

IMAGE OF A LEADER IN POLITICAL ADVERTISING

Nvard Melkonyan

In the article is presented sociological analysis of image of a number of Armenian political leaders who ran for the post of president in 2003. The analysis of political advertising allowed revealing what kind of policy was adopted by this or that politician, which symbols were being used at the same time, how effective was the process of the political leaders' self-presentation from the standpoint of its conformity with the electors' social expectations and its congruence in the current social-political situation. It was studied which stereotypes and ideas, referring to the political leaders' individuality, existed in public consciousness at pre-election period, positive and negative characteristics of political leaders by the electors.

Introduction

For Armenians the year 2003 was full of political events: in February-March the presidential elections were held, in the first round of which 9 candidates took part, In May the elections to the National Assembly were held in which 21 parties and social-political organizations took part by proportional system.

The latest elections in Armenia were quite stormy and not without a dramatic outcome. As a result, scholars faced a number of actualized issues connected with the attitude of citizens to authorities. What is the voters' political choice votersbased on? To what extent does their decision result from confidence and dictated by rational choice? How much do the voters trust in mass media? And what is the extent of influence political advertising has on voters? What are the methods and gimmicks the candidates apply for making their own image? To what extent does that image meets the voters' expectations and how is it perceived by the electorate? What are the stereotypes of the image of political parties and leaders prevailing in social consciousness today? On the threshold of new elections, the above mentioned issues need more detailed consideration and comprehension.

In this article is made an attempt to make a qualitative analysis of the image of Armenia's political leaders, grounding on the results of complex sociological

research of elections held in June 2003. On the one hand were studied the peculiarities of leaders and parties in political advertising, on the other hand - the voters' reactions and estimations to the offered images and symbols. Here are also revealed the widespread stereotypes prevailing in the society with regard to the image of this or that political party or leader.

To conduct the research television advertising was chosen, which is determined by the following factors. Electronic media are a more effective means of communicating with the audience (83% of population considered television to be the main source of information) [1, p. 215-216]. The circulation of print media in Armenia is not large, the price for many people is unaffordable and they are distributed to provinces in limited quantity. Besides, in terms of design and dissemination of image-making information, one should mention the following distinctive features. Both radio and press deliver only verbal images, whereas, television forms and spreads information concerning habitual, kinetic, environmental and, of course, verbal image, which increases its efficiency.

The results of the survey produce interesting factual material for the description and analysis of the image of political leaders and parties. It is reasonable to present the results of the analysis in accordance with the above mentioned structure of political image. Multilevel analysis of political advertising (traditional, content and discourse-analysis) provides a chance to reveal the image devised by this or that politician, the symbols used in image making process, the efficiency of a political leaders' self-presentation in compliance with the voters' social expectations and from the standpoint of the latter's congruencies in current social-political situation. Later on the focus group method was employed to study what stereotypes and concepts, what positive and negative characteristic features concerning the political leaders' individuality were prevalent in social consciousness at pre-electoral period, to what extent the expectations and stereotypes existing in social consciousness were reflected in political leaders' and parties' image and what political myths and symbols prevail in social consciousness today.

Complex analysis of potential voters' perception of the distinctive features of political leader's image is quite broad in Armenia. In the article we will only refer to the examples of image making of those political leaders, who were the main actors in the latest electoral campaign. Let's mention that the purpose of this article is the description of problems connected with political image making and not its estimation.

1. Distinctive features of perception of political leader's image in Armenia

According to research conducted by specialists in electoral technologies, there are two strategies of political leader's image perception. According to the first one, a political leader must be a kind of «superman» («he is better than me»), who is able to find and offer extraordinary solutions to vital problems, a person with exceptional intellectual abilities and strong will-power [2].

The second strategy suggests that only the political leader, who is perceived by the population as «one of us», as an ordinary man with his own advantages and disadvantages, will enjoy popular support.

This attitude may be well applied to the Armenian political mosaic with appropriate historical grounding:

- Loss of independence and statehood as such was the basis of idealizing the Armenian state, which is to be ruled by a fair and wise ruler.
- Republic, as a form of organizing society and democracy, as a political regime of government, was deprived of historical prerequisites to take roots and become a tradition.
- Furthermore, being deprived of statehood, the main form of self-organization of Armenian society were communities, clans and families.

Thus, based on the distinctive features of national history, the two well-known tactics of a leader's self-presentation are interpreted in the following way:

1. *National leader*, this is the wise ruler, savior and messiah, who is able to revive the great Armenian statehood and win back its worthy existence and «its place» amongst the other countries.
2. *Communal leader*, a type of a leader who has historically been evolved to up-to-date conditions. This character of a leader coincides with the type of «their own», «brother» and «a good fellow», who bears responsibility not for the nation or the country as a whole, but for the territory, community and clan entrusted to him.

Political situation in this country during the electoral struggle of 2003 considerably changed. The image of some political leaders (for the last 4 years the political scene in Armenia was striking the eye with high level of mobility), shaped 4 years ago, had undergone considerable changes. Almost all the candidates tried to show their closeness to the nation and their awareness of its problems.

Presidential elections suggest formation of the first model of leader by most of the politicians; however, in practice we had quite interesting symbioses, hybrids of the first and second models. Let's give the following examples:

2. Actualization of image in political advertising: the problem of self-presentation

2.1. Robert KocharianKocharian's image.

The ruling president of the Republic of Armenia ran for the second term. Quite a large variety of technologies were applied in the process of electoral struggle for political image formation. The myth of a leader, who was aware of all the problems of society not just by hearsay, and was ready and on the way of resolving them was actively circulated. It was emphasized in every possible way that the candidate is competent in all the spheres of social life. In this case, the method of comparison and contrast was actively applied in advertising, which develops in three main directions:

- Comparison of Robert KocharianKocharian and L. Ter-Petrosian's terms of office with to reveal the considerable positive changes for the better.
- Comparison of the Republic of Armenia with all the republics of the region, accentuating the advantages of the RA and particularly its economic and political stability and considerable growth of democracy.
- Comparison of R. KocharianKocharian as a political leader with the other candidates, and the phenomenon of opposition as a whole.

The advertising videos urge to comparison by themselves. The striking example of it is one of the advertising videos beginning with the following words: «everything is learnt in comparison», and in the table are visually compared KocharianKocharian, Geghamyan, Demirchyan by the following parameters:

- Experience of political government (in comparison with the others, Kocharian is an experienced and effective political figure.)
- Foreign policy, diplomatic experience (Kocharian's achievements in foreign policy, the striking example of which is his meetings with leaders and well known people from different countries, successful negotiations and the lack of such achievements in the case of the other leaders.)
- Success in the negotiation process on Karabakh conflict.
- Experience of a military man (Kocharian took part in Karabakh's military operations; the other ones don't have such an experience.) His participation in Karabakh conflict.

- Perception by the international community.
- Perception by the Diaspora.

The main symbols applied while shaping such an image are:

- Handshake - Kocharian with a foreign leader;
- Construction (at that, Kocharian is either in the role of a helmeted construction worker, or, which is more characteristic and symbolic, in a pose associating with the statue of the architect Tamanyan bending over Yerevan's master plan);
- *Armenian context*, where the president appears in a military uniform with a weapon in his hand or surrounded by soldiers and the Defense Minister Serge Sargsian.
- *The ribbon cutting ceremony*, newly opened factories and newly-erected buildings.

The image of «leader-politician», who is well aware of all the problems in the Republic and makes every attempt to solve them was actively introduced. The image of «the practical man» is affirmed by the slogan «Let's work together!»

As a result, the image of the experienced politician Kocharian is shaped, whose services are mentioned and appreciated both in his homeland and abroad. In comparison with him, his political rivals (A. Geghamyan and S. Demirchyan) can not even be considered as alternatives. In this way the candidate's «peripheral» image is formed, with no possible alternative to substitute¹.

This image, along with the one of an experienced leader, was considerably reinforced during the second round of the presidential campaign. For example: Robert Kocharian's advertising, which begins with a rhetorical question: «*Whom would you entrust the lives of people dear to you, to the experienced doctor, or his son, who is not even able to hold a scalpel in his hands?*»

Or one more example: «... *there are many directors of idle factories in Armenia like Demirchyan, and some more, who are more experienced than he.*»

The image of «*non-alternative leader*» is also supported by advertisement-inquiries. According to advertising technologists, the individuals, most of the electorate would like to identify itself with (basing upon their appearance, man-

¹ Structure of Image (as a role) is supposed to consist of a core (dominant) and periphery (optional micro-roles). The core may be presented by a block of roles: for example, Patriot is the elected Representative of the people or an Ordinary Person. We think that the image model may be depicted in the form of a «tree», where the trunk is the image's dominant, large branches accompany the dominant in its role and the little ones have undertaken optional micro-roles. The top of the «Image tree» is formed by separate qualities of a leader, such as honesty, capacity for work, modesty, education, decency, etc. (O.C. Иссерс. «Что говорят политики, чтобы нравиться своему народу»/Вестник Омского университета, 1996, Вып. 1. с. 71-74).

ners of behavior, deliberation of answers), say that they are going to vote for Kocharian, and so called «not serious» or «unpresentable» actors of commercials say that they will vote for the other candidates, at that, they often slander and confuse their names (confusing S. Demirchyan with K. Demirchyan). In this way is made an impression of «effect success», which reinforces Kocharian's image of «non-alternativity».

If in most of the commercial broadcasts R. Kocharian is presented in the image of the national leader, then in the ones, the president communicates with the voters, the logic of forming the given type of image is sharply disrupted. However, as the first type of self-presenting strategy prevails in the integral composition of image, there is no evident conflict in image perception.

According to the information of focus-group, Kocharian's image, in the voters' perceptions, is mainly compared with the image of RF president V. Putin. Most of the researchers attribute a number of positive features of Putin to Kocharian (the ones interviewed even mention outward resemblance.) According to the respondents, Armenia needs a leader like Putin (having in view his tough policy and discipline.) Robert Kocharian, on the whole, coincides with these claims.

According to the focus-group participants, the presidential power should be the main ruling branch of the government. The president must have «a strong fist» and carry out rigid policy.

One can single out a few main qualities attributed to R. Kocharian: clever, strong fist, cold-blooded, self-restrained, malicious genius, strong leader and real man.

«The Armenians have Asian character, that's why we need to have more tsars. One shouldn't underestimate the president: he is very clever, flexible and strong, especially in foreign policy affairs, he is a malicious genius, and even if he looks weak and controllable, it is only a matter of strategy for him!» (Focus-group: economic and scientific elite, male, 48 years old.)

One may say that the president's image and the collective context have made a certain space of tolerance, which may be characterized by the following expression: «we turn a blind eye» (an opinion of the young members of focus-group), which, in its turn, results in the formation of a semi-positive perception: *«at least one will not be ashamed to see him representing your country anywhere» (Focus-group: youth, male, 24.)*

It is noteworthy, that just like the survival of the Soviet epoch, the stereotype is still prevailing in the social consciousness, that it is not the ruler (in this case the president) to be blamed for the actual problems in the republic, but his subordinates and surrounding. Here, for the first time, the phenomena of «not well-

informed president» is circulated (as a striking example of this is Stalin, who «didn't know» about reprisals and «was not informed» about his subordinates' tyranny.)

In our society this stereotype is outlined quite well by the image of president Kocharian, who may be impartially informed about the vital problems of his nation: «*the trouble is that there is a long chain of subordinates leading to the president, which prevents people from turning directly to the president with their problems*» (Focus-group, male, 35); «*we attribute to the president both positive and negative features, but we are separated by such a gulf of subordinates, that either our voice never reaches the president or, even if it does, it is too late...*» (Focus-group: v. Shirakamut, female, 63); «*We have a good president but his surroundings are bad*» (Focus-group: budget worker, female, 53).

2.2 Stepan Demirchyan's image

Both in presidential and parliamentary elections Stepan Demirchyan nominated himself as the leader of the social-political faction «Justice».

Demirchyan chose quite an interesting image. Demirchyan's adversaries spared no effort to make his image as «his father's son,» who has nothing more worthy to rely on, besides being related to the indisputable authority like K. Demirchyan. Demirchyan's headquarters made an attempt to reconstruct that image in the context favorable for him: «the worthy son of the worthy father.» At that, this image develops and appears in different micro roles, until it is finally embodied in the image of «Crown prince.» At the same time, it is stressed both blood and the idea of heredity and succession: the son as the successor of K. Demirchyan's work.

In one commercial broadcast an attempt was made to shape S. Demirchyan personal image out of the context of his father's personality (a commercial in response to Kocharian's counter-commercial), where the following interpretation was presented: «... *by the time, K Demirchyan was no longer the Secretary General of Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic, S. Dmirchyan was elected to the post of factory director. At that difficult period, under the conditions of no central financing, when all the other factories were plundered, the «Mars» factory was being built thanks to S. Demirchyan's strong will and resoluteness.*»

In the other commercial broadcast Demirchyan is presented in the family circle; here are his wife, children and mother and the traditions of the Demirchyan family. S. Demirchyan tells that he inherited generosity, loyalty and other good features from his father. S. Demirchyan's mother tells that her husband and son were best friends.

As a matter of fact, in each commercial the idea of succession is stressed. At

the same time, the following symbols are used here: after the tree is sawn down a new sprout grows from its trunk as a symbol of life, succession and continuity.

The analysis of Demirchyan's image perception by the voters (made on the basis of information provided by focus-groups) revealed a discrepancy between social expectations and the leader's personification. The conflict here is caused by the fact that the voters' expectations here are connected with K. Demirchyan and the shaped image has come to prove the identity of these two persons, but, in reality, the voter finds himself facing not realized expectations.

The responders' attitude towards the image of Stepan Demirchyan is considered in two different aspects:

- in the context of his father's personality,
- in the context of strong opposition pretending to unification.

Let's consider both positive and negative associations in the first context:

The positive ones: «*I hoped it would have been good, if he had been elected, as we lived quite well under his father's rule*»; «*if he had been elected the president, he would have at least investigated the case of his father's murder*»; «*he is the worthy son of his father*»; «*a good son of a good man*» (Focus-group: a private sector worker, female, 43.)

The negative ones: «*the apple fallen from the tree may also fall into a pit*» (Focus-group: budget worker, female, 56); «*he is a faded shadow of his father*» (Focus-group: youth, male, 25), «*he is just the son of K. Demirchyan and I am the son of Garegin, but I'll never become Garegin*» (Focus-group: town of Vanadzor, male, 48); «*revenge mustn't give birth to policy*» (Focus-group: budget worker, female, 34.)

Let's take Demirchyan's image as the main candidate of opposition, which suggests estimation of his individual qualities in the context of both positive and negative associations.

The positive ones: «*a new, young politician*»; «*a good man, as he has just stepped into the politics, he is still fair*» (there is also a positive-neutral attitude); «*he is a well-bred and decent person, and his behavior during his conversation with Kocharian has come to prove it*»; (Focus-group, town of Masis, female, 62), «*he is clever, in five years or so he could become a perfect politician*» (Focus-group, a private sector worker, male, 46.)

The negative ones: «*he is no experienced and has no passion for policy*» (Focus-group, youth, female, 23); «*deceitful (as he always hides his eyes and doesn't look straight in front of himself)*» (Focus-group, budget worker, male, 50);

«quite a shady person, he is a man of no importance in the political arena» (Focus-group, town of Sevan, male, 32); «he is not ready to be involved in big politics» (Focus-group: private sector, 52.)

2.3. Artashes Geghamyan's image.

Both in presidential and parliamentary elections Artashes Geghamyan nominated himself as the leader of «National Unity» political party.

In his electoral campaign Geghamyan often used biblical motives. Moreover, the cross occupied the central place in his party's symbolism. «The time of atonement is sure to come,» he says like a messiah in his commercials. It is interesting that in his commercials religious motives are often mixed with purely national episodes. For example, in one of his commercial advertisements Geghamyan is represented against the background of citations and metaphors of the Armenian epos «David of Sasun.» In such a way A. Geghamyan is presented as a purely national leader and national hero with the functional role of «the Savior-messiah. »

Geghamyan's electoral campaign has a clear-cut structure:

- To create panic by disclosing the severe reality about the strangers who have seized the power.
- To awake belief that the messiah is still to come.
- To appear in the role of «the Savior» – a well-educated, skilful politician, who served in the army and who is a native and not a stranger, etc.

In Geghamyan's commercials there is a tendency to use bright colors aimed at making an impression of light. Even the party's name, «National Unity», is interpreted by Geghamyan as the dream of all the generations of Armenians, as a national necessity. Hence, the portrait of the national leader is shaped. The image of the national savior is made more empathetic by the slogan of «Let's save Armenia!»

However, from the other hand, in the commercial advertisement made in different provinces of Armenia, Geghamyan often «struggles» against local authorities and local self-governing bodies, bashes them and communicates with the voters in their own manner of speech. Even the candidate's habitual appearance (a leather coat or a short sheepskin coat, and a cap), contributes to the image of «one of us.»

Boycotting mass media, Geghamyan has practically made an illusion of direct contact between him and his potential electorate, which also coincides with

biblical motives: Jesus Christ did not communicate with his followers through mass media.

In such a way, Geghamyan's image is presented as a symbiosis of elitist and national leader. On the one hand, he is educated, clever and skilled in governing (he was Yerevan's mayor), and on the other hand, he uses the strategy of «I'm one of you.» At that, if in case of Kocharian's image there is no conflict between these two strategies of self-presentation, as the image of «the practical man» already suggests combination of these two images, in case of Geghamyan, the conflict is quite possible, as the first image is shaped on the basis of grandiloquent, pompous phrases and gestures, which do not match the candidate's ordinary way of communicating with the voters.

Geghamyan employs the tactics of idealization of his image, showing off a complex of positive qualities he has, which is represent by the other candidates as unique. For example, his participation in Karabakh movement (clashes at the Station square), service in the army, governing experience and even his origin, not yielding to S. Demirchyan's: «I'm the son of Mamikon, who was loved and respected by everyone.»

Perception Artashes Geghamyan's image by the voters. According to Focus-group, there is not clear-cut, special attitude to A. Geghamyan. Some people consider him to be an educated, humane, and honest man, who has a lot of new ideas to realize. The others rest hopes on him (the image of savior, messiah.)

However, he is also considered the one who often changes his convictions during his political career; in the second round of presidential elections he took quite an indistinct position, that's why the respondents called him «*nether fish, nor fowl*» or «*middling*.»

Geghamyan's person carries authority. No doubt, he is the symbol of his party. Though the respondents know Geghamyan's companion-in-arms (mainly A. Hovhanisyan), they consider «*the leader to be the party's priority*.» The «*National Unity*» Party may be called a party of one person. One cannot see even the party itself, as there is Geghamyan alone, a half-man, half god, more or less perceivable against the background of other opposition candidates (though it is worth mentioning that Geghamyan is not perceived to be a radical oppositioner, although he presents himself to be so.) If Demirchyan's party is first of all oppositional, then Geghamyan's party is just like Geghamyan.

2.4. Aram Karapetyan's image

During the 2003 presidential elections, the campaign based on «new names» was quite advantageous. Since the 1999 elections, Armenia has been waiting for its hero. That's why the appearance of a new figure in the political mosaic was quite timely.

A. Karapetyan appears like a «clean board» (tabula rasa), who has not been stained in the political cuisine of leaders. In his «heroic» image he is distinguished by the micro-role of «a *tough politician*,» supported by his quite aggressive gestures and promises to punish all the ones guilty of the nation's problems. While studying Karapetyan's image, one may say that there are many common things with Russian politicians: the image made for Putin in 1999, and the image of Zhirinovskiy. In comparison with other opposition leaders, whose speeches are quite predictable, A. Karapetyan does not appear on TV very often. He is never the same, and thereby he is not perceived as «ordinary.» His high flown announcements in every day speech about the punishment of the ones guilty («now they threaten shaking a finger, later on they'll do it by something else,» «if necessary we'll even close Parakar», etc.) are very much alike Putin's promises like «we'll corner the bandits in the toilet and wipe them out.»

A. Karapetyan's commercial advertisements are quite dynamic and include symbols with specific meanings. For example, in one of the commercials, while saying the words «when the new times come and we come closer to «progress»,» the big and small peaks of Mt. Ararat change their places (here Ararat is depicted from the side of Western Armenia.) Here the symbols of a striking clock and creaking its mechanisms, etc. are also applied. In his commercial A. Karapetyan walks against the background of the blue sky, together with his wife, emphasizing the importance of family as one of the main values of Armenian community.

The February 4 incident (his supporter G. Babukhanyan was wounded by a knife at his meeting with voters) became an important factor of his image making, which provided an opportunity for his electoral team to create «a myth about conspiracy»: if he is persecuted, it means he is feared, as his rating is rising day by day. As for Karapetyan, he makes himself the image of a brave hero: «I speak fearlessly and quietly...I speak openly»; «I announce that I'm afraid of nothing but catching the flu»; «I promise that I won't come to power, if it isn't changed.» A. Karapetyan's speech is interesting, well-grounded, his gestures are aggressive and at the same time emotional, which gives the leader an air of decisiveness. He is shaping the image of a claimed leader. «It was difficult for me to make a decision to turn from theory to practice, but if we don't build our house by ourselves, we'll be induced to leave the country once and forever.»

In Aram Karapetyan's commercial advertisements one can also notice elements of formation of a myth about anti-hero. Though in most of his commercials anti-hero is not personified and is more often presented in the face of «vicious and criminal power system», however, in a few of them one may notice contrasting of A. Karapetyan with R. Kocharian. For example, in one of them the lightning strikes a baseball, on which is written 1999-2003 (the years of Kocharian's presidency): a reference to the image of president in the office, as a sportsman and basketball-player.

One of the main emphases of A. Karapetyan's image is on the fact that he is a newcomer, and the one from Moscow, which implies the Kremlin's support. It is quite a forcible argument in Armenian reality. On the other hand, this fact emphasizes that he is not involved in Armenian politics.

On the whole, is shaped the image of «an intellectual leader» with the elements of «uncompromisingness».

3. Contemporary Armenian political mythology

In terms of drama, the electoral campaign may be considered to be a play developing in accordance with the laws of drama performance. There is a main character (protagonist) and an anti-hero (antagonist), there are also critical circumstances and complications, which the hero is overcoming all the time, at the same time demonstrating his positive qualities and contrasting them with the anti-hero's negative characterization. This political play also has its props, symbolism, used for the leader's self-presentation. That's to say, according to the popular Russian physiologist D. Olishanski, image is a functioning myth maintained in various texts, and making a myth is a part of image formation process [3, p. 553]. Myth is the content and idea of the form, which is called image. According to G. Pocheocov, «myth appears before us as an image making scenario, at once filling vacant places of the main character's enemies and friends» [4, p. 168].

Among all the possible plots of political myth, one may single out four main subjects: conspiracy, the Golden Age, hero-savior, and unity. 1) The myth about conspiracy negatively interprets perceivable phenomena as a result of secret influence of dark powers. 2) The myth about the Golden Age either calls to return to «the cradle» of bright past, where love, equality and fraternity reigned, where the world was simple and comprehensible or calls to the bright future, considering the preceding periods as «the prehistory», the existence of which is merely justified to the extent it has prepared that ideal future. 3) The myth about a hero-savior endows concrete personages with characteristic features. The hero must have a gift of a prophet, outstanding talent of commander-warrior, admirable moral qualities, etc. 4) the myth about unity is based on contrasting «friends»-

«enemies», «our people»-«strangers» and «we»-«they.» The enemies are the cause of all our troubles and misfortunes. «They» strive to take away our values and that’s why salvation is in unity and confronting «them» [5, p. 231].

The results of complex analysis of documents allow us to single out and categorize the functional roles the politicians played in the process of self-presenting, and their myths, as well as to describe the situational context, which, in the given case, will play a role of a frame for each concrete politician.

Table 1

	Hero	Anti-Hero	The Golden Age	Unity (our people vs strangers)
Robert Kocharian	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An experienced politician, who proves the efficiency of his leadership by his work, • National leader, • Stability, peace and warranty of development 	<p><i>Opposition as such</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Politicians with no governing experience <p><i>General description of the opposition, contingent, deceitful people, who must not be allowed to take the power: Personified opposition:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geghamyan (a provocative person, the visitor of definite medical institutions), • Demirchyan (no one, a puppet), • Karapetyan (someone unknown, who dares to threaten the authorities.) 	A society, which reached economic welfare, stability and peace under Kocharian’s rule and has prospective of intensive development in the future.	An experienced politician vs inexperienced politicians: A veteran of Karabakh warvs the one who didn’t take part in the war for Karabakh.
Stepan Demirchyan	«The worthy son of worthy father,» the one trusted by people: a candidate of united opposition who voices the problems and expectations of the people.	The authorities, which illegally seized power from K. Demirchyan by means of falsifying elections in 1998 and is ready to forge the results of future elections as well.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • K. Demirchyan’s terms of office and the new era of S. Demirchyan as the follower of his father’s work. • The period of restoring justice and punishing the ones responsible for the tragedy of October 27, 1999 and forging the results of elections. This period is sure to be followed by the period of revival and rehabilitation. 	Opposition <i>(The only alternative of authorities)-authorities and opposition – fair and deserving people’s trust</i> <u>Authorities-</u> <i>«Privatized Armenia», anti-national, authoritarian, «aloof from his nation, history and values.»</i>

	Hero	Anti-Hero	The Golden Age	Unity (our peoplevs strangers)
Artashes Geghamyan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Savior (<i>«Let's save Armenia»</i>), • A native Armenian, • (Armenian), • Hard-edged fighter against injustice, • Fair, honest (<i>«We are clean, we leave no traces of blood and plundering behind us»</i>) 	<p><i>Personified anti-hero</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S. Sargsyan («the author of dirty policy»), • R. Kocharian and his surrounding («provincial») Generalized enemy - authorities, • Anti-national authorities – a cruel, strong enemy, (<i>«...the one who tries to make them not to speak»</i>): 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Golden Age will only come when Geghamyan takes the office and makes Armenia «Geghashen.» 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geghamyan and his followers vs the Karabakh clan, • The Armenian nation vs the newcomers from Karabakh.
Aram Karapetyan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intellectual, theorist-professional, • Supporter of hard-line policy, • brave, • Patriot (<i>«He returned from Moscow, though there he had both money and position»</i>). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The president and government (what is more, the opposition is not open in its operations to Kocharian), Generalized enemy:</i> • The ones to blame for all the problems people have. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Golden age will follow the punishment of the perpetrators, • After the criminal authorities retire, • After the corrupted system is changed, • After the reunion of Eastern and Western Armenia (this idea is expressed in his advertising commercials cryptically). 	<p>Karapetyan vs the presidential clan persecuting him.</p>

January, 2007

Reference sources and literature

1. *Погосян Г.А.* Армянское общество в трансформации. Ер., 2003.
2. *Имидж лидера. Психологическое пособие для политиков.* Под ред. В.Егоровой-Гантман. М., 1994.
3. *Ольшанский Д.В.* Политическая психология. СПб., 2002.
4. *Шомова С.* «Политические шахматы. Паблик рилейшнз как интеллектуальная игра». М., 2003.
5. *Политология. Учебник под редакцией Василика М.А.* Глава 12, М., 2001г.