

Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University
Department of Social and Political Sciences

N A R G I Z A K A N K I A

Feature Cinematography in TV Program Structure and Main Aspects of its Functioning
(Based on programs of “Public Broadcaster” Channel I and “Rustavi - 2” in 1996 - 2010)

Abstract of Dissertation

Submitted for the academic degree of Doctor of Journalism

Scientific adviser:

Associate – Professor Giorgi Chartolani



Tbilisi 2011

Structure of the Abstract of Dissertation:

Introduction.....	3.
Chapter I. Feature film as means of influence on mass consciousness.....	6
Chapter II. Characterization of “Public Broadcaster” Channel I and “Rustavi-2”.....	9
Chapter III. Feature film on TV (forms of use and functions)	
1. Show of films	11
2. Film headings: a) series, cycles; b) serials.....	12
3. Functions of film fragments in TV programs.....	24
4. Role of the TV presenter in cinema programs.....	27
Chapter IV. TV audience.....	30
Conclusion.....	33
References.....	36

Feature Cinematography in TV Program Structure and Main Aspects of its Functioning (Based on “Public Broadcaster” Channel I and “Rustavi-2” programs in 1996-2010)

Introduction

Actuality of the Topic. Georgian TV (the only state TV broadcasting existed then) in the initial years of its functioning was mostly engaged in displaying the works of different branches of art, especially, was a means of presenting films. From this viewpoint Georgia was not an exception – here, as well as in other soviet republics, TV became powerful means of mass information and propaganda only times after and the cinema art efficiently assisted it in this. Interest in this branch of art has not weakened since then. Films occupy an important place in TV programs today as well (our period of observation involves 1996-2010). In addition to film demonstrating, it is used in different kinds and forms to perform numerous functions in information, cultural-educational, entertainment, and other programs. As cinematography is a branch of art, it performs the functions demanded from it proceeding from this. However, in our opinion, the film functions in TV programs keep growing, because the functions of journalism are added to it. And if cinematography, independent of TV, is considered to be means of influencing the mass consciousness, in TV, in parallel of performing other functions, it is directed at forming the public opinion. The functions of cinematography in TV seem to us also actual because, when psychologists, sociologists, TV analysts talk about the issue of TV influence on public (namely, violence, aggression, etc), they often mean the films (or film fragments) shown on TV. That’s why we consider it interesting to clarify the place films occupy in Georgian TV (“Public Broadcaster” Channel I and “Rustavi-2”), the functions they have to perform, and the forms and means they are used with; we’ll concentrate special accent on ideological side, at least because at present there exists only one cinema program (“Red Zone”), which is ideological and even more, it leaves the limits of the such a program.

Scientific Novelty. It’s true, considerations exist that cinema in TV plays an important role from the viewpoint of forming public opinion; it’s because in this case it is multiplied by the amount of TV sets (S. Kapitsa. “The Journalist”, 1974, No. 10). Others stress the authority of the film program presenter as well. However, we are analyzing the role of feature cinematography in the Georgian TV, taking into consideration all the specificities of TV and, in our opinion, films in TV are means for forming the public opinion because this is caused by the specificity of the

TV itself and these features are: in a definite moment by simple showing of the film (even without any comments) the ideological side of the film can be intensified, as a concrete film is sometimes associated with the current period and events. This is, to a certain extent, connected with TV specificity – **simultaneity** (simultaneity in the fact happening and presentation).

Strengthening of the film functions (e.g. cultural-educational, and especially, ideological function) is also promoted by the fact that on TV a film can be shown in the form of headings (heading-title is also implied), series, cycles and serials (heading is a wider category and it can imply all of them).

Show of **a film fragment** in different programs with different aims is an ordinary case today. It can acquire such burden, which even the film authors fail to suppose.

The fact is of great importance that cinema programs often have presenters (interlocutors can also participate), that's why his/her influence on the audience should be taken into consideration, more if this presenter is an authoritative person.

If we also add to all this the fact that a film is delivered to the audience at home, which is determined by the unique peculiarity of TV – **accessibility everywhere** – it becomes clear that the amount of film spectators grows much. Proceeding from this, it can be said that influence on mass consciousness will strengthen.

Main Purpose: It should be clarified what functions the cinematography has to perform in “Public Broadcaster” Channel I and “Rustavi-2”, and how efficiently this is fulfilled. For this we should first define what is cinema art like independent of TV – how it exercises impact on people, what are the TVs, which present it, what happens when a film appears on TV screen (what it lacks and what is added to it), how well the audience is studied for which these programs are designated, because without this it is difficult to determine how it influences the audience. Proceeding from all said above, we have made our dissertation according to this plan: 1) Feature cinematography, as means for influencing mass consciousness; 2) Characterization of “Public Broadcaster” Channel I and “Rustavi-2”; 3) Feature cinematography in the structure of TV program, and 4) TV audience. Introduction and conclusion are added to this.

Methodology. The method to give efficient result was required for scientific research. For this we used the **historical method**. To determine or to specify numerous facts we have appealed to the previous period programs as well. For this we had to study the scenarios of the Georgian TV initial periods, with which we have familiarized in the Central Archives. **Comparative method.** For the object of observation we took two channels – Georgian TV “Channel I” (which first was State Television and from 2005 it became “Public Broadcaster”) and independent TV “Rustavi-2” and compared them. But quite often we happened to make use of the programs of other Georgian TV companies as well. Also, as we talk about the post-soviet Georgian TV, for the sake of parallels we often used Russian TV programs (we had to, because Georgian TV, for a long period of time, had to be under its dictate). While discussing numerous issues we made use

of the examples of other countries (especially, of the USA), because their experience turned to be very important for making concrete conclusions.

The Method of Discourse. It's true, we have mostly analyzed cinema programs, but as our aim was to clarify the role of cinematography in TV in general, we naturally observed other programs (e.g. information, entertainment, etc), in which the cinema art is often used.

The Thorough Interview. The talks with TV specialists assisted us considerably, especially with those, which had rich experience of working long in the cinema program department. Through their help we have determined many details. For example, which heading was formed and why, or, on the contrary, which one was abolished, what problems existed (e.g. in regard to films distribution), etc.

The Method of Secondary Analysis. It is clear that this work could not have been prepared based only on empirical material, therefore, we have familiarized with the works of TV researchers, cinema critics, sociologists, etc, newspaper and journal publications and often used them to strengthen our considerations.

Chapter I

Feature Cinematography as Means for Influencing Mass Consciousness

Before talking about the role of cinema in television, we think, we should, first of all, try to clarify what the cinema art itself represents (independently of TV) and how efficiently it can exercise influence of consciousness of the audience, and what means and resources it uses for this.

Cinema possesses a screen, i.e. movable pictures within two-dimensional frame, accompanied with voice. It turned out that just the screen has that unique features and potentials, which no other branches of art have. In result of processing and developing of the screen expressive means system, it turned into one of the most interesting and strong branches of art. At the initial stage cinema was mute, but in that period it still performed its functions quite well. When sound appeared in the films it was already logical and expedient.

As Georgian cinema was founded and developed in the soviet power period, the processes ongoing in the Russian cinematography (because determination of the USSR art direction was managed just from the centre) are of great interest.

At the initial stage, the revolutionaries concentrated attention on this novelty of technique. In their opinion, this means of entertainment, simple at the first sight, in reality served the bourgeoisie and expressed their interests. Having guessed potentials of cinema, V.I. Lenin (which called it the most important among the branches of art), leader of the revolution, did his best to make cinematography serve the ideas of Bolsheviks. For more efficiency of the cinema propaganda the revolutionaries appealed to a new form – cinema shows were often preceded by introduction of renowned speakers, such as Krupskaya, Lunacharsky, etc. This form of propaganda became especially popular in the civil war years. It is known that special propaganda-trains and propaganda-ships existed in that period, which brought the films, penetrated with patriotic aspirations, to the remote regions of the country. As we have said above, the cinema show was accompanied by renowned speakers, it was also a part of the program – concerts were held, political literature was distributed (G. Dolidze. “V.I. Lenin and Problems of the Cinema”, 1974).

Russian film directors were also interested in the issue of influence on the film audience. One of the first among them was S. Eisenstein. He was in permanent search for those means and

resources, with which to efficiently influence people's emotions – such were e.g. “film fists”, “explosions” (“The Problems of Cinema Art”, 1992). In fact, all the film directors of that period tried different ways for influencing the audience.

The factor of exercising influence on mass consciousness by the cinema art is connected with the special “care” of the soviet power towards that branch of art. They kept issuing new resolutions serving to put cinematography “on the right way”.

From the second half of the 80s the so-called period of “Perestroika” (transformation) starts and the political and social changes ongoing in the country echoed and were reflected in the cinema art as well. Taboo was removed from the forbidden topics; it turned out bandits, thieves, etc existed in the country considered up to that period to be a paradise. Drug addiction, hard drinking, prostitution, merciless violence, etc were not “alien” for a “Homo sovieticus” either (“Thieves in Law”, “Little Vera”, “Inter Girl”, etc”. But in the cinematography many forbidden topics still existed, the talk about which became possible only after the fall of the Soviet Empire. Some time passed and another extremity appeared: the screens in the former soviet republics were overfilled with the foreign horror, erotic films, and hits, which were not of high artistic level, the same with the films of local production. Many reasons, surely, existed for this, from which financial aspect was a main one. And, also, after abolishing strict censure, it was necessary to find new ways and forms of expression (before that the Georgian cinema art often applied Aesop's language).

It seems that censure was a stimulus of some kind, required for the development (Georgian film masterpieces, how surprising it may seem, were made just in that period); even more, the same can be said about cinematography of other post-soviet countries, first of all, about Russian cinema. “It was more interesting to work earlier, because of a scaring shadow of the editor...In general, it is far more interesting to move inside the labyrinth” (V. Merezhko. TV-Radio Broadcasting, 1991, No. 2: 23-24).

However, it seems that these two countries have not forgotten that the cinema art was a powerful means for influencing mass consciousness. This is witnessed, for example, by the fact that after the August war of 2008 Russians soon made “Olympus Inferno”, in which main accent was turned at the fact that they were Georgians who unleashed this war. As the Georgian mass media informed the scenario of this film belonged to Georgian playwright M. Doiashvili and no one knows how Russians got it. It's also interesting how Georgians could have shot this film, unless Russians had stolen it.

Cinematographers abroad were also involved in this process. For example, if Americans were shooting the film “5 Days in August” to support Georgians, the other side appealed to E. Kusturica with the request to “strengthen” the positions, but he finally refused. In general, numerous funds are being invested into that branch of art worldwide, because it is universally

known that in addition to the largest financial income, the cinema can exercise efficient influence on public consciousness.

It is a well-known fact that not only cinematographers, but also politicians and others, which are well aware of the cinema potentials, in case of need appeal just to this branch of art to achieve their goals even in the present-day period. For example, as mass media informed in America, in the period before the California governor elections (2003) the TV companies stopped showing the films with the participation of Arnold Schwarzenegger, one of the candidates to this post. That was why the actor decided to show his other popular film “Terminator-3” and in his election campaign he used popular phrases from this and his other films. In result, people always met him with hot applauds.

In different countries, in the very first years the cinematography was created, the talk started on the factor of the cinema influence. For example, due to the reason that, in their opinion, the cinema facilitated spread of violence, crime, numerous laws were adopted, organizations were founded to exercise control over the cinema. One of such organizations is British Cinema Censors Department (1912). Later research also started how the cinema influences the society. The specialists prove (“Media”, published under editorship of Adam Briggs and Paul Cobble, 2005) that the Hayne Foundation project was one of these (was formed in New-York in 1928). After that many research works were conducted and numerous considerations were expressed, but finally the conclusion can be made that the cinema has certain influence on people, but it cannot completely change man’s world outlook. We also consider it important to point that much depends on the audience itself.

Chapter II

Characterization of “Public Broadcaster” Channel I and “Rustavi-2”

The first Georgian TV program was broadcasted on 30 December 1956. All the forms of mass media perform their functions proceeding from their specific potentials. TV specificity determines its place in mass media. Main specific peculiarities of TV are as follows: TV **accessibility everywhere**, due to which it possesses guaranteed mass audience.

That TV has a screen means the audience gets information not only in voice, but also by means of moving pictures, which makes this information more convincing. An important feature of TV is that it can broadcast facts and events directly in the moment they take place. This feature of TV is called **spontaneity**, which in its turn is connected with another unique feature – **simultaneity**. The specialists turn attention to **personification** of TV information as well. Firstly, this is, probably, caused by very many programs having their own personal presenter, whose authority and professional skills determine much as to how the audience comprehends the material presented to it. **Programming** is just that peculiarity of TV, which is one of the guarantees for efficient influence on masses. A TV program involves everything that is being broadcasted. This means of electronic media influences the public consciousness through each of its component elements and by all of them on the whole, because they are inter-related.

As Georgian TV had to be formed and developed in the soviet period, it obviously served the totalitarian regime. TV role in spreading and introducing of the communist ideology should be specially mentioned. Even more, in the end of the 90s of the XX century there still were numerous prohibited topics. This is witnessed by the newspaper article “There are moments of respect in evaluation of the President, his relatives and his environment” by the then opposition representative G. Bokeria, published in that period (“Akhali Taoba”, 30 December 1997). The fact has become known to us from it that in the evaluation of the US Department of State and authoritative international organizations in that period Georgia had the status of partially free country, and that Georgia was among those 58 countries, in which there were no legal guarantees for freedom of speech. It should also be mentioned that in the “Freedom House” annual report Georgia received 68 penal scores.

The fact that “Channel I” of the state TV supported the policy of state authorities became clear in the process of 2003 elections (Koka Qandiashvili, TV presenter of the popular program “What’s Happening?” on 19 November, i.e. 4 days before the revolution, confessed that he acted against the principles of his own conscience – i.e. he was not telling about the real state of affairs in the country, because he was not given such possibility). After the “Revolution of Roses”, when the National Movement representatives came to power, it seemed the country should have walked on the way of democracy development, and mass media should have been given more freedom. This, surely, should have concerned broadcasting media as well, because in the period of Shevardnadze the National Movement representatives stressed their attention just to this moment (it was just to prove this that we cited the newspaper article by G. Bokeria, a representative of the state power, in which he expressed indignation with the pressure on freedom of speech in Georgia, especially, on broadcasting media).

State TV got the status of public broadcaster (2005), which obliged it to serve its own people, but it did not happen so and this is proved by broadcasting media, especially “Public Broadcaster”, in general becoming the subject of opposition permanent criticism (the area of spreading of the oppositional channels was too narrow). Head of “Public Broadcaster” was released from his post and Board of Trustees was formed, which elected new head. However, things did not become better (this is proved by last data of “Freedom House”).

As for the other object of our observation – “Rustavi-2” – it started broadcasting from 1 June 1994. This TV company was considered to be oppositional channel. The then authorities recognized this channel as their enemy and did their best to have pressure on it. This is witnessed by the fact that broadcasting of this channel was twice suspended, but on court decision was twice resumed. However, when the state authorities decided to close the channel in 2002, protest actions started and they resulted in resign of Parliament Speaker Z. Zhvania. Encouraged by people’s support “Rustavi-2” began open struggle against the state power. All this ended in 2003 in the “Revolution of Roses” and lion’s share in this belonged just to “Rustavi-2”. The situation in following years proved that after the “Revolution of Roses” TV channel “Rustavi-2” forgot its being in the opposition.

TV has to perform numerous functions, among which most important is information, cultural-educational and recreation functions (formula of BBC first director John Right). Today Georgian TV (these two channels among them) does not properly perform cultural-educational function, which it perfectly and successfully did earlier. The fact is such – Georgian TV even today still is a powerful means for forming the public opinion. That’s why the present authorities did their maximum to control it (both “Public Broadcaster” and main independent TV companies). Mobilization of “Public Broadcaster” and “Rustavi-2” potentials is vividly felt especially in the period of elections. This ability of TV is well apprehended by the opposition parties, that’s why one of the main mottoes of their demands is that the “Public Broadcaster” Channel I should serve the public at large.

Chapter III

Feature Cinema in TV (forms of use and its functions)

1. Show of films (with no comments)

We have already talked about cinema and TV separately. After this, we can talk about what is happening when the cinema art turns out to be in the TV mechanism. Namely, we think that some films on TV screen somehow lose their aesthetic value, but often their ideological burden increases and even more, in addition to different functions (first of all, cultural-educational one) on TV it is quite efficiently used for forming public opinion and this is caused by: simultaneity, which to some extent spreads on films show; existence of headings (heading-titles are implied), cycles, series, and serials; use of film fragments in different programs and participation of the TV presenter.

Just proceeding from this specific feature of TV let's discuss each of these forms of using a feature film on two channels of Georgian TV broadcasting.

We cannot agree with the consideration of those people, who say that a film on the TV screen does not lose any of its artistic values (e.g. V. Vilchek); we don't consider it right either to share another extremity – to bring film show on TV to the informational level (V. Sapak).

Study of Georgian TV first period programs (familiarization with the archives material) enables us to make such conclusion: film repertoire was mostly from the Georgian and Russian cinematography. However, show of the films of socialist countries was not quite rare, but we cannot say the same about films of the capitalist countries and this, surely, had its reason. Cinema department in TV along with films show and fulfillment of its main function (cultural-educational) very soon turned into an advocator of the soviet ideology. The fact that the film, in certain moment, can acquire additional ideological burden, does not mean that we should search for propaganda of something in all the films shown on TV (in this case we cannot talk about cultural-educational and entertainment functions), but it is the fact that the film, shown on TV even without any comments, quite often is discussed by the audience in relation to contemporaneity. The effect of live programs is often preserved by films (TV Journalism, 1994).

For example, in the days of 9 April 1989 tragedy (when the Russian soldiers mercilessly raided the demonstrators), Georgian TV Channel I showed the film “Gandhi” (Gandhi was an advocator of peaceful methods of struggle), which was apprehended then by the audience as an echo of terrible events in Georgia. In the period of tense situation in Tskhinvali region in 1992 (Ossets demanded independence then) show of D. Janelidze’s film “The Lodgers” was understood as an echo to the processes ongoing there. This film belongs to the category of intellectual films. And when it was shown on TV screen in that period, it somehow clarified and concretized the film allegory (it tells about how the people, simply lodgers in the house, formed problems to the owner of this house, and finally he even had no place for him left in it). The film attracted the attention of wide audience. In the period of war in Abkhazia (1992) Georgian TV tried to strengthen combat emotions by showing Georgian patriotic films (“Giorgi Saakadze”, “Bashi-Achuki”, “Maya of Tsqneti”, etc).

In the period of war of 2008 (in Tskhinvali) Georgian TV programs mostly consisted of information programs and films. Both feature and documentary films were shown. The film repertoire was nearly the same as in the period of wars of the 90s, except some foreign films. The same Georgian films on patriotic topics again appeared on TV screen, the reason being that nothing was shot on this topic in Georgia last years, and what was shot did not carry more patriotic charge than it was in these films. But, in our opinion, it is necessary to preserve a measure of moderateness, because as the psychologists say everything exaggerated causes opposite response. We’ll stop our attention on two foreign films, which were shown nearly on all TV channels those days – “The Brave Heart” and “The Gladiator”. These films were, evidently, selected on certain principle. They were of high artistic cinematographic level (both received supreme award of American cinema academy – “Oscar” – in several nominations) and also their ideology turned out to be very acceptable during the war of 2008. “The Brave Heart” presents devoted struggle of Scots for independence, for which main character of the film sacrifices his life. His death is elevated and special. The last word of this warrior for independence is the word “freedom”.

Main character of “The Gladiator” is a brave warrior, who does not subdue to his fate and fights against his enemy to the end. Though he is a victim to this struggle, his self-sacrifice is not really nonsense – just on the combat arena he disclosed a real face of Caesar.

Show of relevant films in concrete situation is characteristic to other countries as well. For example, in the days previous to coming of Yeltsin to power in Russia, independent TV company NTV intensively showed films compromising the communist system (it ended with showing N. Mikhalkov’s film “Exhausted by the Sun”).

The fact that ideological side of films on TV can grow in certain moments (and can also be used for the propaganda function on TV) does not mean that it does not perform other functions (aesthetic, educational, entertainment) – we come across these functions in a combined form and they successfully combine one another.

2Film-headings

a) Series, cycles

TV programs in general and film programs among them, except some programs, consist of headings, cycles, series and serials. They are basis for the program blocks structure.

It should be firstly mentioned that if a heading has no permanent time and place, then it loses the function for which it is designated. The audience cannot in this case watch it permanently and thus the audience can lose the theme developed from program to program. This can take place especially in terms of numerous programs.

Different forms of programs with continuation exist. They are: cycles (a whole complex of programs, united with common topic), series (they are united not only with theme, but with a genre, main characters, or TV presenters) and serials (programs, films are united in them not only by main characters, but by the plot as well). As for a heading, it is a wider category and it can involve all of them.

In the initial years of Georgian TV foundation, special headings served to popularize advantages of the soviet country and of the socialist system in general. For example, “Cinema art of fraternal republics”, “Cinema art of fraternal socialist countries”, etc (heading “film-quiz” had the function of entertainment), which in parallel involuntarily still performed the cultural-educational function to some extent.

The feeling of love and veneration to the “senior brother” remained in the cinema programs in the following periods. This is witnessed in 1982 by a cyclic heading “60th anniversary of the USSR formation and 200th anniversary of Georgia’s joining Russia”, which united many programs and was dedicated to that “remarkable” event.

From the second half of the 80s the process of democratization slowly, but vividly was felt in Georgian TV. It was expressed in new approaches to earlier existed facts and events. This meant shattering of the soviet ideology.

New headings were also formed in that period. From 1989 the old heading “story of real persons” changed its name and was called “light and shade of film”. This meant extension of the topic of dialogue, and thus it became possible to discuss the issues, which were not tackled and hinted earlier, for example, criticism of the socialist revolution, the issues of deserters, problems of Jews, etc.

Let’s see what the film headings of 1996-2010 were like.

“Window”

Let's start with the heading "Window", suspended in 1996, as this caused great agitation. This cinema program, as well as all the programs of Gogi Gvakharia, aimed at promoting aesthetic improvement of the audience with high artistic films and it, obviously, performed cultural-educational function, because the audience received much interesting information about the history of the country, film director's vision and manner of shooting the film, etc. Cinematographic masterpieces of different countries were shown in it, but main accent was turned on the European cinema art. Gogi Gvakharia did not hide he was no fan of the American cinema. However, it did not mean that films of this country were ignored in the "Window". Even more, if it had been so, then the TV audience had failed to see the cycle "Chapliniana", in which information on the life and work of this great cinematographer expanded from program to program (the talks on first mute, then sound films; Chaplin as actor and film director).

As for closing down of the cinema program the "Window", its broadcasting stopped from June 1996, though such efforts were earlier as well – in April 1995 for three week period the film "The Matador" by Spanish film director Pedro Almadovar was taken out of the program. However, through interference of real film-lovers and their efforts the "Window" resumed and retrospective of the films of this film-director continued from 2 May of the same year with his film "The High Heals". Finally, closing of the heading the "Window" was connected with show of the film "Hot Tears of Petra von Kant" by Rainer Werner Fassbinder in the program. Gogi Gvakharia himself failed to hide his indignation quite justly in regard to this fact. But our attention was attracted by the statement of this film critic, which he fixed in the press due to the prohibition of "Hot Tears of Petra von Kant": "It surprises me that the attitude to television has not changed yet. A great part of our society and many of those working in TV itself think that everything that is shown in the box is propaganda of something. This is usual "communist paranoia", which is deeply rooted in our consciousness and release from which is so difficult. It also surprises me that TV itself, i.e. "television of the democratic country" makes no efforts to cure our society, at least partially, from this paranoia" (the newspaper "Alia", 11 June 1996, 8).

In response to this statement we wrote (The issues of TV-radio journalism, III, 1997) that these people freely, without any implication, will start watching TV programs and, among them, cinema programs when the "television of the democratic country" is written without inverted commas and secondly, TV spectators turned out to be not so "seriously ill", despite being for 70 years under the strong pressure of the communist ideology (TV has largely contributed to this). A great part of the audience has expressed its negative attitude to banning of the program the "Window" and it was, probably, one of the reasons it was resumed.

"Diversity"

The heading "Diversity" was a weekly program from 1996 (it started in 1995). This program echoed, as intensively as it could, to the events ongoing in the cinematographic world. It showed reports from the film shooting grounds, interviews with Georgian and foreign cinematographers,

artistic portraits of cinema art representatives, etc. It was the cinema program, the style and genre of which changed according to the theme, to which it was dedicated. With its systematic form it caused the audience to be permanently aware of the events ongoing in the cinema art.

The ideological function was not alien to this program either (for forming the public opinion). The social-political situation existing in the country was often taken into consideration in selecting the topics. For example, stressing of attention on documentary by Goga Khaindrava “Burial-ground of Dreams” was timely and necessary in the programs of 14 and 21 November 1996, because the film deals with the war in Abkhazia and soon (on 23 November) the plebiscite of refugees from Abkhazia was being held.

“Georgian Film”

The heading “Georgian Film” was formed in 1996 being an important event of that year, because the heading “From the History of Georgian Film” (this heading was formed in the very first years of Georgian TV) was closed a long time ago, and the screen was mostly given to the foreign cinematography. Unlike its predecessor (“From the History of Georgian Cinema”), “Georgian Film” had a TV presenter and had a different form – the film show was preceded by meeting the film creative group members. They told the audience the history of the present film shooting, recalled curious events, etc, and thus strengthened the interest of audience. The program perfectly performed the cultural-educational, entertainment and ideological functions. Even more, it popularized (may be was a means of propaganda) Georgian cinema art, which was good, in our opinion, because the accent on national cinema art was especially necessary (in Russia special channels exist, e.g. “Our Cinema”, and “Culture”, along with the world cinema masterpieces, concentrates main attention at Russian films). Through “Georgian Film” series the audience got more and more information about Georgian cinema art (the program was closed in 2004).

“Illusion”

It was founded by film critic Otar Sepiashvili in the beginning of the 80s of last century. In the so-called “Perestroika” period the program presenter disclosed to TV audience the secret, through which he managed to show the foreign films on TV, the right for which he did not have. The essence of his trick was that in that period it was permitted to show the fragments of these films, but their volume was not specified. Otar Sepaishvili made use of this and managed to show the foreign films in full. They lacked only minor fragments and subtitles about the team of film-makers, about which the audience was informed through the introductory text of the film TV presenter.

It was just through this heading that the Georgian audience had a chance to familiarize then with real masterpieces of the cinema art. Through the “Illusion” it became possible to arrange retrospective show of the films of great film directors F. Fellini, L. Visconti, Ch. Chaplin and others. The program had a cycle “Cinema Reflects Itself” (the same – cinema-in-the cinema), in

which the audience saw “Master of Feats”, “Fedora”, “How We Loved Each Other”, etc. This method of showing the films (cyclic show of the films by renowned film-directors with comments) has later become a good tradition for further headings – the “Window” and “Psycho”.

The “Illusion” seemed to have nothing in common with politics, but we consider it important to mention in regard to this fact that in the soviet period it was used during the days of religious celebrations, later during the political arrangements (meetings, demonstrations). The TV screen was “with pleasure” given to foreign films, thus “recommending” people to stay home (otherwise people had no chance to see foreign films in other TV programs). It’s clear this TV program presenter – Otar Sepiashvili – could not have been free in selecting films for his program and that was why the films were used for “defaming” the capitalist world. It was the reason why the program very often presented the films by S. Kramer “Chained” and “Tired Horses Are Killed, Aren’t They?” and also the film by W. Wyler “Holidays in Rome” (thus saying with it that in the capitalist world even the princess is not free and happy), etc. After break of the Soviet Union the program was led first by Z. Dolidze, then B. Baratashvili. Their introduction mostly dealt with the ideological-artistic values of the presented films. The TV presenter also delivered much interesting information about the film director, actors, etc, to the audience. The scales of films purchasing increased compared with the previous period, films became more accessible and the program creative group tried to select films of higher artistic level, thus facilitating the audience in forming good cinematographic taste. This film program “Illusion” existed on Georgian TV Channel I up to 2004.

“Laterna Magica”

The program “Laterna Magica” was first broadcasted on Public Broadcaster on 14 April 2006. It was a talk between the program presenter Nana Janelidze and an invited guest about the film. The program played an important role from the viewpoint of the audience intellectual development. The issues discussed concerned the role of neo-realist cinematography, importance of light-shades in the cinema art, etc. “Laterna Magica” seemed to have nothing in common with politics, but this was not so. It appeared on the screen when the situation in Georgia was quite tense. For example, on 21 May, 2008 the parliamentary elections had to be held in Georgia. “Laterna Magica” always used to fix it was not ideological and propagandist, which was specially stressed in the program of 13 May, 2008 as well (a week before the elections). This was revealed in having no film that day in the program, but a 2 hour long talk on discussing already shown films. However, it is a well-known fact that silence is also a talk and quite meaningful (to be silent is a method of manipulation, isn’t it?). Let’s remember Georgia of the communist period. It is known that then much was inaccessible for ordinary people. Otar Sepiashvili with his programs: first “Cinema lectures”, then “Cinema objective” and, finally, “Illusion” familiarized the audience with real masterpieces of the cinema art. Their popularity was so great that (as we have mentioned above) during the days of religious celebrations, meetings, demonstrations these films were shown on TV Channel I to make people stay home and watch them, sometimes in time undesignated for them.

In the period of the “Revolution of Roses” TV channel “Adjara” (advocator of the interests of authorities then) tried to send to people the message that everything was all right in the country by means of various films and entertaining programs. Even now, both TV channels we have mentioned quite often apply to this method (while the opposition channels highlight meetings, demonstrations, etc, but the area of their spreading is not wide). Let’s return to “Laterna Magica” again. After the elections finished it turned out that the political issues also were quite interesting not only for an invited guest, but also for the program presenter – when the film “Lady for a Day” was being shown, after the Christmas fairy-tale we found ourselves to be in the present-day Georgia soon – with its social and political problems.

Now we would like to mention about one fact, which we think will make our consideration more understandable – as we have found out (an interview with V. Nozadze, 2008) the program “Laterna Magica” was initiated by the then head of Public Broadcaster – Tamar Kintsurashvili. Namely, in her opinion TV net lacked something that could have given it a perfect, developed form. That’s why she suggested Nana Janelidze to make the cinema program.

Nana Janelidze categorically refused existence of censorship on her program “Laterna Magica”. She said her program had no problems with censorship, because such films were shown in it, which would not irritate the authorities and therefore no restrictions existed in selecting and showing the films. We can conclude based on this that “Laterna Magica” also had definite position and the films were being selected on certain principle (this program stopped in 2009).

“Psycho”

After closing the program “Window” in 1996 Gogi Gvakharia started a new program in different format and under another title – “Psycho”. It began in 1997 on independent TV company “Rustavi-2” channel. This TV company was considered to be as opposition TV and in the first years of its existence it did really have an image of the most democratic and independent television. Appearance of the cinema program “Psycho” on this channel was associated with more freedom. Gogi Gvakharia managed successfully to show in his program those films, presentation of which he meant in the “Window” (State TV). These were films by famous film-directors Almadovar, Pazzolinni, Bertolucci, etc. In the words of G. Gvakharia these films differ a bit from “innocent” films.

We would like to mention about one detail, which, in our opinion, is quite important. In the course of the program “Psycho” spectators had possibility to phone directly and to fix what they thought – thus the accent was made on “Rustavi-2” being a democratic channel. Important mission of “Psycho” (as of cultural-educational program) was an educational function and it should be mentioned the program successfully managed to fulfill it. “Psycho” showed many best samples of the world cinematography, which gave aesthetic pleasure to the audience. The films also had other functions, e.g. ideological burden, even more, aesthetically beautiful film delivers its ideology to the audience in a more interesting and attractive form. In this respect “Psycho”

was most interesting for the real lovers of the world cinema art. We have already talked about the serious propagandist function the cinema programs had to perform in the soviet period. We should also mention that in the present period the fact that the main function of such programs is cultural-educational does not exclude their ideological burden and sometimes they still have their propagandist function as well. We can point to the role of “Psycho” in the period of the “Revolution of Roses”, which G. Gvakharia successfully managed. Within that period from program to program the public opinion was being deliberately formed. So, we would like to talk about it in detail.

In 2003 the information war was unleashed among the TV companies in the pre-election and post-election periods, in which “Rustavi-2” was the most successful. Along with other elements of propagandist influence, films largely contributed to this success (in addition to films showing, they were used in other programs too). Undoubtedly, “Psycho” was the most successful and active in this, because the program presenter G. Gvakharia is the best specialist of cinema and TV specificity

As for “Psycho”, through all kinds of TV specificity and methods of manipulation the program perfectly fulfilled its mission. Let’s start with the statement made by the program presenter G. Gvakharia several months before the elections about starting to show political films. And what films were shown those days in “Psycho” and what did they tell the audience? For example, by showing Goga Khaindrava’s feature-documentary “Burial-ground of Dreams” (deals with the war in Abkhazia) the government, elections-participant politicians and the society in general were reminded that Georgia had the problem of territorial integrity restoration to be solved – Abkhazia should be returned. The film by film-director B. Levinson “When the Tail Moves a Dog” is connected with PR campaign and that’s why the talk was held from this viewpoint – namely, they talked about importance of media and TV role in public opinion formation was especially stressed.

On 1 November, the day before the elections, the cinema program “Psycho” excellently fulfilled its mission. It presented Woody Allen’s picture “Zelig”. It is a film-parody (shot in 1983 and deals with the fate of Jews) about how Doctor Fletcher “cured” Zelig – a man-lizard, a chameleon. It should be mentioned that this film is shot in documentary method. We would like to stress that presentation of this film in the program in pre-election days was of great importance at least for the phrases sounded in this film – “you should be a personality and should make your choice even when your choice is not approved, otherwise you may become a lizard”, or – “Children, preserve your own selves, what you are. You are free people, citizens of a free country – America”. By showing this film “Psycho” and “Rustavi-2” expressed to the end what they wanted to tell and fixed their own position, Certain continuation of this film was the picture by brothers Tavian “Alonzapan” (8.11.03), the main character of which is afraid to make his choice. He always hesitates and does not know what decision to make; that’s why when he has to make a choice between conformism and freedom, he chooses conformism. But, in the end of the film he does choose freedom and dies in the red clothes of a revolutionary. From mid-November,

when the situation in Georgia became very tense, “Psycho” started showing documentaries. In the cycle “non-violent conflict” three documentaries were shown in “Psycho”, namely, the first film dealt with the national-liberation movement in India headed by M. Gandhi. We think, thus the audience was reminded that a peaceful way of conflict settlement also exists, and disobedience is the best way of expressing the protest.

In another film (it was shown the day before the revolution – on 22 November) it was shown how it was managed without using arms to throw down Slobodan Milosevic. If we look at the film from the viewpoint of the course of events, many parallels can be found between the facts described in the film and the situation in Georgia after the elections – for example, black-white posters and symbolic fists of Georgian “Kmara” and Serbian “Otpor”. That’s why we think the film had special influence on the society, because imitation is a natural feature of human beings. It is known that overthrow of the communist regime in the end of 1989 happened because East European countries imitated one another (took into consideration the experience).

As for the third documentary – “Fall of Dictator” (29.11.03), it represented overthrow of Pinochet in Chile. The “Revolution of Roses” was already conducted in Georgia in that time.

We would like to mention that “Psycho” changed its format in that period – the amount of invited guests in the studio increased and the phone calls from the spectators were abolished (now it did not suit “Rustavi-2” any longer to listen to the ideas of the audience).

This series of political films in “Psycho” finished with S. Kramer’s film “Chained” (27.12.03). It continued till the presidential elections, as the program presenter told in the beginning. This time main attention was concentrated on the current situation in Georgia. Namely, how the representatives of different ethnic groups, which are chained to one another with much, should live together.

Thus, we can conclude that “Psycho”, by showing films relevant for the present moment, by involving documentaries into the program, with the comments of its authoritative presenter and his guests, which surely were invited deliberately, turned the public opinion just in the direction the program aimed at. In addition, “Psycho” was a part of “Rustavi-2” program. This essence was oppositional and it did not hide its position either. That’s why “Psycho” realized its interests.

This is a unique example when along with the informational or propagandist programs, the program of such a type, the main function of which is cultural-educational, achieves success during the election campaign, even more, during the revolution.

“Red Zone”

The cinema program “Red Zone” appeared on TV from 27 November 2007. It is presented by “Public Broadcaster” Channel I together with the radio “Liberty”. The program is weekly and is broadcasted on Fridays, 24:00. The program author and presenter is again cinema critic G.

Gvakharia. It is completely dedicated to the communist art, to be more exact, to its new reading, to its understanding from a new aspect (WWW.GPB.ge). The topics, selected by G. Gvakharia for the program “Red Zone”, can be considered to be really interesting and urgent.

The topics are so diversified that somehow embarrass the audience, but they have one thing in common – each of them is directed against violence of any type, be it physical – physical punishment of a man, his annihilation, or influence on spirituality of a person, which is expressed in pressing numerous ideas, myths, prohibitions, etc, onto him.

The first program started with talk about the radio “Liberty” (in the soviet period it was considered to be the hostile radio) and in the end of the program the picture “Good-bye, Lenin” was presented (directed by Wolfgang Becker). With this film the audience once more saw how socialist ideology distorted spiritual world of people. So, we have to say good-bye to it forever (obviously, the film title also points to this). Presentation of this film in the “Red Zone” clarified and outlined the direction of this program.

It is important to mention the fact that the “Red Zone” film repertoire, unlike G. Gvakharia’s previous programs “Window” and “Psycho”, includes many samples of Georgian and Russian cinematography, which can be explained logically (proceeding from the program function), but it also involves many films of foreign cinematography as well and G. Gvakharia successfully appeals to them in case of need (especially in the form of fragments). Our attention was attracted by the fact that feature films presented in the “Red Zone” (both Georgian and Russian) are made mostly in the soviet period, when from 5 films shown in 2007-2008 the first show of four documentaries was held just in this program (in the soviet period the documentary film was subject to strict censorship). Generally, the fact in the documentary is somehow transformed, because it is being shot by a person, who has certain attitude to it. As psychologists say emotion always precedes action (A. Prangishvili, “Essays in Psychology”, 1987) to say nothing of the methods used to get desirable result, e.g. sequence, foreshortening, sight, montage, off-screen text, etc. It is, surely, very difficult to reflect the fact in absolutely objective form.

The topics discussed in the “Red Zone” were not limited only with Georgia and this is very important. For example, the topic “double occupation of Latvia” – it was interesting to determine with it why the problem exists in Latvia in regard to being free from the soviet heritage. And this happens in the country, which was within the Soviet Union only 50 years (24.09.2010). One of the programs “XX century – the Century of Oswiecim” (02.04.2010) dealt with the current problems of Germany..

By analyzing the “Red Zone” we were once more convinced the talk on the soviet ideology and its results (and not only on this) is most effective again through the means of spreading the communist myths – cinema and TV – through synthesis of these two giants, because cinema + TV is far more than each of them separately. We would like to stress the issue that the “Red Zone” is an educational program on the whole and is oriented at improving the intellectual level

of people. It can be said for sure that it is more ideological than the previous programs of G. Gvakharia the “Window” and “Psycho” (if we don’t take into consideration PR campaign conducted by “Psycho” during the presidential and parliamentary elections of 2003-2004). Ideological character of this program is outlined both in the heading-title “Red Zone” and in the fact that the program is being broadcasted from the Museum of Occupation.

This program of Gogi Gvakharia tackles the communist regime, but this does not mean it refers only to that strictest dictatorship period. We do have numerous “red zones” in the present period and we should recognize this and search for the ways to get out of them, otherwise only through humiliating the past and closing eyes to current events we could not achieve anything, we can only remain in the past.

Existence of film headings is a good fact (from the second half of the 80s of last century their amount increased, though from 2003 they slowly reduced and now only one cinema program exists on “Public Broadcaster” Channel I and none – on “Rustavi-2”). Through such programs it becomes possible to achieve more effect and this is caused by, on the one hand, by the fact that they assist to familiarize with and analyze the problem gradually from program to program and, on the other, to arrange the received information into a system. It is, obviously, impossible to deeply and comprehensively highlight the issue in one program. That’s why one-time, general program cannot leave any trace in the mind of the spectators.

b) Serials

Serial suits the TV screen the best of all. Even more, “To prove originality of the TV art, existence of such TV-forms is necessary, to show which on the film screen are impossible, i.e. they differ from the film works by language, artistic conventionality or chronotype.

A part of specialists consider the serials to be such a form. Their presentation on the cinema screen is really impossible, as they are closely connected with the TV nature (R. Surguladze, E. Iberi, “Mass Communication”, 2003: 87).

In the soviet period Georgian spectators watched multi-series TV films on Central TV. The first TV multi-series feature film was “Fire to Me” (1964).

Selection of films, as a rule, was in compliance with the soviet ideology. Therefore, the Central TV authorities used to express special interest in the films of the socialist countries. For example, in the 60-70s of last century the soviet people and, among them Georgian people, had an opportunity to see on the Central TV Polish “Four Tank-Men and a Dog”, “Goal, Which is More Than Life” (about the II World War).

In the soviet period the televisions of the capitalist countries were strictly reproached for showing the serials, especially, the so-called “soap operas”, because it was considered this was irrespective exploitation of the intellect and emotions of the audience (A. Nikolaev.TV

Labyrinths. 1988), and in our opinion there is some truth in this (but a capitalist country has nothing to do with it). It is also quite important as to which country and what TV serials are meant. However, times passed and changed and the Central TV started showing such low level serials as “Slave Izaura”, “Rich Also Cry”, etc. The Georgian audience, surely, was given a chance to see them as well.

Introduction of the term “mass culture” is connected with the German philosophers (they are known under the name of “Frankfurt School”), first it was related with the Nazi mechanism of propaganda (“Media”, under the editorship of Adam Briggs and Paul Cobble, 2005).

In May 1996 Georgian TV Channel I started showing Mexican TV serial “The Wild Heart”, which ended in October. After that they showed Italian multi-series feature film “The Inspector of Criminal Police” and American “Cobra”. In the same period they also showed Georgian multi-series feature film “Data Tutashkhia”.

A great part of the Georgian TV audience expressed special interest in the so-called “soap opera” – “The Wild Heart”. Cinema critic Gogi Gvakharia (in the program “Variations on the Theme”) explained such popularity of “soap operas” in that period by people’s venturesome character, saying that due to such feature he himself appeared among the audience, which watched one of the TV serials (“Rich Also Cry”). In his opinion, people have demand to see such films because they lack something, i.e. we haven’t anything – we have no festive days, he added. It can be said that starting from this period, both these channels – “Public Broadcaster” and independent TV channel “Rustavi-2” allocated much place to TV serials.

We think the fact that TV serials and, especially, the so-called “soap operas” gained much popularity in Georgia is, first of all, caused by the social and political situation in the country. Psychologists state (e.g. T. Gogotishvili said this in the program “Free Topic”) that such films and reality shows are watched with special interest and are popular in the countries with outlined and expressed problems – people in them separate from the reality and replace it with the life of others. This, however, does not mean that these films have no spectators in the countries with fewer problems, for example, in the United States of America (we’ll talk about this below) and we’ll add that the TV serials have numerous spectators, probably, because the plots of these serials enable this – failing to see fragments and even some series does not make people stop watching them (even after missing ten series people can again be involved in seeing them again, because they still can understand everything), and one more, people watching the TV serial can in parallel do some other things (which they cannot while watching other kind of films).

People watch the TV serials to the end because they get used to the characters, sympathize with them and are interested in how all this will finish.

Many countries (e.g. England, Italy) have passed the period of such penetration of “mass culture” (of TV serials as well) of another country and these countries opposed it with putting forward their national culture. By the way, in the first year of our analysis – 1996 – the Russian

TV, namely, “ORT” with pleasure gave place on its channel to different countries, mostly, to Latin-American and American TV serials, but in following years Latin-American TV serials were ousted from the channel. This is witnessed by the fact that in 2010 (e.g. in May) the Russian TV Channel I showed 5 TV serials – 4 Russian and 1 American.

As the population of Latin origin (especially of Mexican) keeps growing fast in America, there exist several Latin American channels in America and the programs on them are exclusively in Spanish, and Venezuelan-Mexican serials are very popular on these channels. As for main channels – CBS, NBC, and ABC – only American TV serials are being broadcasted on them, which are like Venezuelan in style. Such are: “All My Children” on ABC, “Days of Our Lives” on NBC and “The Bold and Beautiful” on CBS. We consider important the consideration of G. Zedelashvili: “Some consider inflow of TV serials a sabotage, because they suspend flourishing of national culture, social development and establishment of national originality. Supporters of this version try to turn everything into the political aspect and loudly say that it is a state crime, but TV specialists know well this is transitional “food” for the Georgian audience, because Georgian TV studio “Theatroni” group tries to make Georgian TV serials. It is known that low level production spoils the comprehension level of the spectators, but this defect is partially overcome by translation. Translation of the TV serials into Georgian forms the effect as if they become somehow national, familiar” (Issues of TV-Radio Journalism, part III, 1998: 112). The studio “Theatroni” created such TV-serials (e.g. “Small-star Night”, “House in Old District”, etc), but they failed to substitute this “transitional food”, because firstly they were not long – some three-four series were unable to change the situation and also it turned out to be far more important to substitute personal problems with beautiful life of other countries. We should say here that with (low level) Georgian translation of TV serials their level doesn’t change and TV serials cannot perform the cultural-educational function for people, though we cannot say they (like the author of these words) really make the apprehension level of spectators dull, because sometimes intellectuals also watch them. As we have seen Gogi Gvakharia turned out to be among them (through our analysis we became sure of this, in 1996). The fact, however, is that such enormous amount of TV serials in the Georgian TV space (especially, introduction of poor level cheap Latin-American serials) is not good. It’s true they are created for rest, for relaxation, but TV has many other functions to fulfill. This mostly refers to “Public Broadcaster”, as it has to satisfy the demands of the spectators of all categories. In our country – in condition of democracy deficit – the serials can be considered to be a good means for manipulation.

3) Functions of Film Fragments in TV Programs

Use of fragments from films was an ordinary event in the Georgian TV in all periods. Even more, this method was used in the programs dedicated to the cinema, in publicist, entertainment and other TV programs. Special headings and separate programs “Komsomol is Hero of Film”, “Devoted Children of Great Country”, etc (archives materials) were compiled just of film fragments and were quite politicized cinema programs – each of them being propaganda of the socialist order (the Communist Party, Komsomol, leading shock brigades, etc), which is witnessed by their heading-titles.

Film fragments were one of the best means for ideological struggle in further years as well. It seems that they failed to get rid of the “revolution achievements” and myths connected with it even in the period of “Perestroika”, the program “Revolution and Screen” (6 November 1987) can be named as evidence of this. For more efficiency the subtitle “Ten Days That Shattered the World” was added to it. Film fragments in numerous amounts were used in it. The program was so displaying and penetrated with the revolutionary aspiration that earlier formed propagandist cinema programs in its background seemed to us comparatively “pale” – e.g. “The Communist on the Screen” (7 November 1984), designation of which is determined in its title and we won't analyze it here. We'll only say that the authors of this program used expediently and abundantly relevant films to reach their goal (starting from “The Communist” by Gabrilowitsch and Riesman and ending with “Secretary of Regional Committee” by R. Chkheidze). We did not want to say that the authors of the present program lied and Communists had no positive features, only their presentation as most honest, faultless and supernatural personalities seems to us disputable. In the present-day period (this time for criticizing the communist ideology), the film fragments, from both documentary and feature films, are used successfully in his author program – the “Red Zone” – by cinema critic Gogi Gvakharia. Well-suited film fragments make concrete topics far more efficient, which is finally designated to form the public opinion.

Film fragments in great amount were used to fulfill cultural-educational function by all those film-headings we have talked about above (at present none of them exists), especially many fragments were used in the heading “Diversity”, which was telling the audience about current events ongoing in the cinema art. We abstain from citing many examples of this, because use of film fragments in TV was really an ordinary, natural phenomenon. I. Belyaev writes: “TV made the audience get used to eclectics and it is apprehended on the TV screen as natural. Even more, being eclectic became a trait characteristic to TV. A TV program is built this way: a feature film – a fragment, a documentary film fragment, the TV presenter – on-screen, the TV presenter – off-screen. They dance, play, cry, and sing – this is what a cinematographer cannot allow himself and cannot imagine – to combine the uncombined, to mix genres, to mix forms – but this is

apprehended in TV as ordinary TV means (Belyaev I.K. Introduction into Art of Directing, part I, M. 1998: 28-29).

To better understand what we want to say, let's take concrete periods (because within 15 years, where, for what the film fragments were used seems to us to be more general review), within which, in our opinion, the importance of film fragments was seen best of all. Such period to us, first of all, is the period before and after 2003 elections. We have already talked about the role of "Psycho" in the period of the "Revolution of Roses". It is also known that in the informational war, unleashed before and after 2003 elections, "Rustavi-2" won, for which all the methods and means were used. Great role was played, firstly, by the informational programs, and "Psycho" also, as we have already pointed, and entertainment program the "Night Show" as well. These programs very often used the cinema art. We'll cite some examples: a few days after the revolution the informational program "Courier" informed that at 5 o'clock at night businessman Boris Berezovski arrived to Tbilisi and from the airport his cortege headed directly to the Palace of Rituals (its owner was Badri Patarkatsishvili). "Courier" tried to clarify how and to whom this businessman under the name of Platon Elinin (i.e. Boris Berezovski) arrived, and this was accompanied by a fragment from the film "The Oligarch", the prototypes of two main characters in which were just these two businessmen. With this "document", naturally, the audience was once more reminded not to forget – they are just these oligarchs and nothing good should be expected from them.

The same days, "Courier" information about taking 25 kg of gold out of Georgia by Levan Mamaladze, Kvemo Kartli governor "was proved" by a fragment from the famous American picture "McKenna's Gold". The audience was told that because of this treasure many crimes were conducted as well as in the film. It was the very second day that "Rustavi-2" showed just this film.

Entertainment program "The Night Show", in the period of revolution tried not to deviate from the interests of this channel and applied to the cinema art to better reach the set goals. For example, in one of its programs of those days to answer the question put what Eduard Shevardnadze will do, will he resign or not? "The Night Show" gave the "answer" by showing a fragment from Leonid Gaidai's popular picture "Caucasian Captive" (afraid with an approaching car G. Vitsin is being blocked by I. Nikulin and G. Morgunov and cannot run away).

In the period, when the situation reached its acme and the opposition categorically and without any compromises demanded resignation of Shevardnadze, "The Night Show" presented a fragment from Irakli Kvirikadze's picture "The Wine Pitcher" (the man, who happened to be blocked in the wine pitcher, is told to come out of it – we cannot take you out of it in parts) seemed to be some warning (or even a threat).

Use of fragments from films for advertising seemed to be a usual event, because TV journalists "guessed" – such advertisement does not require much money and hard work. Main character of

Eldar Shengelaya's film "Unusual Exhibition" – Pipinia Eristavi with his honest act (when he was filling in the receipts for taxes on light and water) gave a fine example for the population to timely pay taxes for consumed electricity. One of the characters in "Wine Thieves" – Elibo – could not have imagined that with the bowl full of Kakhetian wine and the words "Hey, if you can drink this..." he was suggesting coffee imported from Israel.

By the way, use of fragments from films for advertisements is acceptable in other countries. One of such examples is Russia (a fragment from the picture "Peter I" was used for advertising shoes), in America old black-white films are used with this reason. It also did not turn out unacceptable for Georgian actors to participate in political advertisements, and the actors took active part in the advertisements of such type, for example, during the presidential elections appointed after the "Revolution of Roses". This fact did not happen by chance, because use of the representatives of art, especially, film actors (because they are popular) is considered to be the method of manipulation and it is called the method of use of mediators.

The film, as well as the film fragment, is a powerful means and this is proved by the fact that, when many cinema experts, sociologists, psychologists analyzed influence of the cinema on the audience, for the experiment they often applied to the fragments from the films ("Media", under editorship of Adam Briggs and Paul Cobble, 2005).

The role of film-fragments in TV is of great importance. It occupies much place in a TV program (a film-fragment does really suit a small screen). It is used for illustration, as a document for fulfilling ideological (or propaganda), educational, entertainment, advertisement, etc, functions. They apply it in TV, because it contains great emotional charge, and manipulation with associations is a well-approved method of propaganda.

4) Role of TV Presenter in Cinema Programs

Existence of the TV presenter in the cinema programs is one of the factors, which increases cultural-educational function. The talk of the program presenter about the film plays an important role from the viewpoint of artistic improvement of the audience. Film-director S. Gerasimov wrote: “Famous cinema critic, cinema expert shoulders the work to evaluate any film. He turns attention of the audience on how a scene is made, what the idea of an episode is, how actors played, how directors of photography took pictures, how the plot line developed, etc. He selects any film from the whole set and delivers not minor information about it, but reviews it thoroughly and principally” (“Measure of Responsibility. “TV– Our Friend”. 1983: 35-36)

The film TV presenter strengthens the factor of influence from the ideological viewpoint as well. We have mentioned in the chapter dedicated to the cinema that on Lenin’s charge the showing of films was preceded by comments of famous public speakers. This was also quite often done in TV. We can add to this that one of the most powerful means of propaganda and manipulation is to make comments. It’s not by chance that comments in the USA are considered to be “poisoned sandwich”. Special role in this case is attached to the TV presenter’s professionalism. Influence of the audience is stronger when the TV presenter is popular and authoritative. However, it should also be mentioned here that the audience is not uniform. They differ from one another by intellect, aesthetic taste, etc. That’s why they apprehend the program differently. The audience trusts the program presenter more or less, they believe him. In some cases, they are not interested in anyone’s opinion and it is too difficult to influence their considerations. By the way, psychologists prove, for example, that in Bower’s opinion, it is impossible to change the views of the stubborn audience (Bagirov E.G. Essays in TV Theory. 1978).

Use of the one and the same film for different reasons in different times and different cases is not surprising for TV (we have tackled this issue while talking about the fragments of the films). The program TV presenter can make parallels with any character or event. We would like to cite one example. In 1992 (in the period after overthrow of the first President of Georgia) the State TV channel program “Window” showed L. Visconti’s picture “Death of Gods”. Comments of the program presenter Gogi Gvakharia, mostly, concerned the topic of Fascism. He tried to find much in common between the fact described in the film and the reality (it should be mentioned that the film is about the dictatorship and we have just passed such a period, he said). In the period of the “Revolution of Roses” (2003) when this film was once more shown in the program “Psycho” (TV company “Rustavi-2”) the program presenter tried to find parallels now already between current political situation and leaders of the power.

The comments of TV presenters of the cinema programs in the soviet system period, e.g. “Komsomol – hero of the film” (29 October 1963), surely, were of propagandist character, which

is witnessed at least with these words: “The youth topics are in abundance, especially, those on our energetic youth, which every day make miracles, reach new achievements for the benefit of our great soviet home country (fund 1978, description I, case No. 880: 195).

We would like also to mention here that change of the TV presenters’ comments cannot be explained only by censorship and deficit of democracy. Time changes and man’s considerations change on politics, morals, ethics, aesthetics, etc. But, undoubtedly, freedom is the factor obligatory for just, objective mass media”).

Only from the “Perestroika” period the terms were formed for talking about tabooed topics (many of them concerned the cinema art). The cycles, formed in that period (we mentioned these themes when we discussed the headings), were led by cinema experts, cinema critics, film-directors, etc. Just in the so-called “Perestroika” period it became possible for Georgian cinematographers and journalists to personally meet film-directors, producers, actors, etc from abroad, e.g. Marcello Mastroianni, Robert de Niro, Robert Redford, Jane Fonda, etc.

As for Gogi Gvakharia, we would like to mention he belongs to the category of intellectual and popular program presenters and as he was presenter of several programs in the period we have analyzed, we turned our attention on him as he is cinema expert (though he proceeded far from the limits of cinema expert) and the greatest specialist of this sphere. In the period of the “Revolution of Roses”, as “Rustavi-2” was extremely oppositional channel, through his personal program “Psycho” Gogi Gvakharia occupied radical position and in fact success of PR campaign performed by this cinema program was mostly accounted for popularity of this program presenter.

Gogi Gvakharia really belongs to the category of intellectual presenters. He is a professional cinema expert and his considerations, opinions, views on any sample of the cinema art are often very interesting for the audience – they assist the spectators in clarifying certain issues of cinematography. Such examples are numerous, but in rare cases Gogi Gvakharia was sometimes subjective. We (as one of the representatives of the audience) remembered this example well and made it the object of criticism. We are also, probably, influenced by psychological peculiarity, about which Dragan Eremitsch says that evil is heard far more farther than kindness, because kindness is accepted by people silently, when to the evil they respond with squeals and shouts. But no one has guarantees for never being mistaken. We can cite such an example: in the beginning of 1990, famous director and TV presenter Mark Zakharov invited for participation in his program “Cinema Serpentine” popular variety show singer V. Leontiev, who was in that period offered to play Jesus Christ’s role. M. Zakharov, dissatisfied with this fact was not correct in establishing his consideration. Namely, he reprimanded the singer why he dared to agree to this offer. Unlike M. Zakharov, V. Leontiev behaved in very proper and deserving manner – very suitably and calmly he quite interestingly talked about this issue (it seemed it was impossible for him to imagine to play the role of Jesus Christ). M. Zakharov, in the course of his program, understood his mistake (he listened attentively to the singer and the expression of his face proved

this as well). Later he somehow acknowledged his non-ethical behavior in the talk with the journalist, who reminded him of this detail. Namely, in connection with this fact, M. Zakharov made such comments: “Talk with Leontiev belongs to a category of hard talks, because he is not my ideal. In addition, there was the moment of some inner negative emotion in that interview, which was connected with the proposal made to him to play the role of Jesus Christ. I did not like the idea. I, probably, made some ethical mistakes during the talk and, maybe, I failed to formulate something, properly... But, later, I analyzed the talk. When you receive guests, you should be more caressing. I did not deliberately want to hide from him what I thought. I felt his image, his movement with the microphone on the stage and his human face – it’s quite a different thing. I did like how he was thinking (TV-Radio Broadcasting, 1991 April: 11).

Anyone can make a mistake. But we stressed our attention on Mark Zakharov, because firstly he was TV presenter of authoritative category and, secondly, he made a mistake in the issue, which he was so well aware of – in the finale of one of his best films – “Just That Munchausen” – the baron, having limitless fantasies, calls the society around him to smile and reminds them that a wise face of a man does not imply wisdom at all. Even more, all the stupidities all over the world are made by faces with just such expressions, he says.

As the audience is interested in considerations of the professional program presenters about the cinema, such programs on the cinema in many countries are led just by the specialists of this field. As we have clarified from different sources (<http://www.ebertpresents.com>), the program “At the Movies” in America is of such kind. This program has changed name several times, earlier it was “Siskel and Ebert and the Movies”, then “At the Movies with Ebert and Roeper”. In this program two cinema critics share their opinions on new films.

The force of influence of authorities on the society is great in all the countries, and they are often used for manipulation. Who are considered authorities in what country is another issue – sometimes popular figures, more correctly, figures known to everyone are identified with authoritative persons. It is also a fact that to get rid from the influence of authorities is especially difficult for our people (youth is obviously not implied), because long-time rule of the communist system could not have passed without any trace. But their role in all the countries and in all times is so great that in frequent cases they are trusted with “closed eyes”. That’s why influence on the society is quite often exercised through them. However, here the traits of the spectators should be taken into consideration as well. Some of them criticize authoritative persons sometimes, though they themselves can be criticized for this. “In case if an individual finds the grounds for criticizing the authority, the blame for this falls on the individual, which has found these grounds. The fact that he dared to criticize an authority is the document for his being guilty (Erich Fromm. “Authoritarian Conscience”, 1998: 7).

Chapter IV

TV Audience

TV products and, among them, cinema programs, are formed for the audience. That's why it is necessary to take into consideration demands of the audience, which in its turn implies comprehensive study of the audience.

Interest in the audience in the Soviet Union started from the 60s of last century (in that period multi-channel broadcasting has already started), but its aim then was to determine mostly the amount of TV spectators (also TV sets) and not consideration of their interests. The issue of studying the audience had been limited for years, because TV had to fulfill strictly determined functions.

We would like to mention here that the issues of study of the audience and TV programming are closely related with each another, because without comprehensive study of the audience programming of the TV programs won't be perfect and just on the contrary, in the soviet period it was difficult to talk about full-value programming, dependence on the Russian Central TV complicated this. It is clear that in that period the so-called coordination of programs, in reality, was not bilateral. The dictate of the Central TV was so strong and great that even the Russian journalists and TV presenters started to talk about it after the break of the Soviet Union (e.g. V. Zwick in the journal "TV and Radio Broadcasting, 1992).

As the period under our analysis involves 1996-2010, to manifest the situation from the viewpoint of studying the audience, we want to discuss the first, i.e. the situation in 1996. In that period, sociological research department of the TV programs general board of directors served study of the audience. This department continued again those "traditions" and the main reason of this was that it was not an independent organization. By the way, the issue of the audience study remained a problem that time for many post-soviet countries and among them, for Russia as well, and this was witnessed by the words of TV company NTV president Igor Malashenko. Namely, he said that he relied only on his own intuition as, in his words, "there is not a bit reliable system for public opinion questioning and determining the rating of the programs" (TV park, 1996, No. 48: 49). In the end of November 1996 we expressed interest in the rating of main programs of the Georgian TV Channel I, for which we have conducted survey by questionnaire (600 people were interviewed, from which 500 were from Tbilisi, 50 – from Rustavi and 50 – from Samtredia). It was not, however, perfect – it demanded further scientific processing and apprehension, which could have been done only by the specialists of this field, because numerous nuances existed, known only for professionals (later, it was because of this that we did not conduct questioning to determine the ratings. This is done by the marketing services). With

this questioning we became sure that the cinema programs were most popular among the Georgian TV spectators. It became also clear that women (middle-aged) were the most active spectators of the serials, and young people with special intensity watch “Illusion”. Differentiation according to the education was far more difficult. For example, people with secondary education were spectators of serials and also, quite often, of the “Window” and, vice versa, people with higher education, did not refuse TV serials (even more, the second variant turned out to be more distinctive).

We consider the way for improving the situation in that period is as follows: 1) To separate the Georgian TV Channel I from commercial structures and to turn it into the public TV; 2) For comprehensive study of the audience to separate the department of sociological research from the TV-Radio Corporation and to form it as a separate organization; 3) Differentiated approach to the audience, for which existence of numerous channels gives fine opportunity. Even more, we thought it would be fine for the future to concentrate accent on paid channels and one of their forms – ordered programs, in which the spectators could have chosen the program suitable for their taste: to subscribe to a film, a concert, an entertainment program, etc. It is not by chance that they used to often apply to the paid channels then not only in the USA, England, France, Germany, Switzerland, etc, but also in the Scandinavian countries, which always differed with restraint to commercial broadcasting.

What has changed since that period? Let’s follow this with the following order – 1) Georgian TV Channel I, which was a state channel, within ten years since that period has really transformed into the Public Broadcaster, but nothing has changed with it from the viewpoint of democracy (it is pointed about it in last data of “Freedom House”); 2) Marketing service and different agencies are engaged in studying the audience of all the channels of Georgian TV and the Public Broadcaster among them. The reason of this being that with the amount of advertisements, the Public Broadcaster Channel I does not much fall behind the private TV companies. That’s why the accent is made on TV serials and various shows, which enjoy high ratings. Proceeding from this, the issue of comprehensive study of the audience is not considered urgent; 3) if in 1996 several channels existed, within certain period of time the amount of TV channels considerably increased, but as we have seen later, neither the existence of many channels appeared to be a reason for differentiated approach. The talk on healthy competitiveness also becomes a problem. As for paid channels and one of its forms – the programs by order, it remained unreal and unrealized fact till the last year of our research – 2010, because a majority of the population faced problems in paying sums, even for maintaining the “Public Broadcaster”.

We have obtained information on the ratings of TV companies (conducted by BCG), according to which “Rustavi-2” had the highest rating – 94, 40%. This channel can be watched by 99, 50% in Tbilisi, and 99, 40% - in the regions; Channel I is on the third place by rating – 69, 80% and it can be watched in Tbilisi by 97, 80%, in the regions – 94, 20%. It was interesting for us that the “Red Zone” failed to be in the list of educational programs (29 programs were in the list).

We have started the talk on TV audience by saying that study of the audience seemed to be of no interest in the soviet period, as their requirements were not considered at all by anyone. Serious research of the audience seems not to be expedient now either. TV program is being made for the audience. Proceeding from this we can dare to speak about their influence on each other. TV program influences the spectators and the audience facilitates formation of the screen produce. In our country it facilitates, but does not determine formation of TV programs, because this issue is connected with many factors. Scholar N. Leonidze talked about it: “Reverse relation can be limited with ideological-political situation, censorship, and bureaucratic interests of the administration. In such cases the community cannot vividly influence TV programs. Cultural traditions of any country can also become the factor of restraint of broadcasting” (N. Leonidze. “TV Journalism”, 1001: 595).

Conclusion

To specify what place feature cinema art occupies in Georgian TV and what functions it performs (especially for forming the public opinion), we have conducted observations on two main channels: the “Public Broadcaster” Channel I and commercial TV company “Rustavi-2”.

We considered it necessary to show what the cinema art is like, independent of TV – what role it can play. And we have determined:

Cinematography, as well as other branches of art, plays important role in establishing aesthetic taste of people; it also has educational, entertainment functions that does not exclude its ideological function (influence on public consciousness). This often happens in combination.

We have stated from the talk on TV that what is unacceptable for real cinema art – i.e. sheer propaganda – is a usual phenomenon for TV. The word “propaganda” cannot really be considered forgotten yet for the Georgian TV (like many post-soviet republics). However, the propaganda of the present-day period differs from the old one. For example, it is not as simple as the old one and we come across it in different forms, etc. The Georgian TV was formed in the soviet period and it, naturally, kept popularizing the communist ideology till the break of the Soviet Union. But it turned into powerful means of mass media and propaganda after certain period of time (though in the beginning it served mostly spreading of the works of different branches of art). 15 years after the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the Georgian TV Channel I has turned into the Public Broadcaster, though deficit of democracy still exists even today (both in the beginning and the end of our research to prove lack of freedom of speech we have applied the evaluations of the same organization “Freedom House”).

If in the soviet period, at least in the 90s, the Georgian TV Channel I and also “Rustavi-2” tried to form the public opinion mostly through information programs and publicist programs of different types, in recent years both channels day by day increase the amount of entertainment programs and through them formation of the public opinion is being conducted.

As for feature cinematography on TV, it firstly becomes clear that it is designated for performing the cultural-educational function. However, in the soviet period it also appeared as propagandist of the socialist system ideology. Therefore, for this, separate programs and special headings were being formed and it is not surprising – if cinema, which is powerful force for influencing the public consciousness, loses its aesthetic value on small screen, when it appears in the TV mechanism it acquires here journalistic functions as well and because of this, along with the other functions in TV it can be used to form the public opinion. We have considered from the very beginning that among other peculiarities of TV, this is caused by simultaneity, due to which

many films (without comments) are thought by the audience as in relation with the ongoing events (of course, it is nonsense to connect each film with any fact). We were convinced in this on the example of intensive show of films shot on the patriotic themes in the tense periods, during wars; they really were designated to form the public opinion then.

This is also caused by existence of headings (series, cycles, serials) and we were assured of this on the example of “Psycho” cinema program (“Rustavi-2”). The role of cycle “non-violent conflict”, formed in this program in the period previous to the “Revolution of Roses” turned out to be especially important. Foreign journalist also informed about this fact (E. Iberi. Issues of TV-Radio Journalism, part VII 2005). And in regard to serials we have mentioned that in the beginning the Georgian TV audience had an opportunity to watch those serials of Russia and the socialist countries, which involved ideology acceptable only to the soviet system and they finally aimed at forming the public opinion.

In the present-day period, we don't consider it casual that serials are shown in abundance; because we think in this case also manipulation with the public opinion takes place (because the real life is being substituted with the imaginary one).

The role of film fragments appeared important in fulfilling many functions – they are used in informational or different publicist, entertainment and other programs, advertisements, clips – a film fragment sometimes serves to popularization of the film itself (advertising), in other cases, it delivers information about important details of the work of film director or actors playing in it (educational function). In other cases it can possibly serve to strengthening of moral behavior, patriotic feelings (propagandist function), etc.

Existence of a program presenter is also of special importance (it first of all promotes improvement of the cultural level of the audience) from the viewpoint of influencing the society as well. We have seen what results were obtained by cinema critic G. Gvakharia in the period of the “Revolution of Roses” with purpose-oriented talks with the invited guests in his program “Psycho”.

Through the cinema, the factor of public opinion formation is, clearly, connected with the fact that TV audience much exceeds the cinema audience. That means that from the viewpoint of public opinion formation, cinema multiplied on the TV screens can really become a powerful force. Through cinematography, use of different methods of manipulation (propaganda) is possible in TV, for example, the effect of advancing (show of a film suitable to the concrete situation); concealing of the fact (show of foreign film during the religious celebration days in the soviet period); use (especially during the elections) of the effect of mediators (actors, film directors); presentation of documents for visual effect (documentaries show in the period of the “Revolution of Roses” on overthrowing of dictators); emotional effect (which the cinema art has in abundance) at least in the form of film fragments, etc.

How well the audience and its demands are studied? In the period of the Soviet Union study of the audience was of formal character, because TV was not independent and it had strictly determined functions to perform. In recent years, study of the audience was ongoing mainly by marketing service and various agencies, which determine the ratings of the programs. In our opinion, it is very bad tendency, because ratings do not determine everything. That's why, in many countries of the West much money is spent for comprehensive study of the audience. For example, the Russian TV Channel "Kultura" ("Culture") is not a rating channel, which is acknowledged by TV experts of this country as well. However, no one talks about its closing down ("TV-Radio Broadcasting", 2005). And secondly, if a good film, high-level cinema program is often delivered to people, certainly in the period best suited to watching, which surely has to be shown, in the time best fit for seeing, then the audience of such programs facilitates increase in number of such programs.

REFERENCES:

One author book:

1. Amirejibi N. "Screen of Times", Tbilisi, "Khelovneba", 1990.
2. Amirejibi N. "From Cinema to Film", Tbilisi, "Ganatileba", 1990.
3. Bakradze A. "Cinema, Theatre", Tbilisi, "Khelovneba", 1989.
4. Dolidze G. "V. I. Lenin and the Issues of Cinema", Tbilisi, "Khelovneba", 1974.
5. Tvalchrelidze T. "Cinematographic Searches", Tb., "Khelovneba", 1989.
6. Tatarashvili N. "Issues of TV Journalism", TSU, 2003.
7. Kukava T. "Aesthetics", Tbilisi, 1998.
8. Leonidze N. "TV News", Tbilisi, 1987.
9. Leonidze N. "TV Journalism", Tbilisi, TSU, 2002.
10. Noniashvili K. "Methods of Sociological Research", 2009.
11. Zhvania G. "Georgian Documentary Film", 1970.
12. Prangishvili A. "Essays in Psychology", Tbilisi, 1987.
13. Fromm E. "Authoritarian Conscience", Tbilisi, 1998.
14. Ketsbaya K. "Sociology of Journalism", Tb, 2003.
15. Chartolani G. "TV-Radio Journalism", part I, Tbilisi, 2008.

Two author books:

16. Bill Kovac, Tom Rozenstyle. "Elements of Journalism", 2006.
17. Deflore M., Denis E. "On Mas Communication Apprehension", 2009.
18. Surguladze R., Iberi E. "Mass Communication", Tb., 2003.

Several author books:

19. "Problems of Cinema Art" (language, structure, sociology), TSU, 1992.
20. "Personality, Culture, Society", Tbilisi, 2010.
21. "Ethics of Journalism". Centre of Democratic Innovations, 2003.
22. "TV Journalism", Tbilisi, 1998.
23. "Issues of TV-Radio Journalism", vol. I, TB., 1996.
24. "Issues of TV-Radio Journalism", vol. II. Tbilisi, 1997.
25. "Issues of TV-Radio Journalism", vol. III, Tb., 1998.
26. "Issues of TV-Radio Journalism", vol. IV, Tbilisi, 1999.

27. "Issues of TV-Radio Journalism", vol. V. Tbilisi, 2001.
28. "Issues of TV-Radio Journalism", vol. VI, Tbilisi, 2003.
29. "Issues of TV-Radio Journalism", vol. VII. Tbilisi, 2005.
30. Karumidze Z., Nizharadze G., Gvakharia G., Bukhrikidze D., Lordkipanidze A. "In Search of Lost Space" (policy of culture in post-soviet Georgia), Tb., 2010.

Journals and newspapers:

31. Newspaper "Alia", 4 June 1996 (article by G. Gvakharia "Fear of Freedom").
32. Newspaper "Alia", 11 June 1996 (article by G. Gvakharia "Take a Splinter Out of Your Eye and Watch Fassbinder's Films Thus").
33. Newspaper "Akhali Taoba", 30 December: 6, 1997.
34. Newspaper "7 Dghe", 5-6 January, #1, 1998.
35. Journal "Cinema", #2, 1986.
36. Journal "Cinema", #1, 1990.
37. Journal "Drosha", 1988.
38. Journal "Amarta", summer, 2001.
39. Journal "Tskheli Shokoladi", #47, 2007.
40. Journal "Tskheli Shokoladi", #57, 2010.
41. Journal "Tavisupleba", September, 2004.

Literature in foreign language (one author):

42. Беляев И.К. "Введение в режиссуру", часть I, часть II М. 1998:
43. Цвик В," Реклама как вид журналистики", 2001
44. Врус Льюис," Диктор телевидения",М, 1973:
45. Вайсвельд И. "Кино как вид искусства", издание "Знание".1983
46. Голядкин Н. А ."ТВ информация США", 1995
47. Почепцов. Г. Г "Информационные войны" М. 2000:
48. Саппак Вл. "Телевидение и мы", Москва, " Искусство," 1988
49. Утилова Н. И. "Монтаж как средство художественной выразительности" часть I, часть II М. 1998
50. Эллиот Аронсон, "Овщественное животное (Введение в социальную психологию)" М, 1998
51. Эрик Фихтелиус, "Десять заповедей журналистики," 2003

52. Патрик Шампань “Делать мнение: новая политическая игра”), Москва, 1997
53. Саруханов В. А. “Азбука телевидения,” Изд “Аспект Пресс,” 2003
54. Прохоров Е. П. “Введение в теорию журналистики”, М, 1998
55. Прохоров Е. П. “Исследуя журналистику” М, “РИП- Холдинг”, 2006
56. Чалдини. Роберт, “Психология влияния”, М, 2003
57. Ворецкий Р. А. “В Бермудском треугольнике ТВ”, Изд. “Икар”, 1994
58. Вайсвелд И. “ Кино как вид искусства” Издательство “Знание”, Москва, 1983
59. Майкл Рабигер “Монтаж” (режиссура документального кино) Москва, 1999
60. Фрейлих С. И. “Теория кино” Москва “Альма Матер” 2005
61. Вориснев С. В. “Социология коммуникации”, Москва “Юнити” 2003
62. Цвик В. Л. “Телевизионная журналистика”, М 2004
63. Марк Тангеит “Медиагиганты” М 2006
64. Robert J. Wagman, “The First Amendment Book” New York, 1991
65. Edward Jay Whetmore, “Mediamerika, mediaworld” California State University at Dominguez Hills, 1995

Literature in foreign language (several authors):

66. “40 мнений о телевидении”, Москва “Искусство,” 1978
67. “Наш друг–телевидение”, Москва, “Искусство”, .1983
68. “Медиа”(Под редакцией Адама Бриггза и Поля Кобли), 2005
69. Телерадиоэфир (Под редакцией Я. Н. Засурского) 2005

70. Матвеева Л. В, Аникеева Т.Я, Мочалова Ю.В. “Психология телевизионной коммуникации” Москва, “Юнити”, 2002

71. Уильям Уэллс, Джон Бернет, Сандра Мориарти, “Реклама- принципы и практика” Санкт-Петербург “ Питер” 2001

72. “Телевидение вчера сегодня завтра” выпуск 1 Москва, “Искусство”, 1981

73. “Телевидение вчера сегодня завтра” выпуск 2 Москва, “Искусство,” 1982

74. “Телевидение вчера сегодня завтра” выпуск 3 Москва, “Искусство,” 1983

75. “Телевидение вчера сегодня завтра” выпуск 4 Москва, “Искусство,” 1984

76. “Телевидение вчера сегодня завтра” выпуск 5 Москва, “Искусство,” 1985

77. “Телелабиринты”, Москва, “Искусство,” 1988

78. Journalist: Status, Rights and Responsibilities, Prague, 1989

Dictionaries:

79. Reference-dictionary of social and political terms, “Logos Press”, 2004.

Newspapers and journals in foreign language:

80. Теле-радио эфир, 1991 январь

81. Теле-радио эфир, 1991 №2

82. Теле-радио эфир, 1991 апрель

83. Теле-радио эфир, 1991 август.

84. ТВ парк 1996, N48:

85. Журналист, 1974 №10

Web-sites:

86. Rustavi2.com

87. WWW.GPB.ge.

88. www.evertpresents.com

Archives material”

89. Fund 1978, description I, case 369.

90. Fund 1978, description I, case 695.

91. Fund 1978, description I, case 696.

92. Fund 1978, description I, case 697

93. Fund 1978, description I, case 705.

94. Fund 1978, description I, case 760.

95. Fund 1978, description I, case 879.

96. Fund 1978, description I, case 880.