

Vazha Shatberashvili

Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi  
[vshatberashvili@yahoo.com](mailto:vshatberashvili@yahoo.com)

## Cultural Policy of the Democratic Republic of Georgia (1918–1921)

### Abstract

Culture, cultural heritage is a kind of text allowing us to “read” about the identity and genetic code of a nation, or, in other words, providing a key to understanding the “personality” and mindset of the nation and, at the same time, creating a path to the future. Therefore, protecting and developing culture to ensure cultural continuity is an essential prerequisite for ensuring the existence and progress of each nation and country – this is the firmly held axiom on which the cultural policy of states is based. This becomes all the more relevant for Georgia, which, due to its unique location and geopolitical, cultural and strategic importance, already in the distant past embraced the cultural achievements of the eastern and western civilisations and succeeded in creating its uniquely distinct and diverse national culture, thus putting itself firmly on the map of world culture. Of utmost importance in this process is the brief transitional period of existence of the Democratic Republic of Georgia (1918–1921), during which the country actively set about defining and implementing state cultural policy and establishing a national administration system in this sphere. The article argues that the state vision of culture or, in modern terms, cultural policy corresponding to the political system then in place, existed within the aforesaid time frame long before the world, including modern

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.en>), which permits redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, provided that the article is properly cited. © The Author(s) 2023.

Publisher: Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences

Editor-in-chief: Jolanta Sujęcka

Conception and academic editing: Wojciech Sajkowski

Georgia, saw the need to develop a cultural policy. Considering the country's legislative framework, the institutional administration system of the cultural sphere, the dynamics of cultural life and its peculiarities, and internationally recognised concepts and models, we tentatively define the cultural policy model of the Democratic Republic of Georgia in the last part of the article. We liken it, to a certain extent, to the Architect State model as developed by Harry Hillman Chartrand and Claire McCaughey. The bureaucratic-educational concept model offered by Milena Dragičević-Šešić and Branimir Stoykovich also proved to be of interest. The international models put forward by the aforesaid scholars undoubtedly differ from the historically existing ktitoric/protective model of Georgian culture, as well as from the protective model established by the Democratic Republic of Georgia. There are, however, some common features between them: centralised patronage/support of culture by the state, non-intervention in the content of art; considering culture and art as one of the precursors to the social wellbeing of society; highlighting the priority importance of the educational function of culture and art. With due regard for the foregoing, we have tentatively designated the cultural policy model applied by the Democratic Republic of Georgia as the educational model of the Architect State.

**Keywords:** Democratic Republic of Georgia, culture, policy, cultural policy model.

**T**he brief existence of the Democratic Republic of Georgia is of utmost importance in the recent history of Georgia. It was created amid the difficult political situation resulting from the October 1917 coup against the Russian imperial authority, when the country was given the chance to free itself from the domination of the Russian Empire and regain its independence. Before that, from 19 to 22 November 1917, the National Congress of Georgia formed the National Council of Georgia – the first legislative multiparty and multiethnic body to deliberate on problems of great importance to the country. On 26 May 1918, the National Council, based on the Act of Independence it had adopted earlier, declared the independence of Georgia in the form of a democratic republic. On 14–17 February 1919, the Constituent Assembly – the national legislature of Georgia – was elected by a proportional vote, based on the principles of democratic, universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage (equal voting and other civil rights, including women's participation in elections, were still unheard of in Europe then) (Matsaberidze, 2019). The National Council transferred all power to the Constituent Assembly, which formed the executive branch of the provisional Government (Vadachkoria, 2018).

The Constituent Assembly performed the function of the country's main legislative body until Soviet Russia annexed the Democratic Republic of Georgia. The political system of that period was completely different from the existing political systems in Georgia. The short period (1918–1921) during which the Democratic Republic of Georgia existed is highly important in the history of Georgia in terms of the restoration of independence. It was this new democratic political system that completely determined the state's will to develop national trends in cultural policy. According to one type of classification, this political system can be referred to as an open democratic political system, because it implies the priority of individual rights, public control over authority, and is based on the division of power; it excludes the stable and unchallenged rule of the majority and is characterised by a competitive struggle for power, in compliance with constitutional provisions.

The Democratic Republic of Georgia pressed for a democratic political system to be established. Its leaders set themselves the task of making Georgia one of the most democratic countries in the world, as evidenced by the documentary material presented below. Indeed, the political will of the new political system manifested itself in the implementation of a whole series of democratic reforms by both the legislative and executive branches, not only in culture, but in all spheres of public life. As early as in 1917, the National Council of Georgia launched the School and Art Commission, along with other sectoral commissions, oriented towards the development of culture (Shvelidze, 2018). Renamed the Art Commission, it continued to function under the Constituent Assembly. The Constituent Assembly included other sectoral commissions, whether permanent, temporary or small-sized, functioning at various times and closely cooperating with respective line ministries. The Art Commission under the Constituent Assembly consisted of 12 members, while the small art commission was composed of three members. It was first chaired by Konstantine Andronikashvili, later – by Pavle Sakvarelidze, and finally – by Ivane Gomartheli. The secretaries were: Ekvtime Takaishvili and Geronti Kikodze. Its membership also continued to change. The commission dealt with problems in the educational and cultural fields and explored the need to carry out various measures to address those problems; it cooperated closely with musical, theatre and artistic societies, as well as with the writers' union; where necessary, it held meetings with public and cultural institutions and the Ministry of Education. The meetings of the commission were attended by the minister of education, the head



of the municipal government, representatives of various cultural institutions, and others (Chumburidze, 2018). For the administration of culture, there was no executive body in the form of a Ministry of Culture – this function was performed by the Ministry of Education, which along with its subordinate educational institutions comprised cultural institutions of various profiles, for example, the Art Gallery set up in 1920 (Chanturidze & Tsitsishvili, 2018); the Conservatoire; the Caucasus Museum (Chumburidze, 2018). It needs to be specified that the third single-party (Social Democrats) Government approved on 21 March 1919 carried out an optimisation of the ministries. Noe Ramishvili was appointed minister of public education, internal affairs and the military, while before that, under the first coalition Government, the Ministry of Education had existed separately and was headed by Giorgi Lashkishvili (Kupatadze, 2018). In coordination with the Ministry of Education, the large and small art commissions made a number of important decisions, which contributed to the professional development of educational and cultural workers, to the opening of new cultural institutions, as well as to financial support for already functioning cultural and artistic societies (e.g. the Historical and Ethnographic Society of Georgia; the Georgian Artists Society), which ultimately led to the further development and greater diversity of culture. Such a national approach to culture was clearly reflected in the supreme law of the country, which was adopted shortly before the violent overthrow of the democratic Government. To provide greater insight into this effective approach, we consider it necessary to take stock of the Constitution of Democratic Georgia before going on to analyse the multifaceted contemporary cultural life. Before the transfer of legislative authority to the Constituent Assembly, a State Commission was established on 6 June 1918 to develop a draft of the Constitution of Georgia. The commission was composed exclusively of Georgians with knowledge of the European constitutional experience. The draft of the Constitution was developed and in November 1920 was submitted to the relevant commission of the Constituent Assembly for further review (Kantaria, 2018). The country, though not having any independent legal and constitutional experience, succeeded in creating a democratic and in many ways progressive Constitution focused on the protection of human rights, including cultural rights, of an individual as a social being, and which, according to constitutionalists, is remarkable due to its advanced political and legal discourse, and compares favourably with the constitutions of other European countries, both at that time and now. Therefore, it remains one of the most

progressive and democratic constitutions not only in the history of constitutionalism in Georgia, but also in the world (Demetrashvili, 2010). Hans-Dietrich Genscher, former German federal foreign affairs minister, speaking about the 1921 Georgian Constitution stated, “At that time it already advocated such values as liberty, democracy and the rule of law, which the modern Europe is based on at present” [i.e. in the 20th century] (Gaul, 2002, p. 9). Every country is normally governed by a constitution as it reflects the state’s strategic vision of all the main directions. The case was somewhat different for the Democratic Republic of Georgia: due to objective reasons, the adoption of the fundamental law of Georgia in 1921 was preceded by the creation of structural units necessary for the normal functioning of an independent state, and by the implementation of reforms and relevant activities in many areas of public life, including in the field of culture. As mentioned above, the difficult political processes taking place in the Russian Empire at the end of the 19th century, and especially in the early 20th century, had the same resonance for Georgia on the periphery of the empire. Those processes triggered social and political changes in Georgia as well, and what is of greater interest to us, they became one of the causes behind the relative weakening of the pragmatic imperial cultural policy. The intellectually empowered intelligentsia prepared solid ground for the development of national culture, and artists, who were freed from the imperial dictates, formulated new aesthetic ideals and principles and carried out relevant activities in the field of art and culture. The newly independent state’s strategic policy in culture was, in fact, based on the cultural background described above. Independent Georgia existed until 1921, when Bolshevik Russia annexed the country. Fleeing to the Black Sea town of Batumi, the Government of independent Georgia expeditiously adopted the Constitution of the Georgian Republic on 21 February 1921, four days before the occupation of Tbilisi by the 11th Army of Soviet Russia (Ashortia & Elizbarashvili, 2014). Thus, the Constitution of the First Democratic Republic of Georgia only existed for four days. Despite the positive evaluations mentioned above, this Constitution did not and could not have fully covered all issues related to cultural administration. However, its separate chapters and articles contained approaches that may well be considered at least a general cultural concept, if not a cultural policy. In terms of the state’s conceptual understanding of culture, we find as essentially important the following provision of the Constitution: “Art, science and their teaching are free. The state shall be obliged to patronise and support them in development” (*Constitution of Georgia*, 1921, p. 32).

This excerpt draws our attention to the fact that the authors of the Constitution considered the arts [i.e. culture] and science, as well as their teaching, to be areas of free creative activity. In this regard, we would like to add that culture is a product of the creative, free, individual work of a person, but it is as much individual as it is collective, i.e. social in nature. It is opposed to isolation. It needs not only to demonstrate its value to the “open space”, but also to have it evaluated by this “open space”, i.e. by society, because a product of culture created by society or its members is intended for society itself. Such is its genetic nature. As an inherently national phenomenon of state and social importance, it has the greatest influence on the formation and development of the spiritual and psychological vector of a person/society, and is also an indicator of the sustainability of the state going through a long period of turbulence. We, therefore, believe that highlighting the free nature of culture in the first Constitution of Georgia and the state’s commitment to this freedom is of great importance, and is not only progressive in its essence, but also constitutes the founding principle of the cultural policy of the time. A perfect illustration of the universality of the free nature of art is, first of all, the extremely diverse (futurism, acmeism, symbolism...) creative life of that time, well reflected in various artists’ views about the mission of art and culture. For example, Lado Gudiashvili created a graphic painting with the impressive title *Long Live Free Art in Free Georgia*, which was displayed on the front page of the first issue of *Theatre and Life Magazine* in 1918. The idea of free art was echoed by the outstanding artist and cultural activist David Kakabadze, who opposed the institutional subordination of the art commission. He believed that due to the free nature of art, it was impossible to subordinate it to any agency, as this could lead to intervention in art, to the detriment of art itself. Based on the cognitive and educational function of art, he believed it was right for “the department of art to find its place within the Ministry of Education” (Kakabadze, 2004, p. 294). Later, in 1919, he founded the magazine *Shvidi Mnatobi* [Seven Luminaries], where he wrote that “painting can only revive if it serves solely an artistic purpose” (Kipiani, 2018, p. 397). This statement, like the above-mentioned views, goes beyond the personal scope, as such novel conceptual views about the mission of culture and art used to dominate Georgia’s cultural landscape in the 1910s and 1920s and differed fundamentally from what Georgian artists of the previous century had thought about the purpose of culture and art, and particularly of literature, poetry and the poet. The main reason behind this was undoubtedly the imperial system and the threats it posed to

the entire nation and its culture. For many reasons, the beginning of the 20th century in general, and specifically in Georgia, created a new reality for rethinking old values, and this led to putting forward such an interpretation on the importance of culture and art during the period mentioned above.

Let's return to the constitutional provision quoted above, namely the section where the duty of the state as a patron of culture was first enshrined in a document. But this had been an important strategic vector of the Georgian state's cultural policy even before the 19th century. The norm specifying the state's functions in relation to culture is also highly important: the state assumes the duty not only to contribute to the development of culture but also not to interfere with its content. This can also be seen as providing a fundamental political concept for the development of culture, which led to the boom in all creative activity in Georgia during the period from 1918 to 1921. It needs to be highlighted that such an approach to culture prevailing in democratic Georgia is essentially different from the pragmatic imperial policy pursued by the Russian Empire, and it also differs from the ideologised official policy of Georgia as part of the communist empire. The Constitution did not and could not have fully provided a model for the institutional implementation of the state's protective function in relation to culture. However, it pointed to individual mechanisms; in particular, it indicated that this function would be organisationally and financially divided among various central bodies, including local state structures (*Constitution of Georgia*, 1921).

It is significant that, based on the multiethnicity and multiculturalism of Georgia, the Constitution tried to bring the status of national minorities within the scope of law. In particular, the Constitution devoted separate chapters and articles to the rights of national minorities, including their cultural rights and the right to freedom of belief, the right to the creation of national unions for the development of their culture, the right to the protection of cultural heritage, to education in their native language and to the fulfilment of civil duties. Thus, the Constitution of the Democratic Republic of Georgia was well ahead of its time and fully in line with international approaches to the protection of rights. The Constitution, which reinforced the right of national minorities to education and cultural activities in their native language, stipulated that any deputy of non-Georgian origin not knowing the official language sufficiently enough to express his opinions could use his native language in the Constituent Assembly on condition that he had previously submitted an exact translation of his speech to the Presidium. Also of interest is the article



stating that “in the territory of the local self-government bodies where the proportion of the national minority exceeds 20 per cent of the whole population, proceedings in state and public institutions shall be held in the official language together with the native language of the said minority” (*Constitution of Georgia*, 1921). This constitutional norm is also innovative for that time. The fact is, however, that the Constitution made no reference to the need for integration of the aforesaid ethnic groups and the need for them to acquire the state language of Georgia. Nor was there any reference to mechanisms to address this need. In our view, the Constitution envisaged too broad a scope of native language usage – this would far from contribute to national minorities’ effective integration into society, which was of utmost importance for the stability of the state, and, owing to Georgia’s multiethnicity, would hamper the use of the main national symbol – the state language throughout the territory of Georgia. There is a logical explanation for this norm of the Constitution. It can be explained, on the one hand, by the difficult political situation in Georgia and by the need to deal with it, and on the other, by the social-democratic authority’s intensely ideologised position on social issues, including on the protection of national minority rights. Before the elaboration of the Constitution, legislators were of the opinion that national minorities “should be given anything that does not harm the state”. Indeed, the Government of the Democratic Republic of Georgia tried to achieve an “exemplary solution” of the national issue by granting national minorities rights “that were unheard of in any other constitution” (Gonashvili et al., 2017, p. 141). The opinion of constitutionalists should also be taken into account in this regard. According to them, the first Georgian Constitution was the first fundamental law in the world recognising a human being as the main social value (Demetrashvili & Kobakhidze, 2011). In our opinion, all these factors combined to ensure that the Constitution highlighted the rights of national minorities, including their cultural rights. We would also like to add that the difficult political situation had a noticeable effect on the first Constitution adopted hastily and under compulsion. Therefore, due to certain inconsistencies with national interests, the wording of some articles of the Constitution regarding the protection of the cultural rights of small ethnic groups is unacceptable. From today’s perspective, the first Constitution of Georgia, despite the aforesaid and other flaws it contains, put strong emphasis on the role of the state as a patron and promoter of the development of culture, a perfect illustration of which is cultural life during the period from 1918 to 1921, as described below.



On the one hand, the Constitution championed the freedom of creative activity, especially when, alongside the cultural workers who had already emerged in the second half of the 19th century, new actors also appeared in the first decades of the 20th century, who further developed traditional aesthetic ideals or established new ones. On the other, the state succeeded, within a very short space of time, in creating a mobile model of cultural policy, which carried out its protective function for the development of culture. Vakhtang Beridze considers nationalism and universality to be common features of the culture (theatre, music, art, literature...) of this period (Beridze, 2018). Culture truly became more transparent, purposeful and, most importantly, free. That period was characterised by an increasing number of Georgian artists, cultural and scientific figures who directed their efforts towards solving the new tasks facing national culture in the new era. Therefore, we consider as adequate Beridze's generalised vision of culture.

Cultural life in democratic Georgia was so diverse and broadly based that we can only single out some of its highlights. Credit for the development of culture and art goes to the Society of Georgian Artists (including the literature, theatre, fine arts, and music sections) founded by Dimitri Shevardnadze – the artist and museum expert who came to Georgia from Munich in 1916. The society's aim, based on its regulations, was to bring together various artists and to collect and explore their art works, including those of Niko Pirosmiani. The scale of the society's activities is reflected in its minutes preserved at the Shalva Amiranashvili Art Museum. As early as 1918, Shevardnadze appealed to the Government to transfer to the Artists Society the "Temple of Glory", which had earlier displayed materials depicting Russia's victorious battles in the Caucasus. He wanted to open the first national gallery in the history of Georgia and Transcaucasia there. His request was granted in 1919, and the National Gallery was launched by a special decree ("Decree on the Establishment of the National Art Gallery of Georgia", 2004). It was headed by Shevardnadze (Kharatishvili, 1999). In 1919, the former Temple of Glory hosted the first exhibition of Georgian artists, followed by exhibitions of non-Georgian artists. It is worth noting that the board of this society compiled a list of young artists holding government scholarships (Lado Gudiashvili, David Kakabadze, Irakli Toidze, Ketevan Magalashvili, Shalva Kikodze, Valerian Sidamon-Eristavi, Elene Akhvlediani and others) to send them periodically to foreign art centres, starting in 1919 (Beridze, 2018). It is significant that sending government scholarship holders abroad became a kind of trend in 1918–1921, and not only in the field of art. This, too, was part of the culture policy, which points

to the extent and depth of the Government's understanding of its functions and indicates how it oriented itself to the future by conceptualising the past. A perfect illustration of this is the government-created commission that was tasked with selecting and sending successful students abroad. The commission was chaired by the Head of Government, Noe Jordania, but the commission's work was in fact conducted by Niko Nikoladze. High-performing students were selected based on the recommendations of Petre Melikishvili and Ivane Javakhishvili (Javakhishvili, 2018). It was those European-educated future scientists who made the greatest contribution to the revival of Georgian science, as well as artists (Gigo Gabashvili, David Kakabadze, Kirill and Ilia Zdanevich, Shalva Kikodze, others) who became trail-blazers introducing new aesthetic trends and ideas into Georgian art and culture. It is also worth noting that independent Georgia and, in particular, Tbilisi, became a kind of mecca for those writers and artists who fled Russia and distanced themselves from the Russian Revolution. Together with local writers, poets and artists, they gave Tbilisi a new lease of life and a blaze of colours. To quote Grigol Robakidze, "Tbilisi became fantastic". And this fantastic city served as an ideal platform for Georgian and non-Georgian modernist, avant-garde, futurist and Dadaist artists and poets to feature their talent. Their ideas found their way to the columns of Georgian and Russian-language magazines and newspapers published in Tbilisi (*Teatri da Tskhovreba* [Theatre and Life], *Meotsnebe Niamorebi* [Dreaming Wild Goats], *Tsisperi Kantsebi* [Blue Horns], *Shvidi Mnatobi* [Seven Luminaries], *Tolaburasis Sartkeli* [Tolabura Belt], *ARS*, *Peniski* [Phoenix], *Kurantebi* [Chimes], *Arlekini* [Harlequin], *Tbilisi, 41°*), books, brochures and lectures (Georgian and Russian artists delivered poetry and art lectures in Russian in Tbilisi). The year 1918 marks the start of the tumultuous era of avant-garde cafés (Kimerioni painted by Georgian and Russian artists, *Артистический кабачок*, *Simpatia*, *International...*) characterised by strange rhetoric, aesthetic "rebellion", "individualism, freedom, and art as an end in itself" (Kipiani, 2018). Later, this modernist/avant-garde cultural life of Tbilisi became one of the main objects of studies by world art historians.

The years of independence were indeed boom years for museum activities as well. On 1 August 1919, the Constituent Assembly passed a decree on the abolition of the Caucasus Museum and the creation of the Georgian Museum. The National Gallery and the Georgian Museum played a major role in studying and promoting Georgian culture, which, it can safely



be argued, significantly influenced the subsequent development of Georgian culture and art.

Also of great importance in terms of promoting culture and science is the work of the Historical and Ethnographic Society of Georgia founded in 1907 at the initiative of Ekvtime Takaishvili, who headed it from 1918 to 1921. The society operated various departments: historical and archaeological, ethnographic, anthropological, linguistic, and numismatic, and the work they carried out was absolutely tremendous: collecting old books and manuscripts, carrying out archaeological research, publishing scientific papers and books, organising exhibitions, including those of works by ancient Georgian architects, delivering lectures. At the initiative of the society's chairman, the art commission drew up a bill and the parliament passed the Law on the Prohibition of the Export of Art Monuments (Metreveli, 2018).

The years 1918–1921 were also important in terms of upholding the existing traditions of Georgian theatre and establishing new ones. According to popular belief, the old theatre was dead and there was an urgent need for new solutions. The expectations were high for Giorgi Jabadari's Studio founded in 1918 and for the studio members (Veriko Anjaparidze, Akaki Vasadze, Ushangi Chkheidze, Shalva Gambashidze, others). In 1920, the building of the Tbilisi Artistic Society was expropriated and transferred to the Georgian Drama Community (today's Rustaveli National Theatre and its building). Kutaisi also had an up-and-running theatre, headed by Mikheil Koreli and Aleksandre Imedashvili. Aleksandre Akhmeteli was also making his first steps on the stage.

Besides theatres, music centres and schools were also given greater scope for their activities. But before that, it was foreign-educated experts on different music genres and founders of Georgian professional music (Meliton Balanchivadze, Dimitri Arakishvili, Zakaria Paliashvili, Nikoloz Sulkhanishvili, Konstantine Potskhverashvili, Pilimon Koridze, others) who appeared on the scene as early as the end of the previous century, or, more precisely, at the interface between two centuries. Arakishvili's opera *The Tale of Shota Rustaveli* premiered in 1919. A few days later it was followed by the premiere of Paliashvili's *Abesalom and Eteri* and Victor Dolidze's *Keto and Kote*. The music school in Kutaisi, which was launched in 1919 and headed by Balanchivadze, oriented itself entirely towards shaping the future of music education for younger generations; the Tbilisi Conservatoire, founded as early as 1917, continued to work to its full capacity; the Union of Georgian Musicians-Singers, the Georgian Musical and Charitable Society and other

music-oriented centres were opened in 1920 to contribute to the development of national music and make it popular across Georgia by holding concerts and performances (Beridze, 2018).

It is also worth saying a few words about the new field of cinematography, which was still in its infancy then. The years 1918–1921 can be considered one of the stages of cinema development. As early as 1896, motion pictures produced with the Lumière brothers' device, the Cinématographe, were shown at the so-called Georgian Nobility Theatre. The first cinemas (Electron Projector, Odeon, Modern, Apollo...) were built in Tbilisi and Kutaisi. Georgian artists developed a keen interest in cinematography. At the initiative of Valerian Gunia, in 1909 the social comedy *Berikaoba* was recorded on tape, which, regrettably, has not survived to our times. Vasil Amashukeli shot Akaki Tsereteli's trip to Racha-Lechkhumi in 1912. Aleksandre Tsutsunava's screen adaptation of *Christine*, a novel by Egnate Ninoshvili, premiered in 1919. It laid the foundation for the Georgian feature film, but its further development failed in those years. On the other hand, a series of documentaries (*Socialist Delegation to Georgia*, *Transfer of Batumi to Georgia*, *26 May 1919*, *Parade of the People's Guard*, and others) were shot to depict the political and social life of the time (Kereselidze, 2011). It was only subsequent years that saw the development of the Georgian feature film. However, the documentaries shot during the period from 1918 to 1921 contributed to and, to a certain extent, ensured Georgian cinema's international recognition that came at a much later time.

Finally, we would add by way of conclusion that this panoramic view of cultural life in the years 1918–1921 cannot give a full picture of all of its aspects. However, it does contain clear indications of how diverse and fruitful it was. The greatest credit for this should go to the state, which pursued its cultural policy in an integrated and purposeful manner, without, in fact, interfering with the “content” of culture. Such an effective position of the state towards culture combined with the national approach to culture as enshrined in the country's first Constitution allows us to consider it as a kind of illustration of independent Georgia's cultural policy, and to partially correlate it with the modern concept model of Chartrand and McCaughey's Architect State. According to this model, the Architect State funds fine arts through a ministry or department of culture; the Architect State tends to support the arts as part of its social welfare objectives (Chartrand & McCaughey, 1989). For comparison purposes, it is interesting to look at another concept model, identified by Dragičević-Šešić and Stoykovich as the bureaucratic-educational model. According to this concept, culture,

like other areas of public life, is planned and managed in a centralised manner. These scholars maintain that, in addition to the Soviet Union and socialist countries, this model is common to social democracies as well. The latter, however, maintain the principle of creative freedom. It is this combination of centralised management and artistic freedom, characteristic of this model applied by social democracies, which allows us to view it as similar to the model of cultural administration in Georgia in 1918–1921, when the country adhered to social-democratic principles. The concept models outlined by the aforesaid scholars are obviously different from the historically existing ktitoric/protective model of Georgian cultural policy, as well as from the protective model established by the Democratic Republic of Georgia. There are, however, some common features between them (centralised patronage/support of culture by the state, non-intervention in the content of art; considering culture and art as one of the precursors to the social wellbeing of society; highlighting the priority importance of the educational function of culture and art). With due regard for the foregoing factors in total, we have tentatively designated the cultural policy model applied by the Democratic Republic of Georgia as the educational model of the Architect State.

On a final note, we would like to add that despite the difference between democratic Georgia's approach to culture and the above-mentioned models, we find it important to highlight the more or less similar attitude to the degree of state participation in the development of culture. And this, of course, is not accidental. In our view, when reflecting on the state's approach to culture in Georgia's first Constitution, the legislators took into account the historically existing ktitoric/protective policy in relation to culture, as well as the difficult internal and external situation and, most importantly, the importance of culture in general, especially in the process of building a new state.

## References

- Ashortia, T., & Elizbarashvili, T. (2014). *About the Constitution*. Ilia State University, School of Law.
- Beridze, V. (2018). Culture and art in independent Georgia. In G. Papashvili (Ed.), *Culture and artistic life in the First Republic of Georgia (1918–1921)* (pp. 23, 39, 45–56). George Chubinashvili National Research Centre for Georgian Art History and Heritage Preservation.

- Chanturidze, S., & Tsitsishvili, M. (2018). Art gallery. In *Democratic Republic of Georgia (1918–1921)* (p. 150). University Publishing House.
- Chartrand, H. H., & McCaughey, C. (1989). The arm's length principle and the arts: An international perspective – past, present and future. In M. C. Cummings Jr & J. M. Davidson Schuster (Eds.), *Who's to pay for the arts?: The international search for models of support* (pp. 52–55). American Council for the Arts.
- Chumburidze, D. (2018). Art Commission. In *Democratic Republic of Georgia (1918–1921)* (pp. 123, 390). University Publishing House.
- Constitution of Georgia: Adopted by the Constituent Assembly of Georgia on 21 February 1921.* (1921). Printing House N.Y. Khvingias.
- Decree on the establishment of the National Art Gallery of Georgia. (2004). In *Culture policy: European and national experience* (p. 291). Publishing-Polygraphic Center “Saar”.
- Demetrashvili, A. (2010). Overview of the constitutional history of Georgia. In *Constitution of Georgia and 2010 constitutional reform* (p. 8). Regional Center for Research and Promotion of Constitutionalism.
- Demetrashvili, A., & Kobakhidze, I. (2011). *Constitutional law*. Publishing House “Innovation”.
- Dragičević-Šešić, M., & Stoykovich, B. (2007). *Culture, management, animation, marketing*. Publishing House “Kentavri”.
- Gaul, W. (2002). *Development and adoption of the Constitution in Georgia (1993–1995)*. University Publishing House.
- Gonashvili, V., Iremadze, K., Tevdorashvili, G., Kakhiani, G., Kverenchkhiladze, G., & Tchighladze, N. (2017). *Constitutional law*. Publishing House “Meridian”.
- Javakhishvili, N. (2018). Commission for sending successful students abroad. In *Democratic Republic of Georgia (1918–1921)* (p. 516). University Publishing House.
- Kakabadze, D. (2004). How to organize art in our country. In *Culture policy: European and national experience* (p. 294). Publishing-Polygraphic Center “Saar”.
- Kantaria, B. (2018). Constitutional Commission. In *Democratic Republic of Georgia (1918–1921)* (pp. 347–348). University Publishing House.
- Kereselidze, M. (2011). *Georgian encyclopedic dictionary: Cinema*. Blinet Printing and Binding Company.
- Kharatishvili, N. (1999). *Society of Georgian artists: Scientific essays of Shalva Amiranashvili art museum* (Vol. 5). Art Museum Publishing House.
- Kipiani, N. (2018). Fine arts in the democratic Republic of Georgia. In *Democratic Republic of Georgia (1918–1921)* (pp. 396–397). University Publishing House.
- Kupatadze, B. (2018). Government of the Democratic Republic of Georgia. In *Democratic Republic of Georgia (1918–1921)* (p. 273). University Publishing House.
- Matsaberidze, M. (2019). *Political system of Georgia*. TSU Publishing House.



- Metreveli, R. (2018). Historical-Ethnographic Society. In *Democratic Republic of Georgia (1918–1921)* (p. 345). University Publishing House.
- Shvelidze, D. (2018). National council (parliament). In *Democratic Republic of Georgia (1918–1921)* (p. 149). University Publishing House.
- Vadachkoria, Sh. (2018). Declaration of independence. In *Democratic Republic of Georgia (1918–1921)* (p. 112). University Publishing House.

---



---

### საქართველოს დემოკრატიული რესპუბლიკის კულტურის პოლიტიკა (1918–1921)

კულტურა, კულტურული მემკვიდრეობა ერთგვარი ტექსტია ერის იდენტობის, გენეტიკური კოდის, სხვანაირად, ერის „ვინაობის“, მისი მსოფლგაგების „წასაკითხად“ და შესაცნობად, იმავდროულად კი – მომავლისაკენ სავალი გზების განსასაზღვრად. ამიტომ კულტურის უწყვეტობის შესანარჩუნებლად მის დაცვა-განვითარებაზე ზრუნვა ერისა და ქვეყნის არსებობისა და პროგრესის აუცილებელი პირობაა. ეს ის აქსიომაა, რასაც ეფუძნება სახელმწიფოთა პოლიტიკა კულტურის სფეროში. იგი მით უფრო აქტუალურია და აუცილებელი საქართველოსთვის, რომელმაც, უპირველესად, თავისი გამორჩეული მდებარეობისა და გეოპოლიტიკურ-კულტურული სტრატეგიული მნიშვნელობის გამო წარსულში ეზიარა რა აღმოსავლეთისა და დასავლეთის კულტურათა მიღწევებს, შეძლო, შეექმნა თვითმყოფადი, ეროვნული და ამავე დროს, უნიკალური, მრავალფეროვანი კულტურა და ამით თავისი ისტორიული კვალი მონიშნა მსოფლიო კულტურის რუკაზე. ამ პროცესში უმნიშვნელოვანესია საქართველოს დემოკრატიული რესპუბლიკის (1918–1921) არსებობის ხანმოკლე გარდამტეხი პერიოდი, როდესაც სახელმწიფომ აქტიურად დაიწყო კულტურის პოლიტიკის განსაზღვრა-განხორციელება და სფეროს მართვის ეროვნული სისტემის ჩამოყალიბება.

სტატიაში დასაბუთებულ იქნა, რომ ვიდრე მსოფლიოში და მისდა კვალად თანამედროვე საქართველოშიც დადგინდებოდა კულტურის პოლიტიკის შემუშავების აუცილებლობა, აღნიშნულ ქრონოლოგიურ მონაკვეთში არსებობდა პოლიტიკური სისტემის

შესატყვისი კულტურისადმი სახელმწიფოებრივი ხედვა, ანუ დღევანდელი ტერმინოლოგიით, კულტურის პოლიტიკა. ქვეყნის საკანონმდებლო ბაზის, კულტურის სფეროს ინსტიტუციური მართვის სისტემის, კულტურული ცხოვრების დინამიკის და მათი თავისებურებების გაანალიზებისა და საერთაშორისო კონცეფცია-მოდელების გათვალისწინებით სტატიის დასკვნით ნაწილში პირობითი სახელწოდებით განვსაზღვრეთ საქართველოს დემოკრატიული რესპუბლიკის კულტურის პოლიტიკის მოდელი. ის ნაწილობრივ მივამსგავსეთ ჰ.ჰ. ჩარტრენდისა და კ. მაკკოსის მიერ შემუშავებული არქიტექტორი სახელმწიფოს თანამედროვე კონცეფცია-მოდელს. ასევე საგულისხმო აღმოჩნდა კიდევ ერთი, მ. დრაგიჩევიჩ-შეშიჩისა და ბრ. სტოიკოვიჩის მიერ გამოყოფილი სახელმწიფო ბიუროკრატიულ-საგანმანათლებლო კონცეფცია-მოდელი. ამ მკვლევართა მიერ მოცემული საერთაშორისო კონცეფცია-მოდელები ცხადია, განსხვავდება როგორც ისტორიული საქართველოს კულტურის ქტიტორულ-მფარველობითი, ისე დემოკრატიულ საქართველოში არსებული მფარველობითი მოდელისაგან, თუმცა არსებობს მსგავსი ნიშნებიც: სახელმწიფოს მიერ კულტურის ცენტრალიზებული მფარველობა-მხარდაჭერა, ხელოვნების შინაარსში ჩაურევლობა; კულტურა-ხელოვნების მიჩნევა საზოგადოების სოციალური კეთილდღეობის ერთ-ერთ განმაპირობებლად; კულტურისა და ხელოვნების საგანმანათლებლო ფუნქციის პრიორიტეტულობის გამოკვეთა. სწორედ აღნიშნულის შეჯამებითა და გათვალისწინებით დემოკრატიულ საქართველოში კულტურის პოლიტიკის მოდელს პირობითად ვუწოდეთ არქიტექტორ სახელმწიფოს საგანმანათლებლო მოდელი.

საკვანძო სიტყვები: საქართველოს დემოკრატიული რესპუბლიკა, კულტურა, პოლიტიკა, კულტურის პოლიტიკის მოდელი.





---

---

## Polityka kulturalna Demokratycznej Republiki Gruzji (1918–1921)

Dziedzictwo kulturowe jest rodzajem tekstu pozwalającego czytać tożsamość i kod genetyczny narodu, dostarczając klucza do zrozumienia jego osobowości i mentalności, a jednocześnie wytycza ścieżkę jego rozwoju. Dlatego też ochrona i rozwój kultury w celu zapewnienia ciągłości kulturowej jest niezbędnym warunkiem wstępnym do zapewnienia istnienia i postępu każdego narodu i państwa – jest to aksjomat, na którym opiera się polityka kulturalna państw. Staje się to tym bardziej istotne w przypadku Gruzji, która ze względu na swoje wyjątkowe położenie oraz znaczenie geopolityczne, kulturowe i strategiczne już w odległej przeszłości przyjęła dorobek kulturowy cywilizacji wschodniej i zachodniej i zdołała stworzyć swoją unikalną i różnorodną kulturę narodową, tym samym mocno odznaczając się na mapie kultury światowej. Niezwykle ważny w tym kontekście jest krótki i przejściowy w swym wymiarze okres istnienia Demokratycznej Republiki Gruzji (1918–1921), podczas którego władze tego kraju aktywnie przystąpiły do definiowania i wdrażania państwowej polityki kulturalnej oraz ustanowienia krajowego systemu administracji w tej sferze. Artykuł dowodzi, że państwowa wizja kultury lub, w nowoczesnym ujęciu, polityka kulturalna odpowiadająca ówczesnemu systemowi politycznemu istniała we wspomnianych ramach czasowych na długo przed tym, jak świat, w tym współczesna Gruzja, dostrzegł potrzebę opracowania polityki kulturalnej. Biorąc pod uwagę ramy prawne, system administracji instytucjonalnej w dziedzinie kultury, dynamikę życia kulturalnego i jego specyfiki oraz uznane na arenie międzynarodowej koncepcje i modele, w ostatniej części artykułu wstępnie zdefiniowano model polityki kulturalnej Demokratycznej Republiki Gruzji. Porównano go do modelu państwa-architekta opracowanego przez H.H. Chartranda i C. McCaugheya. Interesujący okazał się również model koncepcji biurokratyczno-edukacyjnej zaproponowany przez M. Dragičević-Šešić i Br. Stoykovicha. Modele koncepcji międzynarodowych przedstawione przez wyżej wymienionych badaczy niewątpliwie różnią się od historycznie istniejącego modelu ochrony kultury gruzińskiej, a także od modelu ochronnego ustanowionego przez Demokratyczną Republikę Gruzji. Istnieją jednak pewne cechy wspólne między nimi: scentralizowany mecenat i wsparcie kultury przez państwo, nieingerencja w treść sztuki, uznanie kultury i sztuki za jedną z podstaw dobrobytu społecznego, podkreślenie



priorytetowego znaczenia edukacyjnej funkcji kultury i sztuki. Mając na uwadze powyższe kwestie, wstępnie określono model polityki kulturalnej stosowany przez Demokratyczną Republikę Gruzji jako Model Edukacyjny Państwa-Architekta.

**Słowa kluczowe:** Demokratyczna Republika Gruzji, kultura, polityka, model polityki kulturalnej.

## Note

Vazha Shatberashvili, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia.  
vshatberashvili@yahoo.com

The preparation of this article was self-funded by the author.

No competing interests have been declared.

## Publication History

Received: 2023-03-15, Accepted: 2023-04-12, Published: 2023-12-23

