

1990s, the governance system of Armenia in the 1990s and the 2000s, Armenia's institutions such as elections and the parliament, the ties between informal politics and informal economics, and social mobility in Armenia's elites.

---

**LUIZA AYVAZYAN** is a Researcher at the Caucasus Institute think tank in Yerevan, Armenia. She is part of the research team of Networks of Power and Informal Institutions in Armenia, a project funded by the Academic Swiss Caucasus Net (ASCN). Luiza has worked at various local and international organizations. In 2013-14 she was employed by the Transparency International Anti-Corruption Center as coordinator of a project on Promoting Transparency and Accountability in the Defense Sector in Armenia. In 2011-13 she was a Youth and Civic Programs Manager at the Armenian branch of the National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (NDI), working with youth organizations. She has also collaborated with projects of the OSCE, the European Council and the Council of Europe. Luiza holds an MA degree in International Relations (Russian-Armenian (Slavonic) University, Yerevan, Armenia) and has graduated from yearly journalism courses at the Caucasus Institute. She is currently working on her Ph.D. on Armenia's foreign policy, and studying at the Yerevan School of Political Studies.

### 3.5 **HRANT MIKAELIAN** (Caucasus Institute)

#### **MILITARY REFORM IN ARMENIA: FROM NETWORK TO CORPORATION**

As sources for the study, the Caucasus Institute research team used official biographies of leading military actors, media reports and publications on the Armenian army. Fieldwork consisted of interviews with experts, former volunteers and leading actors in the armies of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh. Theoretical concepts of informality were used to analyse the material and identify trends. There are fewer open sources on institutional development and problems of the army than there are about politics. Interviews with senior figures in the army were the key to the success of the project. All senior military actors of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh were entered into a database and categorized. We used the database to identify trends and create a timeline, which proved similar to the political timeline, indicating that the two spheres were linked. The first stage in our timeline was over by 1991: the emergence of guerrilla troops staffed with volunteers who joined the war in Nagorno-Karabakh. 1991 was when Armenia began creating a regular army. Former volunteers continued to dominate it. As the institutionalisation of the army continued, the influence of former volunteers decreased by the late 1990s; it is almost non-existent now. The current stage is characterized by the gradual introduction of civil control over the army and contract servicemen replacing conscripts in some areas.

Informal relations were present in the Armenian army from the very start, because the volunteer troops that it was built upon were operating entirely based on personal ties. Once the army became a formal institution, the informal ties lost some of their significance. However, informality persists in the army's relationship with the state and with business, e.g. in connection with the use of non-budgetary funds to maintain the army.

---

**HRANT MIKAELIAN** has worked as Researcher at the Caucasus Institute (CI) think tank in Yerevan, Armenia since 2009. He is currently part of the research team of Networks of Power and Informal Institutions in Armenia, a project funded by the Academic Swiss Caucasus Net (ASCN). He has coordinated a number of research projects at the CI, including Armenia and Armenians, Turkey and Turks in Armenian Media and The Nationalist Discourse in Armenia. Hrant has published over 20 scholarly papers, journal articles and book chapters. His spheres of scientific interest include demography, migration, public discourses, domestic politics and local self-government. For five years he has assisted the CI Director in preparing Nations in Transit reports on Armenia. Hrant holds an MA degree in Political Science from the Caucasus Institute. He is working on his PhD at the National Academy of Sciences of Armenia in the field of modern Georgian history, and studying at the Yerevan School of Political Studies.

### 3.6 **YULIA ANTONYAN** (Yerevan State University) & **KETEVAN KHUTSISHVILI** (Tbilisi State University)

#### **“ELITES”: DEFINITIONS, IDENTITIES, AND CULTURAL REPERTOIRES. AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL APPROACH TO RECENT TRANSFORMATIONS IN THE SOCIAL STRUCTURE OF ARMENIAN AND GEORGIAN SOCIETIES**

The presentation will present the book entitled Elites and “Elites”: Transformations of Social Structures in Post-Soviet Armenia and Georgia, which is the result of a joint Armenian-Georgian anthropological survey of the concept of “elites” in contemporary Georgia and Armenia. The survey has embraced a set of topics related to the process of the formation of new national elites in the course of the construction of the nation-states, the genealogy and typology of the new elites, mechanisms and principles of organization of power, old and new hierarchical structures, and their continuity with the cultural heritage of previous periods of history. Being both very much alike and very much distinctive from each other, Armenia and Georgia have developed social structures similar in form, yet discrepant through their inner interplay of meanings, interpretations and correlations of the parts of these structures. This study of elites, elitism and elitists involves different social (and also ethnic and religious) groups which have been affected by the process of reconfiguration of social structures. The volume consists of chapters each representing separate surveys conducted by 8 participants of the project. The topics of the chapters are organized in four parts. Part one, Elitist groups and networks, relates to social groups that are marginal and non-elitist by default, built into existing hierarchies and acquiring elitist statuses within their groups. Part two, New Economic Elites, addresses new types of power elites who build their economic wealth through power and maintain power through that economic wealth. Part three, Religion, nationalism, identity and elites, contributes to our understanding of how religion and nationalism can shape elites. And part four, Post-soviet transformations of Soviet elitism, deals with current changes in the social structures inherited from Soviet times. The chapters are preceded by the introduction, presenting the main theories forming the foundations of the research and discussing the situation related to academic discourse on elites existing in the post-Soviet space and in Armenia and Georgia in particular. The volume is one of the first attempts in the region to address anthropologically the topic under scrutiny, using ethnographical methodologies and approaches.

---

**YULIA ANTONYAN**, Associate Professor of the Department of Cultural Studies, Faculty of History at Yerevan State University. She holds a PhD (“Candidate” degree) in History and Ethnology (2007). Her research interests include the Anthropology of Religion, the Anthropology of Social Structure and Elitism. She has conducted ethnographic fieldwork among Armenians of Armenia, Georgia, Syria and Lebanon. She is the author of 38 articles in Armenian, Russian, English and Polish.

**KETEVAN KHUTSISHVILI**, Professor of Anthropology at Ivane Javakishvili Tbilisi State University, Institute of Ethnology, Faculty of Humanities. Fields of interest are ethno-cultural processes in the Caucasus, religion, ethnic identity and relations, and IDP studies. Author of 62 scientific works, including four monographs. She has conducted ethnographic fieldwork in various parts of Georgia, Caucasus and Turkey. Topics of the theses: “The dream and dream interpretation in Georgian being” (Candidate of History, 2000) and “The Influence of the Religious Factor on Ethno-Cultural Identification and Civil Integration (The Case of the Modern Georgia)” (Doctor of History, 2005).

### 3.7 **KAMIL WIELECKI** (University of Warsaw)

#### **HOW TO ENSURE WHAT FORMAL MECHANISMS FAIL TO ENSURE: THE VALUE OF INFORMAL RELATIONS FOR RUSSIAN SMALL ENTREPRENEURS**

It was petty trade or small entrepreneurship in general that allowed vast amounts of people to survive the crisis faced by post-Soviet Russia. As a result of the collapse of industry, many workplaces simply vanished and millions of people virtually landed out on the street, having no other opportunity to make a living than by engaging in trade activities. The crisis of the state also consisted in the fact that it was unable to