THE PROBLEM OF STUDYING THE CONFLICT IN HISTORIOGRAPHY (IN THE EXAMPLE OF SO-CALLED "SOUTH OSSETIA" IN GEORGIA)

MANUCHAR GUNTSADZE

Senior Scientific Employee, Korneli Kekelidze Georgian, National Centre of Manuscripts
PhD Student, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi, State University
E-mail: m.guntsadze@manuscript.ge

The interesting stage of the conflict in the so-called "South Ossetia", is from the 90s of the twentieth century, up to now. In Soviet historiography, it is obvious that the censorship imposed specific restrictions. Because of this, research of this problem is followed by one basic line, and it is also a familiar factor about the restriction of access to archives in the Soviet times. After 9 April 1991, access to the archives is gradually open, adding the archival materials back to Georgia and removing the censorship. All this would undoubtedly be easier for scientists to research research. It really happened. The actuality of the Tskhinvali conflict has brought additional importance to the study of the conflicting bases. In this period, one of the major obstacles was found. Although the censorship of the Soviet censor was no longer present, the policy intervention would have been a major obstacle in the post-Soviet countries. The origin of the conflicts in Tskhinvali and Abkhazia in Georgia, civil war and other accompanying difficulties has further hindered the scientific methodology and perhaps the direction of general direction. Scientific publications published about Tskhinvali conflict often have a policy impact on the writer. Here, obviously, I do not mean that, like the Soviet Union, the state was still trying to control the scientific sphere, the power of the new political elite had little on the one hand and, on the other hand, was less important.
However, the conflict in so-called "South Ossetia" for the population and scientists has been emotionally impacted, and this was reflected in the subjective factors at the time of research / analysis. In the least part of the researches, when they start to read, they may be unconscious, but the author seeks not to investigate objectively, as well as research on the subject, as well as studying facts, identifying and analyzing the results, but not to analyze the both side. This fact leads to the subjective direction from the very beginning and is less reliable for the reader, when the author offers the conclusion in the head and then tries to argue. It is not strange that the allegations are quite diverse in political debates, but often these accusations are in scientific publications, followed by a review of the reviews and responses of some scholars. In this case, the most brutal form takes the argument with the argument when no specific source is specified. For example, the author wants to bring the fact of response to the argument that it is stored in the archive, but it does not indicate the archive, fund and number or detailed information. This is obviously evident in scientific polemics and resembles the existence of a substitute for emotions and subjective desires to justify a particular party. The following phrases in the works are frequently: "documentary material is confirmed ..."; "Confirmed by an authentic archive material", etc. However, the specific documentation, which is about the archival material, or so forth. Not yet. One more serious problem is the ignorance of sources. This problem is most visible when the author of the so-called "South Ossetia" conflict disputes an important article and / or thick examination, but it does not use the sources that can be argued or questioned or deny, and these sources are neither complicated nor unknown, and in many cases Published a few years ago. It is my purpose to present such problems and to discuss them in the research that is aimed at researching the scientific side, which often occurs in the background of subjective and excessive patriotic motives. Of course, the above-mentioned facts are characteristic for both side historiography. That is to say that at this stage, it is not just to discuss the problems of historiography from my side that it is as if the drawbacks are just a problem with historiography.