saakashvili's government'. This thesis served as the foundation for further analysis during workshops which were part of the 'Civil Caucasus' project.

Thirty Georgian high school and university students participated in workshops on civil society. The participants were from the whole territory of Georgia apart from Abkhazia and South Ossetia. They were selected via the contest 'Georgian Citizens' during which they commented on civil society in the form of an essay or report. The workshop's participants had the following topics to choose from:

1. How do you understand the notion of civil society and what tools do you think would improve its functioning
2. What do you see as the reasons behind the forming of a civil society? Based on your own experience, describe the success or failure of implementing civil society.
3. Describe the civil society of your dreams.

Each workshop team took part in three training blocks run by different coaches.

The training strategy chosen by the coaching duet Joanna Žeber and Monika Zbieg turned out to be the key to success. We focused on the practical delivery of knowledge as it is practiced in informal education. This allowed us to efficiently and pleasantly pass on all the skills and abilities, which are absolutely essential when setting up a non-governmental organization or when it is expanding. Using the training methods of the European Union's 'the YOUTH programme' allowed us to deliver the concept of civil society in an interesting fashion.

Our aim was to introduce other forms of social activity to representatives and members of NGO's. These forms are used in Poland thanks to the country's participation in the YOUTH programme. Thanks to the YOUTH programme, civil society has developed in Poland through NGO's engaging young people in both civil activity and professional careers.

'Breaking Games' started each of the workshops led by Joanna Žeber and Monika Zbieg. Their purpose was to allow the participants to get to know each other and feel more comfortable. After that we delivered our knowledge through practice. The workshop ended with an evaluation made by both the coaches and participants..

The game 'Exchanging Civil Societies Components' proved to be the most interesting for the participants. Among the exchanged components were: loyalty to their native land; loyalty to their president; the multiplicity of opportunities for women to improve their qualifications; freedom of associations; the acknowledgement of a weak political opposition; the strong position of the Eastern Orthodox Church; freedom of speech; religious toleration.

During the workshop we observed how diverse Georgia's society is. There was no consensus among the participants: For example not all the women saw improving their qualifications or gender equality as important. Despite the fact that approximately 84% of Georgians belong to the Orthodox Church, only one person stated that the strong position of the Eastern Orthodox Church is important. Most participants stated that: freedom of speech and associations and loyalty to the country and the political leader are essential compounds of a civil society. The aim we wanted to reach was a reasonable exchange of arguments between the participants – this goal was reached. However, in one of the groups all of the essential compounds were put together in such a manner that they formed the outline of Georgia. This was a surprising and welcome result.

The Georgians have built their national identity under the influence of a variety of cultures and religions and under the watchful eyes of such powers as Russia, Iran and Turkey. Georgia used to be an agricultural society and therefore the process of urbanization was rather slow. Georgia's development was further slowed by the isolation caused by ethnic segregation and wars. The process of urbanization has brought Georgia new challenges to tackle – the ability of mutual understanding, ethnic toleration and being part of a highly integrated society.

b) Georgian civil society in eyes of young Georgians

This review has been conducted on the basis of interviews initiated by the author during the workshop conducted for two groups of students in Tbilisi and one group in Telavi. The subject of this workshop was civil society. This article contains opinions and remarks made by the participants and aims at showing their views on the subject of civil society in Georgia.

In answer to the question of what civil society is, young Georgians focused on interpersonal relations. Some persons said it is “the attitude towards other people”, others called it “each person with whom we are in friendly contact every day”. Besides this, some definitions emphasized the functions of civil society. These were “it is a union of people who have one aim” or “civil society is a mediator between government (one of the means of violence) and citizens”.

Young Georgians underlined the fact that each society creates its own model of civil society. Despite some similarities between models, a model generated in one society must not be uncritically transferred to the second society.

During the workshops participants were asked to choose the most important elements and values which constitute civil society. Most people identified freedom of speech as the most significant. However, young Georgians disagree if this right was respected better after the Rose Revolution or not. However, everybody agreed on the fact that freedom of speech is not totally respected in Georgia. One part of the group claimed that TV channels (this is the most popular media in Georgia) are controlled by the government. The other part of the group stated that in opposition to the situation before changes in 2003 and 2004, when journalists were unified by one common aim, currently there is no common policy of the mass media. Every newspaper and TV or radio channel says what is the most desirable by its management. Unfortunately none of the participants were able to give a solution on how to improve the situation of the media in Georgia.

According to the students, the second value in order of importance is the diversification of opportunities for the self-development for women. What is worth mentioning is that it was not mentioned by women alone. Young Georgians are conscious of the fact that the position of women in Georgian society differs from that of Western Europe. Nevertheless, they claimed that their values are in general similar to those in the West. It was stated that the situation of women living in Tbilisi is much more akin to European standards than that of the provinces. Most people agreed that more women should participate in the public life of the country. Some male students said that such a situation already exists in their country. Regarding the issue of employment, female students noticed that in spite of high results at school they are discriminated against when applying for jobs. Not only is it because of the attitude of the employers, but also it is an outcome of the choice of the course at university made by female students. They are constantly deciding to prepare themselves for employment in less profitable professions.

The problem of the status of Georgian women may be also be observed from the perspective of the interpersonal relations, which are different from those in the West. Young Georgian women have to consider their opinion in

society. Female students said they have to receive the consent of their parents in nearly every matter.

The discussion about the position of Georgian women aroused lots of emotion. The participants admitted that in Georgia there are not many opportunities to change the existing opinions in this matter. None of the students was able to give an example of a project organized specially for women, although they did not deny that such programs exist. The attitude of students towards such initiatives was positive in contrast to the reluctant attitude of many Georgian people. Negative feelings are the result of a lack of adaptation of programs run by Western institution to the specific Georgian values and tradition.

Other crucial elements and values mentioned by students were: loyalty to the political leader, right of association and equality of religions.

No one chose loyalty to the Georgian state, prestige of the church and acceptance of weak opposition.

The participants admitted that in Georgia the attachment to family ties is still much more popular than solidarity with the whole society. As an example they said that they often find a relative or a friend in each institution, if needed, even in a different city. Provided that we use a Western model, these characteristics of clan society may disrupt the development of civil society.

There was no agreement among students about the impact of the donations of NGOs by Western foundations. Some claimed that money is not as important for social activity, which is a result of people's willingness to do something good for society. Other students said it is a crucial factor. According to them, Georgian NGO's exist thanks to international aid; if money was not available, the non-governmental organizations would not exist.

Although the participants of the workshop were chosen in the way of a contest, an extreme minority were members of student organizations or NGOs. A number of people belonged to informal groups. They claimed that it is because of the lack of opportunities.

In conclusion, it must be said that Georgian students were extremely willing to participate in discussions on the issues mentioned above. According to them, they rarely have the chance to talk about it at school or at university.

c) The Karadjala report

Karadjala is a village in the Kakheti region of north-eastern Georgia where the Azeri minority lives. Their longstanding congenial relationships with their neighbors – in light of the volatile Caucasian cultural and religious mixture – is an extraordinary phenomenon.

The village is centered around the water pipe, a damaged primary school and a shed which currently functions as a casino, where cards are played for money. There are no asphalt roads, central heating or any kind of sewage system.



Casino. A villager told us that we were the first tourists there...

mosques there. The windows inside the main mosque are still bricked up – a reminder of Soviet times when the mosques were closed. Rowshan explained that all the items in the mosque, mostly beautiful carpets, were gifts from the local community.

The mufti of the mosque came here from Turkey. “I explain how to pray and what Allah says” – he said. He is also a teacher in the *madrassa* – the Muslim school, where about fifteen pupils study the Qur’an.

After the visit in the centre we made our way to the slaughterhouse where Rowshan told us the story of his life. During Shewardnadze’s reign he was the owner of a bureau de change and, as he said, was a rich man. However, the Mchedrion’s combatants kidnapped him and demanded a \$150,000 ransom. While telling us the story he showed us the scars on his hands and head, a painful reminder of his 28 day confinement. His brother was also kidnapped



Slaughterhouse

and his captors demanded \$500,000 for his release.

People were interested in us, why we decided to come to a place which – one might say – is completely lost and forgotten. Rowshan, a man of about 50, joined us and offered to be our guide.

First, we went to the biggest mosque in Karadjala, not far from the town centre. The Muslim community in Karadjala consists of around 8000 members. There are two more

and his captors demanded \$500,000 for his release.

It then occurred to us that we were just 60 kilometres away from Chechnya...

We went to the slaughterhouse, a few kilometres from the village and scraggy dogs were scavenging everywhere. We found ourselves in a huge, old building surrounded by rubbish and various waste. We

asked the employees about their identity, whether they felt more Georgian or Azeri. In answer to how their mutual relations look, the standard answer was *harasho* – good. As we have already mentioned, relations between the inhabitants of this particular region are rather friendly.

Afterwards Rowshan invited us to a small restaurant for dinner “I earn a lot, I am an owner of a bus, which runs to Baku” – he explained, suggesting that we should not pay for anything.

On the edge of Karadjala there was another mosque to be seen which looked as if it had been a chapel at one time. We were surrounded by laughing children and their families who were affected by our presence – foreigners rarely come to the town. We noticed a wooden Christian cross nearby and this prompted us to ask about relations between Christians living in the next village and the Muslims here. Our guide responded that they live peacefully, once again the reply was *harasho* and that even though he is Muslim, he went to a Orthodox Christian primary school in the other village.

The old primary school which we had seen at the beginning was the last place we visited. We were surrounded by children smiling and hugging us, an official (!) school delegation with the director herself in the fore showed us around the buildings. There are 916 pupils in a school which does not have any computers, a fax or even a telephone. The children are taught in Georgian and Azeri, but they can also learn a foreign language and can choose either Russian, German or



School's delegation. There is a huge need to establish a partnership between the school and a primary school in Poland.



School's delegatio.

English. However, the lack of necessary books makes it rather difficult for them to learn these languages¹⁶.

There is a huge need to establish a partnership between the school and a primary school in Poland.

Unfortunately, schools for the ethnic minorities are at the end of the governments list of schools that need to be renovated, so even if one of the buildings were to be renovated, the condition of the others would still be disastrous.

Even if the Azeri are underrepresented in Georgian public life, especially in the sphere of government, the people from this particular village found Georgia's policy rather positive. Even though Georgia was a corrupt and politically insecure country only a few years ago, nowadays it is not – change is visible everywhere. After the Rose Revolution, one of the main steps that was undertaken in order to eliminate corruption was the implementation of a new remuneration system. According to the new system the average salary of an ordinary police officer was multiplied by a factor of twenty.

People we met in Karadjala were exceptionally hospitable and pleasant. They spent the whole day with us and they did not mind our countless questions or our camera. We drove away hoping to be able to come back one day.

7. “ROOTS” WORKSHOP

a) Description and rules

Aim – to see what people in Poland think about civil society, what they think it is and how they would like it to be.

Where – Everywhere ;) on the streets of Kraków, places where you could go:

- Rynek
- Planty
- Shops
- Bars
- Churches

Groups: you will be divided into 2 groups and each will have a Polish guide who will help with translating into Polish if there is such a need.

Each group will have a camera, notebooks and pens.

After the interviews you will present your results. You can use computers, paper, markers, watercolours and whatever you might need that will help you to make a good presentation.

¹⁶ In the end of 2006 Institute for the Research on Civilizations initiated a project “They need books!” to collect the books needed to learn foreign languages from Polish students and send them to Karadjala Primary School.

As this is a competition each group will be evaluated and the best will win a cool prize:)

Plan:

06.12 14.30 – 17.00 interviews + lunch

07.12 10.30 – 15.00 interviews + lunch

15.00 – 16.30 time to prepare your presentation

12.12 presentations

Extra task – find a place to eat lunch today and tomorrow :)

b) Civil society in Poland – Alex’s Group report

Introduction

First of all, we had to choose the name of our working group and only afterwards conduct a short survey. We joined these parts of our work, which resulted in the name that was chosen according to the focus of the future survey and later in the survey according to the principles implicitly declared in the working group’s name.

We had to undertake a survey in the streets of Krakow without extensive preparation and we would not have much time to analyze the results of the interviews afterwards. Moreover, we did not have enough time to prepare and carry out fully structured interviews, which must be noted was not expected from us. So there arose a question of what to do in order to take as much as possible from this survey. And our idea was to create our perception of Polish citizens’ understanding of Polish civil society and provide our Polish colleagues with an outsiders’ perception.

So we choose to name our group Auris, which in Latin means ear. This was chosen because we had to listen to people, not investigate, not look up some facts but listen. We had to ask some key questions¹⁷ and listen to what they would say. We had to listen to people and then record the impression they made on us.

The Survey

We had two days to carry out the survey. The first day was spent preparing the basis for the interviews, namely creating a questionnaire, choosing group of interest and of course reaching agreement on the distribution of roles among

¹⁷ We would not like to drive the attention to these questions because they were not of any scientific value. They were of value only in regard to our goal, which was to create an impression. So you will see how these questions have helped us in the **Conclusion**. The questions were: What are three main things you think of when you hear “civil society”? What are three main problems of Polish civil society? What TV channels do you watch more often: public or private? Would you spend your time and your hard earned money on charity and on developing civil society? Have you done something like this?

the group. We also carried out three interviews at the end of our “workday”, the results of which were included in the final report but these interviews were also used as pilot interviews for the interviews to be conducted the next day.

The second day was spent on 7 interviews¹⁸ and a brief analysis of the results. The group has to give its special thanks to Jan Meisel-Dobrzanski a Polish student who accompanied the group for the whole day and contributed to the survey by being an interpreter because neither members of the group spoke Polish nor people on the streets spoke English sufficiently to be able to answer our questions.

The decision of the group was not to limit the group of interest by any criteria – age, sex, profession, etc. Moreover, the respondents were chosen during the survey itself on the streets of Krakow with the interest to interview different range of people being the sole consideration. As a result of this, at the end of the survey we had conducted interviews with an elderly woman selling bakery products on the streets, with a brother from the Dominican Order, with students, with young women shopping, with an elderly man selling flowers in the Main Square, with a young women selling cosmetics in a shop, etc. Interviewing this variety of people was also a pursuit of the principle stated above – “to listen...” and to listen to people as different from each other as possible. It was considered by us to be the best way to reach our goal – to create an impression on the perception of Polish civil society by the Polish citizens.

Conclusion

The conclusion of this report contains the results of the survey since the results are the conclusion itself. We did not want to make a separate paragraph in the report to write about the results of the survey and then make a paragraph for conclusion which would contain issues such as: whether or not the goal of the survey was reached, if the questions formulated before the survey were answered completely, etc. Because the result of the survey is itself an answer to these questions since the main goal was to create an impression and this result is the impression.

So this is our impression:

People¹⁹ do not have a clear understanding of “Civil Society”. When talking about the issue they mentioned characteristics which are not linked in any sense with civil society. And most of them focused on personal and social problems like low salaries, etc. We could see this from the answers on ques-

¹⁸ The group reached the agreement that 10 interviews altogether would be enough to create an impression. And that it would be enough as far as the survey were not planned either to be scientifically correct or to provide statistical information.

¹⁹ Here and below by “People” we mean Polish citizens to avoid unnecessary lengthening of the report.

tions about the understanding of civil society and problems of civil society in Poland. But this is not always the case. If a young Dominican brother and an aged bakery seller are so well informed about civil society and the obstacles for its development then it is highly possible that society is not fully neglecting this issue. However, the inability to see past everyday routine, of your own personal problems and inactivity of the society seems to be a major problem for the development of civil society in Poland. The majority of society states that it is willing to help develop civil society, to contribute to charity, etc. This willingness is dependant on whether there is time but this time is mainly occupied by parties, relaxation after a hard day of work, meeting with friends, etc. It occurs that the majority of people who say that they are willing to help never actually do something like this. This is similar in other places, for example in Georgia too, but it does not change the fact that this is a huge problem everywhere in Poland as well as in Georgia and elsewhere.

30.01.07

Members of the working group “Auris”:

Khatia Gigauri

Tiko Khaadze

Nika Agladze

Alexander Chiaureli

8. PROSPECTIVE ANALYSIS

About the Liberty Institute

The Liberty Institute is a non-profit, non-partisan, liberal public policy advocacy foundation. The Liberty Institute, through civic campaigns, debates, surveys and educational activities, strives to establish values of civil liberties, active citizenship, public accountability, rule of law, transparency and free market in public life, politics, legislation and within public agencies.

We aim to maintain and advance individual freedom, including the freedom of association, assembly, press, privacy, petition, religion, and speech, and the rights to franchise, to due process of law, and to equal protection of law, transparency, freedom of information and good governance for all persons through all legitimate and appropriate means.

The history of the Liberty Institute starts on August 26, 1996. It was created to maintain and advance individual freedoms and the rights to franchise, to due process of law, transparency, freedom of information and good governance for all persons through all legitimate and appropriate means.

Freedom of expression, professional ethics for journalists and protection of minority rights are major directions of Liberty Institute’s since its establishment. As a result of Liberty Institute’s activities, the following laws were drafted and later adopted by the Parliament:

- Freedom of information chapter in General Administrative Code,
- Law on Freedom of Expression and Press,
- Law on Broadcasting.
- Law on General Education, Higher Education
- Draft law on restitution
- Amendment to civil code regarding religious organizations registration
- Law on Self-government
- Labor Code

Additionally, Liberty Institute has contributed significantly in drafting legislation which is still pending:

- Draft law on Property Restitution for Victims of Territorial Conflicts
- Draft Criminal Procedure Law

Apart from legislation Liberty Institute works on policy research and implementation. Liberty Institute is actively participating in the implementation of Anti-corruption and Good Governance Strategy, in reforms of the police force aimed at establishing community police and decentralization of the system. Liberty Institute was one of the main initiators and advocates of reform of education introducing principles of participatory management. Liberty Institute was one of the significant contributors in creation of Law Enforcement Reform policy paper in cooperation with Ministry of Justice and EU experts under EU JUST Themis program. Currently, the organization is actively participating on a policy paper on Tolerance and Integration and constitutional reforms.

Liberty Institute has accrued extensive experience in constitutional reforms. The organization advocated the introduction of the Jury principle into the Constitution (adopted in 2004). Besides, number of legislative drafts on constitutional changes have been implemented. Moreover, Liberty Institute staff have worked on a number of analytical articles related to the constitutional process.

Liberty Institute consistently provides resources, training and support for the whole diversity of social and professional groups enhancing effectiveness, professionalism, and active citizenship, principles of civil responsibility, accountability and transparency within society.

Liberty Institute works in close cooperation with leading national and international NGOs operating in Georgia as well as outside the country, such as: Caucasian Institute For Peace, Democracy and Development; Georgian Institute for Public Affairs; CRRC – Caucasus Resource and Research Centre; Human Rights Watch; Amnesty International; Media Diversity Institute; Article 19; British Council; National Democratic Institute; International Republican Institute; Inter-news; International Centre for Journalism; National Chapter of Transparency International; OSCE – Georgia etc.

Youth Programs

Liberty Institute has been supporting active citizenship, youth development and grassroots mobilization to defend human rights and the promotion of liberal policies. Liberty Institute is actively providing practical help to local communities to defend their interests. As a result of our campaigns, strong citizens' groups have emerged throughout the country and advocate for their interests nationwide. The experience of working with young people brings us challenging perspectives for developing the civic culture and active citizenship which is crucial for building democracy in Georgia.

It was excellent experience for us to cooperate with Wyższa Szkoła Europejska im. ks. Józefa Tischnera and to implement program „Obywatelski Kaukaz” which introduced new perspectives in our work and helped us to engage more young people in an interesting life sharing experience with Polish students. Georgia has to learn from transitional experiences of Eastern European countries and it is important that there are strong personal contacts developed between young leaders which makes future cooperation more fruitful and challenging. The program was designed in such a way to help young people from Poland raise awareness about Georgia and introduce themselves to society and culture in Georgia and on the other side to also take Georgian students through the similar experiences in Poland. Based on feedback from participants it is obvious that the program had great success. Georgian students had the opportunity to learn about state institutions in Poland and to meet with interesting speakers. During their stay they prepared group projects and personal projects and it is important that they were able to organize themselves as group because many of them did not know each other before they left country.

For the Liberty Institute, the program opened new perspectives of working with young leaders which will be extended to other activities. We see it as very important to continue the work that has been launched by program „Obywatelski Kaukaz”. The design of the project makes it engaging and interesting for young people to participate and has the potential to grow beyond the project. The networks established during the program implementation phase have been extended and maintained by participants after the completion which is a very important factor. I would also like to stress the importance of this program as a tool of linkage which is so crucial for young leaders in both countries. The connections and traditions established between the two countries based on similarities in culture and similar historical experiences need to be maintained and developed for building resources for successful future cooperation and democratic exchange.

Giorgi Meladze
Program Director
Liberty Institute

9. PARTNER NETWORK – DATABASE

1. Democratization, civil society

The Liberty Institute

Giorgi Meladze
Elene Ladauria
Giorgi Kandelaki
Griboedov 23
Tbilisi, 0108 Georgia
Tel/Fax: (995 32) 936784 or 936615
Mobile: (995 77) 401888
e-mail: giomeladze@Liberty.ge

Open Society Georgia Foundation

Natia Nanava
10 Chovelidze Str, 0108 Tbilisi
Tel. +995 32 25 05 92, 25 04 63
Fax. +995 32 25 26 15
e-mail: natia@osgf.ge
www.osgf.ge

Konrad Adenauer Foundation Regional Bureau to Georgia and South Caucasus

Dr. David Aphrasidze, Head
1 Rustaveli Ave, 5th Floor
Tbilisi
Tel/fax: +995 32 93 51 09
Mob. +995 99 24 90 12
e-mail: kas-geo@access.sanet.ge
www.kas.de

Civil Society Institute

Tbilisi 0171, square of 26 May, V floor
Tel: (995 32) 941 605
Fax:(995 32) 330 417
e-mail: adm@civilin.org
www.civilin.org

International Foundation for Elec- toral Systems (IFES-Georgia)

65 I. Abashidze St., Tbilisi 0162, Georgia
Tel.: (+995 32) 22 74 07
Fax.: (+995 32) 22 74 07
e-mail: ifes2@access.sanet.ge
website: www.ifes.ge

South-Caucasus Institute for Regional Security (SCIRS)

Tsinamdzguriszwili 31
Tbilisi
Alexander Rusecki
Mobile in Poland: 885 557 850
tel. (+995 32) 969905, 961514
e-mail: alex@scirs.org, cctc@caucasus.net

Caucasus Research Resource Cen- ters (CRRC)

Aaron Erlich, Regional Development &
Outreach Coordinator
CRRC Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia

Coalition of Non Governmental Or- ganizations of Georgia

Mzia Todua, R. Liparteliani, Giorgi Gham-
bashidze
6, Machabeli, Tbilisi 0105
tel./fax (+995 32) 987337
e-mail: m.todua@yahoo.com

Organization for Security and Co-op- eration in Europe Mission to Georgia

Martha Freeman, Spokesperson
Press and Public Information Office
Krtsanisi Governmental Residence, Krt-
sanisi St.
0114 Tbilisi
Tel: +995-32 20 23 03
+995 99 92 25 28 (mobile)
Fax: +995 32 24 42 03
Ryszard Pogorzelski, Heli/Logistics Officer
Krtsanisi Governmental Residence
Krtsanisi Street
Tbilisi, 0114 Georgia
tel. (+995 32) 202 303, ext. 329,
fax. ext. 312
Mobile: (+995 99) 918 780
e-mail: ryszard.pogorzelski@osce.org

Transnational Crime and Corruption Center

The Caucasus Office
16, Pasaunauri str., II entrance, I floor,
apart. 15
Tbilisi Tel: (+995 32) 55 01 77; 23 32 04
Fax: (+995 32) 55 01 78
<http://www.traccc.cdn.ge/>

Eurasia Foundation

Georgia Office
2, Kavsadze Street
Tbilisi 380079 Georgia
Telephone/Fax: +995 (32) 22-32-64,
25-39-42, 25-39-43, 25-27-78, 25-27-82
e-mail: georgia@eurasia.org.ge
www.eurasia.org.ge

Community Building Center

36a, Paliashvili Ave, Tbilisi
Phone +995 32 251-347
Fax +995 32 250-893
e-mail: info@cbc.ge
www.cbc.ge

Institute of Self-Governance

address: Kostava # 14, Tbilisi
tel: (+995 32) 99 61 38
e-mail: info@ihr.org.ge
debate@ihr.org.ge
e-mail: debate@debate.ge
<http://www.ihr.org.ge/contact.htm>

Penal Reform International

16 Kikodze, 0105, Tbilisi
Telephone: (995 32) 20 57 75
Tel/Fax: (995 32) 98 35 60
www.pri.ge

Association for Legal and Public Education (ALPE)

8/33, A. Chavchavadze st.
0108, Tbilisi, Georgia
Tel: (+99532) 99-65-12, 92-29-14
Fax: (+99532) 92-05-96
e-mail: office@alpe.ge
Zurab Guntsadze, Director
zura@alpe.ge

Georgian NGO-s

<http://www.itic.org.ge/geongos.html>

Georgian Law Development

<http://www.kakaba.mylivepage.com/>

2. Universities and media

Tbilisi State University

1, I. Chavchavadze Ave., Tbilisi, Georgia
tel. +99532250261, fax. +99532251527
www.tsu.ge
ggogsadze@yahoo.com,
j_salukvadze@hotmail.com
prof. Giorgi Gogsadze, Dean
prof. Joseph Salukvadze, Director of Institute

Ilia Chavchavadze State University

prof. Gigi Tevzadze, Rector
32, Chavchavadze
0179 Tbilisi
tel. (+995 32) 223581, fax (+995 32) 294 713
e-mail: gigi@iliauni.edu.ge

Institute of Asia and Africa

Dr George Katsinadze – Dean of Faculty
of international relations and History of
oriental countries
Adres: 3 Acad. G. Tsereteli str.
0162 Tbilisi, Georgia
Tel: +99532290864
Mob: +995893308938
e-mail: gogis63@mail.ru
www.tiaa.edu.ge

Media Council of Georgia

12 Griboedov Street, I Floor
Tbilisi, 0171, Georgia
Tel./Fax: +995 32 995452

Georgian Public Broadcaster

News, Social and Political Programs Department
Khatuna Kveselva, Director
www.gpb.ge
68 M. Kostava,
0171 Tbilisi
tel/fax: (+995 32) 33 24 35, 36 51 69
e-mail: khatuna@gpb.ge

Georgian Public Broadcaster

Nikoloz Lomidze
Entertainment Programs Producer
www.gpb.ge
68 M. Kostava,
0171 Tbilisi
tel/fax: (+995 32) 33 40 40
e-mail: kedeli@gpb.ge

Georgian Public Broadcaster

Tatia Julakidze
Assistant to General Director
www.gpb.ge
68 M. Kostava,
0171 Tbilisi
tel/fax: (+995 32) 21 33 63
e-mail: tatia@gpb.ge

Civil Georgia

Online magazine
Project Director, Mr. Ramaz Aptsiauri,
Executive Director of UNAG
ramaz@una.ge
Editor in Chief, Mr. Giorgi Sepashvili,
george@una.ge

3. Social care, charity organizations, disabled, immigrants, youth organizations

Scouts

www.scouts.ge
Kostava Str. 12
Tbilisi, Tel: (+995 24) 14 15 98
e-mail: rustaviscouts@yahoo.com

Disability Center

Kedia St, 0154, Tbilisi, Georgia
Tel/Fax: +995 (32)356 609
e-mail: office@disability.ge,
admin@disability.ge, disability@gol.ge
ICQ: 313808636

Social Care International Organization

<http://www.socio.ge/contact.html>
Svanidze George – Chairman.
e-mail: svanidze@socio.ge
Naskidashvili Nana – Chief expert and specialist of department for scientific research.
e-mail: nana@socio.ge
Svanidze Zizi – Head of department for scientific research.
e-mail: zizi@socio.ge

Kbilashvili Rusudani – PR manager of SOCIO.

e-mail: socio@socio.ge
Kaishauri Mzia – HR manager, assistant in organizing trainings, seminars and conferences.

e-mail: mzia@socio.ge
Kurkhuli Vazha – artist, computer graphic designer.

e-mail: vazha@socio.ge
Akhvlediani Jughuli – Physician, specialist of hygiene and epidemiology.

e-mail: juguli@socio.ge
Kituashvili Irina – Doctor veterinary.

e-mail: irina@socio.ge
Svanidze Davit – Economist, Leader of SOCIO economical department.

e-mail: dato@socio.ge
Arabidze Ketevan – Chemist, Specialist of Test Lab and analyses.

e-mail: ketevan@socio.ge
Danelia Vakho – Webmaster, Engineer Programmer.

e-mail: webmaster@socio.ge

Migration Sector NGO Resource Center
2 Dolidze St., Tbilisi 38001
Tel/Fax: (995 32) 33 25 16, 33 52 16
e-mail: una@caucasus.net
<http://www.una.org.ge/iom.html>

Georgia Fencing Federation
tel. +995 32 29 28 75/+995 32 39 74 74
E-mail: geofencing@hotmail.com

4. Minorities

Armenian Cooperation Centre of Georgia

Karen Elchian – founder and president
8, Abovyan Str/ 15, Sayat Nova Str. Tbilisi, 0105, Georgia
Tel/fax: + 995 32 98 83 89 / Mob. +995 93 31 77 84
Karen.elchian@armenia.ge
www.armenia.ge

Diocese of Armenian Apostolic Holy Church in Georgia

Levon Isakhanyan – coordinator of the Information Office
Tel. +995 32 75 41 11
Mob. +995 99 41 34 74
Isakhanyan@yahoo.com

George Babakhanov

Tbilisi, ST. Polidze 29 korp. Flat 16
Tel. +995 93 73 79 77
Hayman37@mail.ru

Aida – journalist, Armenian

Tbilisi, aika_gass@inbox.ru

Rowszan Sulejmanow

Karadjala
Seno Karadjala
Tel. +995 99 43 47 07

Primary School

Deputy Director
Karadjala
Leila +995 99 71 98 06

5. Polish organizations in Georgia

Związek Kulturalno-Oświatowy Polaków w Gruzji “Polonia”

Prof. Maria Filina
ul. G. Leonidze 14, m. 1
Tbilisi 0105
tel. fax (+995 32) 933 707
e-mail: larmaria19@yahoo.com

Polskie Centrum Edukacyjne w Gruzji

Redakcja „Kaukaska Polonia”
Małgorzata Pawlak
8, Czernyszewski Str
e-mail: polcentrum@poczta.onet.pl

Embassy of the Republic of Poland

Zbigniew Wiktorowicz, consul
19, Zubalashvili
0108 Tbilisi
tel. (+995 32) 920398
fax (+995 32) 920397

e-mail: konspolgruzja@internet.ge
ambpolgruzja@access.sanet.ge

Aleksandra Duda PhD Candidate

Intern in the Liberty Institute
Centre for Russian and East European Studies
European Research Institute
Pritchatts Road Edgbaston
Birmingham B15 2TT, UK
www.bham.ac.uk
Mobile: +44 (0) 7716 912817
e-mail: aleksandra_duda@go2.pl
amd545@bham.ac.uk

Diana Zadura

Student of Warsaw University
Intern in the Liberty Institute
dianazadura@wp.pl
tel. 895296182

10. LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

a) Coordinators

KRZYSZTOF GURBA

Address: 10 Parkowa, 32-087 Bibice, Poland

Telephone: +48126832415

Fax: +48126832426

E-mail: gurba@o2.pl

Date of birth: 8.02.1956

Marital status: married

EDUCATION

1986, Jagiellonian University, Krakow

Ph.D. in Philosophy

1981–85, Jagiellonian University, Department of Philosophy doctoral studies

1976–81, Jagiellonian University, Department of Philosophy graduate studies

1974–79, Jagiellonian University, Department of Mathematics M.Sc. in Computer Science

WORK EXPERIENCE

2004–now, Tischner European University
Professor, International Projects Manager, Director of the Institute for Research on Civilizations, Krakow Branch

2003–04, Tischner European University
Dean of the Faculty of Applied Social Sciences

1998–2002, City Council of Krakow
deputy

1998–2002, Regional Board of the Trade Union „Solidarność” Małopolska
Secretary of Board

1993–now, Postgraduate Journalist Studies, Pontifical Academy of Krakow
Program Director

1989–2003, Institute of Philosophy, Jagiellonian University, Krakow
Assistant Professor

1986–1990, Department of Philosophy, Educational Academy of Krakow
Assistant Professor

1986, Center of Educational Technology, Educational Academy of Krakow
Lecturer

1981–85, Institute of Philosophy, Jagiellonian University, Krakow
doctoral studies

1980–81, Laboratory of Medical Informatics, Medical Academy of Krakow
Lecturer

TEACHING

General Statistics – 1980–81, Medical Academy of Krakow

Introduction to Computer Science – 1980–81, 1986–89, Medical Academy of Krakow, Educational Academy of Krakow

Logic – 1984, Jagiellonian University, Krakow

Educational Technology – 1986, Educational Academy of Krakow

Methodology – 1986–89, Educational Academy of Krakow

Artificial Intelligence – 1990-, Jagiellonian University, Krakow

Modern Philosophy of Mind – 1989–90, Jagiellonian University, Krakow

History of Philosophy – 1986-, Educational Academy of Krakow, Jagiellonian University, Krakow

Journalism – 1993-, Pontifical Academy of Krakow

Mass-media in Religion, Pontifical Academy of Krakow.

Virtual Reality – 1997, Jagiellonian University, Krakow

Public Relations – 1997

Introduction to Computer Science – 2005–06, Tischner European University

Rhetorics and Genology for Journalists – 2004–06, Technical and Management University, Rzeszow

History of Philosophy – 2005–2006,
Tischner European University, Krakow

**CONTRIBUTION TO THE SCIENTIFIC
PROJECTS:**

Anaphora – automatization of the resolving of cross-reference clauses in legal texts (1982–86), Jagiellonian University
Systems Thinking (1980–82), Jagiellonian University

Logic and Language (1980–83), Jagiellonian University

Structural Anthropology (1980–81), Jagiellonian University

General Systems Theory (1981–82), Jagiellonian University

Leibniz and Modern Science (1987), Jagiellonian University

Logical Foundations of Computer Science (1985), Jagiellonian University

Limits of the Mechanization of Thought (1987), Jagiellonian University

Mind-Body Problem (1989-), Jagiellonian University

Moral Obligation and Individual Freedom (1993), Centre for Philosophy and Public Affairs, St Andrews University

Philosophy and Error (1996-), Jagiellonian University

Political Thought in Oppressive Conditions (1997), Jagiellonian University.

1982–88 organizer of the unofficial seminars within the „underground university”, e.g. „Political Philosophy of F.A. von Hayek, „Various Faces of Freedom,, „Liberalism and Democracy,,.

SCHOLARSHIPS:

Gibson-Sykora Scholarship, St Andrews University, Scotland, March-May 1993.

The Guardian Foundation Scholarship, London, October 1994.

OTHER:

1981–88 editor of independent journals.

1987–89 editor-in-chief of the interdisciplinary journal "SENS", edited at the

Jagiellonian University (philosophy, literature, law, arts, culture).

1990–91 editor of the monthly "ZNAK"

1991–92 editor of journal "ARKA"

1991–97 I editor of a daily "CZAS"

1994–98 editor of weekly "Gosc Niedzielny".

MEMBERSHIP:

Polish Philosophical Association

Polish Journalists Association

GIORGI MELADZE

Address: Griboedov 23

Tbilisi, 0108 Georgia

Tel/Fax: (995 32) 936784 or 936615

Mobile: (995 77) 401888

e-mail: giomeladze@Liberty.ge

Date of Birth: 10 January 1980

Marital status: married

EDUCATION

Chavchavadze State University

Tbilisi, from 2005

Department of Philosophy and Social Sciences

PhD research fellow

Columbia University School of Law

New York

Visiting Scholar, 2002–03

Public Interest Law Fellow

Project "Developing Freedom of Religion in Georgia"

Tbilisi State University

Lawyer Degree

May 2002

Honors: Tbilisi State University competition in legal writing-Finalist;

Second year Moot Court Program, Best Brief and Best Oral Argument;

Nominee for International Workshop in Humanitarian Law;

Thesis: Constitutional Law of India and federalism in developing countries

WORK EXPERIENCE

Liberty Institute

1. Rule of law Program, Director, Tbilisi, 2004–2006

Main directions of the program: Raise awareness on human rights issues, nationwide monitoring of state institutions, legal assistance, legal drafting
2. Youth Programs, Director, Tbilisi, 2000–2003

Main directions: human rights education, creation of youth groups in six regions, organizing summer camp for activists

3. Religious Freedom Project, Lawyer, Tbilisi, since 2001

Main directions: to provide legal counseling to minority religious representatives and write amicus briefs on violations cases; research and compare European Human Rights Court case law and Georgian domestic regulations on freedom of religion;

Tbilisi State University, Department of Social Sciences, Tbilisi, 2005

Journalism department

Lecturer – Media Law

I. Chavchavadze State University, Tbilisi, from 2005

Department of Philosophy and Social Sciences

Lecturer – Freedom of religion

Article XIX

Research Fellow, London, 2004

Research on hate speech regulations in SA, Australia, UK, Canada and case law of ECHR and UN

Committee on human Rights

Association for Developing Student Self-Government, Tbilisi, 2002

Supported independent student council elections in higher education institutions and lead the campaign against corruption in education system; drafted code of conduct for Tbilisi State University.

Parliament of Georgia

Research on Criminal Procedure Code of Scotland, February 2002

Research on Petit Jury system in U.S., May 2001

Research on Guidelines for election broadcasting in transitional democracies, April-June 2001

Research on Pre trial investigation stage in Scotland, 2001

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Caucasus Resource Research Center (CRRC-Georgia), Tbilisi, 2006

Research grant on Philanthropy in Georgia
Trainer non-violent campaign techniques, Ukraine, 2005, Thailand, 2005

International Center for Transitional Justice, Volunteer, New York, 2003

Research on Truth Commissions in South Africa, Sierra Leone and Peru

Columbia University School of Law, New York, 2002–03

East European Law Review

Rights-link Project activist

Khmara youth movement, trainer, Tbilisi, 2003–2004

Street Law Project, trainer, Tbilisi, 2002

Radio Audience, talk show “Antifreeze”, journalist, Tbilisi, 2001

Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi 1996-2001
Newspaper “Young Lawyer” Co-editor;

Litigant students group member and author of litigation in Constitutional Court against certain provisions of Civil Code;

Chair of Student Council;

Founder and trainer of Human Rights activists group at the law department;

Founder and board member of Human Rights Research Center at Tbilisi State University;

PUBLICATIONS

Constitutional law of Foreign Countries – Co-author, (book), 2001

Constitutional Law of India

Constitutional Law of Iran

Human Rights in Asia Region – Author, (article), 2000

Freedom of Religion, Comprehensive Analysis of US and ECHR Case law, Book Tbilisi, 2005, Editor

International Standards of freedom of Expression, Book, Tbilisi, 2004, Editor
Active citizenship manual, book, Tbilisi, 2005

MEMBERSHIP

Public monitoring board at the Ombudsman's Office, from 2004
Independent oversight council of penitentiary system created by President of Georgia from 2004

b) Key partners

Liberty Institute w Tbilisi

Address: Gribodov 23, Tbilisi 0108 Georgia

Tel. +99532936615, fax. +995936784

e-mail: giomeladze@liberty.ge

www.liberty.ge

Contact person: Giorgi Meladze – program director

Tbilisi State University, Department of Human Geography

Address: 1, I. Chavchavadze Ave., Tbilisi, Georgia

tel. +99532250261, fax. +99532251527

e-mail: ggogsadze@yahoo.com,

j_salukvadze@hotmail.com

www.tsu.ge

Contact persons: prof. Giorgi Gogsadze, Dean, prof. Joseph Salukvadze, Director of the Institute

c) Polish study group in Georgia

Krzysztof Gurba, project coordinator, Tischner European University, director of the Institute for Research on Civilizations, Krakow Branch

Ewa Trznadel, Tischner European University, project assistant

Students, members of the student circle of the Institute for Research on Civilizations:

Aleksander Kostka, student of sociology

Sylwia Kowalik, student of applied linguistics

Hanna Krzyżowska, student of sociology

Arkadiusz Kudelski, student of international relations

Jan Meisel-Dobrzański, student of international relations

Wojciech Nowiński, student of international relations

Katarzyna Pabian, student of sociology

Dominik Skorupa, student of international relations

Monika Zbieg, student of international relations

Joanna Żeber, student of international relations

d) Georgian visitors to Poland

Agladze Nikoloz, male 16, Tbilisi, N23 Public School, 11th year.

Chiareli Alexandre, male 22, Tbilisi, I. Chavchavadze State University, faculty of philosophy and social sciences, 3rd year.

Zuroshvili Mariam, female 19, Telavi, I. Gogebashvili State University, fac-

ulty of law, business and social sciences, 1st year.

Svanidze Maia, female 17, Telavi, I. Gogebashvili State University, faculty of law, business and social sciences, 1st year.

Khaadze Tinatin, female 16, Telavi, N2 Public School, 10th year.

Dzamukashvili Nino, female 16, Telavi, N5 Public School.

Gigauri Khatia, female 17, Telavi, N9 Public School, 11th year

Utiashvili Tsiala, female 22, I. Gogebashvili State University, faculty of law, business and social sciences, 3rd year.

Giorgi Meladze, male 27, Liberty Institute, Program Director

Elene Ladaria, female 23, Liberty Institute, Iliia Chavchavadze University

e) Essay competition participants

Workshop in Tbilisi

1. Agladze Nika
2. Koshelashvili Nino
3. KaWarava Marika
4. Gabisonia Dato
5. Beruashvili Mariam
6. Ugulava Ana
7. Chaladze Mari
8. Kiviladze Tornike
9. Tetoradze Shota
10. Mchedlidze Givi
11. Metreveli Eka
12. Gurchiani Elmira

Workshop in Telavi

1. Utiashvili Ciala
2. Zuroshvili Mariam
3. Khaadze Tiniko
4. Svanidze Maia
5. Dzamukashvili Nino
6. Gigauri Khatia
7. Grishikashvili Levan
8. Gigauri Tamuna
9. Zurabashvili Tea
10. Demurashvili Tamuna
11. Magradze Nanuka
12. Germanishvili Nino
13. Tavberidze Zaqro
14. Tagieva Mariam

Other participants

1. Giorgi Beriashvili
2. Elene Mebagishvili
3. Tamta Kukhaleishvili
4. Maia Fidushvili
5. Nino Gambashidze
6. Ana Solomonishvili
7. Tornike Orbeladze
8. Akaki Gogoladze
9. Aleko Inasaridze
10. Sandro Gabisonia
11. Avtandil Cxadadze
12. Robo Gegamiani
13. Beka Khitarishvili
14. Mariam Janjaria
15. Khatuna Kobiashvili

f) Volunteers

Volunteers taking part in the project were members of the Institute for the Research on Civilizations as well as undergraduate and graduate students of Tischner European University in Krakow.

They have gained experience in numerous activities held by Institute over last 2 years, during which they took part in projects gaining organizational, fund-raising and supporting skills at the University. They organized Globalization Workshops and events promoting knowledge about India, Tibet and Malaysia. They were engaged in “Borders of Europe” and “European Energy Security” conferences. Together with the Consulate General of the USA in Krakow they are involved in the conference concerning immigration. Not only did they conduct the research trip entitled “On the track of velvet revolutions Serbia-Ukraine-Georgia 2005” but they also prepared post-trip projects. In cooperation with the Polish Humanitarian Organisation, they organised events for underprivileged children. They also held artistic, photographic and film exhibitions.

11. APPENDICES

a) Essay Competition – Set of instructions (English)

Rules and principles for the “Citizen of Georgia Award” – set of instructions

1. General rules

- 1.1. The “Citizen of Georgia Award” is being organised by the Institute of Research on Civilizations (the idea-giver), Tischner European University in Krakow (TEU), State University of Tbilisi – Department of Social Geography and Liberty Institute (all mentioned called later “Organizers”). The competition is supposed to provide help to young leaders of civic society in Georgia.
- 1.2. Admissions to the competition should be in a form of essay or a report. They should refer to topics of a relevant edition of the competition.
- 1.3. The “Citizen of Georgia Award” is targeted at young college and university students in Georgia, excluding Abkhazia and Southern Ossetia. Participants should be at least 16 years old and university 3rd years at most (no age limits).
- 1.4. Admissions to the competition are not followed by any further requirements on the behalf of participants.

2. Rules of the competition

- 2.1. General conditions of participation are as follows:
 - Independently writing an essay on one of the topics given
 - Submitting the essay and personal data prior to October 31st 2006 to the address of the Liberty Institute in Tbilisi, with an envelope postscript „Citizen of Georgia Award”
- 2.2. Every participant of the competition is allowed to submit only one paper.
- 2.3. All costs of preparation and submission of the paper are not covered by the Organizers.
- 2.4. Participants are required to familiarize themselves with this set of instructions.
- 2.5. Participation in the competition is free of any charge.
- 2.6. Only papers which were not previously printed , published or were awarded in any other competitions, will be taken into consideration.
- 2.7. Participants of the competition agree that their papers may be used by the Organizers for the purposes of promotion, editorial or any other, according to Organizer’s activities.
- 2.8. Organizers do not take any responsibility for the violation of intellectual property rights by any of the participants of the competition. This responsibility is to be taken by the participants only.

- 2.9. The results of the competition will be announced by November 11th 2006. Decision regarding awards will have been taken by the Liberty Insititute.
- 2.10. All the information concerning results will be available in the office of Liberty Institute in Tbilisi and on the Liberty Institute's website.
- 2.11. Award winners and authors of remarkable but not awarded papers will be informed about the results via telephone or e-mail. Other participants will not be personally informed about the results.

3. Technical conditions

- 3.1. The paper should count 3 to 6 standard pages (around 1800 signs a page, which makes around 5500–11000 signs in total; approximately equals to 900–1800 words). It can also be submitted in handwritten form.
- 3.2. The paper should be signed with a symbol or nickname, all personal data should be placed in a separate, sealed envelope, signed with this same symbol or nickname as that on the paper.
- 3.3. Information in the sealed envelope should be as follows:
 - name and surname,
 - Detailed address,
 - Telephone number and e-mail (preferably),
 - Date and place of birth,
- 3.4. Papers, which do not meet the mentioned expectations will be declined.

4. Awards

- 4.1. At the last stage of the competition, the Organizers will choose a group of 30 people, who have written the best papers. 8 of them will have the opportunity to take part in a study trip to Poland. The whole group will take part in discussion panels in Georgia.

5. Additional regulations

- 5.1. Organizers do not send any confirmation of participation in the competition.
- 5.2. Organizers reserve the right to change this set of regulations in case of changes in legislation, which concerns this competition.
- 5.3. Decision regarding the results is final and no appeals will be taken into consideration.

Topics:

1. How do you understand the idea of civic society and what means would you use to improve its mechanisms in Georgia?

2. What is the phenomenon of Georgia's civic society formation? Based on your personal experience describe the ups and/or downs of civic society formation in Georgia.
3. Describe the civic society of your dreams.

b) Essay Competition – Set of instructions (Georgian)

**saqarTvelos moqalaqe – konkursis wesebi da pirobebi
zogadi wesebi**

1. konkursi “saqarTvelos moqalaqe” organizebulia civilizaciebis kvlevis institutis, tisnes evropuli universitetis (krakovi), Tbilisis saxelmwifo universitetis socialur mecnierebaTa fakultetis da Tavisuflebis institutis mier.
2. konkursSi monawileobis mirebis msruvelebma naSromi unda warmoadginon werilobiTi formiT da upasuxon konkursis pirobebiT gansazRvrul kiTxvebs.
3. konkursSi monakwileobis miReba SeuzliaT axalgazrdebs 16 wlis asakidan, maqsimaluri asaobrivi zRvvari ar aris gansazRvruli, Tumca monawileebi ar SeiZleba iyvnen bakalavriatis mesame kurss gadacilebuli studentebi.

konkursis wesebi

1. monawileobis zogadi pirobebi:
 - werilobiTi naSromi, romelsac monawile asrulebs damoukideblad
 - werilobiTi naSromis wamrodgenis bolo vadaa 31 oqtomberi
 - konkursis moanwile naSroms warmoadgens Tavisuflebis institutis ofisSi: groboedvos q. 23, tel: 93 66 15
2. konkursis monawile warmoadgens mxolod erT naSroms.
3. naSromis momzadebasa da warmodgenasTan dakavSirebuli xarjebi ar anazRaurdeba organizatorebis mier.
4. monawile valdebulia gaecnos mocemul wesebs.
5. konkursSi monawileoba ufasoa.
6. konkurssi Seizleba warmoadginon mxolod is naSromi, romelic ar iyo gamocemuli konkursis gamocxadebamde da arc wardenili sxva konkursSi, konferencieze da a.S.
7. konkurSi monawile Tanaxmaa, rom misis naSromi sesaZlebelia gamoyenebuli iqnes organizatorebis mier da gamoqveyndes an gavrceldes maT-Tan seTanxmebis gareSe.
8. organizatorebi pasuxismgeblobas ixsnian konkursis monawileebis mier inteletualuri sakuTrebis uflebebis darRvevaze.
9. konkursis Sedegebi gamoqveyndeba 11 noembers, 2006. gamarjvebulebs SearCevs Tavisuflebis instituti.

10. konkursis sesaxeb informaciis moZieba SegizliaT Tavisuflebis isntitutis ofisSi.
11. konkurSi gamarjvebul pirebs Tavad dauykavsirdebian organizatorebi telefonis an e-mailis meSveobiT.

teqnikuri mxare:

1. naSromi unda iyos ara nakleb 3 da ara umetes 6 gverdisa. konkurssi monawileobis msurvels SeuZlia wamroadginos xelnaweri, romelic garkveviT iqneba Sesrulebuli.
2. naSroms Tan unda erTvodes warmomdgenis xelmowera an inizialebi. konkursantma piradi informacia unda warmoadginos calke konvertiT.
3. konkursantma unda wamroadinos Semdegi piradi informacia:
 - saxeli, gvარი
 - misamarTi
 - telefonis nomeri an e-mail
 - dabadebis TariRi da adgili
4. Tu naSromi ar akmayofilebs dasaxelebul moTxovnebs is ar iqneba daSvebuli konkurseze.

dajildoveba:

1. organizatorebi konkursantebs Soris SearCeven 30 monawiles, romelTac miecemaT Sesazlebloba miiRon monawileoba saqarTveloSi organizebul diskusiaTa seriaSi. 30-dan SeirCeva 8 studenti, romelic saswavlo vizitiT gaemgzavreba poloneTSi.

damatebiT pirobebi:

1. organizatorebi ar adastureben dokumentis miRebas.
2. organizatorebs SeuZliaT secvalon konkursis pirobebei sesabamis kanon-mdeblobashi cvlilebebis gatvaliswinebiT.
3. Sedegebis Sesaxeb gadawyvetileba sabolooa da ar gasaCivrdeba.

konkursis kiTxvebi:

1. rogor gesmiT samoqalaqo sazogadoebis arsi da ra zomebs miiRebdiT misi gaZlierebisTvis saqarTveloSi?
2. ra aris samoqalaqo sazoagdoebis seqmnis safuzvlebi saqarTveloSi? Tqveni gamocdilebiT seafaset ra CaiTvleba samoqalaqo sazogadoebis warmatebad an warumateblobad.
3. aRwereT Tqveni wamrodgeniT rogori unda iyos samoqalaqo sazogadoeba.