

The Italian Theory of a Nation and Its Influence on Georgia in 1910s

Nino Maisuradze*

***PhD student and a guest lecturer at Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences; an assistant researcher at the Institute of Political Science, Ilia State University.**

Funding

This research [№ PHDF-22-3237] has been supported by Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation of Georgia (SRNSFG).

Introduction

The political stage of modern Georgian nation-building began in 1892–1893 with the establishment of the third generation, i.e., the first Marxist unit, in Georgia. Starting in 1892, disagreements arose between proponents of the Georgian national viewpoint and Georgian Marxists due to the national question. Given that Georgia lacked independence, the restoration of autonomy and the pursuit of freedom became the primary aspirations of a segment of the political and cultural elite. To achieve this goal, this part of the political elite established a theoretical basis for the public by interpreting and analyzing European theories on nations. The periodical press played a pivotal role in Georgia as the primary medium for disseminating ideologies and theories. It was through these publications that Georgian nationalists and Marxists engaged in vibrant discussions regarding the national question, with the latter emphasizing the importance of addressing social injustices within Georgian society, despite the fact that Georgian society had been conquered. The nation in its modern form was formed within the context of Tsarist Russia. Georgian Marxists, often adopting a nihilistic stance towards the national question, considered it of secondary significance. The central research question is: what impact did the Italian theory of the nation have on the establishment of an idea of the nation in Georgia in 1910?

The main aim of this study is to illustrate the impact and importance of European theories of the nation, in particular Italian theory, in the political development of the modern Georgian nation from 1893 to 1917. To achieve this goal, several tasks should be accomplished: 1) to examine and analyze Mikhako Tsereteli's conception of the nation, which is influenced by the Italian theory of the nation; 2) to analyze the influential theory of the nation developed by the Italian scholar Pasquale Stanislao Mancini himself; 3) to determine the influence of the Italian theory of the nation in Georgia in 1910; The research methodology employed involves the analysis and interpretation of secondary documents. Furthermore, in the final part of the study, a comparative approach will be adopted to examine the theories of nation proposed by Georgian and Italian authors.

The theoretical approach

From 1860, press discussions in Georgia became the primary source of translation of European theories of the nation. The Georgian political and cultural elite frequently translated well-known nation theories such as Ernest Renan's¹ 'What is a Nation?' In this regard, the periodical press has played an important role in promoting European notions of the nation in Georgia. Based on this proposition, we can conclude that Benedict Anderson's² theory regarding

the importance of printed capital in nation-building appropriately explains the high level of popularity of European nation theories in Georgia. Benedict Anderson's theory posits that a nation is essentially an imagined community that emerges within a specific historical context. According to Anderson, this historical moment is characterized as the era of 'printed capitalism'. During this period, the availability of books, journals, and newspapers written in the local language plays a crucial role in shaping and fostering a sense of national identity. Anderson views this epoch represents a new stage of history (Anderson, 2006). During the rise of Marxism in Georgia, there was a concurrent exploration of various national theories aimed at formulating a national theory that would oppose the Georgian Marxist's nihilistic national attitude. Representatives of the Georgian cultural and political elite analyzed and then cited European theories of the nation in parallel with the discussion they conducted among themselves in the press. The case of the Georgian nation since 1892 is well explained by Benedict Anderson's theory, but even before 1892, periodicals were actively working in Georgia. It was only from 1892-1893 that these discussions took a more political turn, and the debate around the nation and the national question intensified.

According to Benedict Anderson's thesis, language plays a crucial role in the process of nation-building. The cultural phase of nation formation reaches its completion when the local language is actively used for creating publications such as periodicals and books. This study centers around Mikhako Tsereteli, a representative of the Georgian cultural and political elite, who highlights language as the primary factor in defining a nation. Tsereteli criticizes European theories of the nation, particularly because they do not adequately acknowledge the importance of language in establishing the concept of nation. For instance, Tsereteli strongly disagrees with Ernest Renan's perspective on 'What is a nation?'. It is worth noting that Renan gained popularity in Georgia after his lecture in 1882, which was translated and published in the Georgian press the same year. Mikhako Tsereteli has expressed criticism towards Renan's theory due to its failure to consider the primary role of language as a defining characteristic in the formation of a nation (Renan 1882). In contrast, Tsereteli presents a contrasting viewpoint to Renan, asserting that the recollection of historical experiences, which Renan identified as a significant factor in nation-building, must occur within a specific language. Tsereteli argues that without the support of language, this marker cannot fulfill its intended purpose. Therefore, Tsereteli deems all theories of a nation that overlook the crucial importance of language in the process of nation-building as unacceptable (Tsereteli, 1990).

If we're talking about the formation of the Georgian modern nation, I suppose I should mention Ronald Grigor Suny's work, 'The Making of the Georgian Nation.' As the author puts it,

an explanation of Georgian political movements in the last third of the nineteenth century does not neatly fit the rather clichéd pattern sometimes proposed for the development of nationalism. The specifically Georgian nationalist movement was not at the forefront of the liberation movement by the nineteenth century's end. The relative strength of socialist, rather than nationalist or liberal, answers to Georgia's problems was the historical product of the particular social context and intellectual environment in which all three of these movements arose (Suny, 1988). I'd like to add this: with the formation of the first group of Georgian Marxists in 1892-1893, their popularity grew considerably in Georgia. Later, the 'Third generation,' as this group was called, evolved into the Georgian Social Democrats, Georgia's most prominent and popular party. In the context of these political factors, the work of the part of the Georgian cultural and political elite that tried to advance the national question was particularly interesting when the only problem recognized as a priority by the Georgian social democrats was the solution to the problem of class inequality.

Mikhako Tsereteli and his ideas on the concept of the nation

When discussing the shift of the Georgian nation towards its contemporary political phase, I am specifically referring to the period spanning from 1893 to 1917³. It was during this time that the national question evolved into a political matter, involving the active engagement of various political groups and parties. Mikhako Tsereteli, who was an anarchist and was also a key figure in this debate, always gave priority to resolving the national question. While the national question remained a prominent topic between 1893 and 1917, exploration of the concept of nation itself was rarely undertaken. Instead, the practical concerns surrounding Georgia's autonomy, encompassing both its national-cultural and territorial aspects, were more essential than the establishment of scientific knowledge at the level of conceptions. Mikhako Tsereteli stood out as a unique figure when it came to formulating his understanding of the nation. He is the author of Georgia's first sociological study, 'Nation and Mankind' (1910), in which he focuses on European thinkers' theories of the nation, analyzes and criticizes them, and shows which concepts of the nation were popular in Georgia at the time and which might never be acceptable for Georgian reality.

Paying particular attention to Mikhako Tsereteli in the research is also justified by the fact that his national theory has had a great influence on his contemporary thinkers, a notable example is Simon Khundadze⁴, who focuses solely on Mikhako Tsereteli's theory of the national problem among Georgian intellectuals in his article 'Around the national problem' when discussing the

concept of equality between nations within the framework of international law. In addition, Khundadze discusses theories put forward by foreign authors, but from Georgia he is only interested in Mikhako Tsereteli (Khundadze, 1926). Mikhako Tsereteli's work 'The Nation and Mankind' (1910) has received positive feedback, including a favorable assessment by Archil Jorjadze⁵ in the article titled 'Good Book'. Jorjadze shares Mikhako Tsereteli's viewpoint in the section where Tsereteli argues that class conflict cannot fragment the nation into separate entities. In his book, Tsereteli presents his original interpretation of the nation's definition. According to him, the nation represents a genuine social organism, distinct from mankind, which he considers not to be a social reality. Tsereteli highlights two essential elements that characterize the nation: language and political institutions, namely statehood. The author concludes that the nation is an organism in its own right, while mankind is not (Tsereteli, 1990).

Mikhako Tsereteli's book received significant attention in Georgia, with one notable response coming from Akaki Chkhenkeli⁶, who offered his critique in 1912 through his own publication titled 'The Nation or Mankind'. Chkhenkeli's criticism centered on Tsereteli's dogmatism, characterized by a tendency toward absolute reasoning rather than relative thinking. Chkhenkeli argued that the concepts of nation and mankind are not mutually exclusive but can coexist harmoniously. He emphasized the necessity of intercommunication among nations, as they ultimately unite into a single cohesive entity. While a nation has a physical existence, mankind exists on an ideological level. Chkhenkeli demonstrated the social construct of humanity by citing the example of Europe. The author emphasizes, that the level of solidarity among European nations is remarkable. While it may not fully represent the ideal vision of humanity proposed by social democrats, the tendency demonstrated by European nations clearly points to a growing tendency for nations to create stronger bonds and come together (Chkhenkeli, 2000).

Mikhako Tsereteli examines the relationship between the state and the nation alongside the concept of mankind. His anarchist beliefs become apparent when he suggests that society can potentially exist without the state. Regarding the notion of a nation, Tsereteli suggests that while it is possible for a state to create a nation, this occurrence is rare. Instead, he argues that the nation gives rise to the state. Tsereteli defines a nation as a tangible community that can either generate its own components or conquer other nations in order to establish a state. According to him, the state is a social entity formed by the nation. Mikhako Tsereteli considers the nation a social monad⁷. Mikhako Tsereteli suggests that the formation of a nation occurs when various social entities imitate one another across different domains, leading to the emergence of shared structures and functions. Eventually, this process gives rise to a political function, signifying the beginning

of a nation. Ultimately, the presence of a state in the future serves as the culmination of this nation-building process (Tsereteli, 1990).

Mikhako Tsereteli's characterization of the nation as a monad, or an original substance, could be interpreted by some as aligning with the primordialism theory of nationalism. This perspective posits that nations and nationalism have deep historical roots, dating back to the earliest stages of human civilization. Primordialism suggests that nationality is an inherent and intrinsic aspect of human existence (Davitashvili, 2003). However, Mikhako Tsereteli's stance on this matter is somewhat vague, as he views the search for the precise origins of a nation as irrelevant. It should be acknowledged that he thinks that society has existed since the earliest times, but it remains uncertain whether Mikhako Tsereteli considers the nation to be a distinct type of society within this context. Notably, Mikhako Tsereteli emphasizes that the nation is not an innate and everlasting social entity that has existed in its current form throughout history. Instead, it had a beginning, evolved up to the present day, and, according to the author, will transform in the future as well.

In his theory, Mikhako Tsereteli delves into the concept of homeland and explores its relationship with the nation. It is noteworthy that even in the absence of a homeland, a nation can still exist, as Tsereteli suggests. This particularly applies to nations who have experienced the loss of their territorial base. However, Tsereteli emphasizes a crucial point: a nation lacking a homeland cannot attain an autonomous social existence that is recognized by international law. International law primarily governs relations between sovereign states rather than regulating interactions between nations. According to Tsereteli, international law solely acknowledges the rights of states and not the national rights that can potentially be violated by the state itself. Consequently, a nation lacking a sovereign state as a full-fledged member is not formally recognized by international law. Thus, the preservation of territory remains the fundamental means of safeguarding one's nationality.

Mikhako Tsereteli presents his interpretation of the nation, where he defines it as a social super-organism consisting of various ethnic and social groups. These groups come together to form a cohesive entity that shares a common way of life. This unified society possesses distinct components such as language, politics, law, art, and other characteristic organs. The Italian school also presents similar perspectives on the concept of the nation. In their definition, it appears that all aspects have been encompassed, leaving little to be added. However, it is noteworthy that the definition of the nation itself does not explicitly highlight specific details. For instance, when Mikhako Tsereteli defines the concept of nation, he does not specifically emphasize the key signs or combination of characteristics that play a crucial role in the process of nation-building, or the

main symbol of the nation's existence and creativity. In order to move away from organicism, Mikhako Tsereteli initially stated that comparing nations to organisms was merely a method of explanation. However, he later reached the conclusion that society itself is an organism, going beyond a mere analogy. Therefore, Mikhako Tsereteli holds a belief in organicism.

Mikhako Tsereteli posits a theory highlighting the variations in social forms among nations. While these forms are shared across nations, each possesses its distinct characteristics. Tsereteli supports this notion by employing an illustrative example: the presence of a linguistic marker distinguishes each nation. Although different languages are spoken by various nations, the universal linguistic marker serves as the social form. Consequently, the existence of diverse languages within different nations signifies disparities in the content of their social forms.

Mikhako Tsereteli presents a noteworthy perspective on nationalism. He sees nationalism as a system of aspiration that applies to the nation as a whole, regardless of class affiliation. Nationalism defends the nation's interests against invasion by other national entities, it attempts to improve the nation's internal social life. According to Mikhako Tsereteli, everyone is a nationalist, including socialists, bourgeois, anarchists, and people with other worldviews, because it's impossible for someone to consciously act against the interests of their nation, and if this happens, it's because that person is acting unconsciously or is a traitor. Mikhako Tsereteli characterizes nationalism as the aspiration of a nation to safeguard its unique identity and individuality and to protect its distinct social structure from destruction, regardless of the differing opinions held by its members regarding potential changes in that structure (Tsereteli, 1909).

Mikhako Tsereteli's perspective on nationalism held great significance during the early 20th century in Georgia, because the Marxist ideology that was so popular in Georgia linked the understanding of the content of nationalism to chauvinism, and presented the meaning of nationalism only with this concept. This was a negative understanding of nationalism, the antithesis of what Mikhako Tsereteli articulated. Mikhako Tsereteli speaks of internationalism in addition to nationalism. Mikhako Tsereteli sees nationalism and internationalism as a set of concepts about nations and their relations in general. According to Mikhako Tsereteli, nationalism is not antagonistic to internationalism, for there would be no internationalism without nationalism, the former being a fundamental element of the latter. This perspective was groundbreaking at the time, as in the Georgian context, nationalism was commonly seen as the complete opposite of internationalism. Within this society, while internationalism received support, this segment of society used the terminology of nationalism as an insult in periodic press debates with the opposing side (Darchashvili, 2020).

Mikhako Tsereteli's book titled 'The Nation and Mankind' and the theory of the nation advocated within it have garnered significant acclaim in Georgia. This is evident from the discussions held among prominent Georgian cultural and political figures, who either wholeheartedly embraced or firmly criticized Tsereteli's theory of the nation, showcasing the diverse reactions it brought on. Mikhako Tsereteli's theory maintained its popularity beyond his contemporaries. One such critic of Mikhako Tsereteli's perspective on mankind's phenomena was Vakhtang Erkomaishvili⁸. In contrast to Mikhako Tsereteli, Erkomaishvili argues that mankind does exist, but not in isolation or independently of nations. Instead, he views mankind as a synthesis of nations, emphasizing diversity rather than unity. According to Erkomaishvili, each nation possesses its uniqueness and contributes to the collective human culture, regardless of the extent of its contributions. Even the smallest nation, by simply existing, is an essential part of human culture due to its individuality. Erkomaishvili acknowledges that Mikhako Tsereteli correctly identified and illustrated the distinction between nation and mankind, but he disagrees with Tsereteli's conclusion that mankind is a social illusion (Erkomaishvili 2000).

The Italian theory of nation and its influence in Georgia before 1910

In 1908, Vladimir Darchiashvili, a prominent Georgian Social Democrat, explored the various foreign theories of the nation in Georgia in his series of articles titled 'Nationalism and Internationalism'. Among these theories, he discussed the Italian school's perspective on the nation, and in Italian school, he meant primarily referring to Italian sociologists. According to their viewpoint, it was inaccurate to attribute the essence of a nation to any single marker such as language, territory, or other individual components. Instead, the Italian school argued that the nation should be understood as a combination of multiple elements. According to Italian theory, these elements included a shared territory, a common language, a shared ancestry, shared moral values, a common historical past, a unified legal system, and a common religion. These factors collectively represented the essence of a nation. Vladimir Darchiashvili did not specifically mention any particular Italian author, but he criticized the general concept. In his critique, Darchiashvili highlighted the influence of this theory on Noe Zhordania⁹, the leader of the Menshevik faction of the Social Democrats, who also embraced this perspective. According to Zhordania, a nation could be defined as a group of people who speak the same language, inhabit the same territory, and share common moral values and culture. Darchiashvili argued that this popular hypothesis, originating from Italian sociologists in Georgia, fails to explain why a recognized nation continues to exist and even thrives when one or two elements that are

traditionally associated with it are lost. Therefore, in Vladimir Darchiashvili's view, this theory only offers an external portrayal of the nation, lacking the ability to delve into its underlying meaning or essence (Darchiashvili, 2015).

The Italian theory of nation and its influence in Georgia in the 1910s

Mikhako Tsereteli sets himself apart from other prominent figures of the early 20th-century Georgian cultural and political landscape through his unwavering commitment to prioritizing the interests of the nation, regardless of his political beliefs. He demonstrated a keen interest in theories concerning the significance of the nation for society as a whole. While individual anarchist concepts had been present in Georgia since the 1860s, Tsereteli distinguished himself within this movement by displaying a propensity for exploring and evolving his own perspectives. Notably, he was periodically captivated by Marx's ideas, further adding complexity to his intellectual journey. Upon Mikhako Tsereteli's return from emigration in 1907, he held a prominent position within the national framework in Georgia. However, there is ongoing scholarly debate regarding the extent to which he managed to reconcile anarchism with his nationalistic pursuits. His primary goal upon returning to his homeland was to promote the ideology of anarchism within the national context, as he firmly believed that the national foundation played a decisive role in any movement. To achieve this goal, Mikhako Tsereteli delved into popular European theories of the nation, aiming to disseminate and introduce the concept of the nation to the public. In his work 'Nation and Mankind,' he dedicated an entire chapter to the analysis of European theories of the nation, with particular emphasis on the contributions of Pasquale Stanislao Mancini,¹⁰ to whom Tsereteli allocates substantial space in his examination of European concepts of the nation.

Mancini's social framework revolves around two key elements: the family and the nation, which he considers as manifestations of the natural societal bonds among people. Mancini notably highlights national consciousness and sentiment as the primary defining factors of a nation, surpassing other physical and visible attributes. According to Mancini's definition, a nation is 'a natural community of people, united by territory, blood, common moral values, and language, and characterized by a public awareness'. While this definition may appear comprehensive at first glance, Mikhako Tsereteli identifies certain errors within it. Tsereteli highlights Mancini's initial mistake of considering only the family and the nation as forms of society. Tsereteli argues that it is incorrect to view the family as the primary form of society since the family represents a simpler communal structure and is merely one component of society. According to Tsereteli, if the family is the sole representation of a social organism, then society remains primitive and animalistic.

Mikhako Tsereteli identifies a second mistake in Mancini's theory, which is the absence of a clear definition of society itself as a social entity or as a unified whole. Without such a definition, it becomes challenging to evaluate specific societies. Tsereteli argues that sociological analysis should take precedence over the theory of the nation. However, despite these critiques, Tsereteli acknowledges Mancini's significant contribution in asserting that the nation is the exclusive subject of international law. Tsereteli considers Mancini's analysis of the nation to be the most noteworthy attempt of its time in formulating the concept of the nation (Tsereteli, 1990).

This information holds significance as Mikhako Tsereteli examines and offers a critical assessment of various European theories concerning the concept of nation. Being a Georgian thinker, Tsereteli primarily focuses on the interests of the Georgian nation, taking into consideration the specific historical context and the foreign policy challenges faced by Georgia in the early 20th century as a conquered and deprived nation. Among the extensive array of European theories on the nation, Tsereteli highlights the noteworthy contributions made by Pasquale Stanislao Mancini's theory and Rudolf Springer's¹¹ theory, both of which he has extensively studied and considers highly significant. It can be inferred that Mancini's concept gained popularity in Georgia, possibly due to the influence of Mikhako Tsereteli and his book published in 1910. In my analysis, I have thoroughly examined and assessed Mancini's theory of the nation which helped me to discover the reason behind Mikhako Tsereteli's emphasis on it compared to other European theories of the nation that he presented.

Mikhako Tsereteli's critique of Mancini comes as no surprise, considering his general tendency to be critical of various European theories on the nation that he investigates. For Tsereteli, a nation is like a monad, a fundamental entity. Therefore, Mancini's acknowledgment of the nation as one of the community types after the family would not be acceptable to Tsereteli. If Mancini had emphasized the nation as the primary and most crucial form of society, Tsereteli would have agreed with him. Despite this, Mikhako Tsereteli considers Mancini's main achievement to be the designation of the nation as the sole subject of international law. According to Mikhako Tsereteli, Pasquale Stanislao Mancini's analysis of the nation was the best attempt of its time to create the idea of the nation. Given these considerations, Mikhako Tsereteli refers to Pasquale Stanislao Mancini as the pioneering scientist-theorist of nations, reflecting his positive attitude and admiration for Mancini's understanding of the concept of a nation.

Pasquale Stanislao Mancini's theory of the nation

Pasquale Stanislao Mancini's viewpoints are primarily available through his public speeches and manuscripts, as he did not systematically organize his thoughts or produce significant works. One of his notable contributions is the development of the renowned lecture titled 'Nationality as the basis of international law,' which he began working on since 1851. The public speech on this topic, delivered to an academic audience under the same title, gained considerable popularity. Importantly, the content of the speech targeted a broader audience beyond the confines of Turin. However, it received substantial criticism, particularly in countries characterized by multi-ethnic populations.

According to Mancini's definition, a nation refers to a collective of individuals who possess common attributes, termed by Mancini as 'constitutive elements of nationality.' These elements include language, territory, race, history, laws, and religion. However, it is important to note that these attributes alone are insufficient to define a nation. Another crucial aspect is the presence of a shared psychological and subjective nature. The notion of national consciousness, which recognizes the independent existence of the nation, holds even greater significance. Mancini asserts that the concept of a nation is rooted in various tangible factors that give the appearance of objective characteristics. These factors, despite variations in time and geography, are shared by numerous nations throughout history. Pasquale Stanislao Mancini defines nationality as the natural association of individuals who share a common territory, language, and national consciousness (Bartolini, 2020).

Pasquale Stanislao Mancini argues that the mere presence of a nationality implies the independence and self-governance of a particular group, even without a formal agreement. A society that shares common territory, language, and other tangible attributes, while also possessing a collective awareness of its national identity, holds the rightful claim to exist as a separate entity. A state should be constituted by a singular nation, and all nations ought to be granted freedom and equality. Mancini strongly opposes foreign intervention in the internal affairs of nations, as he considers the infringement upon another nation's independence a serious transgression since freedom serves as the fundamental basis of nationality. Pasquale Stanislao Mancini did not hesitate to adopt more extreme views, stressing that the subjects of international law should be nations, not states. His main idea is that the state is an artificial and accidental subject, but that the nation is the natural and essential object of the international legal order. This idea was followed by severe criticism. It was repeatedly accused of ignoring the process of nation formation because a nation must become a state to have legal value and legal rights. A nation can only be legally significant

if it is organized as a sovereign state. The nation lacks a legal foundation and instead emerges as a result of distinct historical processes (Bartolini, 2020).

A fundamental flaw in Pasquale Stanislao Mancini's theory is its incompleteness, meaning that it asserts that the nation should be the object of international law, but neither describes nor explains how this process affects it in practice. It simply contradicts the fundamental assumption by suggesting that the object of international law should be shifted to the nation rather than the state. Despite this, many authors debated the concept of the nation before and after Mancini, but it was he who ensured that the monopoly of the nation no longer belonged to historians, intellectuals, and philosophers. He made the nation the object of legal and juridical analysis. During his lecture in 1851, Pasquale Stanislao Mancini placed the nation as the central focus of international law. His objective was to establish and safeguard a collection of national values that aligned with universal morality and law. By doing so, he sought to grant the nation crucial rights that could not be denied by either the state or treaties. Mancini believed that this approach could play a significant role in replacing conflicts and suppression with arbitration throughout Europe.

Mancini introduced a paradigm of private international law centered solely around the principle of the nation. Due to his prominence, this conceptualization of the nation had a profound impact not only within Italy but also beyond its borders. As a result of Mancini's influence, the concept of nationality was incorporated into the Italian Civil Code of 1865. This meant that an individual's legal status and rights were determined by the laws of the nation to which they belonged. The Italian Civil Code, influenced by Mancini, remained in effect until 1945 (Bartolini, 2020).

A comparison of Georgian and Italian theories of the nation

When analyzing Mikhako Tsereteli's nation theories, it becomes obvious that he analyzes authors who influenced each other. Pasquale Stanislao Mancini and Johann Kaspar Bluntschli¹² are two of the best examples of this. When studying Bluntschli, we frequently come across instances where he references Mancini. Getting to know one of the authors most likely led the Georgian anarchist to the second thinker's conception of the nation. Mikhako Tsereteli gives both thinkers a prominent place during the discussion of European ideas of nation, but Pasquale Stanislao Mancini had a specific influence on him.

When we draw a comparison between the theories of nation proposed by these two scholars, it becomes evident that Mikhako Tsereteli views the nation as the fundamental societal essence. Conversely, Pasquale Stanislao Mancini posits that the family, alongside the nation, constitutes the societal essence, thereby I am suggesting that the Italian scholar does not

exclusively regard the nation as the primary and singular social construct. Apart from that, Mikhako Tsereteli attempts to clarify the meaning of the nation with other notions, and it is for this purpose that he begins discussing mankind, the state, or society in general. We do not find discussion regarding the essence of society in general as a social fact in the case of Pasquale Stanislao Mancini. Mikhako Tsereteli's sociological analysis that precedes the discussion of the concept of nation is typical for him so that Georgian society can fully understand the meaning of nation and compare it to other social forms.

In addition to these evident differences, Mikhako Tsereteli credits Pasquale Stanislao Mancini as the pioneer among theoreticians in shaping the notion of a nation. Predominantly, both scholars emphasize the vital role of language in the formation of nations. Mancini's proposition holds considerable significance for Mikhako Tsereteli, given that the Italian scholar underscores the unity of language as a cornerstone of nationhood. Nonetheless, the primary area of concurrence within the theories of these two thinkers concerning the concept of the nation is their shared belief that the central core point of international law should be the nation, which could face oppression from the state, an entity that is the subject of international law.

Pasquale Stanislao Mancini's view that the state is an artificial and incidental topic, whereas the nation is a natural and essential object of an international legal order, would, in my judgment, be particularly agreeable for Mikhako Tsereteli. Mikhako Tsereteli expands on this theory by stating that most of the time, the nation generates the state rather than the other way around. He precisely repeats Mancini's view that the state is an artificial social organism formed by the nation, rather than a natural social organism.

Both authors' theories of the nation, in my opinion, are characterized by absolute reasoning, which means that they both require the nation to become an object of international law, but they do not specify how this process affects them in practice. Specifically, they do not address whether the subject of international law should solely be the nation instead of the state, or if both the nation and the state should coexist as active subjects within international law.

Taking everything into account, I believe Mancini's theory had a positive influence on Mikhako Tsereteli; Mikhako Tsereteli did not construct his national theory along with Mancini's criticism, but rather considered it.

Conclusion

As Marxism gained influence in Georgia, the question of resolving the national dilemma remained a major preoccupation in the country between 1893 and 1917. This period saw the birth of ideas concerning the very essence of the nation, and the evolution of theories on the nation was also integral to the resolution of the national question. Part of Georgia's cultural and political elite attempted to analyze the concept of nation to persuade society of the importance of the national problem, which could not be neglected while resolving the question of class inequality, particularly when Georgia was part of Tsarist Russia. Mikhako Tsereteli, a notable Georgian anarchist who, despite his ideological views, acknowledged the necessity of resolving the national issue at all phases of his activity, was among those who maintained the national viewpoint. His influence on his peers, the cultural and political elite, and society was significant.

Mikhako Tsereteli, like other representatives of Georgia's cultural and political elite, paid special attention to the analysis of European theories of the nation because these European theories represented a kind of strong argument in debates with Georgian Marxists about the national issue, with which he justified his view on the priority of the national issue. Even before 1910, the impact of the Italian school on the analysis of the national question in Georgia was mentioned in the Georgian press, but this argument was a bit vague because they didn't point out any specific Italian scholar.

In his work 'Nation and Mankind' (1910), Mikhako Tsereteli carefully studied European ideas on the nation, most of which he criticized, as he tried to construct the theory of the nation taking into account the political-environmental elements that had formed in Georgia. Among the ideas on the nation, he focused on Pasquale Stanislao Mancini's theory of the nation, and, above all, instead of criticizing it, Mikhako Tsereteli evaluated it positively and shared it. In particular, he agreed with Pasquale Stanislao Mancini that nations should be the actual objects of international law. This marked the initial sociological study in Georgia, and notable Georgian politicians like Archil Jorjadze and Akaki Chkhenkeli evaluated this work after it was published. This suggests that the Italian theory about the nation, specifically Pasquale Stanislao Mancini's ideas, had become known among Georgia's influential cultural and political figures.

Notes

¹ Ernest Renan (1823–1892) was a French scholar, French philosopher, historian, and scholar of religion.

² Benedict Anderson (1936–2015) was an Irish political scientist best known for his influential work on the origins of nationalism.

³ The Democratic Republic of Georgia declared its independence in 1918. This is why the research period covers the years 1893-1917, as this period laid the foundations for the events of 1918.

⁴ Simon Khundadze (1897-1933) was a Georgian sociologist, historian, literary critic, and journalist.

⁵ Archil Jorjadze (1872-1913) was a well-known Georgian politician and leader of the Socialist-Federalist Party of Georgia.

⁶ Akaki Chkhenkeli (1874-1959) was a Georgian politician and diplomat who was one of the leaders of the Social Democratic Party in Georgia.

⁷ Mikhako Tsereteli builds his argument upon Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz's notion of the monad, which asserts that the monad serves as the foundation of reality. In this context, a monad refers to a fundamental substance existing within a compound entity. Tsereteli highlights the significance of the monad's presence within complex compounds, emphasizing that the absence of a monad prevents the formation of complex substances, including the state. In a similar vein, Mikhako Tsereteli argues that the absence of a nation inhibits the emergence of complex entities such as the state.

⁸ Vakhtang Erkomaishvili (1932-2001) was a Georgian philosopher who worked as a scientist at the Institute of Philosophy of the Georgian Academy of Sciences.

⁹ Noe Zhordania (1868–1953) was a Georgian political leader and the head of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Georgia. He had a background as a Menshevik and was one of the leaders of the Georgian and Russian Social-Democratic movements.

¹⁰ Pasquale Stanislao Mancini (1817–1888) was an Italian statesman, leader of the Risorgimento in the Kingdom of the Two Sicilies who played a prominent role in the government of united Italy.

¹¹ Karl Renner (1870-1950) was a social-democratic statesman, Chancellor (1918-20, 1945), and President (1945-50) of Austria, who, after the First World War, advocated the Anschluss (union) between Germany and Austria. In the early years of his political career, he was known by many pseudonyms, including **Rudolf Springer**.

¹² Johann Kaspar Bluntschli (1808–1881) was a Swiss scholar, writer on international law, jurist, and politician.

Funding

This research [№ PHDF-22-3237] has been supported by Shota Rustaveli National Science Foundation of Georgia (SRNSFG).

References

- Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London · New York: 'Verso'.
- Bartolini, G. (2020). *A History of International Law in Italy (The History and Theory of International Law)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chkhenkeli, A. (2000). *The Nation or Mankind*. Tbilisi: 'Meridiani'.
- Darchashvili, M. (2020). Publications of Mikhako Tsereteli on the National Issue before his Fundamental Paper 'Nation and Humanity'. *Politics*. Retrieved July 19, 2023, from <http://psage.tsu.ge/index.php/Politics/article/view/182>
- Darchiashvili, V. (2015). Nationalism and internationalism. In T. F. Society, *Chrestomathy of Georgian Leftism* (pp. 76-129). Tbilisi: Tbilisi Fabian Society; You for democracy.
- Davitashvili, Z. (2003). *Nationalism and Globalization*. Tbilisi: 'Mecniereba'.
- Erkomaishvili, V. (2000). *The Nation and the Ideology*. Tbilisi: 'Publishing House of Tbilisi State University'
- Khundadze, S. (1926, July). around the national problem. *Mnatobi* (№7), pp. 211-236.
- Renan, E. (1882, March 11). What is a nation? Paris, France.
- Suny, R. G. (1988). *The Making of the Georgian Nation*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Tsereteli, M. (1909). The four concepts; Nationalism. *Droeba* (№167).
- Tsereteli, M. (1990). *Nation and Mankind*. Tbilisi: Publishing House of the University of Tbilisi.