

Greece and the Greeks in Recent Bulgarian History Textbooks by Sofia Vouri

The collapse of socialism in the countries of South-Eastern Europe in 1989 is a turning point in historiography¹. The change of the political regime in these countries was followed by the immediate replacement of the old regime's history textbooks and the rewriting of new ones. The fact which also constitutes the basic stimulus for our research, implies a concrete political choice that states by itself:

- (i) the direct relationship between historiography and the political power²,
- (ii) the crucial role that historical past is called to play in the present and in fact through the educational practice.

These two assumptions motivated our interest to search the historical knowledge, finally chosen as the most appropriate to be channelled to the students at the present Bulgarian political turning point³.

We have examined the four more recent textbooks on national Bulgarian history, from antiquity until 1944. Respectively two textbooks treat Medieval and Modern Bulgarian history. All were published in Sofia in 1991 and 1992⁴. In fact, it is about the same historical material that was rewritten the following years. The writers and the form of the textbooks are quite different. That means that we have to deal with two separate groups of textbooks according to their years of edition (1991–1992)⁵. Our research method is based more on the qualitative rather than on the quantitative content analysis. The use of the quantitative analysis is applied where a more complete understanding and substantiation is needed. The majority of themes concentrates upon the meaning of power: political, religious, cultural. We have agreed on the following thematical categories and subcategories that were imposed by the searching material itself:

<i>Political Power</i>	<i>Church</i>	<i>Culture</i>
State	Christianization	Ancient Culture
Administration	Pat ri arch ate	Byzantine Culture
Economy	Clergy	Written Language
Military affairs	Mass	Letters
Diplomacy	Ecclesiastic policy	Schools
Foreign affairs		Art

The ideological textbook positions proved to be the frame within which we investigate the image of the Greeks through the recent history textbooks.

A. Political Power

The Greek, against the historical background, is represented as an authority agent, initially and finally, of the Byzantine Empire of the Greek national state⁶. In other words, his political dimension is at all times emphasised. That's to say that in the medieval history textbooks of 1991, the Greek is presented steadily as an invader, a conqueror, and an exploiter of the Bulgarian areas and

population. We can find these features also from the antiquity⁷. As a vehicle of the Byzantine authority, Greeks exercise steadily a hard attacking policy to the Bulgarians. The basic and unalterable aim of all the Byzantine emperors' policies is projecting the split of the Slavic races, the domination and their submission to the Byzantine authority, as well as the abolition and destruction of the Bulgarian state⁸. The war, in its offensive variant, is conceived exclusively as a constituent element of the Byzantine foreign policy. Following the same one-sided view, it is reproached with the consequences of the war: the destruction of villages, desertion, poverty and the "tragedy of thousands of families"⁹. The image of the Greek as a warlike conqueror is reinforced by the frequent report of violations of peace treaties and of the Byzantines' snap attacks to the Bulgarians¹⁰. Through this, what is pursued is the attribution of a defensive character to the Bulgarian wars and finally their legalisation¹¹. This is better emphasized by the parallel report on the respective Bulgarian policy.

Simultaneously, the struggle of the Bulgarian people is projected as a struggle for independence, survival, political unity and for the exclusion of the foreign domination¹². The legislation of the war in the case of the Bulgarians is also imposed by the frequent notes on the successive Bulgarian victories over the Byzantine. Twelve Bulgarian and four Byzantine victories are mentioned in the textbook of 1991¹³. These are always followed by detailed reports on the territorial expansions of Bulgaria (10 times)¹⁴. At this point, a characteristic factor is the repetition of the phrases for the territorial expansion of Bulgaria "from sea to sea", or to "three seas", or "from Danube to Shrededs" (6 times)¹⁵.

The image of Greece as an enemy in the battlefield is also applied as concerning the Byzantine administration in the Bulgarian territories during the period of almost two centuries of Byzantine domination. The character of this authority is explicitly stated by the repeated phrases: imposition, oppression, exploitation, dispersal (1991)¹⁶. Therefore, the imposition of the Byzantine state-military organization leads to the dispersal of the Bulgarian state¹⁷, whereas, respectively, the imposition of the Byzantine tax-system is interpreted as financial oppression of the Bulgarian population. Some aspects of this are: the hard taxes, the fatigue-duties by the Byzantine clerks, the arbitrariness, the profiteering, but also the "selling of children as slaves" with the: participation of the Byzantine administration (1991)¹⁸.

The brave administration of Vasilius II in the occupied Bulgarian territories and also at the same time, it is noted the influence that Byzantium exercised upon the model of the Bulgarian state on the dignitaries' titles and the organisation of court (1992). The recognition of this political influence does not diminish the general negative image for the Byzantine Greek dominator, whose authority in the Bulgarian areas had "unfavourable effects", (1992)¹⁹. Following the "epic pages written in blood by the Bulgarians in the fight for every span of paternal land", the authors of the textbook on medieval history close with the proposition to change Schluberge's title "Byzantine Epopée" into "Bulgarian Epopée"²⁰. From the use of history as paradigm, which is another form of ideological use, the legislation of the dominating ambitions and the expansional claims of the Bulgarian leaders is finally sought. At the same time, the strong centralized state is perceived as a model. At the end of the exaltation of Bulgarian Epopée, it is of certainly emitted as a reason for Bulgaria's loss of power, the political maximalism of Symeon. That, however, does not alter the basic messages. In the textbooks on modern history, the same motives are repeated frequently. More specifically, in the 1991 textbook the negative and neutral references to Greeks are in the obvious majority. Direct positive ones are hardly to be found. As new elements, now we find the accusation for "denationalization" of the Bulgarian people, systematized and planned carefully by the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinopolis, and territorial expansions in Macedonia and Thrace applied by the Greek state policy. Through these accusations is projected a tough, violent, oppressive, insidious, revengeful, unfair, hostile, exploitative, dangerous, merciless character²¹. This image passes through sand becomes enriched also by the image of the Bulgarians themselves. So, the Bulgarians' modern history is marked by their continuous struggle for national unification. The basic hindrance are Greeks and Serbians, whereas they, themselves, perpetual victims of fortune and history, are always underprivileged by neighbours, allies or enemies²².

This trend is repeated after the determination of the ideological orientation of the modern history Bulgarian textbooks were proved to be the quantitative counting of certain phrases with the highest frequency in the two texts as: the national unification of the Bulgarian territories²³, nationalisation policy for the Bulgarians' denationalisation by the Greeks²⁴, the territorial expansion of the Greeks, and other neighbouring states, territorial claims, and the national destruction²⁵. The results of the countings are presented in the following index:

Theme frequency in Bulgarian history textbooks		
Issues	1991	1992
National unification of the Bulgarian areas	30	70
Greece's denationalization policy	24	20
Greece's territorial expansion-pursuits	42	34
Bulgaria's national destruction	11	14
Total	107	138

From the quantitative analysis, it was stated in both books the dominating position, the national unification problem of the Bulgarian territories as well as the territorial problem either as loss or as claim on the part of Greece or other neighbours. The difference is that in the 1991 book the territorial problem is capital, whereas in the 1992 book the percentage of the frequency of references to the national unification problem is doubled. Taking for granted that all the phrases counted so far consist of different aspects of the same national problem, we can maintain that the 1992 textbook concentrates most on the report to them, though it is far enough from the nation-centred and chauvinistic spirit of the 1991 book. Based on that, we can argue that the messages remain essentially much the same. What is changed and improved is the form through the phrasal smoothing.

B. The Religious Power - The Church

The issue of the Bulgarian christianization by Byzantium is dominant in the category. The basic message that penetrates both textbooks is that Christianity was imposed on the Bulgarians from above as an obligatory term of the peace treaty signed by the Bulgarians after their defeat in 862. Christianization is projected as an expression of the Byzantine expansive policy over the Slavs. From the Bulgarian point of view, Christianization is evaluated as an urged action, not globally elaborated, mainly as far as the Bulgarian aristocracy's reactions are concerned²⁶.

The same dimension of imposition is also attributed to the Greek clergy and the Greek language mess as well.

Greek clergy and mess are projected as a danger for the expansion of the political and cultural influence of the Byzantium in Bulgaria and as an obstacle for the development of Bulgaria's intellectuals²⁷. The Ecumenical Patriarchate position is recognised as more conciliatory and democratic in comparison to the West Church in the matter of the national languages used by the Slav peoples²⁸.

This acceptance does not reduce the Patriarchate's role as a vehicle of a clear and scheduled Byzantine expansive authoritarian policy in the Balkans and as a propagandist of the Byzantine culture to Christianized Slavs²⁹. It is also admitted, without great emphasis, the practice of the ecclesiastical order in it (1991)³⁰.

The Greek clergy is accused of economical exploitation above the Bulgarian people "... till the bone"³¹ and the Constantinopolis Patriarchate represents the main obstacle for the creation of an autonomous Bulgarian national church³².

The image of the Greek as an ecclesiastical authority agent is more enriched during the period of the Ottoman domination in the Balkans. The accusations against the Patriarchate and the Greek clergy are multiplied, whereas at the same time, the phrase becomes sentimentally charged and the first adjectival adjuncts; appear. Now, the Patriarchate is openly accused of denationalization policy of the Bulgarian people and of great dominative pursuits, whereas the GreekV clergy is characterised as being fanatic and arrogant³³.

What, of course, has already been mentioned, for the investiture of Greek clergy and mess, great exploitation of the population through the use of ecclesiastical taxes which continued to appear, which brought the notion of the abolition of the Bulgarian Church's independence after its submission to the Constantinopolis Patriarchate's jurisdiction³⁴. Therefore, the privileged Greek's

position is projected, whereas, on the other hand, the image of a spiritually and culturally beheaded Bulgarian people that passes under their authority is constructed. For this reason the Bulgarian ecclesiastical dependence on the Constantinopolis patriarchate is considered as the new form of yoke, whereas the Turkish authority is the second one³⁵.

The year of the establishment of the Greek state in 1830 is considered as the starting point for all these accusations against the Constantinopolis Patriarchate, as articulator of Greece's "chauvinistic" policy and the grand duke's pursuit for the reestablishment of the old Byzantine Empire frontiers³⁶. Although this starting point is not indisputable, one could propose the year 1860. For example we would like to notice the authors' efforts to avoid the generalized and total negative evaluation of the Patriarchate. Even then, however, we cannot be absolute as for the "systematised carefully planned and tough denationalization Patriarchate policy", as it is denounced in the 1991 textbook³⁷, because as it is well known, its practice was largely dependent on each practice adopted in several areas by the Patriarchate representatives. This is ascertained by the various statements made by the Greek Ministries or by the Greek Consuls in the Ottoman territory, for the Metropolitan bishops' incapacity and the antinational attitude of the Ecumenic Patriarchate towards national matters till the end for the Turkish domination on the Bulgarian territory³⁸.

The negative image of the Greek as an ecclesiastical authority agent fades in the 1992 textbook through the existing positive references. So it is explicitly and clearly acknowledged the important contribution of the Hellenophone Church and the Patriarchate to the unification of the Christian world speaking also other languages, to the creation of a united spiritual environment, to the maintenance of continuity of the religious life and through that of the Balkan Christian population³⁹.

The preceding decisive negative tone gets more moderate also in the case of the Greek clergy. It is now admitted that it was not in conflict with the Bulgarian parish⁴⁰, but it was unreservedly projected the positive role of many superior clergymen in the field of the religious sense in the Bulgarian parish, as well as in the organisation of the anti-Ottoman resistance and the Bulgarian struggle for liberation. As an example, the archbishop Dionysos Rallis of Tirnavos is named⁴¹.

However, in recent history textbooks the nationalist tone gets louder again, especially in the 1991 textbook. The Patriarchate is always presented confronting the exarchate's pursuits, it very seriously limits the Bulgarian educational matter. It is the Greek propaganda vehicle, it pursues the Bulgarian population's denationalisation⁴². On the contrary, in the 1992 modern history textbook we do not find references to the Patriarchate. Everything is charged on the Greek state and its policy. Because of the different attitude to the role of the Greek Church and the Patriarchate in the two groups of textbooks, we can discern their different ideological directions. The effort to escape the limited nation-centred frame of historical narration is obvious in the 1992 textbooks in favour of an inter-Balkan ecumenical dimension of the Greek Church⁴³.

C . CULTURE

This category concentrates most on the positive references, especially in the 1992 textbooks, but leaves at the same time most of the blanks. Concerning the negative judgements, we find more moderate allusions, and less emotionally charged phrases. However, we could say that the general image of Greece and the Greeks through all the textbooks is the one of the spiritual dominator who steadily, throughout the centuries, oppresses the Bulgarian people and prevents it, by all means, from its cultural development. During the Byzantine years as well as the modern period, the Greek as spiritual authority is identified with the Patriarchate, which, on its part expresses the policy of cultural expansion in the Balkans, through the model of the Byzantine Empire or the one of the Greek state⁴⁴.

For this reason, the Greek culture is interpreted as a spiritual slavery for the shaking off of which the Bulgarian people fought for centuries. This struggle is turned against the Greek language for the mess, the administration, and the Greek schools. The Greek language is considered a permanent danger of spiritual alienation and the basic hindrance for the creation of a Bulgarian national consciousness⁴⁵. Respectively, the Greek schools are primarily projected as a means of propaganda for the Bulgarian people's denationalisation⁴⁶. On that base, the long Bulgarian fight for the liberation from the spiritual dependence and the acquisition of their spiritual autonomy has to

face a serious enemy. It is the patriarchate that maintains the Bulgarian society's spiritual life submitted under its authority. Consequently, the Greek as a spiritual authority vehicle, originated from the Patriarchate and assisted by the Greek state, is almost always in a power position, favoured by history and luck, through as for the measures he uses for the stopping of the Bulgarian spiritual renaissance. As for an example at this point, the Miladinov brothers are mentioned as martyrs for the Bulgarian educational matters⁴⁷. Respectively, the positive references are interspersed and as we have already mentioned, they are in the majority in this category, whereas at the same time they are succinctly, defectively, or generally stated. We are now going to deal with the most basic and indicative ones.

Specifically, as far as the Greek language is concerned, what is simply mentioned is only the strong tradition it has in the medieval Bulgarian state and its use in the literarization of the Slav writing⁴⁸. But when it comes to the elevation of the Bulgarian leader Symeon's personality, this knowledge of Greek is emphatically projected, reinforced by explanations of the meaning of the word "Greek" in the Middle Ages, that is a high education, personality⁴⁹. Based on the same logic is not strifted the writing and theological preparation of the Tyrnovos Partiarh Eftimios in Constantinople and Athos. On the contrary, in the case of the missionary brothers Cyril and Methodios, their knowledge of the Slav language takes an exceptional position, against their perfect Greek education which passes almost unobserved. Besides, throughout the glorification of the importance of their work for the Slav language, its ecumenical character and the fact that it was a part of a wider programme of the Byzantine state are not mentioned. They are exclusively projected as Slav teachers and are silently disconnected from the Byzantine civilisation which they belong to and represent⁵⁰. The same is also observable in the case of the Athos acknowledgement as the spiritual centre of all the Balkan peoples, as well as the acknowledgement of its monasteries as spiritual centres of the Bulgarian culture. Here the absence of reference to their Greek Orthodox, Byzantine identity in connection with the mention of the monasteries' multinational composition gets corruptible to various interpretations and the obscurity of the historical truth⁵¹.

However, at other points it is acknowledged, rather indirectly, that the medieval Bulgarian culture of the XII–XIV centuries is an inseparable part of the Slav Byzantine society's culture or more directly, that it was influenced by the Byzantine culture and took some features from the early Middle Ages which, however, are not named⁵². Elsewhere we trace more specific elements such as the reference to the strong influence from the great Byzantine centres of Constantinople, Thessaloniki, Athos Monasteries and the reference that Bulgaria being geographically and politically connected with the Byzantine, could not stay out from the cultural procedures taking place in it⁵³. Of course, from the 1991 textbooks is not missing the familiarisation of foreign (Greek) history elements as is the Ioannis Koykoyzel case, being not a different person from Koukouzelis, who renewed the Bulgarian, Slav-Byzantine ecclesiastical music⁵⁴. As for the Greek schools for the period till 1830, it is acknowledged their positive offering only to the dissemination of the cosmic knowledge in Bulgaria whereas after this year, as we have already mentioned, they are characterised as means of the Greek propaganda and the Bulgarians, cultural assimilation.

Respectively, an important ideological differentiation in the 1992 textbook is the rejection of the traditional classical opinion for the danger of the Bulgarian people's cultural assimilation. It is unreservedly acknowledged that the Bulgarian people declared its self-consciousness without being pressed by the Byzantine authority. This fact is justified by the Byzantine culture evaluation as elitist and, as a consequence, had an impact only upon the highly educated Bulgarians⁵⁵. In the same 1992 textbook it is much more specifically admitted the impact of the old Orthodox heritage over Bulgaria's cultural development, the introduction of the Byzantine cultural model in the intellectual life of the Bulgarian society and the contribution of the Greek Enlightenment to the distribution of the Western European ideas of positivism, rationalism and liberalism in Bulgaria. Concluding, the subject that has the absolute admission and adequate analysis is the Greek schools, the positive contribution of which is unquestionable to the offering of a higher level of education for the Bulgarians, to the distribution of the European Enlightenment ideas, to the cultivation of the patriotic feeling, the Bulgarian national sense and the creation of the first Bulgarian national intellectuals⁵⁶.

The differentiation of the new textbooks reflects, indisputably, the prior ideological choices of their writers. We just point out very generally the following:

(a) The writing of the textbooks on Bulgarian national history of 1991 was done in a crucial period from the socio-political and ideological point of view. In the urgency of this conjuncture the "disdained" national history is at last restored. For this reason, we could conclude that the new

image of Bulgarian history is so much national-centred and gives the impression that the ground for a new counter is being prepared. On the contrary, it is clear that the 1992 Bulgarian history textbooks are written in a more European than national-centred point of view.

(b) The recent textbooks restrict gradually the national-centred history and show obvious priority to the political, that is, of course, another view of national history.

(c) They also abolish every relationship with the socialist past of Bulgaria.

(d) We cannot deny that the 1992 textbooks do not show much more respect to the history and culture of the Greeks. However, although remarkable changes have occurred, the positions, especially those concerning the national question, remain unchanged. The trend of more “glasnost” and objectivity has nothing to do with the historical methodology and theory. The narration is factographic and epic and the use of history as knowledge for “mimesis” are the main traits of the text. The intense didactic tone of the historical narration and the multitude of evaluative judgements is a rather old fashioned way of writing about past⁵⁷.

(e) The historical knowledge is finally chosen as the most appropriate to be channelled to the students at the present Bulgarian political conjuncture can be summarized in what follows:

(i) The historical evolution is being presented as a stable conflict between countries and authorities, that is between impersonal and vague forces.

(ii) The role of charismatic leaders is being proved decisive.

(iii) The people is being presented as a per time mythical phenomenon with unaltered characteristics.

(iv) The meaning of continuity and evolutionary course of the fights of the Bulgarian people for liberation and the creation of a new modern state.

(v) The neighbouring peoples are permanent enemies of the national and political integration of the Bulgarian people.

(vi) The faith in the objective approach of history through the facts. This perception of history and the past undoubtedly diminishes the scientific character and the educational value of the history textbooks, especially the 1991 textbooks.

An undistinguished ideologization is presented in these textbooks, and powerful prejudices and national stereotypes are cultivated, what does not contribute to the harmonic co-existence of the Balkan nations. The factors which constitute areas of conflict and encounters between the Balkan nations are not analysed. Nor the expansionism, the war, the violence, and, generally, the ideology of national rivalry is denounced. Concluding, we can state that the one-sided image of the Greek, as it emerges in the two groups of history texts, is an ideological construction for various uses after the political turning point of 1989.

Notes

1. For the new orientations of the historiography after the collapse of socialism in the countries of SE Europe, see *The American Historical Review*, American Historical Association, vol. 97, 4/October 1992, *Historiography of the Countries of Eastern Europe* (Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria), pp. 1011–1117.
2. Enlightening about this subject is the article by Maria Todorova, *Historiography of the Countries of Eastern Europe: Bulgaria*, v.s. *The American Historical Review*, pp. 1105–1117.
3. For the purposes of teaching history in the schools of the socialist states of Bulgaria, Russia, Hungary and Romania, see Panajot Drazev, Milka Dimova, Rumiana Kuseva. *Celite na obucenieto po istorija v srednoto uciliste*, *Istorija i Obstestvoznanie*, 1987, 2, pp. 23–33.
4. The Bulgarian history textbooks of 1991 and 1992 are the following:
 - a) Vasil Gluzelev, Konst. Kosev, Georgi Georgiev, *Istorija za 10 klas*, Prosveta, Sofia 1991,
 - b) Stajko Trifonov, *Istorija na Balgaria (1878–1944) za 11 klas na SOU*, Prosveta, Sofia 1991,
 - c) Petar Angelov, Tsvetana Georgievav Georgi Bakalov, Dim. Tsanev, *Zapiski po istorija na Balgaria (681–1 878)*, Sofia 1992,
 - d) Bobi Bobev, *Zapiski po istorija na Balgaria za 10 klas na edinnite sredni politehniceski uci lista*, Narodna Prosveta, Sofia 1988.

5. See Berelson, B., *Content Analysis in Communicational Research*, New York, Hafner 1952, also Krippendorff, K., *Content Analysis. An Introduction to its Methodology*, Beverly Hills, Sage 1980, Uhe, E., *Schulbuchanalyse mit Hilfe eines allgemeinen Beurteilungsrasters - Intention und Gesichtspunkte*, in: G. Stein: *Schulbuchschelte als Politikum und Herausforderung wissenschaftlicher Schulbucharbeit*, Stuttgart, Klett-Cotta, 1979, pp. 158–164.
6. See Robert Browning, *The Byzantine Empire*, London 1980. Also M. Nistazopoulou-Pelekidou. *The Balkan People During the Medieval Time*, Ioannina 1986.
7. *Istorija*, 10 klas, 1991, pp. 9, 15.
8. *Istorija*, 10 klas, 1991, pp. 26, 27, 31, 33.
9. *Istorija*, 10 klas, 1991, pp. 36, 51.
10. *Istorija*, 10 klas 1991, pp. 29, 37.
11. *Istorija*, 10 klas 1991, pp. 35, 49, 51.
12. *Istorija*, 10 klas 1991, pp. 35, 49, 51.
13. *Istorija*, 10 klas 1991, pp. 26, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 49.
14. *Istorija*, 10 klas 1991, pp. 49–85.
15. *Istorija*, 10 klas 1991, pp. 49–85.
16. *Istorija*, 10 klas, 1991, pp. 70–77.
17. *Istorija*, 10 klas, 1991, p. 70.
18. *Istorija*, 10 klas, 1991, p. 70.
19. *Zapiski po istorija*, 1992 (681–1878), pp. 108, 109.
20. *Istorija* 10 klas, 1991, pp. 64.
21. These adjectival definitions of the Greek are scattered in the textbook on modern history of 1991, 11 klas.
22. *Istorija*, 11 klas, 1991, pp. 19, 75, 89, 97, 108.
23. The unification of the “scattered and mutilated” Bulgarian people and grounds, is steadily presented as a historic request and main mission of the Bulgarian state (1991, 11 klas, p. 52).
24. For this subject we cite a typical extract: “The fortune of the Bulgarians in the Aegean Macedonia was the same as the one of their brothers in the valley of the Vardar. Parallel to the efforts for assimilation of the local population, Greece made efforts for the De-Bulgarianization of the territory. For this purpose in 1919 an Agreement was signed on the exchange of national minorities, which was a recognition of the fact that the population of Aegean Macedonia consisted basically of Bulgarians” (1991, 11 klas, p. 61).
25. *Istorija*, 11 klas, 1991, pp. 61, 91, 120.
26. *Istorija*, 10 klas, 1991, p. 41.
27. *Istorija*, 10 klas, 1991, p. 44.
28. *Istorija*, 10 klas, 1991, p. 39.
29. *Istorija*, 10 klas, 1991, p. 159.
30. *Istorija*, 10 klas, 1991, p. 43.
31. *Istorija*, 10 klas, 1991, pp. 74, 71.
32. *Istorija*, 10 klas, 1991, p. 41.
33. *Istorija*, 10 klas, 1991, pp. 122, 162, 163.
34. *Istorija*, 10 klas, 1991j p. 70.
35. *Istorija*, 10 klas, 1991, pp. 171, 199.
36. *Istorija*, 10 klas, 1991, p. 171.
37. *Istorija*, 10 klas, 1991, p. 171
38. See Vouri, Sofia, *Education and Nationalism in the Balkans, The Case of NW Macedonia 1870–1904*, Paraskinino 1992, pp. 52, 151, and Vouri, Sofia, *Sources on History of Macedonia, Policy and Education 1875–1907*, Paraskinino 1994.
39. *Zapiski*, 1992 (681–1878), pp. 137, 139.
40. *Zapiski*, 1992 (681–1878), p. 138.
41. *Zapiski*, 1992 (581–1878), p. 139.
42. *Istorija*, 10 klas, 1991, pp. 171, 234.
43. *Zapiski*, 1992 (681–1878), p. 142.
44. *Istorija*, 10 klas, 1991, p. 62.
45. *Istorija*, 10 klas, 1991, pp. 44, 71, and *Zapiski* 1992 (681–1878), pp. 39, 43, also *Istorija*, 11 klas, 1991, p. 139.
46. *Istorija*, 10 klas, 1992, pp. 163, 172, and *Zapiski* 1992 (681–1878), p. 200.
47. *Zapiski*, 1992 (681–1878), pp. 37, 39, 18, 52.
48. *Zapiski*, 1992 (681–1878), pp. 42, 43, 107, 108.

49. Istorija, 10 klas, 1991, pp. 47–48, and Zapiski, 1992 (681–1878), pp. 38, 44, 45.
50. Zapiski, 1992 (681–1878), pp. 140, 159, and Istorija, 10 klas, 1991, p. 113.
51. Istorija, 10 klas, 1991, pp. 110, 112, 114, also Zapiski, 1992 (681–1878), pp. 48, 52.
52. Istorija, 10 klas, 1991, p. 117.
53. Istorija, 10 klas, 1991, p. 117.
54. Istorija, 10 klas, 1991, p. 171, also Zapiski, 1992 (681–1878), p. 184.
55. Zapiski, 1992 (681–1878), p. 66.
56. Zapiski, 1992 (681–1878), p. 184, 195, 196.
57. See Hicks, D., Bias in School Books: Messages from the Ethnocentric Curriculum, in: James, A. & Jeffcode, R. (eds.): *The School in the Multicultural Society*, London 1984, S. 163–177; McDiarmied, E., Pratt, D.: *Teaching Prejudice. A Content Analysis of Social Studies Textbooks, Authorized for use in Ontario*, Toronto, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1971. Fritzsche, K.-P., *Kommen wir nicht ohne Vorurteile aus?* In: *Internationale Schulbuchforschung* 1989, 4, 377–386.