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Foreword

The aim of this Handbook is to provide information on the various activities undertaken by POST Research Institute (POST RI) during the implementation of the Education for Peace III project (September 2009 – December 2010). The handbook will especially focus on the Teacher Training Workshop ("Learning Different Histories: Discussing Alternative Approaches") held on 19 – 20 March 2010 and the Historian’s Forum held on 19 July 2010. Information will be provided on the content and subjects studied at the workshops, as well as access to resources and references that could be useful tools for educators in the classroom. In addition, it is our hope that the issues raised and discussed at the Historian’s Forum and outlined in this handbook, will highlight some of the major obstacles educators face in the teaching of history in Cyprus and as such, contribute to the debate of history teaching in Cyprus.

POST RI hope that this handbook will be a useful and stimulating resource for educators, academics, policy makers and researchers in providing an overview of the work of POST RI, as well as outlining the need for further initiatives in the development of history teaching in Cyprus, in order to promote a multicultural, tolerant and peaceful society for all citizens of Cyprus.
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About POST Research Institute

POST Research Institute (POST RI) is a non-profit, non-political organisation established in 2002 by a group of individuals whose aim is to work for the social, cultural and environmental betterment of Cyprus. POST RI has conducted various projects and activities since its establishment, including three Education for Peace projects, Exploring Europe with partners Cyprus College, Divided Communities Project in Mostar, as well as various human rights seminars and film events.

The Project “Education for Peace”

POST RI believes that peace can be sustained through education. This is based on research that has shown that education plays a crucial role in establishing long-term peace and reconciliation after an ethnic conflict has occurred. To this end, since 2004, POST RI has conducted a series of projects entitled “Education for Peace”. The overall objective of the Education for Peace projects is to promote reconciliation, multiculturalism and dialogue in Cyprus, by improving the quality of history education taught in schools. Moreover, the project aims to create an awareness regarding peace education in Cyprus, and to contribute to debates regarding the history curricula in schools of Cyprus.

POST RI’s first project (E4P I) focused on the analysis of the fifth (final) grade primary school textbooks in the northern part of the Island. Extra curricular activities were conducted in order to pinpoint the elements that reproduce nationalism, hatred and prejudice against the ‘other’. The study was published in a book format and was widely disseminated to interested parties, such as academics, teachers, NGOs, researchers, local authorities, unions etc.

Similarly, in the second project (E4P II), the team analysed the revised history textbooks used in lower secondary schools in the northern part of Cyprus, in relation to text and visual materials and noted the differences between the old and newly revised textbooks. The team organized a series of workshops in various areas in the northern part of the Island, in order to meet with history teachers and exchange views regarding the use of the new books and teaching methodologies. The team also developed questionnaires, (one for teachers, one for
parents and one for students), which were widely disseminated in order to gain a broader understanding of the opinions, issues, problems and benefits of the then newly revised textbooks. During March 2007, the final report was published and disseminated widely to various stakeholders; articles outlining the main findings of the project were written and published in daily newspapers and workshops were organized in various locations in Cyprus, in order to discuss the study and the team’s findings with a wider audience.

Reforming the education system by revising history textbooks and the curriculum, is certainly necessary; otherwise the current method of education will carry on poisoning children’s minds by promoting hostility. The reforms should also include changes to the curriculum, teaching methods, and management structures. In addition, the elimination of ethno-centric and racist elements in textbooks and school practices is needed and the reform strategy should aim for a modern, higher standard of education that is objective, free of political opinion, and brings the education system in line with European standards. Textbooks in national subjects such as history, social science and literature should contain material that is acceptable to all (in the case of Cyprus: that is acceptable for both the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot communities).

The development of a dialogue between the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriots teachers, educators, local NGOs and competent authorities, for reforming the education system has also been initiated through the “Education for Peace” projects, which will hopefully see the next generation of citizens and leaders ready to accept a multicultural and multinational society. The histories of both communities should be jointly prepared and common history should be taught. A bilateral, transparent history should be replaced with the unilateral way of explaining occurrences. In conclusion, there is a need for an urgent education reform in Cyprus in order to achieve peace and reconciliation, and the “Education for Peace” projects certainly play a vital role in assisting in this reform in the whole of Cyprus, with the long-term aim of a harmonious island. For this reason, the POST RI team continues its work in this area by undertaking the “Education for Peace III” project, with the aim of making a comparative analysis of the secondary school history textbooks, which were once again revised, and providing training to history teachers across the divide.
“Education for Peace III” Project

Education for Peace III is a 16-month project undertaken and implemented by POST RI from September 2009 to December 2010 and funded by the European Commission under its Civil Society in Action I Programme. The project builds on the previous work initiated by POST RI since 2004 in relation to the teaching of history in Cyprus, with specific focus on the examination of Cyprus history textbooks used in schools in the northern part of Cyprus.

Firstly, the project contributes to the debate regarding history textbooks by conducting an analysis of the new history textbooks introduced in schools in the northern part of the Island in September 2009, by comparing them to textbooks previously used. The project also involves four different study tours to various historical places across Cyprus. The aim is to engage Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot history teachers with cultural and historical sites of Cyprus in a multi-perspective atmosphere, enabling participants to develop varying perspectives regarding these sites. In addition, as part of the Education for Peace III project, a 2-day teacher training workshop (extensive information of which can be found in this Handbook,) was organized in March 2010. Lastly, the project also involved the organization of an Historian Forum with historians and teachers from across Cyprus, details of which are also included in this Handbook.

Why “Education for Peace III” and the Main Findings of the Project

The Education for Peace III project was developed as a result of POST RI’s findings from its previous project, “Education for Peace II”. The issue of history textbooks in Cyprus is a hot topic, especially in political circles. During the last 6 years, Cyprus history textbooks in the northern part of the island have gone through some very visible changes. The first visible change occurred in 2004, with the revision of the history textbooks used in lower secondary schools. These reforms were implemented by the left-wing CTP party (Cumhuriyetçi Türk Partisi – Republican Turkish Party), which were in power at the time. These newly revised textbooks, generally received positive feedback in terms of the attempt to show a more balanced history of Cyprus, as well using more student-centred methods of textbook writing.

However, the books did receive some criticism from more right wing camps and the contents of the textbooks written during the CTP authority were accused of being too far removed from national identity and not teaching students their “real” history. These criticisms were on the
agenda of the right-wing party UBP party (Ulusal Birlik Partisi – National Unity Party) during the Turkish Cypriot election campaign of 2009, with UBP promising a revision of the history textbooks if they came to power. Therefore, having won the 2009 election, UBP first got to work on revising the upper secondary school textbooks, which were introduced into schools in the fall of 2009, followed by the revision of the lower secondary school textbooks.

Therefore, as mentioned above, one of the main activities of the Education for Peace III project, was to carry out a comparative analysis of the latest upper secondary history textbooks compared to the textbooks previously used and to identify in what sense the textbooks have changed and reasons for these changes.

This full analysis can be read in POST RI’s latest publication, “Re-writing History Textbooks – History Education: A Tool for Polarisation of Reconciliation?” released to the public at a book launch on July 15, 2010. This book provides a comprehensive account of the changes made to the history textbooks used in the northern part of the Island since 1971 and also incorporates the previous textbook analyses conducted as part of the Education for Peace II project. The book, is published in English, Turkish and Greek and is a valuable resource for, anyone, both in Cyprus and internationally, interested in history education in conflict and post-conflict areas and how the political changes of a country are often mirrored in the history that is taught to the new generation. (To receive a free copy of the book, please contact POST RI at info@postri.org or visit our website at: www.postri.org)

The main findings of the textbook analysis conducted through the Education for Peace III project, revealed that there is a clear difference between the recent textbooks published under the UBP authority and the previous textbooks written under the CTP authority. The previous textbooks attempted to use a multicultural approach, as well as explaining the history of Cyprus without detaching it from world history. However, the new textbooks focus on the history of the Turks, such as the Ottoman Empire and the formation of Turkey, as well as focusing on the Turkish-Greek conflict. There is a strong notion of homogeneity and a single ‘other’. In addition, the history of Cyprus is mostly narrated from the perspective of the Turkish-Greek conflict. In this respect, the new textbooks can be seen to mostly focus on Ottoman and Turkish history and its relationship with Cyprus, however, the previous textbooks used a multicultural approach and leaned towards the notion of mutual tolerance.
There is a very interesting addition that comes as a surprise in the new books, in that they can be considered to be adopting Turkish Cypriot nationalism in addition to Turkish nationalism. This surprising addition comes in the form a very small section that distinguishes Turkish Cypriot culture from Turkish culture and examines aspects of Turkish Cypriot culture, in a section entitled “Kültürümüz” [Our Culture].

In terms of the visual images, the new textbooks are not structured well in terms of page design and there is lack of student centred images, which is an important shift from the previous books. Instead, visual images are mostly used to support the discourse, instead of using images as a tool to encourage students to question and analyse.

In brief, the new textbooks can be described as encompassing an ethno-centric approach, both in terms of the discourse and images used. Therefore, we see that with the change in the ruling party, the previous ideology of nationalism has once again resurfaced, and this shift has been directly reflected in the textbooks. Even though the format and the visual appearance of these textbooks have similarities with the textbooks written during the CTP era; in terms of content, these textbooks bore more resemblance with the pro 2004 era.
PART I: “Learning different histories – Discussing Alternative Approaches”: A Teacher-Training Workshop

This section will focus on the 2-day teacher-training workshop, entitled “Learning Different Histories - Discussing Alternatives Approaches”, organised by POST RI, with the support of the Association for Historical Dialogue & Research (AHDR).

The teacher-training workshop took place in Ledra Palace Hotel and the Cyprus Community Media Centre (CCMC) in the UN Buffer Zone, Nicosia on Friday, 19 March and Saturday, 20 March 2010. The event included presentations by international experts from the UK, Israel and the USA, discussions co-coordinated by Cypriot experts from across the divide and workshops facilitated by the international experts. The presentations and discussions offered participants an insight into alternative approaches to teaching, whilst the workshops offered Cypriot teachers the opportunity to enhance their understanding of pedagogical approaches to history teaching and the opportunity to touch on more sensitive issues of history teaching.

The declared aims of this two-day workshop were to:

- Enhance teachers teaching skills and knowledge regarding history education.
- Examine ways in which sensitive issues can be addressed in the teaching of history.
- Discuss the problems and possible solutions of teaching in societies that have suffered conflicts.

Below you will find information regarding the opening speeches, as well as the presentations and workshops mentioned above.
Opening Speeches

Mr. Murat Kanatlı, POST RI President

First of all, I would like to thank you all for attending POST Research Institute’s “Learning Different Histories - Discussing Alternatives Approaches” Seminar and Workshops. This event is being organised by POST Research Institute under the Education for Peace III project, funded by the European Commission. This project is the continuation of the previous peace education projects that have been implemented by POST RI since 2006. Since its’ establishment, POST RI has conducted various projects and activities, including three Education for Peace projects, Exploring Europe with partners European University of Cyprus, Divided Communities Project in Mostar, as well as various human rights seminars and film events. POST RI’s work has also been presented in various European counties’ and the US. Our reports and publications on history teaching have also been referenced in many academic journals and publications.

One of the main objectives of Education for Peace III project is to particularly focus on teaching methods in the teaching of history in Cyprus, as a follow up to the previous peace education project, namely Education for Peace II. This stems from the outcome of previous research undertaken by POST RI, which highlighted the fact that although the 2004 history textbooks introduced in schools the northern part of the island were quite well written as far as the content was concerned, teachers had not received sufficient training in light of these revisions. It was also noticed by the research team, that teachers lacked ideas regarding student centred approaches to teaching which are an essential tool in developing students thinking, questioning and analytical skills.

Therefore, POST RI developed the Education for Peace III project based on these findings with the aim of conducting activities that could help address this problem and provide teachers from across Cyprus with an opportunity to develop their teaching skills.

Before I give the floor to the Dr. Chara Makriyianni, President of the Association for Historical Dialogue and Research who are our Associates in this particular project, I would like to thank all those who have worked extremely hard to organise this event, as well as our
esteemed experts who have come from far to be part of this workshop. And, of course thanks to all of you all for attending!

Thank you!

Dr. Chara Makriyianni, AHDR President

Our shared vision, the Associations’ vision for a reform of history education is to transform students’ understanding of the world through the teaching of how to study the past and think historically.

Understanding the past, for our Association, means finding ways to help students become aware of how the world works, which means helping students to give meaning to their present and finding ways to help them to have a glance to the future, not in the sense of predicting it, but in the sense of preventing it from abusing them.

Cyprus is a good example in this point. Cypriots across the divide, who were taught through the promotional official narratives that their own groups were always the victim and the others were the cause of the problems, might feel today discomfort in communicating and discovering these ‘others’ and they might have difficulties in accepting the ideas of reconciliation and cooperation. Why? Because, the ability to take the perspective of the other, starting from a young age, is part of our ongoing process of development. Such development is inextricably linked with the socio-cultural context and the social representation that the students and teachers have regarding the past.

Past animosities between social groups and asymmetry of the status, hinder the capacity to develop the skills to take the perspective of the other: especially, if educational policies and educational systems suppress multi-perceptivity in the teaching and learning of history, as occurring in Cyprus.

History education, in the way the AHDR envisions it, can help ensure educators, students and scholars that history education for history teachers, educators and scholars to develop the knowledge, the skills, and the mental tools that are necessary to understand the contemporary
and future world in which we, all together, are going to live as adults. In our understanding of history education, political and ideological agendas, should not distort history teaching or history to be used as a tool to consolidate division. Historical thinking not only enables us to understand the people distant in the past, but also the contemporary people living next to or far away from us. In other words, by learning to think historically we also learn to understand one another, accept and cooperate which each other.

This, I want to emphasise, does not mean that history education should become a means to overturn one political agenda, but in our case, promotion of national pride and blind patriotism, in favour of another political agenda.

We are confident that this two-day seminar and workshop will contribute to the ongoing discussions and enrich our monolithic perspectives. I am sure that the experienced workshop leaders will help participants and us to take the perspective of the ‘other’ and discuss how to promote dialogue, in history teaching in particular, and contribute to dialogue and cooperation in general.

Many thanks to all our guest speakers and to our partners, I wish you all a pleasant and joyful learning experience.
Presentations

1. “Re-Writing History Textbooks - History Education: A Tool for Polarisation or Reconciliation?” written by Dr. Dilek Latif and Hakan Karahasan, POST RI Researchers and presented by Dr. Dilek Latif

This presentation focuses on the revision of the history textbooks in the northern part of Cyprus and by using peace education as a methodology, analyzes the different history textbooks that have been used in schools. Below, you will find the presentation material provided at the 2-day teacher-training workshop.

Introduction

A brief survey on history education in Cyprus reveals that each side uses history as a way to construct ‘its own’ national identity as being the only one, thus marginalising the ‘other’. As such, history education is seen as a significant tool that creates national subjects. After the Republican Turkish Party (CTP) came to power in the elections in the north of Cyprus in 2004, a revision of Cyprus History books used in the lower secondary schools took place, that replaced Vehbi Zeki Serter’s books, which had been in use since 1971. Immediately following this ‘revision’, a public debate began regarding textbooks as tools that ‘dissolve’ national consciousness.

As such, since 2004 POST RI has undertaken extensive research on the revision of history textbooks used in the northern part of the island.

Methodology

A peace education approach was used as a way of analysing the textbooks (including the visual materials) and a historical perspective was employed to show how and why the content of the textbooks have changed. The use of language in the textbooks, as well as the descriptions of historical events, utilization of visual images, photos and maps have all be analysed from this angle.
Historical perspective

The decision to replace the Cyprus History textbooks in 2004, although very much welcomed by many, was not celebrated by all and instigated a huge discussion in the northern part of the island. Following the publication of the revised textbooks (2004), right wing political parties, journalists and historians reacted strongly against the changes. During the election campaign in 2009, the right-wing National Unity Party (UBP) announced that if they were re-elected, they would re-write the Turkish Cypriot history books. The centre-left parties such as CTP and Communal Democratic Party (TDP) supported the new textbooks and argued that the change from the old books was inevitable. Textbooks that were revised in 2004 were seen as a step towards reconciliation or a united federal Cyprus, because stressing commonality throughout history inevitably contributes to peace in Cyprus (Vural & Özuyanık 2008). Although it was questioned whether any new textbooks would be ready for the 2009 semester, Mr. Dervis Eroğlu introduced the new history textbooks to the public during a press conference on the 8 September 2009.

Comparison of the Cyprus History Textbooks, Grade 9 and Grade 10

One of the ‘big’ differences between the 2004 Cyprus History textbooks and the 2009 versions is that, according to the curriculum, pupils previously had four textbooks for each year, whereas, with the newest revision, the number of textbooks were reduced to two. The ninth grade Turkish Cypriot History textbook now covers the same subjects included in the Kıbrıs Türk Tarihi 1 [Turkish Cypriot History 1] and Kıbrıs Tarihi (1878-1960): Kıbrıs’ta İngiliz Dönemi Siyasal Tarihi [Cyprus History (1878-1960): Political History of the British Period] textbooks that were written during the CTP government.

In terms of information, the new textbooks have less information compared to the old ones (in terms of page numbers etc.) The 2009 textbook for grade 9 covers the subjects: ‘İlk ve Ortaçağ’daki Kıbrıs’ [Cyprus in the Prehistory and the Middle Ages] up to ‘Dr. Fazıl Küçük’in Hayatı, Milli Mücadelemizdeki Yeri ve Önemi’ [The Life of Dr. Fazıl Küçük and his Significance in Our National Struggle]. Whereas the 2004 textbook, covers the subjects ‘Osmanlılar Öncesi Kıbrıs’ [Cyprus Before the Ottomans], ‘Kıbrıs’ta Osmanlılar’ [the Ottomans in Cyprus] and ‘Sosyo-Ekonomik Hayat’ [Socio-economic Life during the Ottoman
Era]. The former (2004) textbooks attempt to not see the ‘other’ in a negative sense, but to take a humanistic stance. A quick look to the prefaces shows the differences in terms of the perspectives. The preface of the 2004 textbooks reads: “Contemporary history education aims to encourage critical thinking and to encourage students to develop their own ideas. One of the aims of contemporary history is not to deny the existence of the ‘other’ but to look at events from a multicultural perspective”. On the other hand, the preface of the 2009 textbooks is as follows: “We [the commission of 2009] would like to emphasise that the reason we wrote this history book was to provide historical facts, to say that Turkish Cypriots are a sovereign power on this island; and to educate youngsters who appreciate their own republic and the state, who are peaceful, and who are bonded to Atatürk’s revolutions, principles”.

Grade 9

The cover page of the 2004 textbook (KTT1) has a picture of Kyrenia with a sailing boat. There is no indication and emphasis on nationality, but the certain connotation is of Cyprus, since it is a view from Kyrenia Harbour. The cover page of the 2009 textbook has four pictures: the biggest one is Atatürk, and near to his picture on the left side, the coat of arms of the Ottoman Empire; below of the coat of arms, there is a view of the Arab Ahmet, and just next to it a picture of the Ottoman Sultan Selim II. The 2004 book can be seen to be more neutral, whereas the 2009 book seems to aim to show that ‘Cyprus is a Turkish island’. The content of the two books (written in 2004 and in 2009) shows that the former books, talks about the issues in a broad perspective, whereas the latter is more Turkish-centric in its approach. The new textbook prefers to use a narrative that is based on the difference between Turkish and Greek Cypriots. However, the old textbook prefers to construct a narrative that is based on the view that all the incidents of the past were bad, but considering the experiences of the rest of the world, they were not unusual. Interestingly, 2009 textbook contains ‘new information’ such as: On page 75, the book talks about the ‘Meclis-i Millî [National Parliament]’ and its significance; On page 78: when Turkey signed the Lausanne Agreement and Turkish Cypriots were given a chance to choose between British or Turkish citizenship: those who preferred Turkish citizenship went to Turkey. For the first time, writers say that ‘Atatürk thought that if many Turkish Cypriots migrated to Turkey, it would be harmful [for Turkey as well as Britain], so he sent delegates to Cyprus and finished the procedure’ (p. 78). The section ‘Our Culture’ is composed of two parts: ‘Kıbrıs Türklerinin Sinemayla Tanışması
[The Acquaintance of Turkish Cypriots with Cinema]’ and ‘Darül-Elhan’ın Kurulması [Establishing Darül-Elhan Turkish Music Group]’ (pp. 100-101).

Grade 10

The 2004 Cyprus History textbook for Grade 11, covers the period between 1960 and 1968. It is the third book out of the four sets of books written for the upper secondary schools. The subtitle of the book is ‘Cyprus Political History’. Unlike the previous textbooks, the 2004 textbook took a humanistic and balanced approach than a nationalist one. The 2004 textbook volume covers a contentious period – the period of interethnic violence in the 1960s – that tends to be told by opposing Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot official narratives and viewpoints. In previous textbooks, this period was seen as the Greek Cypriot aggression against Turkish Cypriots; dark, hopeless and full of dispute. In contrast, this textbook draws a very different picture with its textual and visual features. There is an extensive social history element in the 2004 textbooks, highlighting common concerns and hardships of both communities in Cyprus. Traditionally neglected matters of Cyprus history, such as the educational affairs of the time and the evolution of Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot media, are also incorporated.

The first chapter of the textbook examines the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus. It is argued that Turkish Cypriots had to defend themselves and thus founded many defence organisations. While this topic has been very briefly touched upon in the previous textbook, this volume gives it much more room. The second part of the chapter of the 2009 textbook deals with the establishment agreements for the Republic of Cyprus: the Zurich and London Agreements, the Guarantee Agreements and the Military Alliance Agreement. Two information boxes explain what a ‘guarantor’ and what veto rights are. This is followed by the importance of the Agreements for Turkish Cypriots, such as the prevention of Enosis, veto rights, separate municipalities and Turkey’s guarantee. One can argue that these parts are very Turkish Cypriot-centric. The following chapter portrays the process from the establishment of Republic until December 1963. The textbook lays the blame on Greek Cypriots for the troubles and insinuates a hidden agenda behind their acts. The next discussion question for the students argues that even though the 13 amendment points seem to give Turkish Cypriots some rights, they were full of traps.
The third chapter is entitled ‘Actions of the Greek Cypriots to Destroy the Republic of Cyprus, Turkish Cypriot Resistance and Political Developments (1963-67)’. Preparation questions before the chapter ask: ‘who were the leaders and designers of the Akritas Plan? Examine the mission of UN in Cyprus and evaluate whether it served its mission. Research the importance of the Kumsal area for the Turkish Cypriot struggle.’

Section A gives an account of ‘Greek Cypriot Aggression’; the Lefkoşa, Ayvasıl, Boğaz, Larnaka, Lefke, Limasol and Baf battles; the Erenköy resistance and the Mağusa district combat. As in the original history textbooks, a photograph of Turkish Cypriot Forces General Nihat İlhan’s murdered children is shown. However, it is not the well-known bloody bathroom picture, which has been said to have a bad impact on the psychology of pupils. The hardship of the Turkish Cypriots, the way they were attacked by Greek Cypriots, and their heroic resistance are explained in an emotional and vivid way. Pictures of the ‘martyrs’, war monuments, cemeteries, warriors with guns, fleeing women and children taking refuge in Turkish schools are used abundantly. Section B explains the establishment of the Bayrak radio station, its importance in the Turkish Cypriot history of struggle, and the ways it boosted the morale of the people. Section C covers the London Conference, the UN Security Council Resolution of March 1964, and the prohibition of Denktaş’ return to Cyprus by Makarios. The last part describes the 1967 Geçitkale and Boğaziçi incidents and Turkey’s ultimatum against the Greek junta regime. This part also focuses on the 1963-1974 period and mentions the reasons for the start of inter-communal negotiations and moves on to the bilateral negotiations and intermittent talks until 1974. The part that discusses the 1974 ‘Peace Operation’, describes that Makarios’s plan for Enosis was to devastate Turkish Cypriots in the long term and assimilate them, while EOKA-B supporters wanted to realise Enosis in the short term using violent means (2009, p.56).

In the ‘Peace Operation’ Era: the reasons and justifications for the military operation, the first ‘peace operation’, the Geneva negotiations, the second ‘peace operation’ and the overall consequences of the operation. Visual images such as pictures of Turkish vessels, troops, parachutes, helicopters, tanks, maps showing the progression of the Turkish army, and children watching Turkish soldiers are employed in a militaristic tone. The Greek massacres of the Turkish villages Athlar, Muratağa, Sandallar and Taşkent are mentioned along with pictures of the murdered children and mass graves. There is a diagram weighing the scale of Greek and Turkish troops in the Famagusta region, showing the overwhelming supremacy of
The newly revised textbook volume (2009) depicts Cyprus Turkish History from the official Turkish point of view. The influence of ethnic nationalism can be observed throughout the textbook. Unlike the 2004 textbooks, there is no reference to the common past and common experiences of the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot communities in Cyprus. The former Head of the Turkish Cypriot Educational Planning and Programme Development department, Dr. Hasan Alicik analyzed the textbook, set up statistics, and published them in the Yenidüzen newspaper and concluded that the new textbooks are extremely nationalistic.

The four ‘Cyprus History’ textbooks prepared under the CTP authority for upper secondary schools (Grade 9, 10, 11 and 12) have been analyzed and compared with the two ‘Cyprus Turkish History’ textbooks created by the current UBP authority. The content and the visual images of the textbooks have been evaluated from a peace education perspective. According to the findings of this comparative study, the current Cyprus Turkish History textbooks have reverted to an ethno-centric approach, using more nationalist and militaristic discourse and visual images. The inclusion of the political developments of the Greek Cypriots parallel with Turkish Cypriots has been abandoned. Moreover, there is no reference to the minorities of Cyprus, such as the Armenians and the Maronites. The representation of any Greek Cypriot loss, pain or suffering in the contested periods is avoided. In terms of teaching methodology,
the 2009 textbooks do not adopt the student-centred approach to the extent that the previous textbooks did.

2. “Israel, on The Bilingual Bi-national Integrated Palestine Jewish Schools in Israel: An experiment, which has not yet failed”, by Dr. Zvi Bekerman, Israel

This presentation, given by Dr. Zvi Bekerman, focuses on bilingual and binational integrated Palestinian Jewish schools in Israel. It analyzes the experiences of the involved stakeholders and uses this example to deduct general conclusions about reconciliatory educational attempts.

Dr. Bekerman begins his presentation by talking about intergroup contact theory. He explains how the intergroup contact approach has gained increased recognition as a venue for improving relations and coping with conflict between ethnic/national groups due to its role in reducing prejudice and hostility and fostering mutual understanding (Stephan & Stephan 2001; Bar-On 2002; Bar-Tal 2002).

According to Bekerman, four main models of intergroup contact have been developed:

1. The contact model which draws its inspiration from Allport (1954), the leading figure in the ‘contact hypothesis’ tradition, supports social change through extensive integration towards the achievement of social harmony.
2. The psychodynamic model which emphasizes the need to deal with psychodynamic processes (Ben-Ari & Amir, 1988) while trying to expand personal feelings towards alterity (Katz & Kahanov, 1990).
3. The national groups model (Halabi & Sonnenschein, 2004) which stresses group identities and asymmetric power relations (Suleiman, 1997).
4. The narrative model (Bruner 2002, Polkinghorne 1988), which assumes that one of the main influences on groups in conflict are their perceived histories and memories (Bar-Tal & Harel, 2002; Bar-On & Kassem, 2004; Salomon, 2004).
Having explained what each of these models are, Dr. Bekerman points out that these models reflect diverse negotiations between two poles of identity and identification, where some have a high emphasis on individual identity and a low emphasis on national/ethnic group identification, while the other encounters devote a high emphasis on national/ethnic group identity and a low emphasis on individual identity (Bar-On, 1999; Suleiman, 1997).

Dr. Bekerman then focuses on Israel and details how, partially as a response to a publication of a survey in Israel, which disclosed anti-democratic attitudes and feelings among Jewish Israeli youth towards the Palestinian minority (Zemach, 1980), intergroup encounters were initiated in the country in mid-80’s (Helman, 2002).

He describes how research results in Israel on educational efforts towards co-existence and peace education, are not only not definitive but also scant (Nevo & Brem 2002; Salomon 2004; Walter & Paul 2004). Nevertheless, he points out that the comparison of pre and post quantitative measures has consistently shown that peace education programs can and do, effectively influence youngsters’ peripheral attitudes and beliefs (e.g. stereotypes, prejudices and negative emotions) towards the other group, but the roadblocks of peace education pertain to the core beliefs that stand in the center of the groups’ collective narratives (Hertz-Lazarowitz, Kupermintz, & Lang 1998; Maoz 2000a; Bar-Natan 2004; Rosen 2006). Dr. Bekerman also talks about qualitative studies, which have been slowly developing, where researchers have discussed the dominance of Jewish participants (Rabah Halabi & Nava Sonnenschein, 2004) and have shown how dialogic encounters reproduce monological discourses of identity, which ultimately legitimize power differentials and structural inequality (Helman 2002).

Dr. Bekerman devotes the next section of his presentation on his long-standing ethnographic study at the 5 existing integrated bilingual schools in Israel. He specifically looks at the questions these schools have raised related to the desire to create a peaceful and democratic society where all groups can coexist while simultaneously striving to retain hegemonic group identities.

Dr Bekerman proceeds in showing participants CNN news coverage of the Hand in Hand's Max Rayne Jerusalem School, where over 400 Jews, Muslims, and Christians study together. The video can be accessed from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=seblkkKosXk.
At the bilingual integrated Palestinian-Jewish schools, educators and parents have chosen a model that emphasizes both individual identity and national/ethnic group identification. In interviews with parents and teachers, while bringing the two people together has been emphasized, concerns that these schools might threaten the children’s ethnic, national, cultural and religious identities have also been raised. Accordingly, due to parents’ and teachers’ concerns regarding the children’s “proper” understanding of their own national, religious and cultural traditions, some curricula and ceremonial events were segregated, where children were not encouraged to attend the “other” group’s ceremony.

Dr. Bekerman explains that overall, the attitudes of adults and children seem to reflect very different understandings of the construct of identity and its relevance within the social context. While adults seem to be captive to hegemonic essentialized identity perspectives that create (in part) the protracted nature of the very conflict they are trying to resolve, young children do not seem to hold to an understanding of identity as a boundary marker. He states that, observing the children’s behaviors have shown how children, regardless of their ethnic affiliation, exhibited the same affinity to Palestinian and Jewish teachers and even when children recriminated each other, they never invoked ethnically denigrating innuendos when naming the "guilty party.” However, Dr. Bekerman clarifies that this does not mean that children had no consciousness of, or respect for, their ethnic/religious affiliation. In fact, they had awareness and even felt free to play with their identities. However, the everyday practices of these schools—from recognizing the exceptionality of students who participate in religious practices outside of their ethnic background to segregating national ceremonial events—were shown to promote static and nationalistic notions of identity that limited the potential of these schools to advance authentic and meaningful change for peace.

Dr. Bekerman then explains that there has been much debate on the extent to which school leaders should highlight or obscure race, religion, or ethnicity in educational settings, due to the fact that researchers on racial and ethnic identity have pointed towards situational characteristics (traditional meals, festivals, family celebrations, etc.) as being responsible for fluctuations in feelings of ethnic salience (Yip and Fuligni 2002; Hitlin, Brown, & Elder 2006).

He further details how historians, sociologists, culturalists, and even psychologists have argued that conceptions of “identity” are the key building blocks of the most universal of modern structures and ideologies: the nation-state and nationalism, and how schools are the
main technology developed to achieve this ideology (Billig, 1995; Gellner, 1983; Giddens, 1991; Smith, 1992). Teachers, though involved in initiatives geared toward interrupting these othering processes, are still heirs to everyday practices that persist in their immediate contexts and make it difficult to escape from particular forms of national(istic) socialization. They have come of age in circumstances that support the formation of an “us and them” mentality accomplished through “myth-making,” which idealizes one’s own group and demonizes others (Aho, 1994; Zembylas, 2008). In this sense, they have grown accustomed to settings in which there is no recognition of diversity (Blee, 2002).

Therefore, at the end of the presentation, in regards to these problems, Dr. Bekerman suggests that children need help to become ingénues about the ways in which social categories are constructed and engineered by nation-states. He believes that one of the main goals of reconciliatory educational attempts should focus on teaching students to become artists of design, explorers who uncover the ways society is organized and have the knowledge and skills to envision alternative designs and construct new ways of living together.

In line with this goal, he suggests two main directions for future work:

1. The first relates to the need to seriously research children’s subculture and the ways in which they organize the world through more flexible identity categories than the ones dictated by present national paradigms.
2. The second relates to the need to consider how these new understandings could influence curricular undertakings.

He ends his presentation by declaring that sustaining children’s cultures is a possibility adults need to consider, especially if they offer openings for overcoming some of the greatest ailments that trouble our society and are conducive to engaging intractable conflicts.
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3. “On History & Histories – must the past divide us?” by Mr. Jamie Byrom, the UK

Mr. Byrom’s presentation focuses on history teaching, and how teachers can provide history teaching that helps students overcome conflicts arising from divided pasts. Below is Mr. Byrom’s presentation, as it was delivered at the workshop on 19 March 2010.

I have taken as my title the question “Must the past divide us?” and I hope you will not misunderstand me or be too alarmed if I answer my own question straight away by simply saying, “Yes – it must”.

I say the past must divide us because it always has done. The only times and places where history has at least on the surface failed to divide people, have been authoritarian societies that suppress views that are not approved by the state and even there, beneath the surface, disagreements and alternative perspectives have lived on in secret. The past must divide us if we are free to speak our mind.

But must the past lead us into conflict? Not necessarily. Once again the evidence of history is that different views of the past can be a powerful agent in leading to rivalry and even warfare – but it need not be this way. The healthy and positive ambition of history teachers
should surely be to help young people to understand why we see the past differently and how it is possible to hold different views while respecting other perspectives.

Perhaps it will help us to think about this issue if we begin with some examples from our own lives. If I force you to choose between two options, which would you take? If the choice is between cats or dogs some will prefer one and some will prefer the other. The same is true when choosing between sunbathing and walking. Perhaps the widest gulf would be between shopping and football. The point is that we disagree because we are different. We disagree in the present about the present so we should not be surprised that we disagree in the present about the past.

My last example concerned football. Let’s continue the analogy. (You must forgive me but as I speak we are just weeks away from another World Cup and the English nation is stirring itself for another characteristic melodramatic failure!) If we cast our minds back to the last tournament held in Germany in 2006, there was an incident in the final that became notorious around the world. The French captain Zinedine Zidane was sent off for head-butting an Italian defender. Within days a different video clip appeared on YouTube that purported to show the incident through the eyes off different onlookers. To the neutrals in the crowd the scene was shown exactly as it appeared on our screens around world. To the French however (according to the YouTube clip) the Italian merely walked directly into a lamppost that had mysteriously appeared on the playing surface. To the Italians, Zidane appeared to fly in horizontally like a missile as he struck their player. To the British press, the Italian defender rotated several times in the air before landing on the ground. One incident – at least four different interpretations! Must the past divide us? Yes!

Of course the YouTube video was simply a bit of fun. The audience can see its point – and they can see how the “truth” has been crudely manipulated. Our task as teachers of history is to use such devices to help young people detect other less obvious but often more dangerous “editing” of the past. How do we do this? We do it by involving them in the work of the historian. This can be summarised as follows:

It is both inevitable and healthy that we disagree about the past because:

- We are different (Diversity)
- The past is complex (Complexity)
- Historians have to work to reconstruct the past (Activity)

Our classrooms must therefore reflect all these factors. They must have:

- Diversity – in the content we teach
- Complexity – in the concepts we teach
- Activity – in the way we help children to learn like historians

Of course it is foolish to pretend that our children really are working as historians in the fullest sense of the term, but they need to face similar challenges if they are to understand that life - including all past life – is a fascinating and challenging puzzle.

The approaches I have set out above have helped to shape much of my recent work as an author writing resources to support history teaching in England. With my colleague Dr Michael Riley, the director of the Schools’ History Project, I have co-authored some training resources about the teaching of diversity in our classrooms. These aim to support teachers in their attempts to show young people just how different and fascinating people are both within and across national boundaries. The resources are available online to members of the Historical Association. We called the training pack “Dimensions of Diversity”. They form part of the HA’s resources for E-CPD (Electronic Continual Professional Development) and can be accessed at http://www.history.org.uk/resources/secondary_resource_1326_11.html.

In those materials, Michael and I considered six main aspects of diversity. These are:

- Diversity and British society - emphasising that societies are made up of men and women, rich and poor, strong and weak, rural and urban, and that the lives of all these individuals and groups are interconnected.
- Diversity and the locality – showing how any national version of the past may or may not be reflected in the locality where the young person is growing up. A national story is almost always over-simplified.
- Diversity and ethnicity – so important in a multi-cultural, post-imperial society such as modern Britain
Diversity within world cultures – helping young people to see that other nations and peoples have their own complex societies and these too cannot be subjected to dangerous generalisations or stereotypes.

Diversity and division – showing how differences between people can lead to conflict.

Diversity and individuality – making the point that even where two people may have grown up in a similar social context, they still may differ. In some cases individuals dare to choose to be different and take a stand.

The overriding point of the training resources is to help teachers plan a curriculum in which diversity is richly reflected. This can only help young people to seek to understand differences in the world in which they live.

In another part of my work as an author, I have recently tried to help English students to understand many of these aspects of diversity and social complexity and to try to understand them through engaging historical activities. In this venture I once more worked with Dr Michael Riley and also with Christine Counsell of the University of Cambridge. We have written a text book aimed at students aged between 11 and 14 years of age in English schools. It is called “Meetings of Minds – Islamic encounters with a wider world, 570-1750” and is published by Pearson. As far as is possible for white English authors, we have endeavoured to write a book that seeks to understand Islamic history on its own terms rather than through the eyes and experiences of Britain. There is of course a pressing need for this in England: if we do not try to understand Islamic history and culture, the past is sure to continue to divide us.

The text tries not to preach. Amongst its enquiries, it examines the origins and spread of Islam, the extraordinary achievements of Abbasid Baghdad, it helps students wrestle with evidence as they try to understand the experience of the crusades from the Muslim point of view and it explores the power of the mighty Ottoman Empire. In each case they are seeking to understand the past in all its complexity and as they do so they prepare their minds and emotions for living in a world where people are sure to differ.

But all this is very difficult and open to controversy, even in England where there has been a culture of allowing teachers considerable freedom in the way they explore the past with students. What holds us back? Recent research in England by the Historical association has
led to the publication in 2007 of the TEACH report – “Teaching Emotional and Controversial History”. Through interviews with teachers and others and observation of current practice, the authors identified various obstacles that may limit the willingness or effectiveness of history teachers in dealing with these difficult and potentially divisive histories.

The barriers included:

- Lack of time and status for history in the curriculum
- Official guidance that plays safe and does not encourage risk-taking
- Inadequate access to high-quality training
- Lack of teacher knowledge of the complexities of history
- Teacher avoidance of controversial issues
- Lack of balance when tackling controversial issues

While there may be many differences between teaching history in England and Cyprus, it is likely that this list looks familiar to you: even in diversity there can be similarity!

So what can we do to help young people grow up in a world where the past will divide us but need to lead us into open conflict? It seems to me that we must tackle the issue directly: we must study all sorts of diversity, not just the diversity that can lead to war. We must also put activity at the centre of our teaching, the sort of activity that reflects the careful critical thinking and controlled imagination of the historian who learns to respect evidence and to respect people. And above all we must keep history complicated – partly because it reflects life and helps us to avoid the dangers of the simplified stories and stereotypes that were mocked in that YouTube video of Zinedine Zidane, but mainly because it keeps us puzzling and makes the study of history so much more challenging and so much more fun!

4. "America and the 'Best War Ever’”, by Dr. Peter Rutkoff, the USA

The following presentation, given by Dr. Peter Rutkoff focuses on the “Good War” myth, its definition and the ways in which certain elements support the creation of this mythology. Below, you will find a summary of Dr. Rutkoff’s presentation.
Dr. Rutkoff begins his presentation by showing the last five minutes of the film, “Sands of Iwo Jima”, starring John Wayne. Before showing the film, he asks participants to consider how a child would react to such a movie and asks participants “read it [the film] with the eyes of a child”.

The clip shown takes place in Iwo Jima, Japan, where American soldiers are fighting against the Japanese during World War II. In these last five minutes, John Wayne, as Marine Sergeant Sojn Stryker, is killed by a sniper during a lull in the fighting. His men find an unfinished letter on him, addressed to his son, saying the things he wanted to say but never got around to. The film ends, when Stryker’s men turn around and watch the iconic flag rising on Mount Suribachi in Iwo Jima.

After the film, Dr. Rutkoff discusses with participants the possible meanings of such a film for a young child. These are:

- Dying for the flag is honourable and heroic, and doesn’t necessarily have to be regarded as a sacrifice.
- The enemies are cowardly and nothing is too bad for them, therefore there is a very clear, distinctive good versus evil in every war, where the Americans are always the embodiment of heroic good.
- The way John Wayne dies is clean, fast and sanitary with no apparent pain involved.
- There is a diversity of American ethnicity, which is what really won the war for America: a democratic ethnic diversity and strength.

Dr. Rutkoff goes on to explain how these are constructed ideas and not necessarily true. For example, the great diversity of American ethnicity excludes African Americans, as they were not allowed to fight during World War II. Also, to a certain extent the Native Americans are also missing from the “democratic ethnic diversity” of America.

He then goes on to define the notion of “good war”, which he describes as a fight between good and evil, where democracy overcomes evil and nobody gets really hurt and people die as if they were peacefully dying in bed, and in the end, the iconic glorious flag is raised.
Dr. Rutkoff describes how this movie is regarded as real by American society, due to its use of real footage of the iconic raising of the flag at the end. However, he explains that this real documentary source is actually constructed by the army and the flag raising was never a true event and as such, this movie does not have real validity. Nevertheless, as Dr. Rutkoff claims, since most Americans choose to watch films rather than to read books, this becomes the story they learn about with regards to what happened during World War II and the constructed ideas listed above is what they regard as the truth.

Then, Dr. Rutkoff goes on to reveal letters his father had written to his sister and his wife whilst he was a soldier in World War II. His father had been wounded during the war and had ultimately died after being in the hospital for six years having not recovered from the injuries he sustained. He explains how these letters are the real sources, the kind you find in archives and which historians try to recreate history from.

The letters, in which his father depicts his situation to his family, expose how his father is tries to be heroic, minimizing his wounds, and always asking his family not to worry about him as he is doing OK. In a way, his father is holding on to the same ideas listed above, where he is sanitizing his wounds, his situation, and believing that all that has happened is for a good cause. In fact, Dr. Rutkoff points out that unintentionally, his father is participating in the “good war” myth and therefore becoming a tool for it to be reproduced. He then suggests that if all soldiers behaved like his father and movies are produced which depict these same ideas, and then in the end, a whole culture is created which understands events in particular terms, as it has happened in the USA.

Dr. Rutkoff ends his presentation by summarizing his attempt to present the “good war”, which is a very powerful mythology of an “ideologically pure”, “good versus evil”, “death-is-clean” experience through concrete examples how ordinary people participated in the creation of a certain kind of mythology.
5. “History Goes to the Movies: Historical Films in the Classroom”, by Dr. Jonathan Stubbs, the UK

This presentation by Dr. Stubbs focuses on visual sources, specifically on historical films, and discusses how these films are used to shape public ideas about history using the analysis of three films. Below you will find Dr. Stubbs presentation as it was delivered at the workshop on 19 March 2010.

The idea of using historical films to educate people about historical events is nothing new. Writing in 1915, DW Griffith, who was probably the leading film director in America at the time, asked readers to imagine a library of the future in which films had taken the place of books:

Suppose you wish to ‘read up’ on a certain episode in Napoleon’s life. Instead of consulting all the authorities, wading laboriously through a host of books, and ending bewildered, without a clear idea of exactly what did happen, and confused at every point by conflicting opinions about what did happen, you will merely seat yourself at a properly adjusted window, in a scientifically prepared room, press the button and actually see what happened. There will be no opinions expressed. You will merely be present at the making of history. All the work of writing, revising, collating and reproducing will have been carefully attended to, by a corps of recognized experts, and you will have received a vivid and complete expression.¹

Unfortunately, the film Griffith was promoting when he wrote this article was Birth of a Nation (1915), a landmark for film technique, but a viciously racist and largely inaccurate depiction of American history following the Civil War. The film depicts chaos in the Southern States following the end of slavery as black Americans ran riot, leading the Ku Klux Klan to step in and to restore order. Black men are shown to be evil, violent, and even inhuman; the Ku Klux Klan are shown to be heroes. So rather than expressing ‘no opinions’, Griffith’s history film gives an entirely biased account of historical events. Rather than collating all available sources into a single, unified account of this period of history – as if

such a thing were possible – the film selects only the sources, which support a racist interpretation of history. And rather than allowing viewers to be ‘present at the making of history’, as though cinema were a kind of time machine, the film is heavily coloured by the racial tensions and prejudices at work in America in 1915. Birth of a Nation is perhaps an extreme, untypical example of the potential for distortion in historical cinema, but it does point towards the problems that can occur when people treat fictional films as straightforward records of the past.

At the same time, historical films need to be understood as one of the key ways through which people, not least students, form connections to the past. The racism of Birth of a Nation may be appalling, but it was probably the commercially successful film of its era and it was praised by many critics and even some historians. A 1998 study based on interviews with 1500 Americans found that people are far more likely to encounter history through films and television than they are through books or museums. More recently, the cover story from a 2010 issue of Time magazine named Tom Hanks ‘America’s Historian in Chief’, due to his involvement in various historical films and TV serials. There can be no doubt that the producers of film have the power to shape public ideas about history. Some have even been self-conscious about it. According to James Cameron, reflecting on his film Titanic in 1997, “We have a great responsibility. Whatever we make will become the truth, the visual reality that a generation will accept”. He could be right: for better or worse, the ‘visual reality’ of Titanic crashing into an iceberg with its fictional lovers on board has had a greater impact than anything that has been written on the subject, just as Tom Hanks’ films and TV shows influence public perceptions of the past more directly than work by any number of history professors toiling in archives.

Are the high profile Hollywood films of a problem? For some people the answer is yes: historical films, particularly Hollywood films, offer biased, inaccurate versions of the past that freely mix fact with fiction without really making it clear where the distinctions are. We could
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4 Quoted in Marnie Hughes-Warrington, History Goes to the Movies: Studying History on Film (Abingdon: Routledge, 2007), 101.
also accuse many films of simplifying historical conflicts and putting too much emphasis on the actions of heroic individuals rather than social forces, and in many cases of moulding the lives of historical figures to fit a predetermined narrative shape. On the other hand, we might ask whether traditional sources like books necessarily do the job any better. The tendency to regard the written word as inherently much more reliable, accurate and objective than visual sources such as films is very strong, but it does not necessarily stand up to close analysis. Since the 1970s, thinkers such as Hayden White have argued that written history is much closer to fictional forms than traditional historians have tended to admit. In the attempt to transform dry data about the past into history, historians tend to create narratives, omit details that do not fit in, and allow ideology to shape their interpretations – all things that historical films are often accused of. The idea that books are the only true source of historical knowledge is perhaps best understood as a cultural bias rather than an unshakable truth.

Other approaches to historical films have emphasised the ways in which they are able to tell us about the present in which they were made as well as the past, which they represent. In this way, historical films can tell us about the ways in which different cultures have related to the past and in some cases have used it to talk about the present. There are numerous examples of this. Historical films made in the late 1930s and early 1940s, such as The Sea Hawk (1940) and That Hamilton Woman (1941) attempted to draw parallels between Hitler and European despots from earlier periods. Some of the ancient world epics of the 1950s, such as The Ten Commandments (1956) and Ben Hur (1959), can be read as Cold War allegories, which denigrate Stalinist Russia by analogy. And some recent historical epics, such as Kingdom of Heaven (2005) and 300 (2005), reflect post-9/11 fears about the Middle East. Whether by intention or by accident, historical films can be used to learn about the present in which they were produced as well as the past, which they represent.

In order to illustrate some of the issues that surround the use of historical films in the classroom, this article looks at three films and the ways in which they represent the past. My intention is neither to attack nor to defend mainstream historical films, but rather to encourage thinking about how they work. The first example is Lawrence of Arabia, a British-American production made in 1962 about the Arab revolt against the Ottoman Empire during World
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War I. The other two concern Cypriot history, and are probably less well known: *Exodus*, a Hollywood film made in set in Cyprus in the late 1940; and *The High Bright Sun*, a British film made in 1964 and set entirely in the Cyprus of 1957. All of these films can be said to simplify the historical events they portray; I would like to look at how they do this, and why.

**Lawrence of Arabia**

One of the most successful films of its era, *Lawrence of Arabia* tells the story of a British army officer who takes a mission to work with Arab tribes in their revolt against the Ottoman Empire and thus to advance British interests in the Middle East. Lawrence becomes an unofficial leader to the Arabs, impressing them with his will power and taking them to various improbable military triumphs. In the process he begins to adopt the appearance of an Arab warrior. The film is set around 1918, when Britain’s colonial involvement in the Middle East was increasing, and it was produced in the early 1960s, when Britain was in the process of withdrawing from its empire.

As might be expected, the politics of the film are very complicated. In many places *Lawrence of Arabia* is anti-imperialist and certainly anti-war, but at the same time the film shows disdain for the Arab people and for colonial nationalism in general. The scenes towards the end of the film, when Lawrence and the Arabs attempt to establish an Arabian government in Damascus after getting rid of the Ottomans, are particularly revealing. Beating the British into the city, Lawrence and the Arabs take control and form the Arab National Council in the existing town hall. Their meeting is chaotic; members walk across the tables to insult each other and petty tribal disputes forestall debate. Lawrence calls order by banging his pistol on the table, but on this occasion it is beyond his powers to organise and lead the Arabs. As the power generators burn and Ottoman soldiers perish in the unstaffed military hospital, the Arabs begin to abandon Damascus. Lawrence remains in the emptying town hall, abandoned by the Arabs but apparently still hoping to maintain control over the city on their behalf. In these scenes, the Arabs are depicted as childish, backward and inherently divided. Unable to govern themselves, they drift back into the desert where they came, allowing the British military to take command. Despite Lawrence’s heroic efforts in their name, the Arabs are shown to be incapable and undeserving of self-government.

The implications of these scenes in 1962, as former colonial states all over the world became independent and began to form sovereign governments, are striking. The film’s ambivalence
towards imperialism and colonial nationalism is also evident in the character of Lawrence himself. An outsider in the British army, Lawrence quickly finds himself at home among the Arabs and declares that he supports their pursuit of independence. Neither colonial nationalist nor European imperialist, Lawrence is able to mediate between these two positions, initially with great success. However, Lawrence’s involvement with the British military ultimately compromises his operations for the Arabs. Learning of the Sykes-Picot Agreement, which arranged for Ottoman possessions in Arabia to be divided between Britain and France, General Allenby, who leads the British in Arabia, cautions Lawrence for his surprise: ‘You may not have known, but you certainly had suspicions. If we’ve told lies, you’ve told half-lies.’ Outflanked by the back-room deal making of British politicians, and possibly by the Arab leaders too, Lawrence’s good intentions are ultimately defeated.

The real, historical Lawrence was a far more enthusiastic agent of British imperialism, but the film lets us believe that he was a romantic adventurer whose ideals were betrayed by scheming bureaucrats, a characterisation that makes him far more likable and which ultimately redeems him. Despite his sense of destiny, he was never in control, and thus not truly to blame.

*Lawrence of Arabia* gives a complex account of the Arab Revolt, criticising British imperialism while also failing to endorse Arab independence as an alternative to it. What the film cannot do, however, is to provide an Ottoman perspective on the Arab revolt. A few Ottoman Turkish characters exist in the film, but there is no attempt to furnish them with psychological or political motivations or even to explain why they are fighting. Instead they are simply monstrous, associated with rape, as when Lawrence himself is captured by Ottoman soldiers and tortured. I think this deficiency points to one of the major problems with many Hollywood historical films: they are very bad at depicting conflicts with more that two sides. *Lawrence of Arabia* depicts the conflict between British and Arab interests in great detail, but it is unable to explain the role of the third force in this conflict, the Ottoman Turks. This problem is also evident in both of my other examples.

**Exodus**

It is not well remembered today, but *Exodus* was one of the biggest Hollywood films of the 1960s. Based on the bestselling novel by Leon Uris, the film tells the story of the Jewish
settlement of Palestine in the late 1940s, under British mandate at the time, and the creation of Israel. However, the first hour of this long film is set in Cyprus, where thousands of Jewish refugees have been imprisoned by the British military while attempting to reach Palestine. A group of these prisoners, led by the Haganah soldier Ari Ben Canaan (played by Paul Newman), escape from the prison onto a ship in the Famagusta port, and after staging a hunger strike for several days they are allowed to set sail for Palestine, where the rest of the film takes place.

*Exodus* has been widely criticised for its inaccuracies and soap opera-esque inventions, but the scenes set in Cyprus are broadly historical. It is estimated that between 1946 and 1949 an estimated 52,000 Jewish refugees were temporarily imprisoned in Cyprus, mostly around Famagusta and Dhekelia, before eventually being allowed to settle in Palestine.\(^6\) The film makes extensive use of Cypriot locations in these early sequences. In fact, the film was shot on location in Cyprus in the summer of 1960, just one month before the declaration of the Cyprus Republic – an interesting time to be working on the island.\(^7\) The opening scene of the film features a Cypriot tour guide who explains the island’s colonial history to a woman he assumes to be British:

> Cyprus has been conquered many times, he explains, conquered by Phoenicians, Assyrians, Persians, Macedonians, also conquered by Greeks, Romans, Byzantines, Turks, purchased from the Turks by your esteemed selves, the British Empire.

Right from the beginning, Cyprus is positioned in terms of its colonial status, although the woman the guide is talking to, quickly points out that she is in fact American.

This American woman, Kitty Freemont (played by Eva Marie Saint) travels from here to Famagusta, where she sees the imprisoned Jewish refugees and watches one attempt to escape. Shortly afterwards she meets with the British Governor of the Island, a family friend it
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emerges, in another high profile Cypriot location. As an American, Kitty is able to pass between the different groups on the island – British, Jewish and Cypriot – and she maintains this mediating function throughout the film, much as Lawrence does with British and Arab interests. The film charts her conversion from being politically disengaged as the film begins, to becoming a supporter of Zionism who decides to live in Israel with the handsome Haganah leader Ari Ben Canaan. Throughout the Cyprus-based scenes, the film works to connect the struggle of Jewish characters to be free of British rule in Palestine with the superficially comparable plight of the Cypriot characters. This connection is made most clear through the character Mandria, a Cypriot businessman who works with Ben Canaan to help the Jews to escape the island. Played by Hugh Griffith (a Welsh actor with a less than perfect grasp of the local accent) Mandria declares, ‘We Cypriots are with you! For the Jews, Mandria will do everything’. Later in the same scene, he insists that his is not ‘anti-British’, saying, ‘If I must have a master the British are the best. But the problem is, why have a master at all?’ As Ben Canaan leads the Jewish escapees on a hunger strike, Mandria is shown organising a food collection and hundreds of Cypriots are shown lining up to donate. The solidarity of Cyprus and Israel is very clear. Nevertheless, the film is careful not to criticise the British government too strongly – Britain was a major market for Hollywood films after all.

The cooperation of Cypriots and the Jewish underground organisation, the Haganah, may in fact have some basis in fact. According to a letter written by the British Governor to the Colonial Office in London, the British administration on the island believed that the Haganah were cooperating with AKEL (the Cypriot Progressive Party of Working People) and even providing military training. Understandably, the British administration feared that this would strengthen the colonial nationalist movement on the island. Nevertheless, the connection the film makes between Jewish and Cypriot anti-colonial movements is a little too simplistic, functioning largely to maintain a schematic opposition between coloniser and colonised in the film. Once the film moves to Palestine, the film continues to oppose Jewish characters with British colonial administration. However, this time the conflict is complicated by the additional presence of Palestinian Arabs, whose obviously differences cannot be absorbed into the simplistic two way conflict that was created when the film was in Cyprus. As in Lawrence of Arabia, conflicts with more than two sides prove to be too complicated to depict.

---

And so the Arab characters in Exodus remain marginal, if not entirely negative, their most significant scene occurring when German Nazis arrive in Palestine in order to organise the Arab resistance against the Jews. Like the Turks in Lawrence of Arabia, the Arabs of Exodus are surplus to the requirements of the simple narrative, which the film constructs.

The High Bright Sun

My final example is The High Bright Sun, a film which has largely been forgotten, but which is (as far as I know) the only fictional, feature length British film made about Cyprus.\textsuperscript{9} I think it warrants close examination for this reason alone. It was released in 1964 by Britain’s largest film studio of the period and stars Dirk Bogarde, who was one the biggest stars in Britain at the time. Perhaps inevitably, given the political situation in Cyprus in 1963 and 1964, the film was not actually made in Cyprus – instead, locations in southern Italy were used. The landscapes are not a bad match, but the absence of Cypriot actors robs the film of a degree of authenticity.

\textsuperscript{9} Several short documentaries about Cyprus were produced in Britain, however; most were sponsored by the Colonial Office or the Ministry of Information. Titles included Cyprus is an Island (1946), Report on Cyprus (1955) and The Land of Cyprus (1950). See the Colonial Film Database for more information: www.colonialfilm.org.uk/country/cyprus
The story is set in 1957 and focuses on Juno Kostanzi, a Cypriot, born in America who is visiting the country in order to do archaeological research. She comes under the influence of British Officer Major MacGuire, who is involved in tracking the Greek Cypriot fighter Skyros, who is wanted for killing British soldiers. Juno accidently discovers that Skyros is hiding in the house where she lives, along with a younger independence fighter, Haghios. Major Maguire suspects that Juno has information about Sykros’ whereabouts, and pressures her to pass the information on to him. This leads to the film’s major conflict – should Juno remain loyal to her Cypriot heritage and conceal the activities of Skyros, or should she tell her secret to Major Maguire, with whom she is also falling in love? As in other post-colonial narratives, the battle for the soul of an emerging nation is embodied by a young woman, who must decide where her identity lies. Predictably perhaps, as this is a British film, Juno decides to side with the British and Maguire. However, it seems significant that Juno’s decision to pass intelligence to the British does not actually lead to the capture of Skyros, and at the end of the movie, both she and Maguire are forced to leave the island as anti-British violence escalates. Although the film’s narrative comes to a close before Cyprus became independent, it is nevertheless quite clear that British rule on the island has been defeated.

Like Exodus and Lawrence of Arabia, The High Bright Sun represents a conflict between British imperialism and a local independence movement, in this case Cypriot. And like those films, particularly Exodus, it is also a conversion narrative, presenting an initially neutral character that must decide which side she is on. But unlike Lawrence and Exodus, The High Bright Sun makes absolutely no attempt to explain what the Cypriots are actually fighting for. Although the word ‘EOKA’ is written on the wall of one of the exterior locations, it is never mentioned. Similarly, there are no references to Enosis, and no attempt to establish what the Cypriot agitators want from the British. In the absence of this contextual information, Cypriots in the film seem to be beyond ideology: with no reason or motive for their violence, they are simply barbaric. The tagline used in promotional material for the film reinforces this interpretation: ‘Treachery and Fear, Love and Hatred… Always Ready to Explode Into Violence!’

10 Bhowani Junction (1956), set on the eve of independence and partition in India, is a good example of this trope.
It is also striking that the film makes no attempt to represent Turkish Cypriots at all. As before, conflicts involving more than two sides are too complicated to represent – the film has no room for Turkish Cypriots and thus they are excluded from the narrative. The only reference to Turkish Cypriot culture comes in an unintentionally comic scene towards the beginning of the film, when Haghios visits the Greek Cypriot family who are hiding Skyros and angrily declines the offer of a cup of coffee, declaring ‘I don’t drink Turkish coffee!’ Presumably intended to establish Haghios’ fierce loyalty to Cyprus, it in fact underlines the film’s defective and partial understanding of Cyprus’ complex history.

There is a lot more to say about all of these films, but I hope I have been able to show some common characteristics in the way they represent history. In each case, the films are unable to represent the complexity of historical processes, instead reducing them to two-sided conflicts at the expense of other groups involved. These conflicts are also reduced to an individual level, particularly though the use of characters who find themselves torn between the two sides – Lawrence in *Lawrence of Arabia*, the American Kitty in *Exodus*, and the Cypriot-American Juno in *The High Bright Sun*. Why do they do this? I would suggest that it is principally the need to make historical events conform to predetermined narrative shapes based around literal or psychological journeys undertaken by characters which spectators can in some way engage and sympathise with. This, after all, is the way mainstream cinema tells stories, whether they are historical or not. This is not to say that the films I have mentioned are necessarily ‘bad’ history, but they do illustrate limitations common to the genre. There can be no doubt that historical films have a role to play in the classroom, but they need to be approached on their own terms and in their own historical contexts, and not as straightforward records of the past.
Picture 2 The opening scene of the Hight Bright Sun (1963)
Workshops

The second day (20 March 2010) of the seminar was fully dedicated to workshops in which Dr. Zvi Bekerman, Mr. Jamie Byrom and Dr. Peter Rutkoff facilitated three consecutive workshops in which smaller groups of educators participated.

1. Workshop on Clarifying values in Conflict Ridden Societies

Facilitated by: Dr. Zvi Bekerman, Israel
Venue: Cyprus Community Media Centre, Ledra Palace

The purpose of this workshop was to introduce participants to the notion of addressing and discussing sensitive issues in the teaching of history. Through previous interviews and focus groups with educators, POST RI realized there was both a need and a desire by some educators to begin to address more conflicting issues, rather than simply focusing on the similarities between communities in Cyprus. Many teachers expressed that the teacher training workshops they had attended in the past although beneficial, only dealt with “soft issues” and began to become repetitive in their approach. Therefore, POST RI decided to take the brave step of bringing educators from across Cyprus around a table to focus on not only the similarities between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots, but also their differences.

Dr Bekerman primarily focused on the notion of Values Clarification (VC) as the theme for his workshop. VC was conceived by Raths et al. (1966, 1978), both as a theory and as an intervention. Theoretically, VC was inspired by humanistic writers such as Maslow (1959) and Rogers (1961), who believed that individuals are responsible for discovering their own values through processes of self-examination and search for truth. Dewey's (1939) assertion that the experience of valuing involves the interdependent processes of reasoning, emoting, and behaving, is also central to VC development. According to VC theory a clarified value must have been (a) chosen freely, (b) from among alternatives, (c) after careful consideration of the consequences of other alternatives, (d) be prized or cherished, (e) affirmed publicly, and f) acted on repeatedly. Individuals who are confused or unclear about their values will tend to behave in immature, dissenting ways. In contrast, people who have undergone a
process of VC tend to behave in a calmly confident and purposive way. In spite of its popularity during the 80’s VC has not been immune to criticisms and has suffered scathing critique as supportive of moral relativism (Stewart, 1975). More recently VC has been re-conceptualized and introduced into the sphere of values conflict and clarification (Kinnier, 1995).

The first exercise asked participants to write the ten most outstanding features, which characterize in their view, a Turkish Cypriot and a Greek Cypriot.

**Exercise 1**

In the following please write the ten main characteristics of a Greek Cypriot (as you – the participant - see them)

1) ____________  
2) ____________  
3) ____________  
4) ____________  
5) ____________  
6) ____________  
7) ____________  
8) ____________  
9) ____________  
10) ____________

In the following please write the ten main characteristics of a Turkish Cypriot (as you – the participant - see them)

1) ____________  
2) ____________  
3) ____________  
4) ____________  
5) ____________  
6) ____________  
7) ____________  
8) ____________  
9) ____________  
10) ____________
The exercise was devised to allow for the exposure of participants prejudices and or appreciations of self and other and to engage participants in a dialogue on these issues. Dr. Bekerman first encouraged participants to volunteer to present their answers and later on to try and help them sustain a dialogue. Participants engaged in the activity with ease and contributed avidly to the dialogue. They seemed hesitant to be fully honest at first but with time they seemed to be ready to acknowledge that they hold negative (and at times positive) stereotypes, which they sometimes hide but are able to discuss, when in an open and trustful atmosphere. Participants also seemed excited about the opportunity that they were given to discuss what otherwise (in other similar events) is hidden and is never talked about in the open.

Dr. Bekerman ended this particular session with some theoretical comments on prejudices and stereotypes in which he tried to emphasize the importance in educational activities of being open, for in any case our students are fast to realize what is being hidden, and pointed at the fact that stereotypes seem to be a necessary cognitive devise, not always necessarily damaging, if dealt with care.

The second part of Dr. Bekerman’s workshops involved a short exercise, which was built as a semantic differential, in which participants were asked to circle the number which best represents their position regarding the ‘ought to be’ characteristics of a future state of Cyprus. The three central questions participants were asked about were: if they believe the state of Cyprus should be "a state for all its citizens" or "a Turkish/Greek state", "secular" or "religious" and "segregated" or "integrated". The participants were asked to mark on a scale from 1 (the least) to 6 (the most) the extent to which they would like to see each of the contrasting concepts of the differential characterize Cyprus.

**Exercise 2**

Please look carefully at each of the conflicting/contrasting concepts presented in each line in the following exercise. These concepts are all answers to the question “the Island of Cyprus
should be…”between each of the conflicting/contrasting concepts a scale running from 1 to 5. Please circle for each question one number. Circle the number, which best expresses the best your position regarding the questions being asked.

For example

I (you the reader/participant) would like the island of Cyprus to be

One united state 1 2 3 4 5 two separate states

If for example you circle number 1 it means you very much want a one united state

If for example you circle number 5 it means you very much want two separate states

Any other number would mean you are less decisive in your answer …pay attention that between 1 and 5 there is no middle so in all cases you will be taking a position towards one side or the other.

And please answer all following questions.

The island of Cyprus should be

One united state 1 2 3 4 5 two separate states

A Greek dominated state 1 2 3 4 5 a state for all its citizens

A Turkish dominated state 1 2 3 4 5 a state for all its citizens

A religious state 1 2 3 4 5 a secular state

A socialist egalitarian state 1 2 3 4 5 a neo liberal capitalist state

The EU should impose a solution to Cyprus 1 2 3 4 5 Cypriots (G and T) are the ones that will find a solution
Without returning lands to the refugees of both sides there is no solution to the conflict. Financial compensation for all is enough of a solution.

A state which holds strong connections to its mother lands (Turkey and Greece) is not totally independent from its mother lands.

Some groups found this exercise to be a bit more difficult, in the sense that it touched upon very sensitive issues related both to personal histories of the participants (as sons or daughters of refugees), as well as representatives of their national ethnic groups. Again, as in the previous activity, participants slowly opened up the dialogue to more sensitive issues and expressed views that are not easily expressed in mixed groups. The participant’s responses showed among other things, how the rhetoric used (and assume to be understood by all) many times hides misunderstandings, disagreements, and or assumptions of commonalities, which are not really there and need to be openly discussed if we wish to sustain open and honest dialogues.

All in all, participants seemed to have found the activities developed of interest, mainly because they seemed to sense that this was one of the first times in which they have allowed themselves in the context of a cross-cultural (inter-group) encounter to raise issues which usually are not discussed.
2. Workshop on: Thinking History – Practical approaches to teaching sensitive issues in the history classroom

Facilitated by: Mr. Jamie Byrom, UK  
Venue: Ledra Palace Bi-Communal Room  
Rapporteurs: Zehra Beyli, Eleni Lytra

Mr. Byrom’s workshop focused on how specific activities and tools can be used in the teaching of sensitive issues, as a way of encouraging students to question, think andanalyse historical events. Moreover, the workshop was designed to focus on activities that model some of the following approaches:

- Keep history complicated (Complexity)
- Study all sorts of diversity, not just diversity that leads to conflict (Diversity)
- Model how historians work so that students learn that history is fascinating and complex and open to interpretation (Activity)

Mr. Byrom firstly introduced and explained such approaches and the possible outcome for students.

Mr. Byrom’s first activity involved the use of pictures to explore history and historical events:

1 – **Use stories to explore the big ideas of history**

Mr. Byrom explained that students tend to think that history is just a simple story of what happened in the past. Even when they are very young, teachers can show that it is much more complicated than this and that there is a lot of room for differences of opinion.

As an example, Mr. Byrom used a card sorting activity about the life of Florence Nightingale based on an activity first devised by Christine Counsell (Senior Lecturer, Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge, UK). The eight cards showed simple line drawings of scenes from Florence’s life. (Participants were explained that normally the cards would be used after students have already learned a great deal about Florence Nightingale.)

The grid below shows some of the main activities that Mr. Byrom asked participants to carry out in relation to Florence Nightingale. Each activity allows for discussion and healthy disagreement, which is the main idea behind good history teaching and learning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Activity</strong></th>
<th><strong>What this helps children to understand about history</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrange the cards in the order in which they happened</td>
<td>Chronology – but also why some things had to happen before others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stretch the spaces between cards to show when you think there were long/short gaps in time.</td>
<td>Develops a much more complex view of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagine a three-part television drama is going to be made about her life. Decide where you would end episodes 1 and 2.</td>
<td>Gets children to think how we “shape” the past as we re-tell it. Groups may disagree about how to do this. This is normal and interesting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you had to tell the story of Florence’s life with just three cards, which would you choose? Why? Is there any picture that we simply must not leave out?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find examples of pairs of cards where the event in the first one caused the event in the second one. Keep finding more and more pairs. We can call this the “And so …” game.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find pairs of cards that show how things changed in the story.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find as many different types of people as you can in the story.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrange the cards with a picture of Florence at the centre and then put cards showing other people around her. If they are very important in shaping the story (“central to the story”) put them near Florence in the middle. If not put them further out towards the edge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove some cards. Can you remember which ones have gone?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This was the main activity of the workshop and during discussions between Mr. Byrom and participants, it was agreed that the activity could be used with many historical figures whose stories are told in history lessons. By doing this activity with a well-known story, it helps students realise that all historical events have many different layers and that things are always more complicated than some simple history books make out. In addition, it allows room for healthy disagreement, which is an important tool in developing students analytical and communication skills.

Before concluding this section of the workshop, Mr. Byrom introduced the name Mary Seacole to participants and asked if anyone had heard of her.

As none of the participants had heard of that name, Mr. Byrom explained that Mary Seacole was a black nurse who came from a poor Jamaican family in the West Indies. As a nurse, she chose to go to the Crimea to work on the battlefield. Mr. Byrom asked participants why they felt that they did not know about Mary Seacole and why it is in general that she has not been remembered in a similar historical context as Florence Nightingale has. Such questions and methods could also be used in the classroom in order to get students to think about what is considered as historically important and why.

Recently the story of Mary Seacole has been introduced in schools in the UK in order to teach that there are other people from other cultures and countries who also have a place in history.

2 – Use role-play to understand diversity and points of view in the past

In the second part of the workshop, Mr. Byrom introduced the use of role-plays in the classroom. He explained that role-plays do not need to involve real acting and they do not need long complicated scripts. A useful approach involves writing about eight character descriptions of people in a particular historical situation. These could be real people or it may be easier to invent characters based on the sort of people that we know were really involved. Then invent about twenty or thirty short descriptions of things that were part of the historical situation.
For the purpose of the workshop, Mr. Byrom used the example of “Smalltown USA” an imaginary town in America in 1928. A character such as “A businessman who wants to entertain and impress rich clients from neighbouring cities in order to encourage them to invest in Smalltown” was used as well as “A cheap motel on the edge of town” as distinguishable features of the town.

Participants were given a character card and they had to decide what would be their characters five favourite and five least favourite features of Smalltown. The characters were then mixed up in groups. Participants were asked to discover if they share any likes or dislikes about Smalltown. What are they? Why do they agree / disagree? If a newspaper reporter were to visit Smalltown in 1928 to write about it for readers far away in a big city, whom should he or she interview? What overall impression would the readers get and why?

Role-play activities like this can be adapted for almost any social history setting. They help to show diversity and complexity in society. It is not necessary to do this for all historical situations, but if teachers incorporate such an activity into their lessons from time to time, this will help to strengthen the notion that history is made up of the lives of millions of different people with different interests and points of view.

Mr. Byrom also briefly considered a range of other role-play activities with participants:

*Teacher in role:* Can help to have the teacher play a role as he or she can give intriguing answers to children’s questions or keep prompting discussion.

*Groups in role:* This way the children must become experts on their own characters’ situation. The teacher acts dumb and asks them questions.

*Student in role:* As above but this time a single student must prepare the role.

*Improvisations:* These make children think about what their character would think or feel in a situation and come up quickly with an unprepared answer.

*Trios:* This helps children see different points of view – and how people in the past had to make up their minds about what they should do.
Mimes/Masques: This simply makes children bring the past to life and to think what it would have looked like.

Issues: This makes pupils look for different sides of arguments or situations to show their audience how complicated things were.

Statues/Portraits: This allows pupils to play around with how we might see a person, changing posture or props to reflect e.g. pride, courage, cruelty etc.

Conscience alley: This is another excellent way of helping pupils consider different points of view and showing that people in the past were human just as we are and had difficult choices to make.

 Thoughts in the head: This gets pupils to realise that what people say and what they think may be very different things!

See the lesson plan section of this handbook for further information on the use of role-plays in the teaching of history.

3 – Use pictures to draw pupils more deeply into the past and to reveal its complexities and how historians work with evidence

In the third part of the workshop, Mr. Byrom introduced ways in which pictures are an important resource in teaching history, even though we tend to use pictures less and less as children grow older. Books for younger children are filled with images, but by the time the same young people are in their teens they will often be given texts with barely an image to be found. Mr. Byrom stressed that in his opinion this is poor history and it certainly does not help learning.

Mr. Byrom explained the importance historians and history teachers to make people and places live in the imagination, in order to draw student in to historical events. This can be achieved with well-told stories, of course, but the imagination can do so much more when fed with pictures and supported by purposeful activities. Once again, though, Mr. Byrom stressed
that in order to keep history healthily complicated, using images to show that there is always more to see than first meets the eye, is important.

See the lesson plan section of this handbook for further information on the use of pictures in the teaching of history.

4 – Use written text to draw pupils more deeply into the past and its complexities

As important as pictures are in opening children’s minds to the complexities of the past, historians will always rely heavily on the written word. Accordingly, Mr. Byrom explained that history teachers need to find ways of helping young people access documentary sources that can be quite dense or demanding. He went on to highlight the importance of teachers in planning carefully exactly which sources to use at what point in a sequence of lessons.

Mr. Byrom stressed that short extracts have their place, but - as with pictures – it is important to ensure that there are regular opportunities for deep, thoughtful exploration of the text through which the pupils learn to look for layers of meaning and to discern how the writer builds and develops ideas. If we do not do this, we unwittingly give the impression that people in the past spoke in what we might now call “sound bites”, summing up their views in simplistic, one line statements.

Mr. Byrom explained that one way of helping young people to examine text in detail is to make the process active and suggests three ways in which this can be done. Please see the lesson plan section of this handbook for activities on analysing text.

5– Helping pupils to understand “interpretations of history”

Mr. Byrom concluded that if we are committed to helping young people understand why the past can divide us, it is essential that they develop a mature understanding of what the English National Curriculum calls, “Interpretations of history”.

It is important to understand what is meant by the word “interpretations” in this context. It refers to any conscious reflection on the past made at a point significantly later than the events
that are being considered. The word “Interpretations” in this sense is concerned with different viewpoints about the past. It is not directly concerned with different views of events by people in the past, although these may of course affect how the past is viewed differently at a later date. It is important to help pupils understand how the absence of source material or disagreements about what conclusions can be drawn from sources will, of course, shape the later interpretations that people put forward.

Over the past fifteen years or so, teachers and authors in England have found some interesting ways of helping pupils to understand how and why people disagree about the past and interpret it differently. Mr. Byrom, along with his colleagues and co-authors Christine Counsell and Michael Riley, have attempted to include some of these methods in two series of schoolbooks for children aged between 11 and 14. These methods can be found in the series entitled “Think through history” published by Pearson Education and in the book entitled “Impact of Empire” in the “This is history!” series published by Hodder Education.

Some examples of activities that are related to interpretations of history can be found in the lesson plan section of this handbook.

**What are pupils expected to learn about interpretations of history?**

In ways that are appropriate to their age and development, pupils should have opportunities to:

a) Develop awareness that history is represented in many different ways
b) Investigate how interpretations of the past may differ
c) Consider reasons why interpretations of the past differ
What might progression in work on interpretations involve?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Move children from …</th>
<th>Move children to …</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Identifying a few ways in which the past is represented</td>
<td>• Identifying a wide range of ways of representing the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Working on a narrow range of interpretations, with an emphasis on stories</td>
<td>• Working on a wide range of interpretations e.g. museums displays, novels, films, websites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Understanding that there can be different versions of what happened</td>
<td>• Evaluating the accuracy of what happened by reference to prior knowledge of the period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identifying differences between simple interpretations</td>
<td>• Explaining why interpretations differ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Being aware that our knowledge of the past depends on having sources that we can use as evidence</td>
<td>• Showing how limitations in sources (e.g. gaps or bias) can influence the interpretation reached</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Where do we find “interpretations of history”?**

Here are just some examples that pupils may encounter:

- Non-fiction history books
- Historical novels and stories
- Drama: theatre, film and television
- Museum displays
- Talks by visiting experts
- Re-enactment by individuals or groups
- Guides, guide books and displays at historical sites
- Popular views about the past
- Teacher’s particular selection and emphasis
- Web sites
- Children’s work
Why do interpretations of the past differ from each other?

The interpretation may have been affected by …

- Purpose (Inform? Persuade? Sell? Entertain?)
- Audience (Young? Old? Novice? Expert?)
- Limitations of sources (Gaps? Viewpoint? Typical? Unusual?)
- Historical rigour with sources (Selecting, Mixing, Concluding)
- Authorship (Background, Preferences, Knowledge, Culture)

Participants seemed to find Mr. Byrom’s workshop very informative and useful and many stressed that they gained invaluable ideas that will help them in the classroom.

At the beginning of the workshops participants were divided into smaller groups, which allowed for more in depth communication during the carrying out of activities and also allowed participants to interact with people from other communities. The workshop also allowed participants to, both be put in the role of students, as well as teachers. In addition, participants were given an extensive handout with a variety of useful examples and approaches for history teaching.

![Educators exchanging views](image_url)

*Picture 4 Educators exchanging views with Jamie Byrom on formal and non-formal teaching methods*
3. Workshop on: Learning from the American experience of textbooks and history teaching: Thomas Jefferson, Founding Father, Slaveholder etc.

Facilitated by: Dr. Peter Rutkoff, USA
Venue: Ledra Palace Bi-Communal Room
Rapporteurs: Gina Chappa, Berna Serener

Dr. Rutkoff’s workshop focused on the way in which textbooks have been and in some ways still are, important tools in hiding and/or misrepresenting historical events. Dr. Rutkoff used his extensive knowledge and experience of teaching American history to provide the context for the workshop.

Participants were divided into groups to allow for more in depth discussions and interactions. Each group was given specific materials related to a particular part of American history and were asked to examine the material in their groups and then proceed in designing a lesson plan to present to the rest of the group. When presenting the lesson plan, participants were told that the other groups listening to the presentation should take the position of students and look at the material presented to them in such a way.

Examples of Materials provided:

Images

Dr. Rutkoff asked participants to first begin by commenting on what they saw in the pictures and then think about the similarities and differences in the pictures and what message they are giving. Participants were then encouraged to discuss what they believed the common factor of the pictures was – in this case it was religion. As discussions became more in-depth, Dr. Rutkoff revealed further information regarding the sources of the pictures and information on the background on those people featured in the pictures. This in turn helped to divulge how such pictures were used to uphold stereotypes of black people in America and how white people used such information to tell the story of American history to portray a certain image of black people, as well white people.
For example a picture, which at first glance participants believed was of black people, was in fact depicting white people painted black to look African American, using shoe polish or coal.

This picture was of a theatre show called the “Minstrel Show” – once the most popular form of entertainment in the USA for over 60 years. The Minstrel show was an important tool in the stereotyping of black people and conveying messages that black people were only good for certain things, such as singing and dancing.

**Texts**

Participants were asked to study the text and discuss the terms slavery, equality and liberty in relation to what they read and the way such terms are presented in the text.

The subject matter concentrated on Thomas Jefferson. Dr. Rutkoff engaged participants in a discussion related to the many contradictions in the USA regarding the name of Thomas Jefferson as a historical figure and especially in relation to the history of the slave trade in the USA. After analysing the text, participants were asked to summarise “who was Thomas Jefferson?”.

Further sources (text from various books) were provided which provided an alternative view to that was first held by participants. These were:

- American History Textbook used in Colleges in the USA, “American Journey”: This book only contains one sentence stating that Thomas Jefferson was a slave owner.

- Book “Enduring Vision”: “Among the Whig slaveholders who saw many of his slaves escape to British protection was Thomas Jefferson”.

- Third textbook “A People’s History of the United States”, written by Howard Zinn, from a Marxist perspective: The book clearly states that Jefferson owned hundreds of slaves till the day he died (he died 40 years after the Declaration of Independence).
Fourth textbook by Will Scott contains a whole paragraph about Jefferson and one of his black slaves, with whom he bore 5 children. It goes on to state that Jefferson never acknowledged the children as his own and he did not free them from slavery.

What emerged was, that unlike previously believed by participants; Thomas Jefferson was actually a slave owner. However, due to the sources first analysed, this was not apparent. It was only when an addition source was introduced that participants were made aware of this. Dr. Rutkoff pointed out that this is an important message that students should always be made aware of when analysing historical events and historical figures. Teachers when teaching history should ensure that students critically examine sources and question their reliability, rather than taking them at face value. Activities such as choosing a specific subject matter and slowly introducing sources to students, is an important method in encouraging young people to examine, analyse, question and to re-question. Dr. Rutkoff went on to explain that in the American history textbook (American Journey) only one sentence in the text points to the fact that Jefferson was a slave owner. This led to a lively debate amongst participants about why this may be the case and the questioning of sources and textbook reliability was questioned.

Dr. Rutkoff took the discussion to another level by explaining to participants that the USA has decentralized education. There are 50 states in the USA and each state has 80-100 counties and each county has a different school system choosing their curriculum. However, the state of Texas, which is one of the largest states in the USA, houses the largest textbook industry in the country. Therefore, for a textbook to become popular in the USA, the State of Texas needs to be in agreement with it. Texas has a large and predominantly rich and conservative population and therefore this may affect what is chosen as an appropriate textbook to be taught in the State of Texas and as such, has implications throughout the USA. This example was extremely welcomed by participants who then began to question and discuss the textbooks used in Cyprus and possible influences in the subject content and political motives of textbooks used.

Although the subject matter of this workshop was mostly unfamiliar to many participants, this was in some way a benefit, as participants were asked to examine particular historical sources with no pre-judgement and be placed in the shoes of a student. Through the carefully selected sources and planning of the workshop content by Dr. Rutkoff, participants engaged in lively discussions around the reliability of sources, representations of messages and their use and the
issue of textbooks in teaching of history. Participants were also able to play the part of teacher in the designing of lesson plans and see how the use of various sources can help to make history lesson more interesting, as well as developing student’s analytical skills.

*Picture 5* Peter Rutkoff with educators on the importance of visual images in textbooks
PART II: Historian Forum

This next section concerns the Historian Forum that was organized by POST RI Research on 15 July 2010 at the Cyprus Community Media Centre (CCMC) in UN Buffer Zone, Nicosia. The aim of the Forum was to bring history teachers, academics, and educators together from across Cyprus to discuss teaching methods, alternative materials for the teaching of history and ideas for the future. The Forum began with presentations on various aspects of teaching history in Cyprus, followed by a roundtable discussion.

Presentations

1. “The Textual and Visual Analyses of the Upper Secondary School Cyprus History Textbooks: A Comparative Analysis of the Old and New Cyprus History Textbooks Summary”, by Dr. Hakan Karahasan, Cyprus

Dr. Hakan Karahasan’s presentation provides findings of POST RI’s study involving a comparative analysis of the history textbooks used in upper secondary schools in the northern part of Cyprus. The study’s findings are summarized in the table below. For further details, please refer to the presentation by Dr. Dilek Latif and Dr. Hakan Karahasan, which took place on the 2-day teacher-training workshop.

Under the Education for Peace III project, POST RI undertook a comparative study of the upper secondary Cyprus (Turkish) History textbooks. Four ‘Cyprus History’ textbooks prepared under the Republican Turkish Party (CTP) authority from 2006 until 2009 for Grades 9, 10, 11 and 12 were analysed and compared with the two current ‘Cyprus Turkish History’ textbooks created under the auspices of the current (National Unity Party – UBP) authority. Shortly after UBP came to power, following the April 2009 general elections in the northern part of Cyprus, these four Cyprus History textbooks were replaced with new Cyprus Turkish History textbooks. A peace education approach was used as a method of analysing the ‘discursive strategy’ and the visual aspects of the textbooks. Besides theoretical information on the use of language, descriptions of historical events, utilization of visual images, a historical perspective has also been given to show how and why textbooks have changed, and why this is still a ‘hot debate’ in the politics of Cyprus.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Former Curriculum</th>
<th>New Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Cyprus History Textbooks</td>
<td>2 Cyprus <em>Turkish</em> History textbooks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More information on Cyprus history and World history</td>
<td>More focus on the history of Turks –Ottoman Empire, formation of Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Multicultural perspective used to examine events</td>
<td>More emphasis on the history of Turks, such as the Ottoman Empire and the formation of Turkey, as well focusing on the Turkish-Greek conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emphasis on social history - used as an instrument to teach mutual understanding and tolerance</td>
<td>Social history is integrated in to political and military history and in doing so exemplifies the hardships of Turkish Cypriots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explain the history of Cyprus without detaching it from the rest of the world – as such it can be understood that like other countries in the world - Cyprus is simply one place in the world that experienced conflicts.</td>
<td>Depicts the past from the Turkish ‘official memory ’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highlights common concerns and hardships of the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot communities</td>
<td>No references to the common past and common experiences of Turkish and Greek Cypriots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>Emphasis on “Cypriot-ness” of Turkish Cypriots</td>
<td>Emphasis on Turkish Cypriots being Turks from Anatolia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Narrative based on tolerance and understanding</td>
<td>Narrative based on the struggle of Turkish Cypriots since their arrival to the Island.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Less emphasis on the ‘other’ and the ‘other’ is not necessarily depicted as being Greek Cypriot</td>
<td>The notion of homogenous and single “other” present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outlook</td>
<td>Visually attractive</td>
<td>Poor page design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visual images used to encourage students to question and analyse</td>
<td>Visual images are mostly used to support the discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cover of textbooks – linked to Cyprus, such as map of Cyprus, pictures of Cypriots</td>
<td>Cover of textbooks – many Ottoman figures used, military images, no map of Cyprus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. “History teaching in the Greek Cypriot Community of Cyprus - Intervention in the Historian Forum (POST RI) in the Buffer Zone” by Dr. Gregoris Ioannou, Cyprus

Dr. Gregoris Ioannou’s presentation focuses on history teaching in the Greek Cypriot community, discussing the governmental changes undertaken in relation to history education, the influence of nationalism and ethnocentrism in history teaching in schools and what can be done to overcome them. Below, you will find Dr. Ioannou’s presentation, as given on the day of the Historian Forum.

In 2003, I had finished my undergraduate studies on International History at the LSE in the UK and came back to Cyprus to submit my degree to the Republic of Cyprus in order to apply for a history teaching position at secondary education. There, I was informed that I could not and that I needed to equate (eksomioso) my degree from the University of London with that issued by the University of Cyprus. Details of the said conversation that took place between me and the civil servant present there:

Me: “What do you mean?” I asked the middle-aged civil servant.

Civil Servant: “Well,” she said, “how can you teach history if you don't know the Greek language?”

M: “But I know the Greek language” I responded, “It is my first language”.

C.S: “Yes, but you studied in England. You need to take lessons in modern and classical Greek and Latin at the University of Cyprus”.

M: “But I am not applying to teach modern nor classical Greek nor Latin”, I responded. “I am applying to teach history, that is my subject”.

C.S.: “There is no such thing” she responded. “You need to become a philologist. Then you will be teaching all the philological subjects”.

I refused and applied instead to postgraduate and later on PhD studies in Political Sociology again in the UK.
Having established that I am not ‘officially speaking’ a historian, barred that is from teaching history, I can start my presentation in which I will discuss the political and sociological implications of ethnocentrism in the Greek Cypriot (hereinafter G/C) educational system in general and history teaching in particular and the continuing struggle to overcome it in the interests of modernisation, social progress and peace. This, as you can already sense, will not be merely an academic, but also and more importantly, a political and an activist presentation.

1. Ethnocentrism at the Centre of History Teaching

The fact that history is not treated as a fully autonomous science, but subsumed within Greek studies/philology, constitutes in my opinion the structural basis of ethnocentrism in the G/C educational system as a whole. Today, this is essentially a phenomenon of the Greek-speaking world, as in most countries language and literature studies are clearly separated from the study of history. And although the implications of this fusion of two separate disciplines/academic fields are more severe in the primary and secondary education in the sense that the past is examined, understood and narrated through a national lens, the roots of the problem lie to be honest in the Greek speaking academia. Despite their minor differences, the University of Cyprus follows the pattern of Greek Universities of demanding from history undergraduate students to take up a number of modern and classical Greek as well as Latin courses as part of the curriculum. At the same time it demands from Modern Greek and Classic students to take history courses as part of their curriculum. And at the end of the day it issues to all the same degree – Greek Philology. Although some sort of specialisation does take place, this is not necessarily and not usually taken account of later on when these philologists are appointed to teach Greek or History according, not to their personal specialisation in terms of their major direction at undergraduate studies, but according to the general needs of the G/C secondary education system.

When I raised this issue in a conference about the process of educational reform in 2008, I got the response by a secondary school teacher that “philologists are historians and that historians are philologists” while the political academics (those involved in the educational reform) remained silent. It seems that this fusion of Greek literature and history passes more or less as a self evident fact of life, and has never seriously being questioned, not even by that relatively radical manifesto for educational reform of 2004 adopted by Papadopoulos' government and supposedly in the process of implementation by the current Christofias' government. Now
why do I insist on this? Because, this subsumption of history under Greek studies has ontological, epistemological and political implications. It automatically places the idea of the Greek world at the centre of the historical stage viewing in other words broader global and regional historical developments only or primarily in relation to “Hellenism”. From an epistemological perspective, this narrows the field of study making it monothematic and one-dimensional and most importantly ignoring the specific methodologies of the science of history such as multiple sources and rigorous analysis which are reduced to some classic texts and their literary discussion. From a political perspective this leads to a conscious as well as unconscious confusion between national myths with historical facts and reproduces an inability to think beyond the terms of “National History”, that state-building ideology of the 19th Century Europe. The subsumption of history within the domain of the national culture facilitates the incorporation of mythical elements in the historical narrative often in an “innocent”, almost automatic manner through literary licence and ingenious linguistic forms.

Now moving from the intellectual basis to the ontological essence of ethnocentrism, we encounter the old, a bit more than a century old that it is, political presupposition of G/C nationalism – that Cyprus has been, is and must continue to be Greek. Many researchers have analysed the phenomenon of nationalism in general and G/C nationalism in particular in various ways and forms. What I want to point out here is that Mavratsas' 1998 claim that nationalism in the G/C community defines the parameters of political orthodoxy and therefore the exposition of nationalist ideology constituting an act of social critique, continues to hold today as well. A brief examination of the syllabus and textbooks of “history” in the G/C schools immediately strikes one as being primarily “a history of Greece” and secondarily “a history of Cyprus” which in any case in seen as Greece's extension. Papadakis' PRIO Report of 2008 analyses and explains the basic schema still in use today in the G/C schools and identifies its basic political implications – that is the identification of the concepts of “Greek” and “Cypriot” and hence the exclusion of the T/C from Cypriotness, through either the denial of their ethnic identity (seen as really being Greeks in need of assimilation) or their essentialization and demonization as the national Other that is “Turks”. Some of my 20-year-old students last year thought that Turkish Cypriots were Turks that came to Cyprus after 1974 and that they should go back to Turkey. I hope of course that this current misconception does not acquire the status of a de facto reality in the coming decades. To be sure, political reality and the officially stated goal of the establishment of a bizonal bicommmunal federal republic is at variance with G/C nationalist ideology and attempts to bridge them by
pragmatic and otherwise liberal politicians and intellectuals lead to incoherence, arbitrariness and blatant contradictions.

The political implications of the continuing hegemony of nationalism in the G/C community in general and history education in particular are three fold. Firstly, the elite strategy of constructing and maintaining “national unity” is implemented through the official national historical narrative. This process consists of inventing traditions in Hobsbawm's famous term and constructing factoids to back them up (the secret school in Turkokratia, the raising of the flag in Ayia Lavra on 25th March of 1821, the demanding of enosis in the archbishop's welcoming address to the British in 1878). This is of course a process of distortion of the actual historical developments, nevertheless its systematic repetition especially in primary education instils them in young people's consciousness and it needs years of study and questioning at university level to actually manage to see through them. Secondly the Turkish Cypriots are seen as a minority with weaker historical and political rights in comparison to the Greek Cypriots on the present and future of Cyprus, thus making them unwilling to support or even merely accept a power-sharing agreement in a future federal context. Thirdly G/C students become unaccustomed to think outside the national frame thus weakening their capacity for critical thought, multi-perspectivity and multi-dimensionality of analysis and historical dialogue.

2. The Effort for Educational Reform Away from Ethnocentrism 2004-2010

The Turkish Cypriot revolt in 2002, the opening of the checkpoints in 2003 and the entry into the EU in 2004 had created new facts on the ground and raised again the stakes of the ongoing contestation concerning the history of Cyprus. As the possibility for a new future opened up, there was new impetus to re-think both our past and re-orient the educational process as a whole towards the vision of the future. In this context, the committee of the seven academics produced its manifesto for a thorough and structural reform of the educational system. The most radical element of that document was the attack on ethnocentrism which was seen as dominant, culturally monolithic and narrowing the ideological and political frame of Cypriot education. It conceptualised Cyprus as being autonomous and European and it put forward the idea of taking seriously into account the realities of bi-communalism and multiculturalism and incorporating them in the educational system. The importance of that proposal lies not so much on its actual influence in the process that followed it but more on its pushing
the acceptable limits of the public debate on education in general and history teaching in particular. What was more or less censored before as unpatriotic and traitorous was now coming out from the mouth of experts appointed to consult the state.

The change of the Turkish Cypriot (T/C hereinafter) history books in 2004 was hailed by progressives in the South and it armed us with an additional argument about the need to reciprocate in the context of the on-going reunification process. Nevertheless, the more general climate during the rest of Papadopoulos term, especially after the death of the reformer Minister of Education, Pefkios Georgiades was such that did not allow much hope for such an ambitious educational reform. It was only in 2008, after the election of Hristofias that the possibility of implementing the changes suggested re-opened. The new minister, Andreas Demetriou seemed prepared to move on and spoke a new language in his original circulars. He talked negatively of nationalist G/C and T/C para-military groups in the era 1963-1974, he questioned the need of militarised school parades, he said that our models and heroes should not only be dead teenagers and he talked about the need to democratise our schools. He also proclaimed the 2008-2009 academic year, the year of “cultivating the culture of peaceful coexistence” and he left open the possibility of contacts between G/C and T/C students. But the nationalist hysteria that was unleashed in the last two years, spearheaded by the Archbishop, the leaderships of the POED and OELMEK as well as from politicians from all parties except AKEL did not leave much prospects for significant changes to be allowed or even tolerated. (Ekpedeftiki Allagi, 2009 and Kalemi, 2009)

The attack against the efforts for educational reform in general focused on the subject of history. AKEL was accused of trying to “instrumentalise history” and “ideologise its teaching”. So effectively the conservative nationalist camp employed the liberal rhetoric of a “value-free education” putting forward the idea that there was no ideology now in the educational system and that AKEL was trying to put one in. Even Persianis' last book (2010) about the politics of education in Cyprus, which otherwise acknowledges the inextricable link between politics and education at some point, (p. 113) criticises the attempt for educational reform as being politically and not pedagogically motivated. This rhetoric was articulated from a system's perspective, from the perspective of the current hegemonic socio-economic bloc that considers its own ideology as the reality, its own view as not being political but the framework of permissible politics. Needless to say that in order to construct this one “objective truth”, the basis that is of the official history, there has to be censorship of other,
alternative voices, themes and phenomena as Panayiotou (2009) notes: the lower class political culture and class conflict are two such examples.

AKEL’s response was mild in the sense that it refrained from a head-on collision with the forces of nationalism and tried to moderate its position in order to achieve some sort of a consensus. This proved wholly elusive as the conservative nationalists stood firm in their positions – the teachers unions’ officially abstaining from the preparatory committees and the political parties not voting the budget in the parliament. The academic history committee was appointed with a view to reflect the general balance in this public debate. Eventually it split into two – a majority proposal (3) and a minority proposal (2). The majority proposal was published two months ago in the webpage of the Ministry of Education and it is considered to be the official, while the minority one is yet unpublished.

The majority proposal is really unacceptable. The “new” analytic programme is essentially a copy-paste of the old/existing ethnocentric analytic programme with some minor insertions on the specificity of Cyprus and one single reference in the skills section “to the ability to evaluate and comment upon sources and accept possible multiple interpretations of the historical fact or phenomenon to which they refer” (p.25). However this allusion to multiplicity of interpretation is really rhetorical as one reads the whole thematic and analytical framework proposed. The narrative is still focused on Hellenism and Cyprus is still considered to be unquestionably fully encompassed within it. The students are for example asked to debate for and against Kapodistrias' policy, for and against Trikoupis' policy and for and against the Megali Idea. The alleged multi-perspectivity is squarely situated within the frame of the nation. Multiple perspectives are allowed only within Hellenism not in relation to it. And certainly not even within the G/C community where despite the references to the two poles (AKEL and Ethnarchy p.55) the students are not asked for example to debate for and against Enosis or for and against EOKA.

Overall the proposal for the primary education is far worse than that of the secondary education. In the primary education history, which is much more brief, the Ottoman period in Cyprus is not examined autonomously like the Western (Frankish and Venetian) period but subsumed in three sections entitled “The Greek world from the Fall (of Constantinople that is) until the revolution of 1821”, “The preparation and the turning points of the Greek Revolution of 1821” and “Cyprus in the last period of Ottoman rule 1830-1878” where supposedly the
The enosis movement appeared. In the primary education general aims there is a direct reference to the students' “historical and national identity” which history education “will allow them to gain”. The idea is the progressive gaining of knowledge about “the history of Cyprus and the Greek world and then also of the various different periods co-habitating religious and national groups of the island.” In the secondary education the general aims and the framework is more or less the same but because the syllabus is much more extensive there is some more detail about the Ottoman, British and independence periods.

The minority proposal is not a radical alternative one. It does however constitute a moderate reform of the philosophical orientation of history teaching and a relative progress because of three reasons:

a) It does approach the history of Cyprus autonomously, primarily linked but not subsumed to Greek history, and related also with the history of the Mediterranean civilisations, European and global history. In this context there is no reference in the general aims to the students' developing a “national identity” but a more general and potentially inclusive “love of their country” by “knowing the conditions of its creation, independence, liberties and rights of its people”. Hence both thematically and analytically Cyprus becomes the centre of the story and “National History” is approached separately and in contradistinction to the “Science of History”.

b) It does not link the Greek Revolution of 1821 with the Fall of Constantinople in the Tourkokratia frame but to the French Revolution of 1789 and the onset of modernity. In this context the French Revolution has shaped global history whereas the Greek Revolution has shaped regional (that is Ottoman and Mediterranean) history. Upon this almost internationalist perspective the minority proposal also places more emphasis to modern and world historical events like colonization and decolonization, the Russian Revolution etc.

c) It proposes for the last two years, independent bibliographical research by the students under their teachers' supervision on a variety of generalised themes in a comparative manner such as:

- The origins and development of Christianity and Islam,
- The political and economic context of the Byzantine and Ottoman Empires,
3. Resisting Ethnocentrism in Practice

I am not going to speak any more about the minority proposal. Let it be published (most probably by its authors rather than by the Ministry of Education) and then hopefully we can debate on it. On the level of political analysis however, one thing seems obvious. That up to this moment, after 6 years the attempt of the state to reform history teaching away from ethnocentrism has failed dismally. So let us see what we can do at the level of civil society. If there is one thing clear by now is that moderating our positions and expectations, and waiting from the state itself to proceed to changes in school history has proven to be naive. Ethnocentrism is still dominant in society and more so in the state mechanism, which rules it and this cannot change from “above”. Nationalism is a hegemonic social force, inscribed in the public sphere and discourse and rooted in the educational system. Our strategy for the future must be more pragmatic and simultaneously more offensive. That is we should focus our energies and efforts to countering specific aspects of the “official history” in alternative publications that could be used in the classroom as well. That is rather than attempting to construct history textbooks we should be aiming for history teaching supplements. And of course not expect the state to authorise their use (like the Association for Historical Dialogue does – or at least did in the past) simply because it will not; unless there is an agreement for reunification the two regimes are unlikely to change their basic conceptual schema about the past. As Kizilyurek noted in 2007 (POST) “history is dealing with the future not with the past” therefore, unless the possibility of a different future opens up, the G/C history teaching seems unlikely to change.

This of course begs the question, how can the possibility for a different future open up in the context of a nationalist educational system? This is a political and practical, not an academic and theoretical question. Therefore to sum up in a nutshell the suggestion is this: resisting ethnocentrism through alternative sources and interpretations and telling different histories. Creating Internet thematic archives, in audiovisual as well as print form and disseminating the
information amongst teachers and students through unofficial and informal networks. Bringing in sufficiently the international and local histories, focusing on the social dimension, employing oral history and independent student research. Unearthing the hidden stories and breaking the silences and the censorship, both about the historical porousness of Cypriot ethno-religious identities as well as about the recent dark moments of ethnic conflict. Really exploring the idea of multi-perspectivity and multiple interpretations both within and without the ethnic and communal group. Finally, promoting bi-communalism as the Cypriot way to multiculturalism through encouraging and organising contacts between G/C and T/C teachers and students. A more ambitious plan already discussed by the Teachers Platform “United Cyprus” is the creation of an autonomous bi-communal school, first on a part time basis and if possible in the future on a full time basis in the dead zone. In the current circumstances, there does not seem to be another way out.
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Ideas Developed during Roundtable Discussions

The ideas that were formed during the roundtable discussion have been grouped under three headings and shown below.

1. History Textbooks

- Teachers can explain subjects from different perspectives by using supplementary examples.
- Teachers should be familiar with the similarities and differences across the divide and provide students with good examples, putting special emphasis on the similarities.
- Different perspectives of historical events should be included in history.
- Local and international context should be available in sources.
- Dichotomy should be removed from textbooks.
- Question – to create a dialogue with “nationalist” hierarchy?
- Common history textbook should be written by all Cypriots.
- We need to re-write Cyprus history – not Ottoman, Turkish or Greek history.
- All communities and groups in Cyprus should be included in textbooks.
- Alternative sources should be used as supplementary materials.
- More oral history studies/research should be used as an “informal” dimension of subjects taught.
2. General History Teaching

- Using a “Peace Education” approach in classrooms.
- Using more supplementary materials / other resources rather than the national textbooks.
- Using student-centered approaches in history teaching.
- Use of Internet – as a powerful tool to reach out to students and teachers across the divide – a way to offer alternative resources to all.
- Need for different types of history to be included in textbooks and teaching e.g. history of women, history of sports, social history, history of human rights – rather than simply concentrating on the time-line of history and Cyprus history.
- Pose questions to students in order to encourage them to think analytically about events in a global context e.g. what was happening in the world in 1960 when the Republic of Cyprus was established.
- Promote critical thinking.
- Teachers from across the divide should join forces in order to promote reconciliation and peace and create a dialogue.
- Different sources need to be used.
- Should take on a more pragmatic approach and not wait for the state to make changes to official history teaching.
- Teachers should use their autonomy in the classroom and take initiative without state backing.
- Sources should be used and not just those directly related to Cyprus history e.g. history of women, gender equality, human rights, protection of environment, multiculturalism.
- Need to look at the relationship with trade unions and approach them to work more closely.
• Publish new teaching materials.

3. **Ideas for the Future**

• Writing of a Common History Textbook.

• Use of Oral history research/studies.

• “Peace Education” methods to be used in teaching history.

• More use of audio-visuals in the classroom.

• Common radio station.

• Common history teaching.

• Teachers need to meet more regularly in order to exchange views on education, peace and reconciliation.

• Need to by-pass authorities, take initiative, focus on pragmatist teachers to find practical solutions.

• Open a bi-communal, multicultural school.

• Create either a new website or a page on POST’s website in which teachers from across the divide can post resources/sources/lesson plans – a way in which to share ideas and materials that can be used in schools across Cyprus.
Picture 6 Participants brainstorming on peace education during the roundtable discussions
PART III: Lesson Activities for Teachers: Practical Approaches for Use in the History Classroom

All information here has been kindly provided by Mr. Jamie Byrom (Adviser for History, UK).

Role Play in History: The use of role play to understand diversity and points of view in the past.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Brief Comment</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher-in-role</strong></td>
<td>Teacher plays the part of a controversial or unpopular figure to prompt debate or answer questions from class</td>
<td>Roman general who defeated Boudicca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Groups-in-role</strong></td>
<td>Groups research and prepare actions / activities / attitudes of groups. Teacher/student then processes through asking questions.</td>
<td>Factory inspector (teacher) inspects aspects of factory life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Student-in-role** | a) Hot seat one member of a group that has been researching a character and or portrait  
                  | b) Individuals prepare role for homework | An evacuee  
                  |                                | Tutenkhamen |
| **Improvisations**   | a) Tableau pictures in groups then respond to teacher (… Keep each one short! 30 seconds)  
                  | b) Groups investigate two different pictures then “visit” each others’ situations  
                  | c) Groups investigate a character and teacher selects pupil from one group (then another etc) to improvise reactions to given situations. | Railway station  
                  |                                    | Country / City scenes  
                  |                                | Duke of Medina Sidonia (Spanish Armada commander) |
| **Trios** | In threes, one is undecided on an issue. Others prepare case for/against. | Should a Roman join the army? |
| **Mimes / Masques** | Groups present mimes of scenes representing a significant issue / activity. Others work out the event/issue characterised. | Eg scenes of London life before the Great Fire |
| **Issues** | Groups prepare short plays that highlight an unresolved issue/decision. Audience must decide what should happen next. | Should we erect a statue to Drake? |
| **Statues / Portraits** | Groups set up a pupil with correct posture, props etc for a statue or portrait bringing out the person’s achievements and character. | Florence Nightingale |
| **Conscience Alley** | Pupil walks between two lines of other pupils who try to persuade him / her to take their advice. | Alfred the Great – fight the Vikings? |
| **Thoughts in the head** | One pupil speaks publicly, supported by another who speaks aloud the thoughts in their head. | Cortes and Aztec leader Montezuma |

**Working with pictures in the classroom: an alternative approach to understanding historical events**

Teachers need to choose an activity or technique for working with a picture according to the nature of the image and the learning intention they have in mind. The list below suggests over thirty different ways of working with pictures in history lessons and readers will be able to add many more. The teacher might blend several of these, positioning them carefully in the sequence of learning activities to engage interest, to focus attention on detail or to see the
significance of image in the wider context. Over the years, pupils will learn that images (including photographs) are almost always carefully composed and constructed to convey a particular view which will influence our own interpretation of the event. They will learn how to read the picture and how to infer the intentions of the person or persons who created it. Their sense that the past is complex is deepened as is their confidence in looking beyond first impressions of any event.

Activities and questions when working with pictures

- I’m going to let you take a very very quick “subliminal” first look at this picture – what will you see? What impression will it make? Why? How?
- Describe what you see as if to a blind visitor
- Which of these descriptions of this picture is best?
- Step into the picture and walk through it.
- Choose a character and talk to him / her
- You look for this and you look for that
- Draw a big copy of something in the picture that tells us that … (X, Y Z)
- If you can see something that needs a closer look, I’ll let you use this magnifying glass.
- Can you follow the “story” suggested by the picture?
- Who can find…?
- Draw your/your friend’s “face” and place it over someone’s face in the picture. Why there?
- You are (person X) in the picture: What can you see? smell? hear? feel? taste?
- Would you trust this person?
- Does anything about the picture surprise you? ... Why do you think it was shown like that?
- What do they have which we lack? (and vice versa)
- Make a list of… (then sort by highlighting or under headings)
- Why was the scene composed in that way?
- What was the artist trying to say to us?
- Why does the artist show the world so differently?
• What does the “message” tell us about that time?
• If this was the only source we had from that time/place what would we be able to learn?
• What would be a good title for this picture?
• Which of these words best sums up the picture? Why? (“Frame” with suitable words)
• Stand inside this cardboard frame and adopt a pose / hold props to suggest a message
• List ten objects you could include in a portrait of this person to suggest a message
• Write me a ‘Picture profile’: research into life beyond the picture eg about the home life of a worker
• What do you think is happening just outside the frame? (Or in the room?)
• What do you think happened just before/after the incident in the picture?
• Which of these three paintings might a historian save from a fire and why.
• Role play/write the conversation when the sitter told the artist what she or he wanted.
• Use these post-it notes to plan a ‘hyperlinked’ ICT version of this picture on a website.
  Show me which parts of the picture would trigger a link to a text commentary and what the commentary would say.

**Interpretations of History: Useful activities**

• Help a hopeless historian
  – **Invent a historian who does not understand how to use sources and reaches foolish conclusions.** By advising him or her on how to use sources properly, pupils will learn how serious historical interpretations should be built on careful use of sources.

• Advise a television presenter
  – **This is very like the Hopeless historian idea, but works well at historical sites such as a castle or palace. Imagine that a television programme is being made about the site but the presenter is hopeless. The pupils must help the presenter to understand the site and how to get its importance across on television.**

• Edit and improve an internet encyclopaedia
  – **Rather like the two ideas above, give pupils a very weak historical summary as if from a poor online encyclopaedia. Get them to improve it by checking facts and deciding on opinions. This is very important as more and more children will get their “interpretations” from web sites like these.**
Take on the role of a historian with a particular view

- Invent two historians eg one who takes a very gloomy view of the past called Dr Doubtful and another who is very optimistic about the past, called Professor Positive. Divide the class in two so that half look for evidence that Dr Doubtful would use to support his view of a period while the other half looks for evidence that Professor Positive would want to emphasise.

Construct a museum exhibition

- Pupils must select from a range of artefacts the ten objects that they would include in a museum gallery. Which objects? Why? What should labels on the wall say about the objects? What should the exhibition be called? It works well if you use the Positive/Doubtful idea so that half the class must present the period in one way and half must give an opposite view. Use the experience to show them that museums are not “neutral”.

Offer advice on someone’s personal history

- This can work very well if the teacher can give pupils an account of something from his or her own ancestors’ history about which the teacher may be troubled. (In my own case, some ancestors made money from running factories at a time when workers were poorly paid and badly treated) Ask pupils whether the people today should feel guilty about things that were done by their ancestors. If carefully handled, this can help children understand that history seeks to understand and explain but not to apportion blame.

Developing pupils’ understanding of interpretations of history: A range of activities for teachers

Work on “Interpretations of history” is a complicated but rewarding area of activity. The ideas summarised below set out the sort of advice that has been used with success with history teachers in England.

a) Show two stories / non fiction books / films / websites about the past and ask pupils to spot differences (and to suggest reasons why they may differ)
b) Do a text marking exercise of a page in a text book to spot “facts” and “opinions” – the opinions are “interpretations” of the past. Get pupils to write paragraphs for others to text mark in the same way.

c) Take pupils to a museum or site that interprets a period they have been studying and ask them to decide whether it is a good place to learn about those times? (Or invite an actor to re-enact aspects of the period they have been studying. Did it fit with what they knew? Was it a good way to learn?)

d) Interview a person who is in some way an “expert” on something the children have been studying. Pupils must explain what they think they know about the event and ask the person whether his/her own version would agree.

e) Take an extract from an historical feature film or book and challenge pupils to check how true to the evidence the film maker / author has been in reconstructing the past.

f) Give two or more groups of pupils different and contrasting sources about a topic. Get groups to present their “interpretation” and all must explain why they differ.

g) Give pupils the same set of sources about a period. Invent two fictitious historians. One is an optimist who looks on the positive side and the other is a pessimist. Get pupils in groups in role as one of the historians. They must consider the evidence and to write (or talk) about how good / bad life was at the time. (You could have a third “balanced” group too).

h) After studying an event, provide pupils with three different “conclusions” and get them to choose which one best sums up what they have learned.

i) Give pupils about ten pictures of (e.g. Saxon) artefacts to go into a museum display about something they have studied (or are about to study). Get them to organise the display with captions and a gallery title … and later tell them that their gallery must be cut to half the size. Which will they keep and why? They must justify their interpretation.

j) Give them a (made up) magazine account of an event or person. Give them new evidence has come to light since the article was written and get them to amend the account. Get them
to write to the editor to persuade him / her that the article must be changed and explaining why it is necessary.

k) Invite pupils to design ways of “selling” a local history site eg through guide books and souvenirs that balance what life was like at the time on the site with commercial appeal.

Written Text: Imaginative ideas to draw students more deeply into the past and its complexities

“From text to picture”

See the instructions below to learn how to give pupils a reason for reading carefully and communicating clearly the main messages of a text in speech, writing and drawing.

Text to picture game

This works best when a source is describing a person or a place or an event

Put pupils in a group of 3 or 4

Give each group a large sheet of paper and pen(s)

1. Tell them –
   • You have some text and they must do a rough drawing that represents what the text says.
   • On the paper sheet they must first draw four boxes in the four corners. Tell them that they will need to decide four key words to describe the person or place or event and then write these words in the four boxes.
   • Their drawing can include labels and speech thought/bubbles
2. Invite just ONE person from each group to look at the text for just long enough to read most of it. That person goes back to the group and they discuss what they should draw. They can begin drawing if they wish.

3. Repeat the above another two times (ie three different people have come up to look and to report back).

4. Groups compare drawings and explain

5. Discuss key features especially the four key words they chose. Do they agree that these are the most important aspects of the source?

“Working with sources - Seeing beyond the surface”

This has become a fairly well-established technique in English schools for helping young people to see different ways in which historians use a document (or image). Pupils have to place a text in the centre of a large sheet of paper surrounded by boxes or circles spreading outwards. They read the text and work out what they think it tells them very clearly and directly (even if they may doubt its validity) and write these things in the first circle. In the next circle they write down what they can infer from the text (i.e. things that it suggests but does not directly say). In the outer circle they record any follow-up questions that the source has made them consider. In this way the exercise “keeps history complicated” and pupils realise that a single text can be read in different ways by different people and that this may help to explain why historians and communities may disagree about the past. (Note that a more physically active version of the exercise, called “Race to the wall”, is suggested at the end of this section)
Working with sources – Seeing beyond the surface

A chart like this can be used to help students learn how to work with sources and to see how different people can draw different conclusions.
“Race to the wall!”

Dale Banham has used this idea in a more active way. He places the source on a table in the centre of the room. He then puts two more tables between that one and the wall. Students must put their idea on Post-It notes on each table and on the wall. Who can reach the wall quickest and/or most often?

“Miming for meaning”

Another powerful way of helping young people to engage with long texts is to turn its contents into a mimed story. Obviously this only works with narrative texts, but if the teacher becomes the narrator and gets pupils to take parts and mime actions as he or she reads through a long text, it gives pupils a good sense of what the text is about before they read it for themselves. After acting out the text, pupils will be much more confident if they are asked to identify which friends did what at certain parts of the story before going into deeper thinking about e.g. the turning points in the story or the two most important people, or the three things in the story that they would want to explore in more detail if they were historians etc. Once again, the point is to help them understand complexities in history and how historians work.
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19 MARCH 2010, Friday  
**Venue: Ledra Palace Hotel, Bi-Communal Room**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.00-16.30</td>
<td>Registration of participants at Ledra Palace Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.30 –</td>
<td>Opening speeches:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.45 –</td>
<td><strong>Mr. Murat Kanath</strong>, President of POST Research Institute (POST RI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dr. Chara Makriyianni</strong>, President of the Association of Historical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dialogue and Research (AHDR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.45-17.00</td>
<td>Presentation by <strong>Dr. Dilek Latif</strong>, Researcher of POST RI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00 –</td>
<td>Presentation by <strong>Dr. Zvi BEKERMAN</strong>, Israel, on The Bilingual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30 –</td>
<td>Binational Integrated Palestine Jewish Schools in Israel: An</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>experiment which has not yet failed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:30 – 18:00</td>
<td>Presentation by <strong>Mr. Jamie BYROM</strong>, UK, on History &amp; Histories –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>must the past divide us?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00 –</td>
<td>Tea/Coffee break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.30 –</td>
<td>Presentation by <strong>Peter RUTKOFF</strong>, US, on America and the 'Best</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.00 –</td>
<td>War Ever’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.00 – 19.30</td>
<td>Presentation by <strong>Dr. Jonathan STUBBS</strong>, UK, on History Goes to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Movies: Historical Films in the Classroom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 MARCH 2010, Saturday  
**Venue: Ledra Palace Hotel - bi-communal room & CCMC Conference Room**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Group colour</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09.30 – 10.00</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Registration of participants at Ledra Palace Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00 – 11.30</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Three parallel workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Workshop on:</strong> Clarifying values in conflict ridden societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td><strong>Facilitated by:</strong> Dr. Zvi Bekerman, Israel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Workshop on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30 – 12.00</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Thinking History – Practical approaches to teaching sensitive issues in the history classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00 – 13.30</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Learning from the American experience of textbooks and history teaching: Thomas Jefferson, Founding Father, Slaveholder, and....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30 – 12.00</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Clarifying values in conflict ridden societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00 – 13.30</td>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>Thinking History – Practical approaches to teaching sensitive issues in the history classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30 – 12.00</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Learning from the American experience of textbooks and history teaching: Thomas Jefferson, Founding Father, Slaveholder, and....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30 – 14.30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 14:30 – 16.00 | **Yellow** Three parallel workshops  
**Workshop on:** Clarifying values in conflict ridden societies  
**Facilitated by:** Dr. Zvi Bekerman, Israel  
**Venue:** Cyprus Community Media Centre, Ledra Palace  
**Rapporteurs:** Dilek Latif, Annita Kyriakou |
| 16.00 – 16.30 | Tea/Coffee Break                                                                                 |
| 16.30 – 17.00 | Closing Remarks                                                                                  |
| 17.00 – 17.30 | Evaluation questionnaires and Certificate Ceremony                                                |
FORUM ON HISTORY TEACHING IN CYPRUS

15 July 2010

15.00 - Opening of Forum

15.05 – 17.15: Presentations:

- **Odysseas Christou** - "Pedagogical Reform and the Potential for Reconciliation" followed by question and answer session.

- **Hakan Karahasan** - "History textbooks: A Tool for Polarisation or Reconciliation?" followed by question and answer session.

- **Gregoris Ioannou** - "History Teaching in the Greek Cypriot Community of Cyprus" followed by question and answer session.

17.15: Coffee Break

17.30 – 19.00: Round table discussion on:

- History textbooks
- Teaching methods
- Alternative materials
- Ideas for the future

19.00: End of Forum

19:30: Book Launch Cocktail

*We thank you for your participation!*

This document has been produced with the financial assistance of the European Union. The contents of this document are the sole responsibility of POST RI and can under no circumstances be regarded as reflecting the position of the European Union.

This project is funded by the European Union. This project is implemented by POST Research Institute.
3. The Biographies of the Speakers

**Zvi BEKERMAN** teaches anthropology of education at the School of Education and The Melton Center, Hebrew University of Jerusalem. He is also a Research Fellow at the Truman Institute for the Advancement of Peace, Hebrew University.

His main interests are in the study of cultural, ethnic and national identity, including identity processes and negotiation during intercultural encounters and in formal/informal learning contexts. Since 1999, he has been conducting, with the support of the Ford, Spencer and Bernard Van Leer Foundations, a long-term ethnographic research project in the integrated/bilingual Palestinian-Jewish schools in Israel. He has also recently become involved in the study of identity construction and development in educational computer-mediated environments.


**Jamie BYROM** is an adviser for history in schools and a textbook author. He taught history in English schools for twenty years before becoming an adviser for history teaching in 1998. This role involves him in working across the full age range from 4-19, helping teachers to make history interesting, fun and rewarding. He does this by leading training courses, contributing to conferences, working alongside teachers in schools, observing them, offering feedback and planning new work and resources.
Jamie has also written many history textbooks for use in English secondary schools. These include titles jointly written with his close friends and colleagues Michael Riley and Christine Counsell, whose approach to enquiry-based learning he shares. These books and Jamie’s training sessions are based on the idea that children learn history best when there is a problem or puzzle at the heart of the learning and when they are challenged and supported, not just to know what happened, but to select and use a range of historical evidence to show their understanding of a wide range of big historical ideas.

Jamie’s work is based in Devon in the south west of England, but he has travelled to take part in history conferences, carry out research and lead training in places as far away as Russia, Egypt, France, Italy, Turkey, and Cyprus.

Gregoris IOANNOU has studied International History at undergraduate level and Political Sociology at postgraduate level at LSE. He has worked as a researcher at the Cyprus Research Centre on an Oral History project and he is currently a lecturer at Frederick Institute of Technology. Since 2006, he is a PhD candidate at the Sociology Department of the University of Warwick. The topic of his doctoral thesis, which will be submitted in the spring of 2011, is labour relations in Cyprus. He is a member of the Teachers’ Platform "United Cyprus".

Hakan KARAHASAN graduated from the Radio-TV, and Film department of the Eastern Mediterranean University (EMU) in 2000. He then undertook his MA in English Studies at the Department of English Literature and Humanities at EMU. Since 2003, he has been studying at the Faculty of Communication and Media Studies at EMU as a PhD candidate. Along his studies, he has been involved in several projects regarding history education in Cyprus with POST-Research Institute (POST RI) and some of his papers have been published in several academic journals in Cyprus. Hakan is one of the founding members and researchers of POST RI.

Dilek LATIF is senior lecturer in International Relations department at Near East University in Nicosia. In August 2005, she obtained a Ph.D from Middle East Technical University in Ankara on Peace building in Ethnically Divided Societies, with a focus on Bosnia and Herzegovina. She was Fulbright Visiting Scholar in California State University-
Dominguez Hills in the fall of 2007 and was a researcher on “Peace Education: New Approaches to the Teaching of a Contested History”. Her particular scholarly interest lies in the area of peace studies, focusing on strategies toward establishing peace and reconciliation in divided societies. She has been involved in several projects regarding history education in Cyprus with POST-Research Institute (POST RI).

**Peter RUTKOFF** is chair of the American Studies Program at Kenyon College in Ohio. He has taught there since 1971 and founded the American Studies program in 1990. His fields include African American studies, with emphasis on blues, jazz, and rhythm and blues, alongside American Studies.

As a scholar, he has written several books, including "Fly Away: The Great American Cultural Migration" with Will Scott (Johns Hopkins University Press, spring 2010). He has also authored several works of fiction, a novel titled "Shadow Ball: A Novel of Baseball and Chicago" and a volume of short stories, "Cooperstown Chronicles: Love and Other Camp Stories". Rutkoff has received several awards for teaching excellence and been a Fulbright scholar to Paris and, more recently, to Cyprus (2005).

**Jonathan STUBBS** has taught at universities in Britain and Canada and is currently Assistant Professor in the Faculty of Communication at Cyprus International University. His research focuses on the representation of history in American and British cinema, the cultural and economic relationships between the British and American film industries, and the depiction of imperialism in cinema. His research has appeared in various journals including The Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television and The Journal of British Cinema and Television, and he is currently preparing a book examining the relationship between historical cinema and genre.