

Balkan Horizons

The academic dimensions of the joint history project
By Prof. Maria Todorova*

When the Southeast European Joint History Project (known in its abbreviated version simply as the Joint History Project -JHP) was initiated in 1998, it was based on our shared conviction that history, which is at the center of legitimising and reproducing political and social relations in the Balkan region, has to be approached in a new way. While none of us shares the illusion that "historia est magistra vitae", we remain convinced that the only way to overcome history, to deal with the predicament of the region that, in the words of Churchill, produces more history than it can consume, is to intimately know it. Thus, in its broad outlines, the Joint History Project presents a broad and open-ended educational, social and political program with the goal of bringing about informed, significant and realistic change in historical research and education in the countries of Southeast Europe. Its aim is to target intellectual elites in the following spheres: academia (universities and research institutes); educators at the secondary level (high and middle-school teachers); media; religious institutions. The geographic span of the project includes the following countries: Albania, Bosnia/Hercegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Greece, Hungary, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Moldova, Romania, Slovenia, Turkey, and Yugoslavia. It is carried forward by a broad international team drawing mostly on scholars from the region itself who recognise an urgent need to critically examine their own national histories and how these are transmitted to the public at different educational levels.

The extent and complexity of our tasks persuaded us to divide the activities of the Joint History Project into two sections, overseen respectively by an Academic Committee, and a History Education Committee. The Academic Committee looks for ways to increase and co-ordinate academic contact between scholars, mainly those in universities and research institutes within the region. More specifically, it fosters dialogue and research that can overcome the confining but still dominant nationalist paradigms. In addition, it sees as one of its primary objectives the nurturing of the younger generation of scholars in the region by creating appropriate venues for their professional development. To this end, two lines of activities have been followed: the organisation of research conferences and seminars, and the convening of junior scholars' workshops.

The Academic Committee consists of seven members: Prof. Fikret Adanir (University of Bochum, Germany), Prof. Karl Kaser (University of Graz, Austria), Prof. Paschalis Kitromilidis (University of Athens, Greece), Prof. Ioannis Koliopoulos (Aristotelion University of Thessaloniki, Greece), Prof. John Lampe (University of Maryland, USA), Prof. Maria Todorova (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA), and Prof. Alexander Zub (University of Jassy, Romania). Maria Todorova serves as the present chair of the Academic Committee. The Academic Committee is the main body, which proposes the topics of conferences or seminars in view of directing the profession toward important problems or coordinating existing research efforts. As a rule, respective members of the Academic Committee who have initiated a project proposal serve as the prime organisers of such meetings. The Academic Committee initiates calls for papers, which are distributed via the JHP's network of academics thus attracting both established and young scholars in the region to the seminars. Applications are carefully screened, and the decisions are taken through consultations over the mail and at informal meetings.

The first big project and success of the Academic Committee was the organisation of a major international conference on the island of Halki in June 1999. The conference was striving to provide the setting where scholars on and from most countries of the region would focus on broadly defined problems -such as national memory and national identities-- providing the basis for intra- as well as inter-regional comparisons. In the course of several days, over 40 scholars exchanged ideas in a highly cooperative and professional atmosphere. A forthcoming volume on National Identities and National Memories in the Balkans, edited by Maria Todorova (who was also the main academic organiser of the event) and published by C. Hurst & Co.

(London) in conjunction with New York University Press, is the result of this conference. It presents seventeen articles, written by historians, anthropologists, and literary historians, which are unified by three major problems: the construction of historical memories on different levels, from the individual to the nation; the sites of national memory; the transmission of national memory and the mobilisation of national identities. It is the collection's goal to contribute to a theoretical refinement of the understanding of memory and identity but primarily to explore and assess the significance of particular manifestations of national identities and national memories in the region. While most articles are understandably located within the national space, they challenge the isolationist national approach by their common and universal scholarly language and approach. The volume hopes to demonstrate that the Balkans can be a normal object of study like any other area. Memories in the Balkans, though not the non-existent "Balkan memory", are like memories elsewhere but have their local specifics. Identities in the Balkans, though not the missing "Balkan identity", are like identities everywhere, and it is their peculiarities in time and space that have attracted the attention and inspired the exchanges of the contributors.

The Halki conference was the first in a series of international meetings organised around one thematic focus. The next, equally successful initiative was the international seminar on the problems of Migration in the Balkans held in May 2000 in Thessaloniki. Its academic organisers were Fikret Adanir and Karl Kaser. This seminar targeted younger scholars and managed to provide a fruitful framework for stimulating scholarly exchange. One of the important issues addressed at this and other thematic conferences is the methodology supporting scholarly work. It also contributed to consolidate the networking between scholars in the region, a task the Academic Committee holds as one of prime importance. Four of the best contributions to the seminar can be read at the website of the CDRSEE (www.cdsee.org). The format of the seminar -with younger scholars presenting their research, and senior colleagues invited as commentators- foreshadowed the organisational pattern of the Junior Scholars' Workshops, which are described later. The next international seminar on the The Idea of Liberty in the Balkans with Paschalis Kitromilides as its chief academic organiser is to be held in the fall of 2001.

The work of the Academic Committee has been supported through the Royaumont Process by the Government of the United Kingdom, and by the Government of Austria. More specifically, the seminar on Migration in the Balkans was supported by the Winston Foundation for World Peace.

The Academic Committee's work has partly expanded to the Board of Eminent Scholars, a group of scholars who are specialised in the Southeast European region, and who are recognised in the academic community and beyond for their original and influential research and publications. The idea is to create a permanent pool of senior scholars who would provide intellectual support and facilitate the networking of the JHP. It is from this pool that senior scholars' participants are drawn for the annual Junior Scholars' Workshops. The members of the Academic Committee are also members of the Board of Eminent Scholars. The current list of members of the BES is as follows:

1. Prof. Maria Todorova, Chair, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, USA
2. Prof. Fikret Adanir, Ruhr University, Bochum, Germany
3. Prof. Ivo Bicanic, University of Zagreb, Croatia
4. Prof. Lucian Boja, University of Bucharest, Romania
5. Prof. Richard Crampton, Oxford University, UK
6. Prof. Marco Dogo, University of Trieste, Italy
7. Prof. Karl Kaser, University of Graz, Austria

8. Prof. Paschalis Kitromilidis, University of Athens, Greece
9. Prof. Ioannis Koliopoulos, Aristotelion University, Thessaloniki, Greece
10. Prof. Lazlo Kontlar, Central European University, Budapest, Hungary
11. Prof. John Lampe, University of Maryland, USA
12. Prof. Diana Mishkova, University of Sofia, Bulgaria
13. Prof. Andrej Mitrovic, University of Belgrade, Yugoslavia
14. Prof. Zafer Toprak, Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey
15. Prof. Peter Vodopivc, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia
16. Prof. Alexander Zub, University of Jassy, Romania

The Board of Eminent Scholars is organising annual "Junior Scholars Workshops" - conferences for new doctoral research on the history of Southeast Europe. The goal of these conferences is to promote the work of younger scholars, as well as to stimulate international and intergenerational intellectual exchange. At these meetings, prospective young scholars present their research, comment on the research of their peers, and discuss their work with a team of senior scholars. These workshops are advertised through the system of the CDRSEE with calls for papers. The applications go through a rigorous evaluation process by a team of senior scholars from the BES, who have been assigned to participate in the respective workshop. The first Junior Scholar Workshop took place in October 2000 in Chalkidiki, Greece where sixteen graduate students presented their subjects, defended their methodology, and discussed their work with their peers as well as with the senior scholars. The second Junior Scholar Workshop took place in Dubrovnik in June 2001. Fifteen graduate students scholars were selected out of forty applicants. The Government of the United States through the State Department has supported the work of the Board of Eminent Scholars for the Junior Scholars' Workshops.

As already mentioned, at present the academic dimensions of the JHP comprise two main directions: the convening of thematic scholarly meetings (conferences or seminars), and the organising of junior scholars' workshops. This is as much the result of strategic thinking as it is of funding opportunities. In the future, the Academic Committee would also like to expand the activities of the JHP in the direction of promoting and facilitating university teaching and scholarly exchange. This can be carried out by supporting guest lectures, which would bring in authorities in different fields and expose local intellectual communities to different types of discourse. Funding permitting, this could be expanded in setting up semester-long visiting professorships at different sites. Finally, the effort could be also helped by tapping into the existing fairly sophisticated system of international summer (and winter) schools in the region, like the ones at Blagoevgrad University, Bansko, and Plovdiv (Bulgaria), Kluj (Romania), Bosphorus University (Turkey), CEU (Hungary), Dubrovnik (Croatia), Kotor, and Novi Sad (Yugoslavia), etc. All these fora can serve also as places for the exchange and coordination of university curricula, the best way to achieve mutual understanding of the complex history of the region, and thus contribute to the main ethos of the CDRSEE: the promotion of democracy and reconciliation in the Balkans.

The History Education Committee: Two Years of Joint Effort

by Dr. Christina Koulouri*

The History Education Committee, initially called the Textbook Committee, held its inaugural session in Halki in June 1999. Dubravka Stojanovic, Mirela Luminita Murgescu, Hanna Schissler, Niyazi Kizilyurek, Alexei Kalyonski, Thalia Dragonas, Anna Frangoudaki and Neven Budak attended and formed the first nucleus of this committee. After the Halki conference,

new members joined us: Bozo Repe, Vera Katz, Valentina Duka, Emilija Simoska, Kaloyan Fol, Halil Berktaş, and at a later stage, Snjezana Koren, Didem Erpulat and Wolfgang Hoepken who replaced Hanna Schissler.

Today the HEC includes 17 members representing all Southeast European countries. We are all teachers and researchers at universities and institutes of the region and, with few exceptions, we are historians. We are also all very much concerned with the teaching of history in our countries and we would like to be more or less engaged in changing it. Some, like Neven Budak, Snjezana Koren and Bozo Repe, are already authors of history textbooks. Some others have worked on curricula development or on the authorisation of history textbooks. In fact, what really unites us is not only a common scientific jargon, which we can find in most of the conferences we attend, but also the willingness to be active citizens in the Balkans. In the last decade, the concept of a new Balkan community emerged as a counterweight to new aggressive and defensive nationalisms. The consequent idea to stress a common history of the region was also launched in political and intellectual environments. However, this new history should not be a new construction which would replace the national histories. As historians, we promote a new interpretation of the national pasts based on a common Balkan cultural and institutional heritage. This new approach implies the introduction in history teaching of supra-national elements as a counter-weight to ethnocentric or even nationalistic historical narratives.

From December 1999 to December 2000, a series of seven workshops were held under the title "Teaching sensitive and controversial issues in the history of South-East Europe". The workshops aimed at addressing the practical and immediate problems of history and history teaching in primary and secondary schools in the region and at investigating the possibilities of eliminating "conflict-producing" national stereotypes from textbooks. The issues dealt with were, as the titles of the workshops indicate, sensitive regional questions emerging from current controversies and having an impact on the interpretation of the past and on the teaching of history.

During the workshops, we have thus investigated our parallel histories through history textbook analysis. Since December 1999, we have dealt with very sensitive and delicate issues in the teaching of history such as the Cyprus question, the Macedonian identity (or identities) and the perceptions of the Albanian past, and we have realised two things: 1) that textbooks are in most cases really problematic and they have to change, 2) that in every country there are people ready to work for the revision of history teaching, sometimes against official politics. We are convinced that reforms and changes can be initiated by civil society, by intellectuals, teachers and academics.

Each workshop was organised as follows: a questionnaire was distributed to participants and answered by them before the meeting; a report was produced which provided a description of the situation in each country, a general survey and -if possible- some conclusions about possibilities of change and improvement. During the workshops, papers on historiography, other school subjects apart from history, media, the process of nation building, and the construction of national identities were also presented.

In March 2001, a first report of the JHP workshops was published under the title, Teaching the History of Southeastern Europe. In this publication all the members of the HEC expose their personal remarks and conclusions regarding history education in the region and make suggestions for the improvement of the present situation. By the end of the year the proceedings of the seven JHP workshops will be edited and compiled into a single volume published under the title, Clio in the Balkans. The Politics of History Education.

The JHP workshops were useful and fruitful in many aspects.

1. They have been an occasion to communicate and to exchange information on the Balkan educational systems, the authorisation and distribution of textbooks and the degree of state control.

2. They have contributed to mobilise human potential in the region and to create a network of regional historians especially of the young generation.

3. The papers which were presented and the discussions which followed -all of a very high academic level- allowed for a comparison of the situations in different countries of the region, and led to a comprehensive understanding of the specific problems in each case.

4. All participants were critical of the textbooks in use and recognised the need to revise the content of textbooks and teaching methods and to produce alternative teaching materials.

During the JHP workshops we realised two things: 1) that the results of the textbooks analysis should be propagated in all SEE countries, especially to decision-makers in the field of history teaching; 2) that history teachers are more important than textbooks in disseminating stereotypes and biased interpretations of history and that we should include them if we really want to make significant changes in history teaching.

As a result, a new project, the "Southeast European History Teachers' Education Project" was launched by CDRSEE as a follow up of the JHP. Since December 2000, five regional, teacher training workshops were held dealing with historical issues common to all curricula, such as the Balkan Wars, the First World War, the Second World War, the Decline of the Ottoman Empire and the Creation of the Nation-States. During these workshops two procedures were followed:

1. Historians from different SEE countries taught the same historical question to a group of history teachers from a different country. For instance, at the 4th workshop in Tirana educators from Albania, Greece, Bulgaria, Croatia and Turkey presented the "Balkan Wars and the Creation of the Albanian State" to a group of 15 Albanian history teachers, ministry officials and people involved in the production of Albanian history textbooks.

2. Multilateral discussions: groups of Southeast European history teachers from different countries were taught sensitive historical questions simultaneously. This was the case in the other four workshops where educators and teachers came from the same countries. For example at the 1st workshop in Thessaloniki dealing with the Balkan Wars, there were educators (2 per country) and history teachers (5 per country) from Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey.

History teachers were very enthusiastic about their experiences at the workshops, thus confirming our initial idea that there are, in both primary and secondary education, many history teachers eager to change their method and content of teaching.

Communication between teachers from different countries seems very important because it is a chance to acquire information from neighbouring countries, they realise common difficulties and shortcomings, and they are introduced to multiperspectivity.

History teaching is a long-term investment where results cannot be achieved immediately. It is however an investment that deserves our patience. Revising our view of the past is closely related to our view of the future. That's why the future in the Balkans depends on our past -or to be more precise, on our interpretation of the past.

By Costa Carras*

For many people the words "reconciliation" and "Southeast Europe" represent a contradiction in terms. Starting from Cyprus, the Kurdish minority problem in Turkey, and the absence of Armenians from large parts of their ancestral homeland, they would move gloomily west and north, cataloguing Greco-Turkish hostility, Albanian instability, Slavo-Albanian conflict in FYR of Macedonia and in Kosovo, the recent hideous bloodbath in Bosnia, of Bosniak Muslims in particular, the harsh opposition of Croats and Serbs that twice brought barbarity to the former

Yugoslavia, and the degraded condition of the Roma in a majority of the countries in the region.

I intend to illustrate just how central history may be argued to be alike to democracy and reconciliation -and the lack of them- in Southeast Europe and elsewhere. On the one side Southeast Europe has a lower incidence of strictly religious prejudice, on the other it has a greater incidence of communal prejudice based on the political implications of religion. On the one hand there is greater openness and humanity in personal contact, on the other inhuman ferocity, breaking every traditional bound and bond, when it becomes a question of promoting the imported Western model of the nation state, the nation state over and against other nations.

To be free of the burden of history requires us to understand of what the burden consists. I do not share the view that in all respects Southeast Europe is retrograde or backward, although it has certainly delayed tragically in realising that since World War II, Western Europe has moved dramatically away from its earlier nationalist models. It is clear very many citizens and not a few leaders in this region have made notable contributions to peace, tolerance and reconciliation. What help then can be given them through the approach to history in schools?

It is this question that was posed early in the life of the Center for Democracy and Reconciliation in Southeast Europe, at the conference of July 1997 in Thessaloniki. In 1998, our Chairman, Matt Nimetz, suggested the Joint History Project should be the first we undertook, and it did indeed get off the ground in 1999.

The effort has been overseen at Board level by myself, and at the operational level by two committees, one the small Academic Committee under Maria Todorova, a historian of Bulgarian origin who has written the seminal work "Imagining the Balkans". There happens to be a Cypriot on this Committee, Paschalis Kitromilidis and there is also a scholar of Turkish origin, Fikret Adanir. The other is the History Education Committee (formerly the Textbook Committee) under Christina Koulouri, with Halil Bertkay and Dubravka Stojanovic as vice-chairs. On this Committee, every country in the region is represented, Cyprus by Niyazi Kizilyurek.

The work of these two Committees has been supported by a number of donors, the most generous of whom has been the British Government under the Royaumont Initiative. Support under the same Initiative has come from the Austrian Government and, for activity concerning Cyprus, from the Cyprus Federation of America. Further work on the academic side has been energetically sponsored in particular by the US State Department and also by the Winston Foundation. The Center's more recent work on the way teachers transmit knowledge in the classroom, as opposed to history textbooks, has been supported under the Stability Pact by the Austrian, Swiss and Norwegian Governments. None of the Center's core funding however has come from any government.

What has been achieved to date is impressive. Successive meetings of academics, younger and older, starting with a conference in Halki in June 1999, articles from which are to be published in early 2002 by C. Hurst & Co. (London) and New York University Press, entitled "National Identities and National Memories in the Balkans", edited by Maria Todorova, and continuing with a series of seminars on subjects such as "Migration in the Balkans" and "The Idea of Liberty in Southeastern Europe" have created an international network of scholars whose experience is not limited to a national framework or by the consequences of purely national patronage. Some of the articles by younger academics are available on the Center's website, at www.cdsee.org.

As striking has been the experience of twelve workshops held to date out of a total of fourteen planned, seven on history textbooks and seven on history teaching, the harmony with which the Committee on History Education has worked is truly remarkable. The interim conclusions so far as history textbooks are concerned are reflected in the report "History Teaching in Southeastern Europe".

A fuller report, including a treatment of religious education and of history teaching apart from textbooks, should appear in early 2002 under the title "Clio in the Balkans The Politics of History Education".

You may indeed read in the most recent "Friends of Cyprus" Report (Autumn 2000) an article which is a good example of the sort of work I have in mind. A Turkish-Cypriot, who lived in Paphos as a child, dissects the two official versions of events during the March 1964 conflict in that town, and finds them both seriously lacking. And in the same issue, Niyazi Kizilyurek and Loris Koullapis analyse Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot history textbooks respectively.

These are important tasks. My purpose today however is different, namely to point out that acknowledging the truth as to past events is a difficult, important but small part of the overall problem of the approach to history in Cyprus, and elsewhere. By far the larger part of the problem is to change the focus.

The change of focus to which I refer can come in several ways. Allow me to mention just a few. The first would be to take into full and fair consideration the story line of the other and to accept there may be legitimate differences in the interpretation of some of the events that occurred.

A second would be to avoid national stereotyping, which does not however mean denying the obvious, namely that various historical traditions have encouraged different types of achievement. Another would be to increase the emphasis on economic, social and cultural history, where similarities and cross-influences are more frequent compared with political. Due emphasis should also be given to local history in relation to national.

And finally, just as in the history of a religion -and religion is a subject which I am convinced should be taught in school- it is in most instances not one people who are the subject of attention but many, so we should explore the possibility of histories of the rule of law, of the concept of citizenship, of liberty and of democracy, values which again, like religion, are not confined to any one people or nation.

This last point is particularly relevant to the ongoing European experiment. For the first time in history, as a result of the follies of nationalism gone berserk, and of racism turned satanic -and this happened in Western or Central Europe, not in its Southeast- a great post war experiment began, the first to attempt a loose union of Europe on the basis not of compulsion but of consent.

The European Union is based on an acceptance of national, linguistic and religious difference: too few people have yet appreciated the significance of the acceptance of Turkey as a candidate country despite the widespread view among Christian Democrats, politically the main founding political group of the European movement in the early post World War II period, that Europe was by definition Christian. What is quite clear however is that this European Union has moved very far from the Europe of the 1920s: the rule of law, a mutual acknowledgement of the privileges flowing from citizenship, and emphasis on liberty and democracy are now central tenets. These now represent the most important aspects of the otherwise largely economic *acquis communautaire*.

In such a European Union Cyprus can find not just a place that is honourable, and beneficial, for all its people, but one which can allow them to heal their mutual wounds. It is within the context of this vocation of all Cypriots that the task of addressing the problem of history textbooks and history teaching should be approached.

Within such a framework and such a vocation it should also be possible, over time, to address the fundamental errors of the 1950s, which set Cyprus in the wrong direction for almost half a century.

Today however the European Union's economic power and social magnetism in relation to any other single state in Europe combined with the practical lessons it gives through its operation, where conflicts of interest are resolved by discussions and voting, not by arms, and where there is a common acceptance of the rule of law as of basic political principles, gives an opportunity at last to all Cypriots to correct the errors made in the 1950s, provided all other international actors act in the same spirit, and Cypriots respond.

And one of the most productive means of response, and of preparation for accession, one which can involve Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots together in a common preparatory enterprise, is precisely the issue of history textbooks and history teaching in general for a united, federal, bi-communal and European Cyprus.

History Teacher Training Workshops,

December 2000 to June 2001

by Dr. Valery Kolev*

The Teacher Training Workshops are centered upon the most vital element in the history educational process - the teachers. The quality of the textbooks and teaching materials are of less importance than the way in which they are presented to the pupils during the history lessons. A good textbook is not a guarantee of good history teaching, but a skillful teacher can easily overcome the disadvantages of a low quality textbook or even of a one-sided curriculum.

The three Teacher Training Workshops in which I participated (Thessaloniki - December 2000, Tirana, May 2001 and Bucharest, June 2001) were a valuable experience for me both as a university teacher and as a textbook writer. Their clearly defined aims can be grouped in two directions. The first is the notion of multiperspectivity as an approach to historical sources, historiographic texts, and the so-called "additional materials": photos, charts, diagrams and maps that start to take a more and more significant part in the process of history teaching on every level. These additional materials enable the teachers to overcome the shortcomings of the official educational texts that still bear the burden of the traditional nation-centric approach and are helpful considering the development of different skills and struggling with the traditional prejudices towards "the other" thus promoting tolerance and mutual understanding. The second direction was a practical one: to disseminate the results of the JHP, to investigate the different ways of history teaching and overcome its negative teleological aspects and to initiate alternative and innovative teaching methods. Thus everyone can easily find out the common aspects and the specific characteristics of events and processes that are the core of every nation's national historiography: the foreign influences and the past legacy in the nation-states' creation, the uniqueness of the Balkan wars and of their results for shaping not only the map of the peninsula, but also the mentality of its peoples.

In the working groups, during the plenary sessions and in private conversations the participants were able to get acquainted with the recent foreign research, with new methodological approaches in history teaching and to strengthen the relations of trust and tolerance between the teachers from different neighboring countries by promoting cooperation and understanding.

The Balkan empires: common heritage, different heirs

The fifth textbook workshop of the Southeast European Joint History Project took place in Istanbul with the title, "The Balkan empires: common heritage, different heirs", on 21-23 September 2000. This series of articles (page 9 to 23) is a sample of the analysis of history textbooks that the History Education Committee has conducted, led by Chair, Dr. Christina Koulouri.

The Organising Committee consisted of Dr. Halil Berktaý of Sabanci University (Turkey), Dr. Christina Koulouri of Democritus University of Thrace (Greece), and Dr. Peter Vodopivec of the University of Ljubljana (Slovenia). According to the usual procedure, a questionnaire was

circulated to representatives from eleven countries prior to the workshop. The answers to the questionnaire provide a comparative analysis of the historical narratives on the Byzantine Empire and the Ottoman Empire as they are presented in school textbooks. The following countries participated: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Greece, FYR of Macedonia, Romania, Slovenia, Turkey, and Yugoslavia.

The aim of the Workshop was to investigate:

1. How the Byzantine and the Ottoman empires are incorporated in each Balkan country's national history.
2. The possibilities of a revised view of the regional past where the Balkan empires (Byzantine and Ottoman) could serve as a basis for a common history of Southeast Europe.

The analysis of the textbooks in the Istanbul Workshop, in accordance with the format for all of the workshops, was structured around the answers to the following questionnaire.

QUESTIONNAIRE

1. GENERAL INFORMATION

- 1.1. In which grades is history taught? How many hours per week? Which historical periods per grade?
- 1.2. Are other history subjects taught besides national history? What are the proportions between national, Balkan, European and world history?
- 1.3. What is the system of authorisation, publication and distribution of textbooks?

2. HISTORY TEXTBOOKS ANALYSIS

- 2.1. How many pages are devoted to the Byzantine and to the Ottoman Empire respectively? What maps and illustrations are included concerning the history of Byzantine and Ottoman Empires?
- 2.2. What kind of history is taught in respect to the two Balkan Empires? Political, military, cultural, economic or social?
- 2.3. Is Byzantine Empire presented as a Greek Empire? Is the Ottoman Empire presented as a Turkish Empire? Is it clearly stated that the two empires were multiethnic, multi-religious and multicultural? How are the relations of different ethnic groups within these empires described?
- 2.4. Is the Byzantine Empire integrated in your country's national history and how? How is it historically evaluated in respect to the common past of the region?
- 2.5. Is the Ottoman Empire integrated in your country's national history and how? How is it historically evaluated in respect to the common past of the region?
- 2.6. Are there heroes from Byzantine and Ottoman periods integrated in national history? Who are they? How are they qualified? Are there any anti-heroes?
- 2.7. Are there negative stereotypes for other Balkan peoples especially in Byzantine and Ottoman history?
- 2.8. What are the main events of the history of the two empires mentioned in the textbooks? What are the most controversial ones? How are they interpreted?

2.9. How are Orthodox Christianity and Islam associated with the history of the two empires? How is the relation between state, religion and society presented?

Following are some answers to questions 1.3, 2.3, 2.4, and 2.5 as a sample of the analysis conducted at the textbook workshops. For the purpose of this publication, the textbook titles and authors are omitted. During the regional workshops, however, specific history textbooks were cited and discussed in detail. Complete and specific information and conclusions from the regional workshops will be available in the forthcoming publication, *Clio in the Balkans. The Politics of History Education*.

1.3 What is the system of authorisation, publication and distribution of textbooks?

Albania

By Ilira Caushi, University of Tirana, Department of History

Textbooks are published in Albania by "Shtopia botuese e librit shkollor" (Textbook Publishing House). Books are printed in different private publishing houses, and they are distributed to different schools and specialised bookshops by "Ndermarrja shteterore e shperndarjes se librit" (the state-owned Book Distributing Enterprise).

Bosnia and Herzegovina

By Vera Katz, Historical Institute, Sarajevo

We are a country after a terrible war and we do not have an established system of authorisation, publication and distribution of textbooks. We use textbooks from 1994, printed in Ljubljana. This school year (2000-2001), the Ministry of Education reprinted these books after some correction made by the Office of the High Representative.

Bulgaria

By Alexei Kalionski, University of Sofia, Department of History

Bulgarian school textbooks are authorised by the Ministry of Education and Science after an open competition among different authors or teams of authors. The textbook drafts are evaluated by independent experts who are university lecturers, teachers or scientific researchers. However, the ministerial administration controls the administrative side of the process. Fortunately (or maybe unfortunately), for most of the last ten years the ministers of education in Bulgaria were historians, experts in Modern Bulgarian history and that is supposed to have influenced the whole process of authorisation.

The textbooks are published, with several exceptions, by private publishing houses. Their distribution is based upon the principles of free market economy. It should be mentioned that most of the teachers strongly oppose the system of alternative textbooks, while the university professors, who make up the teams of authors, admire it. The authors and co-authors are professional historians from different generations, academic positions, methodological and emotional affiliations, preferences, etc. Every teacher has the prerogative to choose one or another textbook.

According to Bulgarian regulations for every grade there should be at least two official alternative textbooks. But for the 6-th, 7-th, 9-th and 10-th grades, there is only one officially approved textbook, and for the 5-th and 11-th grades, there are three textbooks used.

Croatia

By Snjezana Koren, Osnovna skola Eugena Kumicica, Velika Gorica, Croatia

In Croatia, there are several privately owned publishing houses dealing with publication and distribution of textbooks. For history textbooks, there are two major publishers and two smaller ones. The authors of textbooks are obliged to follow, more or less, the National Curriculum approved by the Ministry of Education. The same Ministry invites applications for

textbooks, approves up to three alternative textbooks per grade and subsequently teachers are free to choose among them. Nevertheless, for the school-year 2000/2001 the Ministry approved as many as five alternative history textbooks in certain grades. As a result, the textbook situation in Croatia this year is a bit chaotic: there are 32 different obligatory textbooks and 14 obligatory workbooks. There are also some 10 other books as accompanying material to textbooks that are not obligatory: so-called History Reading books which contain historical sources, and atlases which contain historical maps. Despite the common curricula, the approach and the selection of data in textbooks are different; therefore, when analysing those textbooks, it is often difficult to draw general conclusions.

Cyprus

By Loris Koullapis, University of Cyprus

In the primary education two books were published by private publishing houses in the second half of the 70's. Their writers were teachers, primary school inspectors or primary school directors. Soon these two books were authorised (but not published) by the Ministry of Education and they have been used for over twenty years with small changes. In the secondary education a slightly different authorisation system was adopted. At the beginning of the 90's the Department of Secondary Education of the Ministry of Education and Culture assigned a team of historians and teachers the task of writing three history textbooks, one for each grade of the Lycee. In 1994 one single textbook was published by the same department and by the same writers for all three grades of the Gymnasium which is a mere summary of the three above-mentioned textbooks of the Lycee. The history textbooks published in Cyprus in the course of the last twenty years have exclusively dealt with the history of the island. There is only one textbook authorised or published for each grade and all of them are distributed free of charge, including the ones imported from Greece.

There are some differences in the use of the above-mentioned six history textbooks. In primary education and on the first level of secondary education (Gymnasium) history is taught on the basis of the textbook imported from Greece. The local textbook is used only on the occasion of some very important events of the Cypriot history. On the second level of secondary education (Lycee) 20% of the material taught derives from the Cypriot textbook and the rest from the Greek one.

Greece

By Triantafyllos Petridis and Maria Zografaki, presented at workshop by Dr. Thalia Dragona, Dr. Nelli Askouni, Greece

Until 1998 the Greek Minister of Education commissioned scientific groups to write textbooks. After this date the status has changed: the Greek Minister of Education publicises the contents of each textbook and authors submit their proposals. Then, the Pedagogical Institute (a Department of the Ministry of Education) chooses one book. There are only a few textbooks produced this way to date. Textbooks are published by the National Publishing Organisation of Textbooks (OEAB) and distributed to all students. There is only one book for each lesson common to all Greek students, published by the State.

Romania

By Codruta Matei, Dr. Mirela-Luminita Murgescu, Dr. Bogdan Murgescu, University of Bucharest

In the Romanian school system, the renewal of the history schoolbooks has passed through several stages during the 1990's.

At first, soon after the revolution of December 1989, the Ministry of Education decided to reprint, making no changes, the Romanian history schoolbook written by Petre P. Panaitescu at the beginning of the 1940's. The experiment was aborted because the Panaitescu schoolbook was practically not used in schools. A few months later, it was accepted to use the schoolbooks of the late 1980's, avoiding the parts which had been too outrageously perverted by the official

ideology of the Ceaucescu regime (for example the chapters about the Romanian Communist Party and the whole communist rule). Then, in 1991-1992 a new series of schoolbooks for Romanian history was published.

The third phase was that of the alternative schoolbooks authorised after an audit and an auction according to Western standards and co-financed by the World Bank. The process of evaluating the new textbooks is co-ordinated by the CNAM (The National Commission for Schoolbook Approval), which appoints specialised evaluation teams consisting generally of secondary school teachers and, as an exception, university teachers. The CNAM selects three history textbooks for each gymnasium grade according to quality/price criteria, and approves an unlimited number of schoolbooks for high-schools.

Theoretically, the principal steps in authorisation, publication and distribution of the textbooks are:

- The publication of the curricula, realised by a commission nominated by the Ministry of Education, and approved by the Ministry of Education. The members of the Commission are especially secondary teachers, and one or two representatives from the University;
- The announcement of the public auction;
- The offer of the publishing houses (the publishing houses are those who search for the authors). The offer is anonymous for gymnasium, and free for high school, where we have a free market;
- The selection and the approval of the textbooks according to some criteria regarding the conformity with the curricula (80-85%); the contents, the language level, the pedagogical method, the illustrations, the originality, the printing aspects and the quality of the paper;

Theoretically, samples of all textbooks must be sent to schools by the Ministry of Education and by the publishing houses in order that the teachers could choose the appropriate textbook. The schools order the textbooks, which are free for elementary schools, but must be used for no less than five years.

Slovenia

By Dr. Bozo Repe, Dr. Peter Vodopivec, University of Ljubljana

Textbooks must be authorised by the State Council for Education (usually for five years), publication and distribution of textbooks depends on the publisher and the market. There are funds of textbooks in the schools, supported by the state, where students (pupils) can borrow textbooks for a low cost.

Yugoslavia

By Srdjan Rajkovic, Dr. Dubravka Stojanovic, University of Belgrade

The Ministry of Education is in charge of history textbooks.

2.3 Is Byzantine Empire presented as a Greek Empire? Is the Ottoman Empire presented as a Turkish Empire? Is it clearly stated that the two empires were multiethnic, multi-religious and multicultural? How are the relations of different ethnic groups within these empires described?

Albania

By Ilira Caushi, University of Tirana, Department of History

Neither the Byzantine Empire nor the Ottoman Empire is presented as the Greek or Turkish Empires. As far as the Ottoman Empire is concerned, the books stress that the empire was created by those who later became the forefathers of the Turks. Generally, it is stated that

these empires were multiethnic, multi-religious and multicultural, and that the different groups could live together in times of peace, but during conflicts as well.

Bosnia and Herzegovina

By Vera Katz, Historical Institute, Sarajevo

The Byzantine Empire is not presented as a Greek Empire and the Ottoman Empire is not presented as a Turkish Empire. In our textbooks, we use the name Ottoman Empire (Osmansko Carstvo), but before the recent Bosnian war in previous Yugoslav historiography, we used the Turkish name for the Empire. Now, we use "Turkish" for the modern Turkish State. Only two sentences describe the multiethnic, multi-religious, and multicultural characters of the two empires. There is no relevant description about relations between different ethnic groups.

Bulgaria

By Alexei Kalionski, University of Sofia, Department of History

With few exceptions, the Byzantine "Greekness" is evident in many cases. On the other hand, during considerable periods, the Byzantine Empire encompasses the Balkan ethnic complexity, which indirectly portrays it as multicultural (but not as multi-religious). The Ottoman Empire is presented strictly (and occasionally detailed enough) as multiethnic, multicultural and multi-religious not only in its Balkan domains. Here all the textbooks follow the academic distinction between the Ottoman elite and the "common Turk".

A complex Balkan ethnic picture is depicted as different groups are presented either as neighbours or as minorities within Bulgarian state borders or "Bulgarian ethnic territories" (Moesia, Macedonia and Thrace). Here we see an important and almost everlasting distinction between the official state policy (external or internal) on the one hand, and peaceful cohabitation between the different ethnic and religious groups or "peoples" on the other. It is most typical for the Ottoman times, when Balkan Christians, Turks and Muslims equally "suffer" from the imperial regime (due to taxes, wars, changes and disorders).

Croatia

By Snjezana Koren, Osnovna skola Eugena Kumicica, Velika Gorica, Croatia

The Byzantine Empire is included as a subject in some elementary and secondary school textbooks, while in others it is completely ignored. Some of the 5th grade textbooks list territories which were part of the Byzantine Empire leaving the pupils to make their own conclusions, which is perhaps not to be expected from the children of that age (11 years), e.g.: "The Byzantine Empire ruled territories of Asia Minor, Egypt and the Balkans, lands with many large and wealthy towns". Other textbooks, both elementary and secondary school ones, mention peoples who inhabited the Empire. However, most textbooks emphasise that, after the Slav and Arab conquests, the territory of the Empire was reduced, more or less, to the Greek lands and that "the Byzantine Empire lost its Roman features and the Greek ones prevailed (language, culture, official name)".

Textbooks also describe the settling of the South Slavic tribes in the Balkan Peninsula but only some of them pay attention to reciprocal relations between Slavs and the Empire.

The Ottoman Empire: The Croatian textbooks, particularly the secondary school ones, follow quite closely the expansion of the Ottoman Empire from the beginning of the 14th century onwards. It can be concluded, therefore, that the Empire was comprised of a number of (conquered) territories which were not inhabited by the Turks, i.e. its multiethnic character. It is perhaps more clearly expressed in the secondary than in the elementary school textbooks. However, only just in some textbooks dealing with the 19th century the Ottoman Empire is for the first time clearly described as a multinational state. It might be interesting to note that some of the textbooks (three out of twelve) regularly use the name "Turkey" instead of "Ottoman Empire", one of them even stating that "it is not quite correct".

In Croatian textbooks, the Ottoman Empire is described as a theocratic state with Islam as the official religion. Textbooks also mention that, next to Muslims, a number of Christians, both Catholics and Orthodox, lived in the Empire; two textbooks also mention the Jewish community. Exactly the religious affiliation, not ethnic, is outlined as a basis for the social position in the Ottoman society. Every person who converted to Islam could reach even the highest honours, regardless of his ethnic origin. Textbooks state that the Christian population did not enjoy equal rights as Muslims, but their position is described, in most of the books, as "tolerable", especially during the first period of the Ottoman Empire.

Textbooks dealing with the 19th century show development of the national identity of Balkan nations and consequently their conflicts with the Ottoman authorities, describing them as a struggle for independence. Secondary school textbooks mention such national movements and uprisings in Serbia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Greece, Romania (Wallachia and Moldavia) and Bulgaria, while elementary school ones are restricted to the neighbouring nations. Similar movements among Arabs in the Middle East are not included (with the exception of one textbook mentioning the events in Egypt at the beginning of the 19th century). One textbook also includes the relation of the Ottoman authorities towards Armenians at the beginning of the 20th century: "Ottoman authorities were further discredited by the slaughter of more than one million Armenians in the period between 1915 and 1922".

However, textbooks also mention the attempts of the Ottoman sultans to reform the Empire and emphasise those decrees that introduce the equality of all inhabitants without distinction of religion. Nevertheless, those measures are described as inadequate, which consequently led to the collapse of the Empire.

Cyprus

By Loris Koullapis, Univeristy of Cyprus

In the Greek Cypriot history textbooks, two types of dichotomies can be observed. The first dichotomy is clearly of an ideological nature. The Greek Cypriot textbooks identify themselves with the Byzantine Empire. On the one hand this can be interpreted as a heritage of the Greek historiography, on the other hand it is related to the political, cultural and religious influence of the Church of Cyprus in the contemporary Greek Cypriot society. The Church of Cyprus is supposed to guarantee and to keep up the Byzantine tradition. This perception is noticeable in all chapters of the Byzantine history, but the fact that there is a pompous picture of the present Archbishop of Cyprus in a chapter related to the 4th or 5th century reveals a complete identification with this medieval state.

On the contrary, the Ottoman period is presented as a black page in the history of the island. The fact that the Ottoman Empire is not perceived as part of the Greek Cypriot identity is related to both the Greek historiographical tradition and the contemporary relations to Turkey, not to mention the partition of the island. After all the terms "Turk" is used quite often in the Greek Cypriot school books replacing more or less the the term "Ottoman administration".

The second dichotomy is more or less a typological one. In primary education, subjects dominate that are connected to the military history. Both the Byzantine and the Ottoman periods of the island are full of epic battles, massacres and heroes and, needless to say, history narration is still based on events and persons and less on the historical process itself. In the textbooks of secondary education there is a shift of emphasis: the above-mentioned subjects are repeated but a less emotional vocabulary is used. In addition, themes from the social, economic or cultural history take up a significant part of the material taught which do not occur in primary education.

Therefore, in primary and secondary education, respectively, different types of arguments are used to construct this black and white approach to the past. The identification with the Byzantine Empire in primary education is created on the example events, heroes and emperors. In secondary education this identification is created in the form of a cultural

continuity. The same is true with regard to the perception of the Ottoman Empire: the enmity to this state in primary education is connected to massacres, epic sieges and historical figures who are supposed to protect the Greeks. In secondary education, in addition, the disapproval of the Ottoman Empire can be observed on the scarce information given about the influence and the presence of the Ottoman culture in Cyprus.

Greece

By Triantafyllos Petridis, Dr. Thalia Dragona, Dr. Nelli Askouni, Greece

The Turks in the Greek history school textbooks.

Despite the changes in the last twenty years, in the Greek textbooks there are still negative attributions to the Turkish people. Most of these negative attributions are included in the textbooks of the Gymnasium, and they almost all concern the Ottoman Turks, characterised as "Asian conquerors", and "adventurers", who conquered Byzantium by chance. The Sultanat of Oman (as the first Ottoman State is named in the books) did not have frontiers neighbouring the other Turkish Emirats of Asia Minor, but it was neighbouring the Byzantine Empire. Thus, this vicinity as well as the fact that the Byzantine Empire was aged and weakened by interior fights, made it an easy prey to the expansive territorial goals of the Ottoman Turks. The spreading of the Ottoman Turks in the Balkans ended with the occupation of Constantinople, followed by "a cruel tyranny of the Turks", "a dark period of slavery", and "unaccountable suffering caused by the Turkish occupation".

The whole period of the Ottoman rule is described as disastrous for Hellenism. "The burst of Ottoman invasion in the Byzantine territories of Asia Minor at the end of the 13th century, the taking of the Thracian city of Kallipolis in 1354, and finally the fall of the Byzantine Empire in 1453, have been the beginning of misfortune that put in danger the mere existence of the Greek nation". The "consolidation of the Ottoman rule over the Greek land had disastrous consequences for the Greeks", since it was followed "by the painful darkness of the fall of Constantinople", by "the slaughtering, the pillage, and the economic misery". The image formed in the mind of Greek students about the Turks is the one of a violent and aggressive people, unwilling to come into dialogue with its counterparts. The State is oppressive over its entire population, and particularly the non-Muslim part of this population. There are in the books no positive qualifications at all for the Ottoman Turks. Moreover, since the information on the history of the Empire is poor and mainly indirect, the events are not easily understood, since they stand out of context. Thus, besides the negative qualifications mentioned, there is no other element of information, by which the students could form an image of the Ottoman Turks other than the descriptions conveyed by emotional terms, such as, "violence", "slaughtering", "misery", and "darkness".

The history textbook of the 2nd grade of the Lyceum, on the Greek War of Independence, includes no negative qualifications at all. There is one exception. In the chapter on Philhellenism, there is a comment accompanying a picture of an arrogant and victorious officer of the Ottoman army saying: "Here is what the unfortunate rajas had to deal with: an arrogant occupant, who had to kneel in front of the European flags, the religious and political authorities".

The Turks after the fall of the Empire are mainly accused of causing wars, because of their aggressive nationalism, which is also attributed to almost all the Balkan people, and it is never considered as characterising the Greek people.

FYR of Macedonia

By Nikola Jordanovski, Skopje

The very beginning of the Byzantine subject in the textbook is called "Eastern Roman Empire from the 4th to the 12th century". It is described as a realm of Greco-Roman culture and Christianity. It is especially underlined that: "until the 7th century for all inhabitants of Byzantium from the basic foundations of the Byzantine culture (Greco-Roman and Christian),

other elements that contributed to its specific character are mentioned, such as influences of Asiatic peoples (sic), especially Armenians, then also "Slavs and others", with whom Byzantium was "connected directly or indirectly".

The Ottoman State is depicted as clearly Turkish in its beginnings, and continually unacceptable throughout the centuries, since the narrative shows the constant uprisings and all possible forms of resistance. The conclusion would be that the Christian subjects never recognised it as a state that embodied their interests of any kind.

In this sense, in the case of Byzantium the stress is on migration of the Slavs, and on the "slavisation" of most of the Balkan Peninsula, followed later by the coming of the Bulgarian. The mentioned "slavisation" encompasses not only the toponyms and the linguistic realm of the Balkans, but also the remnants of the autochthonous population, especially descendents of the ancient Macedonians. Both Byzantine and later Bulgarian authority over the territory of Macedonia are described as "foreign, or alien" authorities. Samuel's empire is presented as an expression of autochthonous "Macedonian" struggles, and here the creation of the "Macedonian people" is located. So, the multiethnicity of the empire is somewhat problematic, since it is not presented as harmonious, but rather as a field of unsettled interests going in different directions, producing confrontations.

This is even more stressed in the case of the Ottoman rule, since through numerous examples it is depicted as "misfortunate" for the country and the population. Ottomans are mere conquerors, who gain control over most of the Balkans by consecutive wars or using the discord and fragility of the small Christian realms. Later, the Ottoman authorities are described as prone to changing the nature of the subjected lands by forced colonisations, islamisation, changing of toponyms and so on. Relations between different ethnic groups become ones of cooperation in the early stage of the liberation struggle, and of obstructions and hostilities, in the period of "competing propaganda" on the territory of Macedonia.

In general, both the Byzantine and Ottoman Empires are described as frameworks where different ethnic groups were bound to parallel lives (national and to some extent even cultural), with substantial permanent conflicts of interest, and where the rulers were always more rather than less oppressors of legitimate strivings".

Slovenia

By Dr. Bozo Repe, Dr. Peter Vodopivec, University of Ljubljana

The ethnic structure and multiethnic character of the Byzantine Empire is not explained in detail in Slovenian textbooks, but the textbooks clearly show that the Empire is not only Greek. The importance of the Greek (and Roman) heritage is however clearly stressed. Its multi-religious character is not particularly pointed out.

The same with the Ottoman Empire: it is presented as a Turkish Empire. The multiethnic and multi-religious characteristics are mentioned, but mostly not explained more extensively. The relations between different ethnic groups are also not explained in detail, only the hierarchical relation between the Moslems and the Christians is emphasised.

Yugoslavia

By Srdjan Rajkovic, Dr. Dubravka Stojanovic, University of Belgrade

The Byzantine Empire is on no occasion presented as a Greek empire. The subjects of the Empire are always called Byzantines i.e. Rhomaioi (Romans). It is clearly stated that it was multiethnic, but never multi-religious or multicultural. The only religion is Christianity (later on Orthodox Christianity) and the culture is based on the Roman and Hellenistic inheritance enriched by Christianity. The relationships between different ethnic groups within the Byzantine Empire are not discussed at all. Both titles (Ottoman and Turkish Empire) are used synonymously. In the parts that describe atrocities it is usually stated that they were

committed by "Turks". Each lesson is followed by a short passage taken from historical sources in which those who commit the described actions (usually atrocities) are called "Turks".

The Ottoman Empire is not presented as a multiethnic or multi-religious community. The only relation between the Ottoman Empire and the peoples who lived in it is presented as the relation between the "Turkish yoke" and "the enslaved peoples". The impression is that there was no connection between them, since there is not much data concerning economic, social or cultural history. The relation between the "Turks" and the others is presented as the relation between the conqueror and the conquered. It says: "Conquered peoples in the Ottoman Empire were brutally oppressed. Being Christians they were in the inferior position". (7th grade).

2.4 Is the Byzantine Empire integrated in your country's national history and how? How is it historically evaluated in respect to the common past of the region?

Albania

By Ilira Caushi, University of Tirana, Department of History

In the Albanian national history, Byzantine history is integrated in different themes, especially in ones that are related to the Illyrian period at the time when Illyria was included within the Byzantine Empire; the economic and social relations were interdependent, which was reflected in the political system, as well. But in general, when referring to the common past of the region, this empire is defined as an empire that influenced other populations of Southeast Europe in different ways, thus making possible the survival of the Byzantine culture and civilisation.

Bosnia and Herzegovina

By Vera Katz, Historical Institute, Sarajevo

In the national history of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Byzantine Empire is not integrated, only in some sentences there are opinions on the influence of the Orthodox Church in Bosnia in the Middle Ages.

Bulgaria

By Alexei Kalionski, University of Sofia, Department of History

The different extents and ways of integration of Byzantine history in Bulgarians' past are more or less evident from the previous answers. However, Bulgarian national history is presented by no means as something "quasi-Byzantine". It follows its own ways side by side with the empire, in a constant diplomatic and military conflict with Constantinople, but at the same time -under strong influence of the great Byzantine culture. The cultural role of medieval Bulgaria in the "Slavonic-Byzantine civilisation" is featured as almost equal and, in some historic moments, even leading for the "Slavonic" part of the Orthodox world. It goes without saying that Byzantium is evaluated as one of the two great medieval Christian civilisations, but less "dynamic" in comparison to the European West (especially in 12-th - 15-th centuries).

Croatia

By Snjezana Koren, Osnovna skola Eugena Kumicica, Velika Gorica, Croatia

The Byzantine Empire is dealt with mainly in the 5th and 6th grades of elementary school and in the 2nd grade of secondary school. In both elementary and secondary school textbooks there are separate lessons on Byzantine history included in chapters dealing with medieval European history. However, some data concerning Byzantine history is integrated in the lessons on Croatian history as well, especially in the early Middle Ages, when there was a strong Byzantine presence in the eastern-Adriatic coast.

In elementary school, first lessons concerning Byzantine history are included already in the last sections of the 5th grade textbooks. One lesson deals with the Byzantine Empire at the time of

Emperor Justinian; another two include Slavic migrations in 6th and 7th centuries, but they mention the reign of Emperor Heraclius as well. It is interesting to note that Croatian textbook authors disagree about the exact time of emergence of the Byzantine Empire. Four textbooks place it in the 4th century, after the division of the Roman Empire in 395, one textbook in the period of Emperor Justinian I, and two textbooks in the 7th century, during the reign of Emperor Heraclius. One textbook simply states that the Eastern Roman Empire was in the Middle Ages named the Byzantine Empire.

In textbooks for the 6th and 2nd grades, early medieval Byzantine history receives the most attention. Both in elementary and secondary school textbooks there are separate lessons dedicated to the Byzantine history (one lesson in elementary school textbooks and two in secondary school ones). Those lessons cover the period from the 6th to the end of the 11th century and include the relations of the Empire with neighbouring South Slavic states (Bulgaria, Serbia, Montenegro), briefly describing their history as well. In both elementary and secondary school textbooks some data concerning early medieval Byzantine history is included in lessons dealing with Arabs, Franks, the missionary work of the Christian Church etc. After the 11th century, the amount of Byzantine history in textbooks has been greatly reduced, especially in elementary school textbooks. There are no separate lessons: a few facts mentioned in textbooks are included in lessons on European history.

Textbooks describe the Byzantine Empire as an important political factor in the region, but first of all they emphasise its cultural role: "Cultural creativity of the Byzantine Empire set an example to Western Europe as late as the 12th century". This cultural influence in the region lingered long after the 11th century, when Byzantine political influence was diminished and gradually disappeared. In that respect, when dealing with the Byzantine-Slav relations, textbooks mention their conflicts (especially the Byzantine-Bulgarian struggle for the supremacy over Balkan Peninsula), but also dedicate considerable attention to the cultural influence of the Byzantine Empire in the spreading of Christianity among Slavic tribes and in developing of the early medieval South-Slavic culture.

Textbooks emphasise the missionary work of St. Constantine and Methodius: "From the Byzantine Empire arrived in Great Moravia brothers Constantine and Methodius, born in Salonika. They brought some church books translated into Slavic language. At the same time, according to the Greek alphabet, they composed the new [Glagolitic] script". Development of the Cyrillic alphabet by disciples of Constantine and Methodius is included as well.

Textbooks also include a number of illustrations showing Byzantine influence in architecture; however, this is more obvious in secondary than in elementary school textbooks which include more such illustrations.

As far as Croatian history is concerned, textbooks emphasise that in the early Middle Ages two cultural circles -western and eastern, Latin and Byzantine- meet in Croatian territory, and Croatia receives influences from both of them. These are examples of data included in Croatian history lessons dealing with Byzantine political, religious and cultural influence in early Middle Ages:

- The book of the Byzantine Emperor Constantine VII, *De administrando imperio*, is mentioned in textbooks as an important source for the early Croatian history, i.e. the settling of Croats and their conversion to Christianity.
- Secondary school textbooks mention the Aachen Peace in 812 and its consequences: "The Byzantine Empire recognised Charlemagne's imperial title and Frankish hold on Istria and Croatia, while the Frankish Empire recognised the Byzantine rule over Venice and Dalmatia".
- Textbooks mention the role of Emperor Basil I in restoring the Byzantine rule in the eastern-Adriatic coast and in the spreading of Christianity among some of the Croats. They also emphasise that "at that time Croats and other Slavs, residing along the Adriatic coast, were introduced to the Slavic liturgy and the Glagolitic alphabet, achievement of the activity of

Constantine and Methodius". Textbooks mention other influences coming from that cultural circle: "Two alphabets were in use [in Croatia]: Latin and Glagolitic... Soon after, spreading from Macedonia, the Cyrillic script comes into use in Croatia... This will make Croats the only European nation using three different alphabets".

Textbooks mention mutual political influences of the Byzantine Empire and the Croatian Kingdom during the early Middle Ages, e.g. the Byzantine role in the struggle for the Croatian throne in the 9th century and the Croatian rulers getting involved in the Byzantine-Bulgarian conflicts the 10th century. In return, the Empire surrendered in certain periods the authority over Dalmatia to the Croatian rulers (Tomislav and Stjepan Droislav).

Cyprus

By Loris Koullapis, University of Cyprus

Byzantine History: The Byzantine period of Cyprus (4th century BC - 1191) is divided into three periods:

- a. The Protochristian / Protobyzantine period (4th century - 7th century)
- b. The period of the Arabic Raids on Cyprus (7th century - mid 10th century)
- c. The main Byzantine Period (965 - 1191)

The Greek Cypriot school books stress different issues in these three periods. With regard to the Protochristian period, all analysed school books lay emphasis on the struggle of the Church of Cyprus to remain independent from the attempts of the neighbouring Church of Antiocheia to include Cyprus in its administration. The positive outcome of this dispute in the 5th century is stressed in all school books. From this time on, the Church of Cyprus became once and for all autocephalous. Generally speaking, this period is presented as a time of prosperity, growth and social development thanks to people's hard work, the interest of the Byzantine emperors and the decrease in taxation.

Much space is devoted to the development of frescoes, icons and the Byzantine church architecture in Cyprus, especially in the secondary education. This is attributed to the fact that in Cyprus Byzantine architecture had flourished for many centuries and, on the other hand, it reveals the studies and the preferences of the authors of the textbook used at Lycee. The same approach is to be found with regard to the main Byzantine period. In total, in the above mentioned school book, the Byzantine architecture, the development of frescoes and icons in Cyprus takes up over 36 pages, i.e. over 44% of the material taught in the 2nd class of the Lycee.

The Middle Byzantine Period (Arabic Raids) is characterised by the hostilities between Byzantines and Arabs over Cyprus and therefore little space is devoted to the other aspects of human life. Massacres, plunder and military operations, during which a significant part of the population was killed, are the main characteristics of this period. There are two important events mentioned: a) the transportation of the population of Cyprus to the Marmara Sea coast (Artaki, Kyzikos), near the medieval Constantinople, in 691. The majority returned back at the beginning of the 8th century. In the school of primary education this measure was taken by the Byzantine Emperor to protect the local population from the continuous hostilities. However, at Lycee a different reason is given: the Byzantine Emperor wanted to found a new city near Constantinople in the 7th century, so that it could be used as a breakwater to possible attack by the Arabs against the capital. b) Another important event mentioned in all school books is the joint rule over Cyprus by the Byzantines and Arabs from the mid or late 7th century up to the mid 10th century. The abolition of the Arab rule over Cyprus (and Crete) is depicted as "liberation" or more or less as a national victory. The Greek Cypriot school books show clearly that they identify themselves with the Byzantine administration and that the Byzantine period of the island is perceived as an important link in the continuity of the Greek nation in Cyprus, although an explicit "Greekness" of the Byzantine Empire is nowhere mentioned.

The emergence and the spread of Islam in the 7th century are mentioned in a few pages within the framework of the Byzantine-Islamic conflict. With respect to this subject no prejudices are constructed but the Arabic raids on Cyprus (not the emergence of Islam itself) are presented negatively. In one textbook of the primary education there is an interesting paragraph promoting multicultural co-existence and respect for the Islamic religion though this is the exception to the rule.

Another example of an indirect construction of the "Greekness" of the Byzantine Empire and therefore of Cyprus is the emotional depiction of the mythical hero Digenis Akritas in primary education. This subject takes up 3,5 pages or 25% of the material devoted to the Byzantine Empire in this school book. Digenis Akritas - the only hero mentioned for the whole Byzantine period - is supposed to have been himself in Cyprus in the 10th century. Although it is said that all that stories are in all probability legends, he is depicted as "new Hercules" and as a "protector" of the Greeks.

No other people are mentioned as existing in Cyprus during the Byzantine period and therefore no negative images are constructed for other peoples in the Greek Cypriot school books. The silence of the Greek Cypriot school books about other peoples is an additional form of an indirect construction of the "Greekness" of Cyprus. Thus, nothing is said about the multilingual, multireligious or the Balkan dimension of the Byzantine Empire.

Greece

By Triantafyllos Petridis, Dr. Thalia Dragona, Dr. Nelli Askouni, Greece

In almost every history textbook there can be detected a tendency to positively evaluate the national self, often by contrast to the negative image of the national others, and in this case of the Turks.

There is also a tendency to interpret the negative events by reference to chance. Although there is mention of the exterior and interior reasons causing the fall of the Byzantine Empire, there is, for example, a concluding citation making a clear reference to fate: "The dynasty of the Paleologues fatally closes the cycle of the life of an empire, which for a thousand years did not stop to struggle against its enemies in consecutive waves. The empire resisted the many attacks, lived long in order to spread civilisation around it, and finally got tired, and fell".

The fall of the Byzantine Empire is followed by the rise of another Empire, the Ottoman one (clearly influenced by the former on many levels) using by force its Christian populations as managers in the public administration and the army. In this new empire, the Greeks succeeded to survive [as a group] by conserving their particular cultural heritage, which led them to the Revolution in the beginning of the 19th century and the creation of an independent state, which constituted the new metropolis of Hellenism.

The Byzantine Empire is the link between the Ancient Greek culture and modern times. This culture as part of the classical antiquity belongs to the Greeks and constitutes their cultural idiosyncrasy which led them to the struggle for liberty, since "during the difficult times of slavery, under the harsh conditions of life imposed by the occupant, culture had not been lost. It contributed to the rise of 1821".

Moreover, Byzantine art survives the fall of the empire, and becomes the model of the new Muslim monuments in Constantinople.

During the period following the fall of Constantinople, "the faith in the cultural significance of Hellenism and the hope of resurrection kept Hellenism alive. "In due course, they will be ours, once again"...". The conception contained in the school textbooks is in a few words that very difficult times awaited the Greeks following the fall of Byzantium, "a cultural darkness covered Greece (sic) during the 1st century of Turkish dominance, albeit many efforts to keep culture alive, wherever this was possible". The high culture and education has nevertheless helped the

Greeks to overcome their difficulties, and struggle hard in order to get their freedom back, thus, re-establishing the link [with the cultural past] having been cut by the fall of Constantinople. The national consciousness of the Greeks existed the moment the Byzantine Empire fell because, "if the Modern Greek world had not been already formed before the fall of Constantinople, it would have been impossible to survive through the tyranny of the Turks. The [Greek world] had faith in the coming liberation. This faith was transmitted from generation to generation, until it became reality, as the popular song narrates". The message according to which the Greeks are carrying a high culture appears in the books as often as the mention of their quality of resistance towards the difficulties endured by the Ottoman rule.

The message that the Byzantine Empire is Greek, and constitutes the link between Greek Antiquity and the Modern Greek State is a direct one. "The population of the Byzantine Empire, as well as many among its emperors have considered Ancient Greek culture as their heritage and believed they had to conserve it". After the fall of Constantinople, "most of the manuscripts of Ancient Greek works were transported to the West", nevertheless, "during the dark years of slavery and the harsh conditions of life imposed by the conqueror, this culture has not been lost. It thus helped the uprising of 1821". "Hellenism had its own intellectual heritage, its age long history, which, even as a far away memory, still enforced [the Greeks] in the difficult times of slavery. This [heritage] was their pride. That is why they believed that culture will bring liberty again".

The Orthodox Church and particularly the Patriarchate, using the privileges accorded by Mohamed the Conqueror, renewed by his successors, became the center of unity of Christian populations in the Balkans, and especially the Greek populations. The privileges gave the Patriarch the role of "a national leader, heading not only the Orthodox Church, but having moreover political responsibilities towards the Orthodox populations of the Ottoman Empire". The Orthodox Church was the one which conserved Greek culture. "While the Catholic Church was going through a deep crisis, because of the Reform, and while the Renaissance, enforced by Greek scholars, was spreading in the European area, in the ranks of the enslaved Hellenism, humble teachers, often monks or members of the clergy, were keeping alive the cultural and spiritual tradition of the Nation, or tried to transplant the Greek intellectual tradition in other Orthodox countries". This long cultural effort was greatly helped by the Greek Enlightenment, which was a "homogeneous ideology", which lead the Greeks to "foresee their liberation, by their own forces shortly after".

FYR of Macedonia

By Nikola Jordanovski, Skopje

The Byzantine Empire is definitely integrated in Macedonian national history, taking into account that it represents a substantial portion of the narrative on all levels of teaching and writing history. The problem of how this is done is already a more complicated one. For instance, one undoubtedly positive feature of this common history would be the baptism of the Slavs (in Macedonia) by the brothers St. Cyrillius and Methodus. Nevertheless, this is taken out of some more joint context, almost as if the mission was a private enterprise of the Thessaloniki brothers. Also, the main consequence of this is the founding of the Slav literature and culture, while the elements of becoming a part of a certain community are missing. Once founded, the same Slav culture immediately takes its own course, generally apart from (if not opposed to) the other effects derived from belonging to same cultural pattern. This is visible in the texts about the medieval culture in Macedonia. For instance, painting of icons is presented as being part of "Macedonian art", out of the context of the common Byzantine art. The Byzantine influence is given somewhat more credit in the field of music. The most illuminative example is chosen to be Joan Kukuzel, a 14th century composer and musician. His origin from western Macedonia (Debar) is emphasised, but he is also described as founder of the "note-alphabet in the Eastern Church, i.e. reformer of Byzantine music". To finish with, a bold statement in the textbook for the second grade of high school claims that "Macedonia is rightfully considered by science as a fatherland of the Slav literacy and literature".

Since the obvious attitude is that only autochthonous states are desirable ones, and lacking a real example of such a kingdom on the territory of Macedonia in the Middle Ages, Samuel's empire is described in detail as the only one responding to the wishes and interests of the population of Macedonia. This implies that there was something like definitely shaped specific interest of the inhabitants of the geographic territory of Macedonia, apart from similar ones in the other countries. As a result of this, 11th century uprisings are given a meaning of national struggles of the "Macedonian people" against the Byzantine authority, or in other words "mass national-liberating uprisings". The ultimate impression would be that the Byzantines (since they are never named as Greeks) were enemies of the Slavs, and especially of the Slavs in Macedonia, showing antagonism of races and cultures and the Byzantine Empire as oppressive. This goes equally for its role in a broader context of other medieval kingdoms in the Balkans; Byzantium is again only a key player in the game for domination, a game that in essence is unjust and expansionistic. This expansion is always on the account of the "other", and the "other" being in Macedonian textbooks simply the "Macedonian people" for whatever that means from this distance now, or meant back in the concrete time.

Slovenia

By Dr. Bozo Repe, Dr. Peter Vodopivec, University of Ljubljana

In Slovenian textbooks, the Byzantine Empire had no direct influence on Slovene history and its history is not integrated in it. The Byzantine Empire is very highly evaluated. Its impact on the Western cultural development and European cultural heritage is clearly emphasised.

Yugoslavia

By Srdjan Rajkovic, Dr. Dubravka Stojanovic, University of Belgrade

The Byzantine Empire is integrated in Serbian national history in several aspects. Serbs received Christianity from Byzantium and their statehood and church were based on the principles introduced by the Byzantines. Later on, the Serbian medieval state was enlarged due to the successful conquering campaigns against the Byzantine Empire. Religious, cultural and social influence of the Empire is quite often mentioned in Yugoslav textbooks, as well as the common destiny regarding the oncoming Turkish raids and the fall under the Ottoman rule. There are no references to the recent past of the region.

2.5 Is the Ottoman Empire integrated in your country's national history and how? How is it historically evaluated in respect to the common past of the region?

Albania

By Ilira Caushi, University of Tirana, Department of History

The Ottoman Empire is widely integrated in different treatments of the Albanian national history, especially in the moments when our history was directly related and linked with this empire. Historically, this empire in relation to the common past of our region is treated as an empire that had its own political and military organisation and that had a mainly negative and obscure influence on the other populations of the region.

Bosnia and Herzegovina

By Vera Katz, Historical Institute, Sarajevo

The Ottoman Empire is integrated in our country's history. About fifteen pages are dedicated to the subject in our textbook for students in the second grade of Lycee. A very serious problem in our historiography is that there are very different opinions about the Ottoman Empire. It depends on the nationality of the historian, whether he is Bosniak, Croat or Serbian.

Bulgaria

By Alexei Kalionski, University of Sofia, Department of History

The Ottoman Empire is presented as a general factological frame for the "own" history of the Bulgarian and Balkan peoples. Under the Ottomans, their development is qualified as "delayed" and "anachronistic" (in the "common European" context). The predominant attitude is negative, despite many nuances and "neutral" qualifications. The image of the empire is constructed in the terms of an "alien" ("non-European", "Oriental") state, religion and civilisation. The gradual economic progress, adoption of (West) European style and ideas, the national "awakening" and cultural "Renaissance" are the most important processes in the 18th to 19th centuries. The uprisings against the empire in 15th-17th century and the liberation/revolutionary movements in the 19th and beginning of the 20th century show the way out of the "stagnation". The appearance of Balkan national states over the former Ottoman territories is presented as a final and "long desired" exit, leading to "normal", "modern" and "dynamic" development.

Croatia

By Snjezana Koren, Osnovna skola Eugena Kumicica, Velika Gorica, Croatia

The Ottoman Empire is dealt with mainly in the 6th and 7th grades of elementary school and in the 2nd and 3rd grades of secondary school. A few facts from the Ottoman history (from the beginning of the 20th century until 1918) are also mentioned in the 4th grade textbooks. Both 8th and 4th grade textbooks include some data on modern Turkey; that data is now mentioned in sections dealing with 20th century Asia.

The 6th and 2nd grade textbooks follow the same pattern, although the 2nd grade curriculum is much more detailed. There is one separate lesson in both elementary and secondary school textbooks dealing with the Ottoman history from the 14th century to 1453; it is included in the section dealing with European history from the 11th to 15th centuries. In the second half of the 15th century, Ottoman Turks begin to play an important role in Croatian history as well; from that date onwards, until the end of the 17th century, all other data concerning Ottoman Empire is included in the lessons on Croatian and Bosnian history. That data included in lessons on Croatian history is related exclusively to the Croatian-Turkish conflicts and the conquests of the Croatian territory. All data related to the organisation of the Ottoman State and its social structures is in the elementary school textbooks included in the lesson dealing with Bosnia during the Ottoman rule, which is, again, included in the section dealing with Croatian history in the 16th and 17th centuries. (In secondary school textbooks, that data is included in lesson dealing with the history of the Ottoman Empire.) It is interesting to note that among four elementary and secondary school textbooks dealing with that period, only one dedicates about half a page to the Croatian territories under the Ottoman rule, even though some of them were part of the Ottoman Empire for 200 years. However, it has to be said that this issue in Croatian historiography is poorly researched.

The 7th and 8th grade textbooks and the 3rd and 4th grade textbooks, dealing with the period of the 18th and 19th centuries, differ a great deal in the arrangement of material. Generally speaking, after the cessation of the Croatian-Turkish conflicts there is no data concerning history of the Ottoman Empire included in the national history lessons.

In the 7th grade textbooks, which cover the period from the end of the 18th century to 1918, there are no separate lessons considering the Ottoman history. All data concerning history of the Ottoman Empire in the first half of the 19th century is included in lessons dealing with Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia. The information dealing with the second half of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century is included in lessons on European history (the Great Eastern Crisis, the Congress of Berlin, the Balkan Wars and the First World War). In the 3rd grade textbooks there are two to three separate lesson dedicated to Ottoman history; they are included in sections dealing with European and world history. There is some data in the lessons concerning the history of other Balkan countries as well. It is interesting to note that secondary school textbooks include facts on Bosnian history in lessons dealing with the history of the Ottoman Empire.

For the period from the end of the 14th century to the beginning of the 18th century, textbooks emphasise, in the first place, the conquering features of the Ottoman Empire. The Ottoman conquest had a strong impact on all Balkan states, which were forced to organise defense and to lead defensive wars. Some textbooks mention examples of co-operation among Balkan states, e.g. one elementary school textbook, describing the battle at Kosovo in 1389, says that "Serbs asked for help in the West and Bosnian King Tvrtko responded by sending some of his forces and as well some Croatian troops, because a considerable part of Croatia was at that time under his rule". Textbooks mostly describe the position of those who came under the Ottoman rule using term "subjugated peoples" and as the most important consequence of Ottoman conquests they mention migrations and resettling of Balkan peoples and changing of ethnic structure of some territories. However, textbooks also emphasise that the Ottoman Empire had an excellent and very successful army and well-organised government and therefore the status of Christian peasants in some Balkan lands improved after the Turkish conquest.

Concerning consequences the Ottoman conquest had in Croatia, textbooks put on the first place conquering of two-thirds of the Croatian medieval territory, redrawing of Croatian borders and changes of ethnic structure. Textbooks also mention that, because of these wars, Croatia starts to fall behind the economic development of the Western Europe.

Dealing with the 18th and the 19th centuries, textbooks emphasise that this is the period of the administrative, social and economic decay of the Ottoman Empire. They often use the well-known phrase, first used by Russian Tsar Nicholas I, who called the Empire "the sick man of Europe". For that period, the presentation of its history is based upon descriptions of the economic and political crisis, the liberation movements of subjugated Balkan peoples (which are presented as legitimate) and war defeats which led to the loss of territories and general weakening of the state and consequently to the disappearance of the Ottoman Empire. Consistently, the Ottoman Empire in Croatian textbooks no longer presents an important factor in the 19th and the 20th century Croatian history, with the exception of the influence the Empire had on Croats living in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Cyprus

By Loris Koullapis, University of Cyprus Ottoman History

After Greece's independence in 1830, Greek historiography defined all periods of the Greek history characterised by foreign rule with the word-ending "-kratia" (domination). This ending in its historical context is connected a priori in the Greek collective consciousness with negative associations whenever the first component is a people. There are three big periods of this sort: The Roman period, the Frankish period and the Ottoman one (the "Tourkokratia"). The idea of the cultural superiority to the above-mentioned people, whose name contains "-kratia", was invented to counterbalance these "long nights" in the history of the Greeks. Needless to say, Greek Cypriot writers of history (text)books adopt as a rule the vocabulary and the perceptions of the Greek historiography.

Within this general framework of history interpretation, the Ottoman conquest of Cyprus in 1570-71 is described as a quite negative event in the history of the island. In all textbooks, emphasis is put on both the battles between Venetians and Turks and the massacres by the latter in Nicosia and Famagusta. These passages are characterised by emotionalism, auto- and heterostereotypes which are repeated on the occasion of the massacres in Nicosia in July 1821 during the Greek War of Independence. It is characteristic of this attitude that 41% of whole Ottoman period is devoted to the sieges of Nicosia and Famagusta. The depiction of the conquest of these two cities reminds one of the vocabulary of the Greek school books with regard to the fall of Constantinople in 1453.

The whole "Tourkokratia" is perceived as a struggle of survival by the Greek inhabitants of the island against the Ottoman administration which falls in line with the perception of the Ottoman period in Greece. Greek Cypriot textbooks devote much space to the positive role of

the Church of Cyprus describing it quite paternalistically as a guardian of the cultural and national consciousness of the Greeks.

In most school books, especially in primary education and to some degree in secondary education there is a gap in the narration from the Ottoman conquest of the island up to the mid 18th or the early 19th centuries. Therefore, there is very little information about the cultural, social or economic development of the island. Only in the textbook used at Lycee the above-mentioned issues take up a good percentage of the material taught (22 pages, 27.5%), but even in this case there is very little information about the Ottoman architecture and its influence in Cyprus, as the emphasis is put upon the development of the Church architecture and the Church interior decoration.

An important institution of the Ottoman period mentioned in all Greek Cypriot school books is the one of Dragoman (=Interpreter). This institution reached its climax on the example of Chatzigeorgakis Kornissios who served this post for almost thirty years (1780-1809). The depiction of this institution and especially the presentation of its most important representative does not differ very much from the vocabulary used in the Greek textbooks of history about the Phanariots: both are perceived as protectors of the Greek population, who together with the influential Church, made the arbitrary administration of the Turks less painful.

The Greek historiography that emerged in the mid 19th century among other things stressed the uprisings of the Greeks during the Ottoman period. The same perception can be found in all Greek Cypriot school books published since 1960. However, in the school books of secondary education published since the end of the 70's a different approach is recorded: with regard to the uprisings in Cyprus in the mid 18th or the early 19th century, it is clearly said that both Greeks and Turks took part as a result of some social and economic problems which faced the local society as a whole. Besides, the Greek Cypriot school books try to construct the Greek origins of the Turkish Cypriot population of the island: a significant part of them (no numbers mentioned) are supposed to be descended from Christians or Latins who converted to Islam during the Ottoman era. These are the only issues mentioned in the Greek Cypriot school books which reveal a different approach to the Ottoman past compared to the school books imported from Greece.

Greece

By Triantafyllos Petridis, Dr. Thalia Dragona, Dr. Nelli Askouni, Greece

The historical role of the Turks

In the Greek textbooks, neither the Ottoman nor the Turkish history is included as part of world history. Its partial and limited presence in the books serves the needs of the description of the Greek history and its evolution.

The Turks are presented entering the scene as "Asian invaders", aggressive and expansive, who destroyed the previous status quo in Eastern Mediterranean, and creating first the "Seltzuk State". The fall of this state because of interior antagonisms follows the establishment of the Sultanat of Bursa a creation of Osman, which will gradually develop and become the Ottoman Empire. This first State, as well as the Ottoman Empire, is an authoritarian state, ruled by a military aristocracy, good in wars and very disciplined as presented in textbooks. This ruling group exploited the decadence and dysfunction of the Byzantine Empire in order to spread in Asia Minor and the Balkans gradually creating a new empire. In their effort to build a continuously stronger and dedicated army, as well as an educated bureaucracy, in order to rule this new big state, they performed massive forced islamisation of the state's Christian population, a particular form of which was the forced gathering of children and the forced enrollment in the Ottoman navy. This extended assimilationist policy made it possible for them to succeed their goals, and dominate the area of Eastern Mediterranean and of South-Eastern Europe, after the taking of Constantinople, which they made the capital of their new state, concluding the first phase of this policy. The imposition of the Ottoman rule in the above geographic area has been the cause of an age long suffering of all Christian populations, among which the Greek people, presented in all the books as the natural heirs of the Byzantine

Empire. Besides the above mentioned slaughtering and economic deprivation, suffered by the Greeks, they also suffered complete intellectual deprivation, which, according to the books, followed the establishment of the Ottoman rule. In this situation of economic and intellectual deprivation, the only consolation and hope for the Christian populations was the Oecumenical Patriarchate. The privileges, accorded the Patriarchate by Mohamed the Conqueror, were accorded also by his successors, and lasted until the declaration of the Turkish Republic, when the status of the Patriarchate was changed.

The already mentioned absence of sufficient and coherent information about the Empire makes the above description and the indirect messages produced by the notions of oppression, economic exploitation, and intellectual deprivation the only tools to construct an image of the Ottomans.

The same absence of information leaves the passage from the image of the arrogant and all-powerful Empire to the one of a weak and decadent one, dependant as well on the European states' interests as for its survival, without any rational explanation.

The image of the Turks, indirectly painted by all the above, is a very negative one, since they are a people first invading European territories, and then obstructing the Christian populations in the Balkans from following the important European developments in the political, economic, intellectual and artistic sphere. The definite impression given to the Greek student is that the Ottoman Empire has caused the Greek people an important delay in the course of European development since Europe was their natural environment, contrary to the Turks, coming from Asia.

In the Greek history textbooks, there is no reference whatsoever to the Ottoman or the Turkish point of view. The only exception is the inclusion of two references, concerning events of the Greek War of independence, in the textbook of the 2nd grade of the Lyceum.

FYR of Macedonia

By Nikola Jordanovski, Skopje

After the fall of the small feudal states in Macedonia under Turkish control in the 14th century, and the town of Thessaloniki in 1430, "the long lasting Ottoman reign started". Reprisals and atrocities in those early stages of the conquest are not forgotten. Details of this process of further subjection of the Balkan peoples by the Turks (unlike the case of the Byzantines, the Ottomans are more often nominated as Turks, or Turk-Ottomans) are presented for every separate national kingdom. Not many values are shared with the new rulers, so the narrative mainly concentrates on a description of the Ottoman feudal system, administrative divisions and so on. However, there is a deliberate "distance" in the discourse, as if those administrative and social measures were happening either only on paper or were used only by the rulers, not really affecting miserable and unhappy (consequently rebellious) ancestors. The spirit is clearly one of total alienation of the Ottoman State and its Christian subjects. As it was already said, this is even more visible in the chapters on the 19th century in which the Ottoman Empire disappears as a substance, becoming "doomed", something to discard, to leave, and the story is all about how that was accomplished.

The notion of the common past of the region during the Ottoman reign is one of similar resistance against it, in different countries. There seems to be a certain inclination for describing the details of the Ottoman policy of punishment by public mutilations and executions. The list of features left behind by the centuries of Turkish presence in Macedonia, apart from anarchy, injustice, violence, colonisation and islamisation, contains also positive moments (if one is benevolent enough to interpret them that way), such as "oriental appearance" (or "character"), given to the "Macedonian towns" by intensive incorporation of Moslem architecture.

Slovenia

By Dr. Bozo Repe, Dr. Peter Vodopivec, University of Ljubljana

The history of the Turkish Empire is more integrated in Slovenian history according to the textbooks than is the Byzantine Empire, but mostly through the presentation of the invasions and their consequences. The picture of the Turkish Empire is negative, though its force and high cultural level at the beginnings is mentioned. In respect to the common past of the region the picture is negative.

Yugoslavia

By Srdjan Rajkovic, Dr. Dubravka Stojanovic, University of Belgrade

The Ottoman Empire is taken as sort of breach in Serbian history in textbooks in Yugoslavia. We are presented with a picture of the lofty national medieval past interrupted violently by the Battle of Kosovo and continued four centuries later. One drastic example of this is the textbook for the 3rd grade of elementary school in which students meet with facts about their past for the first time. The unit entitled "The fall under the Turkish Power" is followed by the unit on the First Serbian Uprising in 1804 thus omitting the Ottoman period completely. The same approach can be found less drastic this time in the textbook for the 7th grade (of elementary school) which covers the period between the 16th and 19th centuries where only 17 out of 135 pages are devoted to the four centuries long Ottoman history on this territory. Historically the period is evaluated as a period of slavery, stagnation and the extremely bad position for Christians. The only positive information given in a short paragraph is the upturn in the city's economy from the 16th to the 18th centuries. The existence of a thin segment of Christian spahias is mentioned and also added that they changed their religion to Islam, thus creating the impression that the rest of population lived as rightless subjects (raya).

by Prof. Fikret Adanir*

The Academic Committee, which met during the first workshop of the Joint History Project (Halki, 1999), decided that the next meeting should be restricted to young scholars from Southeast European countries who are in the process of writing or have recently completed their doctoral thesis or postgraduate work. Professors Fikret Adanir (Bochum, Germany) and Karl Kaser (Graz, Austria) were entrusted with the organisation of such a seminar. The organisers chose to place the general theme of "migrations" at the center of the workshop. Under migration they understood, more or less, human mobility, voluntary or compulsory. Southeastern Europe had witnessed human mobility, migrations and deportations, since time immemorial. However, the last two centuries were to form the time framework of the seminar. Its focus was to be the various types of migration and their causes, as well as the integration of migrants into a new culture and society.

The scope of subjects that were suggested to be treated by the applicants included:

- migrations caused by imperial (Ottoman or Habsburg) invasions or by nation-state formation since the nineteenth century
- examples of forced migration
- migrations of livestock breeders; their conflicts with sedentary populations
- migrations of itinerant groups (e.g. gypsies)
- various forms of labor migration, including seasonal migration and modern forms of trader migration
- migration from rural to urban areas and vice versa
- student migration.

The applicants were expected to propose papers representing innovative approaches, theoretically or methodologically. The organisers also wished to foster an interest in those aspects of migration that might have an impact on gender studies. Given the compartmentalised nature of social sciences, another aim of this meeting was to demonstrate and/or encourage a multi-disciplinary approach, with participants representing different branches of social sciences (historians, sociologists, anthropologists, political scientists, scholars specialising in comparative literature and so on). Last but not least, it was hoped that the meeting would contribute to establishing an intra-Balkan network of researchers - something that was missing in the past. However, the project being of very recent origin and the efforts in publicising it not yet really systematic, the resonance fell rather short of the organisers' expectations. Still, altogether 19 papers were submitted.

The subjects treated covered a vast field from traditional forms of migration (Alexei Kalionski, "The Last Nomadic Migration in the Balkans"; Florea Ioncioaia, "Urban Immigration and Local Attitudes. Foreigners and Jews in the Romanian Principalities in the First Decades of the 19th Century"; Maria Nicoleta Turliuc, "Jewish Immigration in Romania in the Late 19th Century: The Psychosocial Impact on the Native Romanians") over the forms of forced migration or expulsion of populations (Zoran Janjetovic, "The Disappearance of the Vojvodina Germans: Reasons, Social and Economic Consequences"; Tudor Pitulac, "The Mechanisms and Consequences of Forced Migration and Natural Re-Migration inside Romania during the Last Five Decades"; Dilek Goeven, "The Anti-Greek Riots of 1955 in Istanbul") to student migration (Leonidas Rados, "Students from the Romanian Lands in Athens in the Second Half of the 19th Century") and migrant labour (Vlasidis Vlasidis, "New Settlers at the End of the Twentieth Century: The Case of Naoussa Province"). Several papers addressed problems of socio-cultural integration (Marijana Jakimova, "Bulgarian Migrants in Austria: A 20th Century's Experience of Peaceful Integration"; Ekaterini-Lina Venturas: "Institutions in Post-War Belgium: Integration or Differentiation of Greek Migrants"; Sonila Kora, "The Albanian Community in America"; Aleksandar Vukic, "The Traditional Community in Modern Society: Croats from the Island of Susak in New York"). The issue of citizenship and political integration was also discussed (Elpida Voglie, "Refugees and the Question of Citizenship in Insurgent Greece"; G. Yulia Ghazaryan, "Refugee Policy Analysis of the Republic of Armenia: Obstacles to Integration and Naturalisation of Ethnic Armenian Refugees"; Tanja Petrovic, "Speaking a Different Serbian Language: Refugees in Serbia between Conflict and Integration"). In respect to methodology, too, the papers displayed a rich variety. Along with studies utilizing conventional methods of historical criticism, some were clearly inspired by modern anthropological research (Stefan Dorondel and Ionel Stelu Serban, "Relative and Community in Zabala Village/Covasna District: Migrations and their Oral History"). Also papers with a biographical focus, dwelling on questions of memory and identity, were not missing (Rula Gianuhailidou, "Memory and Identity: The Case of Greek Asia Minor Refugees in Greece"; Michailidis D. Iakovos, "Victims and Avengers of the Nation: Reassessing the Interwar Balkan Refugee Experience"). Only one paper made use of the techniques of content analysis and quantification (Gabriel-Iulian Lataianu, "Image of the Romanian Citizens in Gazeta Wyborcza. How a Stereotype is Emerging").

The seminar was conceived as a workshop for which discussion was vital. Therefore, individual presentations were not supposed to exceed 20 minutes, so that enough time would be left to discuss each paper in depth. Senior scholars attending the meeting participated in most debates - apart from members of the Academic Committee (Professors Richard Crampton, John Koliopoulos, John Lampe, Diana Mishkova, Maria Todorova), an anthropologist, Professor Klaus Roth of the University of Munich, had been invited as a discussant, some local historians (e.g. Basil Gounaris) joining in occasionally. Propitiously, the discussion was rather intense from the start. As was to be expected, however, papers with some relevance to current political questions proved more conducive to debate than studies dealing with general historical topics. For example, the debate became livelier when concepts of citizenship versus ethnic affiliation (the papers of Elpida Voglie and Yulia Ghazaryan) or the issue of socio-political integration versus marginalisation (the papers of Vlasidis Vlasidis and Tanja Petrovic) were treated. The discussion grew particularly controversial when Gabriel Lataianu presented his findings

regarding the "false" image of Romanians produced in Poland by an injudicious journalism which used the terms "Gypsy" and "Roma" indiscriminately.

At the end of the seminar, the organisers as well as the participants felt pleased with the results attained. The latter were given, and made full use of, the opportunity to present their work to an interested audience. The discussion accentuated the impression that research in the history of migrations retains its importance for understanding the contemporary problems in Southeastern Europe. And finally, new friendships were contracted which opened perspectives for future scholarly networks in the region.

"In my opinion, the Dubrovnik workshop has been fully successful, not because it has brought at one table young scholars of different "nationality", open to dialogue and reconciliation. But because it has put to work young scholars with different research perspectives, all of them eager for multi-perspectivity, methodologically well equipped against the traps of anachronisms, and sufficiently sound in their scientific training to accept criticism from their colleagues and from the senior scholars without feeling diminished. As for the senior scholars, they have done their job, it seems to me, without patronising attitudes and without making any concession to the supposedly "special" nature of Balkan history. The Dubrovnik workshop has certainly provided a model of efficient scientific communication and transaction".

Prof. Marco Dogo, History Professor at the University of Trieste
Sheila Cannon
Introduction

No single narrative can capture the different voices present at the Junior Scholars' Workshop in Dubrovnik in June 2001; this report, therefore, is a confluence of responses and thoughts from the participants in their own voices. Each participant gained different insights from the workshop, each from a different perspective. From the standpoint of the Center for Democracy and Reconciliation in Southeast Europe (CDRSEE), an international NGO based in Thessaloniki, the workshop was a great success because 22 scholars of Southeast European history left Dubrovnik with new ideas and thoughts, enriched by 2 days of intense and constructive discussion with newly acquainted friends and colleagues.

CDRSEE is grateful to all those who contributed to the success of the second Junior Scholars' Workshop: 15 Junior Scholars (listed below), and 8 Senior Scholars: Prof. Maria Todorova, Prof. Fikret Adanir, Prof. Ivo Bicanic, Prof. Marco Dogo, Prof. Karl Kaser, Prof John Lampe, Prof. Diana Mishkova, and Prof. Peter Vodopivec.

The Junior Scholars who participated in the workshop are in the process of completing their PhD Theses. This workshop was an opportunity for the scholars to present their work, to hear and comment on 14 other research topics; it was a forum for international and intergenerational academic exchange. The 7 senior Professors present were drawn from CDRSEE's Board of Eminent Scholars, part of the Southeast European Joint History Project.

Nada Alaica, Linacre College, University of Oxford
The question of national "identity" on the Croatian Military Frontier in the 19th century.

The CDRSEE conference in Dubrovnik was an uplifting experience for me, as I'm sure it was for most of the other participants. After several years of tedious and seemingly futile research in the archives, I had lost much of my initial passion for my thesis and the energy I need to bring it to completion. However, having met other scholars who share my enthusiasm for both the study of history and South Eastern Europe has helped me to put my entire project into perspective. The realisation that one's work is appreciated and is one piece among many which contributes to a better understanding of this region, can not fail to inspire. In this way I think the Dubrovnik conference has provided me with the impetus and motivation I need to carry on and complete my doctoral thesis.

Giorgos Antoniou, Department of History and Civilisation, European University Institute, Florence

Dissertation Title: The Ethnic Dimension of the Greek Civil War

The ideas that came to my mind at the Dubrovnik workshop have been extremely useful to my PhD project. My research has improved greatly by adjusting other people's concepts and approaches and applying the ideas to my own work. It also made me realise that different projects could well have very similar methodological and theoretical problems and questions. From my perspective, the main aspects of the comments by senior scholars were the need to elaborate our projects in a concrete and solid way, the necessity of posing significant questions instead of spending time and energy on minor issues and, something that was mostly insinuated, the need to apply interdisciplinary methods based on a comparative point of view. In general, I found very impressive the fact that all people participating in the workshop were indeed speaking a common scientific language. This is something that proves the importance of such efforts and the necessity of building bridges between the southeast European scholars so as to avoid nationalistic perspectives that are still dominant in the region.

John Ashbrook, Department of History, University of Florida, Gainesville
Politicisation of Identity: Regionalism in Istria in the 1990s

The conference in Dubrovnik was a good experience for me in that the professors offered some good advice as to how to improve my dissertation. The scholars from the region, especially Prof. Vodopivec offered excellent criticisms on the question of regional mentalities. Prof. Lampe too was helpful in suggesting some finer points on the history chapter of the dissertation. Some of the best suggestions and criticisms came from the graduate students though. With the many different perspectives each of us had, everyone was able to ask questions to stimulate discussion to improve our works in progress.

The forum, though not as draconian about time as it needed to be, was generally productive. More workshops of this type should be held in the future and maybe individual scholars could receive a more complete work of a student's dissertation for a private meeting between the two in a future workshop. Also, a workshop could be arranged between beginning and experienced students to discuss how topics should be undertaken and the pitfalls associated with graduate school in a number of different universities in the US and in Southeastern Europe. The workshop was generally helpful and accomplished much in such a short period of time.

Stefan Detchev, South-West University, Department of History, Blagoevgrad
"Mother" of "She-Bear", Russia in Bulgarian Press, Public Opinion and Popular Political Culture 1886-1894.

The Dubrovnik workshop was very fruitful experience for me. I received suggestions, advice and comments during the sessions and informal meetings concerning my thesis.

From the senior scholars, Prof. Diana Mishkova encouraged me to emphasise problems connected with social aspects of Russophile and Russophobe political cultures as well as national identity and nation-building. Prof. John Lampe approved my approach towards geographical differences in Russophile and Russophobe political cultures and their explanations. He turned my attention to the role of radical Russian intelligentsia and its influence in Bulgaria in order to explain both discourses. Prof. Fikret Adanir encouraged me to emphasize the influence coming in Bulgaria through the river Danube and the town of Rouse in order to explain Russophobe phenomenon. There were many fruitful general remarks and suggestions about historical studies I received from Professor Ivo D. Bicanic, Prof. Marco Dogo, Prof. Karl Kaser, Prof. Peter Vodopivec.

From the young scholars, my peer, Natasha Miskovic-Weiss, provoked me to think about a new chapter concerning problems I had addressed in the end of the thesis. She advised me to support with more relevant primary sources my conclusions about Russophile and Russophobe

cultures at the grass-roots level and encouraged me to present more explicitly my methodology of studying public opinion in the past and my conception about public opinion in Bulgaria in the mentioned period. Giorgos Antoniou suggested that I emphasise the appropriation of Russophile discourse in the communist propaganda after 1945. Onur Yildirim advised me to clarify to what extent Russia cared about its image in Bulgaria political culture.

Rozita Dimova, Department of Anthropology, Stanford University, Stanford
Negotiating Subjectivities: Arts, Aesthetics and Ethnicity in Contemporary Macedonia

The people from the Center for Democracy and Reconciliation did a great job to enable us to get to know each other, our work, and to provide a possibility to meet the senior scholars from the region as well. Meeting people from Southeast Europe was the best part of the workshop in Dubrovnik for me. I also got a lot from the comments after my presentation regarding the main arguments of my dissertation. While I've attended similar workshops in the west, this was the first opportunity for me to attend such a meeting in the region itself. The location did make a crucial difference, I must admit, since most of us who were from the region found a safe ground to discuss sensitive issues such as nationalism, minorities, histories without being subjected to a constant "critical" reminder of the troubles of this part of the world. The absence of sensationalism of the region was truly refreshing. This is not to say that there weren't attempts by some to remind us of the importance of the west (or who runs the "game"). Fortunately, however, these attempts could not diminish the great working atmosphere and socialisation among the participants. The workshop should really become a regular event.

Theodora Dragostinova, Department of History, University of Florida, Gainesville
Between two Motherlands: Changing Memories of the Past within the Greek-Bulgarian Minority and Refugee Communities, 1906-1939.

The workshop in Dubrovnik was one of the most useful experiences I have had in my professional career, and the comments I received both from the senior scholars and my peers were incredibly valuable. My work focuses on the Greek minority in Bulgaria and the migration of these "Bulgarian citizens of Greek origin" to Greece in the first part of the 20th century. Rozita Dimova pointed out important theoretical issues I could consider in my future work. These ideas include a challenge to Brubaker's theory on the relationship between homeland, minority, and nationalizing state; the issue of successful and unsuccessful nationalisms; everyday form of resistance to nationalism; the gendered dimensions of nationalism; the question of truth, subjectivity, and authorial voice in the historical narrative. In addition, Onur Yildirim pointed out the need to be sensitive when using loaded terms such as "motherland", "homeland", or "repatriation". Giorgos Antoniou emphasised omissions in the historiography concerning the problem, and suggested a further investigation of nostalgia and victimisation during refugee experience. Professor Adanir proposed an investigation in the role of religion in the conflict between the Bulgarian majority and the Greek minority. Professor Mishkova suggested a more detailed inscription of my research in the "Big picture" of minority and refugee experience in Bulgaria. Such an approach would also avoid the pitfalls of creating an image of "Bulgarian exceptionalism", and explain the more "tolerant" behavior of the Bulgarian State towards minorities not in terms of culture or national character, which creates stereotypes, but in terms of structural changes and political context.

Ranka Gasic, The Institute for Contemporary History, Belgrade
British and German Influence on the Belgrade Elite 1936-1941

The discussion with junior historians and senior scholars was very helpful in several ways. Firstly, I've got some useful suggestions about sources and publications that should be consulted. Secondly, in the field of methodology - I have realised some problems on which I could further elaborate, such as the influence of culture and education on political events, and notions of Britain and Germany in public opinion in the longer perspective. A useful suggestion concerning methodology is to focus on the definition of elite as a class (middle or upper), in the sense of defining elite either as a class or as a non-class. My attention was also brought to

the history of banking in inter-war Yugoslavia, focusing my research to the period from 1929 onwards, instead of that from 1936 to 1941.

The dissertations of my colleagues allowed me to learn of the current topics of historiography in neighbouring countries, and gave me the opportunity to compare the developments in my field at home and abroad.

Etleva Lala, Department of Medieval Studies, Central European University, Budapest
Papal Policy toward South-Eastern Adriatic Coast

Taking part in a regional conference was a very interesting and fruitful experience for me. Although the presented topics covered large periods of time and many issues, which were not directly connected with my own topic, they helped me greatly in better understanding the regional background. I have now a better scope of the specifics of the region, and have got a new insight in the religious matters of this region. Through the comments of the senior and young scholars, I became better aware of the risks that the spread of religion in the Middle Ages presents for my study, but also can see more clearly the scope in which my topic fits, and the importance that such a topic has for the regional historiography. This new perspective has made me work joyfully. The nice, constructive atmosphere of the whole conference has also deleted some fears, which were obstacles for the progress of my research, so I am very grateful to all the participants of the conference for being so instructive and appreciative to each other.

Marina Liakova-Nedialkova, Center for Studies on Turkey, University of Essen
The Official Discourse of the Bulgarian Historiography concerning Turkey and the Turks

The first suggestion of the senior scholars was to extend my analysis so as to pay attention to the overall official discourse in Bulgaria and not only to the discourse of the Bulgarian historiography concerning Turkey and the Turks.

Another point discussed was the extension of the second part of my dissertation. Because of the limited time of the presentation I wasn't able to present all details of the research in the second part. I had obviously left the impression that the negative image of Turks in the Bulgarian public was produced only through the history schoolbooks. In the second part of the analysis, the influence of folklore, literature and myths on the authors of schoolbooks and of the genesis and the spread of negative images of Turkey and Turks in the Bulgarian public have to be analysed in more detail.

An interesting suggestion was to analyse the "missing pieces" of the Ottoman History in the Bulgarian schoolbooks. This means to look at topics analysed in the Turkish schoolbooks, but not represented in the Bulgarian ones.

I appraise the workshop in Dubrovnik as a very useful one for my work. It was very motivating to meet doctoral students and eminent scholars from the region who work on similar topics and to discuss different methodological and scientific approaches. I see the opportunity to present my work to a public as very important and the criticisms as constructive.

Mila Mancheva, Comparative History, Central European University, Budapest
Nationalism and Muslim Minorities in Inter-War Bulgaria 1918-1945

Maja Miljkovic, The Institute for Contemporary History, Belgrade
The Serbian Elite in Vardar Macedonia, 1918-1941

Paper presented: "The city of Mostar: hidden traditions and contemporary perceptions".

Natasa Miskovic-Weiss, Historical Institute, University of Basel
Belgrade "life worlds" in the 19th century

At the Junior Scholar's Workshop in Dubrovnik, I met many peers and senior scholars working in the same field. We discussed problems specific to the region, such as the heterogeneity of

Southeastern Europe, where issues inherent in the whole region still have to be studied in the local context. We discussed whether historical concepts developed in Western Europe, such as the theories on the German "Bürgertum", can be used in a Southeastern European context. One full hour was dedicated to the discussion of our own research. I was assured that I am on the right track, and an interesting exchange of ideas on the relationship between peasants and town-dwellers in the nation-states at the end of the 19th century emerged. I received concrete personal support when a senior scholar offered me his help to publish my dissertation with the publisher I was wishing for. I went home full of positive energy and with a handful of addresses of new friends. The workshop really helped me to get on, and I am thankful that I was offered the opportunity to participate.

Ines A. Murzaku, Religious Studies Department, Seton Hall University, New Jersey
The Activity and the Role of the Jesuits in the Albanian History and Culture 1841-1946

The workshop was productive and insightful. I think that CDRSEE accomplished its mission and contributed a great deal in bridge building among scholars from different nations and different generations. I realised I was not alone in my field, exploring the ecclesiastical history of Albania. I learned a great deal from my peers and their scholarly projects and the senior scholars as well. There were a lot of issues I was struggling with in this stage of my career, and the workshop clarified a lot of them. I am very grateful to the sound advice of the senior scholars: how to climb the ivory tower and be successful in an academic environment. I am clear now as to what kind of language I should use in a scholarly publication and how to keep the right balance between a specialised vocabulary and the natural/popular language. Another question I was struggling with before the Dubrovnik workshop was finding the right title for my book and what makes one title wrong for a project and another one right. I got not only feedback, but a title as well: Catholicism, Conversion and Culture in Albania. The workshop gave me a clear vision of my future project as well. I am very much looking forward participating in other CDRSEE projects.

Simona Stefanescu, Institute of Sociology, the Romanian Academy and the University of Bucharest
Mass Media Coverage of the Yugoslav Conflict (1991-1995): a Comparative Approach.
Introduction to an Analytic Framework

This workshop opened to me a new way to understand the events that I am studying, namely the conflict in former Yugoslavia (1991-1995): an historical approach, a little different from my sociological one. Another way of approaching the same issue is always useful. Although the substantial (and also my favorite) part of my thesis is the comparative sociological analysis of the media coverage of the conflict, most of the comments which followed my presentation focused on the first part of my paper, regarding a sociological explanation of the crisis. Those remarks are also useful. So, I decided to review this first part of the thesis, which I had considered, until the workshop, as completed. I take into account, for example, the comments made by Prof. John Lampe. He appreciated my point of view regarding the cause-effect relationship between global and local conflicts, different from Samuel Huntington's theory, and he also gave me suggestions to develop it. Therefore, I shall try deeply to argue my approach. I also retained Prof. Peter Vodopivec's remarks about the necessity of a thoroughgoing study on the last decade of the former Yugoslav federation (1980-1991). I am sure I will find out a lot of interesting details, which will help me to better explain this bloody war. Anyway, the presented papers, as well as the comments following my presentation, opened to me new study opportunities, based on both sociological and historical ground.

Onur Yildirim, Princeton University, New Jersey; Department of Economics, Middle East Technical University, Ankara
Scholars, Diplomats and Refugees: Mapping the Turco-Greek Population Exchange, 1922-1923

The workshop provided me with ample opportunity to discuss some of the conclusions of my dissertation before its final submission to the Department of Near Eastern Studies at Princeton University. Both eminent and junior participants of the conference posed challenging questions

that prompted me to reconsider these conclusions before embarking upon writing the general conclusion chapter of my dissertation. The organisation of the conference was especially conducive in creating an atmosphere in which discussion took precedence over presentation and resulted in a more dynamic exchange of ideas than what usually happens in an ordinary academic meeting where the presenter dominates the floor and the ensuing discussions generally get stuck with the polemical exchanges between participants over terms and concepts rather than ideas. The homogeneous outlook of the group (that all the participants were historians) certainly played a crucial role in this respect. That everyone shared a common language of history and a set of common concerns as to the history and historiography of the region under question, which is usually not the case with many academic meetings, led to a more efficient and beneficial discussion. Nearly two dozen questions that I received during the discussion period, which focused on the theoretical underpinnings of my research, helped me to reframe the general conclusion of my dissertation and to come up with a more orderly presentation of the findings of the three fairly long chapters that make up the body of the dissertation. The questions of certain senior historians on my points concerning the commonalities and differences between the stances of Turkish and Greek national historiographies over the Exchange of Populations were especially noteworthy. These questions prompted me to incorporate certain political developments that took place outside the borders of these two countries which have, in fact, significantly affected the orientation of the domestic historical research on the subject. Whether the stance of the Turkish state on the Armenian question, which has become one of the popular themes of research on the international platform due to certain political developments of the 1970s, offers an explanation for the silence and indifference of Turkish national historiography over the topic of the Turco-Greek Exchange of Populations is a question that I have been thinking about since I returned from Dubrovnik. This is an issue that is difficult to accommodate at this point of my dissertation project, but will certainly become one of the principal questions to be addressed while turning my dissertation into a book. In the same vein, another challenging question is whether the Turkish refugees ever formed political pressure groups similar to their Greek counterparts during the period 1923-1935 and later. This question drew my attention to an aspect of the subject that I had addressed only to a limited extent in my dissertation. But perhaps more importantly, the question of how I reconcile the fact that the founders of the Turkish Republic were themselves of refugee background with my argument that the nascent Turkish state adopted an indifferent attitude to the problems of the refugees is an intriguing issue that I have long shunned to deal with and had to face sooner or later. All these questions and many others that I was exposed to in this intellectually stimulating and challenging atmosphere will certainly help me to shape the direction of my future research on the subject and my engagement with them will represent the imprints of the Dubrovnik Workshop in my scholarship.

Reconciliation in Southeast Europe
by Dr. Christina Koulouri*

The History Education Committee, initially called the Textbook Committee, held its inaugural session in Halki in June 1999. Dubravka Stojanovic, Mirela Luminita Murgescu, Hanna Schissler, Niyazi Kizilyurek, Alexei Kalyonski, Thalia Dragonas, Anna Frangoudaki and Neven Budak attended and formed the first nucleus of this committee. After the Halki conference, new members joined us: Bozo Repe, Vera Katz, Valentina Duka, Emilija Simoska, Kaloyan Fol, Halil Berkday, and at a later stage, Snjezana Koren, Didem Erpulat and Wolfgang Hoepken who replaced Hanna Schissler.

Today the HEC includes 17 members representing all Southeast European countries. We are all teachers and researchers at universities and institutes of the region and, with few exceptions, we are historians. We are also all very much concerned with the teaching of history in our countries and we would like to be more or less engaged in changing it. Some, like Neven Budak, Snjezana Koren and Bozo Repe, are already authors of history textbooks. Some others have worked on curricula development or on the authorisation of history textbooks. In fact, what really unites us is not only a common scientific jargon, which we can find in most of the conferences we attend, but also the willingness to be active citizens in the Balkans. In the last

decade, the concept of a new Balkan community emerged as a counterweight to new aggressive and defensive nationalisms. The consequent idea to stress a common history of the region was also launched in political and intellectual environments. However, this new history should not be a new construction which would replace the national histories. As historians, we promote a new interpretation of the national pasts based on a common Balkan cultural and institutional heritage. This new approach implies the introduction in history teaching of supra-national elements as a counter-weight to ethnocentric or even nationalistic historical narratives.

From December 1999 to December 2000, a series of seven workshops were held under the title "Teaching sensitive and controversial issues in the history of South-East Europe". The workshops aimed at addressing the practical and immediate problems of history and history teaching in primary and secondary schools in the region and at investigating the possibilities of eliminating "conflict-producing" national stereotypes from textbooks. The issues dealt with were, as the titles of the workshops indicate, sensitive regional questions emerging from current controversies and having an impact on the interpretation of the past and on the teaching of history.

During the workshops, we have thus investigated our parallel histories through history textbook analysis. Since December 1999, we have dealt with very sensitive and delicate issues in the teaching of history such as the Cyprus question, the Macedonian identity (or identities) and the perceptions of the Albanian past, and we have realised two things: 1) that textbooks are in most cases really problematic and they have to change, 2) that in every country there are people ready to work for the revision of history teaching, sometimes against official politics. We are convinced that reforms and changes can be initiated by civil society, by intellectuals, teachers and academics.

Each workshop was organised as follows: a questionnaire was distributed to participants and answered by them before the meeting; a report was produced which provided a description of the situation in each country, a general survey and -if possible- some conclusions about possibilities of change and improvement. During the workshops, papers on historiography, other school subjects apart from history, media, the process of nation building, and the construction of national identities were also presented.

In March 2001, a first report of the JHP workshops was published under the title, Teaching the History of Southeastern Europe. In this publication all the members of the HEC expose their personal remarks and conclusions regarding history education in the region and make suggestions for the improvement of the present situation. By the end of the year the proceedings of the seven JHP workshops will be edited and compiled into a single volume published under the title, Clio in the Balkans. The Politics of History Education.

The JHP workshops were useful and fruitful in many aspects.

1. They have been an occasion to communicate and to exchange information on the Balkan educational systems, the authorisation and distribution of textbooks and the degree of state control.
2. They have contributed to mobilise human potential in the region and to create a network of regional historians especially of the young generation.
3. The papers which were presented and the discussions which followed -all of a very high academic level- allowed for a comparison of the situations in different countries of the region, and led to a comprehensive understanding of the specific problems in each case.
4. All participants were critical of the textbooks in use and recognised the need to revise the content of textbooks and teaching methods and to produce alternative teaching materials.

During the JHP workshops we realised two things: 1) that the results of the textbooks analysis should be propagated in all SEE countries, especially to decision-makers in the field of history teaching; 2) that history teachers are more important than textbooks in disseminating stereotypes and biased interpretations of history and that we should include them if we really want to make significant changes in history teaching.

As a result, a new project, the "Southeast European History Teachers' Education Project" was launched by CDRSEE as a follow up of the JHP. Since December 2000, five regional, teacher training workshops were held dealing with historical issues common to all curricula, such as the Balkan Wars, the First World War, the Second World War, the Decline of the Ottoman Empire and the Creation of the Nation-States. During these workshops two procedures were followed:

1. Historians from different SEE countries taught the same historical question to a group of history teachers from a different country. For instance, at the 4th workshop in Tirana educators from Albania, Greece, Bulgaria, Croatia and Turkey presented the "Balkan Wars and the Creation of the Albanian State" to a group of 15 Albanian history teachers, ministry officials and people involved in the production of Albanian history textbooks.
2. Multilateral discussions: groups of Southeast European history teachers from different countries were taught sensitive historical questions simultaneously. This was the case in the other four workshops where educators and teachers came from the same countries. For example at the 1st workshop in Thessaloniki dealing with the Balkan Wars, there were educators (2 per country) and history teachers (5 per country) from Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey.

History teachers were very enthusiastic about their experiences at the workshops, thus confirming our initial idea that there are, in both primary and secondary education, many history teachers eager to change their method and content of teaching.

Communication between teachers from different countries seems very important because it is a chance to acquire information from neighbouring countries, they realise common difficulties and shortcomings, and they are introduced to multiperspectivity.

History teaching is a long-term investment where results cannot be achieved immediately. It is however an investment that deserves our patience. Revising our view of the past is closely related to our view of the future. That's why the future in the Balkans depends on our past -or to be more precise, on our interpretation of the past.

By Costa Carras*

For many people the words "reconciliation" and "Southeast Europe" represent a contradiction in terms. Starting from Cyprus, the Kurdish minority problem in Turkey, and the absence of Armenians from large parts of their ancestral homeland, they would move gloomily west and north, cataloguing Greco-Turkish hostility, Albanian instability, Slavo-Albanian conflict in FYR of Macedonia and in Kosovo, the recent hideous bloodbath in Bosnia, of Bosniak Muslims in particular, the harsh opposition of Croats and Serbs that twice brought barbarity to the former Yugoslavia, and the degraded condition of the Roma in a majority of the countries in the region.

I intend to illustrate just how central history may be argued to be alike to democracy and reconciliation -and the lack of them- in Southeast Europe and elsewhere. On the one side Southeast Europe has a lower incidence of strictly religious prejudice, on the other it has a greater incidence of communal prejudice based on the political implications of religion. On the one hand there is greater openness and humanity in personal contact, on the other inhuman ferocity, breaking every traditional bound and bond, when it becomes a question of promoting the imported Western model of the nation state, the nation state over and against other nations.

To be free of the burden of history requires us to understand of what the burden consists. I do not share the view that in all respects Southeast Europe is retrograde or backward, although it has certainly delayed tragically in realising that since World War II, Western Europe has moved dramatically away from its earlier nationalist models. It is clear very many citizens and not a few leaders in this region have made notable contributions to peace, tolerance and reconciliation. What help then can be given them through the approach to history in schools?

It is this question that was posed early in the life of the Center for Democracy and Reconciliation in Southeast Europe, at the conference of July 1997 in Thessaloniki. In 1998, our Chairman, Matt Nimetz, suggested the Joint History Project should be the first we undertook, and it did indeed get off the ground in 1999.

The effort has been overseen at Board level by myself, and at the operational level by two committees, one the small Academic Committee under Maria Todorova, a historian of Bulgarian origin who has written the seminal work "Imagining the Balkans". There happens to be a Cypriot on this Committee, Paschalis Kitromilidis and there is also a scholar of Turkish origin, Fikret Adanir. The other is the History Education Committee (formerly the Textbook Committee) under Christina Koulouri, with Halil Berkay and Dubravka Stojanovic as vice-chairs. On this Committee, every country in the region is represented, Cyprus by Niyazi Kizilyurek.

The work of these two Committees has been supported by a number of donors, the most generous of whom has been the British Government under the Royaumont Initiative. Support under the same Initiative has come from the Austrian Government and, for activity concerning Cyprus, from the Cyprus Federation of America. Further work on the academic side has been energetically sponsored in particular by the US State Department and also by the Winston Foundation. The Center's more recent work on the way teachers transmit knowledge in the classroom, as opposed to history textbooks, has been supported under the Stability Pact by the Austrian, Swiss and Norwegian Governments. None of the Center's core funding however has come from any government.

What has been achieved to date is impressive. Successive meetings of academics, younger and older, starting with a conference in Halki in June 1999, articles from which are to be published in early 2002 by C. Hurst & Co. (London) and New York University Press, entitled "National Identities and National Memories in the Balkans", edited by Maria Todorova, and continuing with a series of seminars on subjects such as "Migration in the Balkans" and "The Idea of Liberty in Southeastern Europe" have created an international network of scholars whose experience is not limited to a national framework or by the consequences of purely national patronage. Some of the articles by younger academics are available on the Center's website, at www.cdsee.org.

As striking has been the experience of twelve workshops held to date out of a total of fourteen planned, seven on history textbooks and seven on history teaching, the harmony with which the Committee on History Education has worked is truly remarkable. The interim conclusions so far as history textbooks are concerned are reflected in the report "History Teaching in Southeastern Europe".

A fuller report, including a treatment of religious education and of history teaching apart from textbooks, should appear in early 2002 under the title "Clio in the Balkans The Politics of History Education".

You may indeed read in the most recent "Friends of Cyprus" Report (Autumn 2000) an article which is a good example of the sort of work I have in mind. A Turkish-Cypriot, who lived in Paphos as a child, dissects the two official versions of events during the March 1964 conflict in that town, and finds them both seriously lacking. And in the same issue, Niyazi Kizilyurek and Loris Koullapis analyse Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot history textbooks respectively.

These are important tasks. My purpose today however is different, namely to point out that acknowledging the truth as to past events is a difficult, important but small part of the overall problem of the approach to history in Cyprus, and elsewhere. By far the larger part of the problem is to change the focus.

The change of focus to which I refer can come in several ways. Allow me to mention just a few. The first would be to take into full and fair consideration the story line of the other and to accept there may be legitimate differences in the interpretation of some of the events that occurred.

A second would be to avoid national stereotyping, which does not however mean denying the obvious, namely that various historical traditions have encouraged different types of achievement. Another would be to increase the emphasis on economic, social and cultural history, where similarities and cross-influences are more frequent compared with political. Due emphasis should also be given to local history in relation to national.

And finally, just as in the history of a religion -and religion is a subject which I am convinced should be taught in school- it is in most instances not one people who are the subject of attention but many, so we should explore the possibility of histories of the rule of law, of the concept of citizenship, of liberty and of democracy, values which again, like religion, are not confined to any one people or nation.

This last point is particularly relevant to the ongoing European experiment. For the first time in history, as a result of the follies of nationalism gone berserk, and of racism turned satanic -and this happened in Western or Central Europe, not in its Southeast- a great post war experiment began, the first to attempt a loose union of Europe on the basis not of compulsion but of consent.

The European Union is based on an acceptance of national, linguistic and religious difference: too few people have yet appreciated the significance of the acceptance of Turkey as a candidate country despite the widespread view among Christian Democrats, politically the main founding political group of the European movement in the early post World War II period, that Europe was by definition Christian. What is quite clear however is that this European Union has moved very far from the Europe of the 1920s: the rule of law, a mutual acknowledgement of the privileges flowing from citizenship, and emphasis on liberty and democracy are now central tenets. These now represent the most important aspects of the otherwise largely economic *acquis communautaire*.

In such a European Union Cyprus can find not just a place that is honourable, and beneficial, for all its people, but one which can allow them to heal their mutual wounds. It is within the context of this vocation of all Cypriots that the task of addressing the problem of history textbooks and history teaching should be approached.

Within such a framework and such a vocation it should also be possible, over time, to address the fundamental errors of the 1950s, which set Cyprus in the wrong direction for almost half a century.

Today however the European Union's economic power and social magnetism in relation to any other single state in Europe combined with the practical lessons it gives through its operation, where conflicts of interest are resolved by discussions and voting, not by arms, and where there is a common acceptance of the rule of law as of basic political principles, gives an opportunity at last to all Cypriots to correct the errors made in the 1950s, provided all other international actors act in the same spirit, and Cypriots respond.

And one of the most productive means of response, and of preparation for accession, one which can involve Greek-Cypriots and Turkish-Cypriots together in a common preparatory enterprise, is precisely the issue of history textbooks and history teaching in general for a united, federal, bi-communal and European Cyprus