



(ISSN: 2587-0238)

Safran, M. & Dönmez, A. (2022). A Comparison of The Results of World War I in The History Textbooks Taught in Turkey, Azerbaijan, Russia and Greece, *International Journal of Education Technology and Scientific Researches*, 7(19), 1875-1890.

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.35826/ijetsar.502>

Article Type (Makale Türü): Research Article

A COMPARISON OF THE RESULTS OF WORLD WAR I IN THE HISTORY TEXTBOOKS TAUGHT IN TURKEY, AZERBAIJAN, RUSSIA AND GREECE*

Ayşegül DÖNMEZ

Ins., Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey, adonmez@gazi.edu.tr

ORCID: 0000-0002-5074-6295

Mustafa SAFRAN

Prof. Dr., Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey, safran@gazi.edu.tr

ORCID: 0000-0003-4153-8918

Received: 25.05.2022

Accepted: 05.08.2022

Published: 01.09.2022

ABSTRACT

History has a special importance for countries that have close relations for political, military, economic and other reasons. In this study, the results of the World War I, in which the conflicts of interest of the countries that have an important place in the shaping of world history and are examined in the context of this study, were discussed comparatively. It is aimed to comparatively examine the results of the World War I covered in the high school history books of Turkey, Azerbaijan, Russia and Greece. Document review, which is one of the qualitative research methods, was used in the study. In this context, textbooks dealing with the consequences of World War I were examined in high school level history courses of 4 countries (Turkey, Azerbaijan, Russia and Greece). For this reason, history textbooks in Russia (10th grade), Greece and Azerbaijan (11th grade) and Revolution History and Kemalism textbook in Turkey (12th grade) were examined. As a result of the research, it is seen that the textbooks taught in countries other than Russia include the post-World War I peace agreements, Wilson's principles and the Paris Peace Conference. In addition, while agreements are included in textbooks by name and chronology in some countries, in others they are not included.

Keywords: Comparative history, history textbooks, World War I.

* Bu makale, birinci yazarın ikinci yazar danışmanlığında yürüttüğü doktora tezinden üretilmiştir.

INTRODUCTION

History remains to be an important way of understanding how individuals and society have changed over time, offering a kind of perspective not found in any other discipline or body of knowledge. This view and perspective continues from ancient times to the present day (Reese, 2010). "Knowing history" and "making history" represent the two main approaches to teaching history. With regard to the teaching of history, public opinion mostly focuses on "knowing history" or acquiring basic knowledge of history. According to this understanding, students need to know the facts that are considered important. Pedagogical experts, on the other hand, assert that these two approaches should be combined. Researchers argue that systematically combining knowing and making history in history lessons can help students develop a deep understanding of history (Havekes, Arno-Coppen & Luttenberg, 2012). Historians also believe that the study of history sensitizes the individual to the universality of human experience and the features that distinguish cultures and societies. From this point of view, students are more likely to show tolerance and appreciation for others. In addition, they become more equipped to live together with people who think differently in a multicultural society (Joseph, 2011). History courses are taught in different countries of the world within a certain program at different grade levels, and the aim of the states to raise citizens in accordance with their own ideology still continues. In other words, the history course taught in schools is based on ideological citizenship (Rautiainen, Räikkönen, Veijola & Mikkonen, 2019). Historical education, which is generally controlled by the state, is used as a basic tool in the development and strengthening of national identity. Many social and political scientists emphasize the power of history in creating identity by accepting the links between mass education and identity formation (Sakki & Pirttilä-Backman, 2019). However, what should not be overlooked at this stage is that the goals of teaching history can vary according to time, country, society and even government policies (Keleşzade, Güneyli & Özkul, 2018),

There are also some differences between countries in teaching history. For instance, some countries have only a few topics related to national history in their education systems, while in some other countries, the history of different civilizations and some international events are included in the history curriculum. Undoubtedly, such issues show that different societies give importance to historical events-facts in their curriculum and that these societies attach importance to their historical knowledge and to the educational use of these historical events. The perception of history in each country can be affected by the common perception of history in its culture and these effects can be revealed especially in history teaching (Carretero, Jacott & López-Manjón, 2002). History teaching, or history learning in accordance with a more constructivist approach, is a type of learning and teaching within pedagogical foundations based on curriculum-related knowledge and skills in schools under the guidance of history teachers (Keleşzade, Güneyli & Özkul, 2018).

Today, instead of focusing on obtaining fact-based information about important people, events and dates, new ideas such as improving students' historical awareness and revealing the importance of multiple perspectives of education have been put forward by developing students' historical thinking and analysis skills (Van Drie, Braaksma & Van Boxtel, 2015). In this way, it is aimed to raise awareness of students in order to participate in

active democratic citizenship and to develop their critical thinking skills about historical events or people (Sakki & Pirttilä-Backman, 2019).

Considering the curriculum as a whole across countries, it is striking as there has been a continuous trend towards similar curriculum contents in recent years. If a comparison is made about mathematics or natural sciences, it can be easily seen that there are huge similarities between different countries. However, when it comes to teaching history, there are some differences between countries. For instance, some countries have only a few topics related to national history in their education systems, while in some other countries, the history of different civilizations and some international events are included in the history curriculum. Undoubtedly, such issues show that different societies give importance to historical events-facts in their curriculum and that these societies attach importance to their historical knowledge and to the educational use of these historical events. The perception of history in each country can be affected by the common perception of history in its culture and these effects can be revealed especially in history teaching (Carretero, Jacott & López-Manjón, 2002).

There are different features that distinguish history textbooks taught in one country from those taught in other countries. However, there is an important feature among them that appears as a distinctive situation in the textbooks of every country. It is possible to express that feature briefly as "nationalist perspective". This situation has a special importance for countries that are in close relationship with each other on the stage of history for political, military, economic and other reasons. At this stage, understanding how other countries' history education takes place will make it easier to understand our own history education. In other words, a comparison in history education will enable us to see the shortcomings of our own education system. Although it is known that almost no historical study can make progress without making comparisons (Haupt, 2007), comparative history studies are often found to be marginal and this field is hardly touched despite the fact that it covers many fields, (Cohen, 2004). The reason is that comparative history studies are more demanding than other history studies. Thus, in the comparison to be made, clarity, a methodological approach, the logic of comparison, the correlations woven between the objectives and the comparison units must be taken into consideration (Haupt, 2007). Within comparative history research, especially global history and world history studies come to the forefront.

National unity and solidarity is often one of the top priorities of states, and education is seen as a key element in this process. By educating young people in national language, history and culture, the political elites of these states hope to strengthen national unity and patriotism and reduce internal divisions of an ethno-social nature. Such initiatives have often been seen in western and eastern states, both now and in the past, due to nation-building policies. The main point on which these policies are based is the focus on history education and history textbooks (Janmaat, 2007).

Textbooks, which are the most frequently consulted primary resources by teachers and students almost everywhere in the world (Şahingöz & Bilalli, 2018), are also approved by educational historians who have been working on the educational process since ancient times (Alves, Moura & Carlos, 2013). In this context, textbooks

are considered as an important way to convey to students the knowledge and values determined and established by the state and society. In other words, textbooks have an important legitimacy in transferring all the cultural values created by societies to future generations. As stated by Şimşek and Cou (2019), one of the most important tasks in the construction of national identity falls on history lessons. In this process, it is a known fact that textbooks are used as the main source in history lessons (Şimşek, 2008). History textbooks include the events that a nation accepts as truth, the norms, basic values and ideologies that make that nation a nation (Commeyras & Alvermann, 1994; Van Nieuwenhuysse, 2019). As a result of this situation, history lessons and textbooks taught in schools, especially in the period leading up to university, are embellished with the official ideology of the state (Taylor & Macintyre, 2017). Another feature that should not be overlooked in this process is that history textbooks are fond of national pride (Van Nieuwenhuysse, 2019). However, sometimes this situation leads to certain problems, and ideological policies and the basic reasons listed above can sometimes get in the way of the information (Commeyras & Alvermann, 1994; Paxton, 1999).

We think that a brief mention of the 19th and 20th centuries, when the main backbone of history textbooks was formed, would better serve the purpose of understanding the subject. The emergence of nation states in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries was crucial both in shaping political history and in terms of the professionalization of history and its becoming a scientific discipline (Grever & Van der Vlies, 2017; Fuchs, 2014; Lerch, Russell, & Ramirez, 2017; Taylor & Macintyre, 2017).

Almost every society has had to reinterpret and rearrange the dominant historical narratives, images and symbols that its citizens remember and children learn. In a rapidly globalizing world, the process of creating and reviewing collective memories extends beyond national borders and often leads to contention between countries (Hamada, 2003). One of the areas of contention is history textbooks. In fact, history textbooks are also an important factor in societies having a negative perspective towards each other (Deveci Bozkuş, 2014). That's because targeting and a national narrative of victimization in history textbooks is a factor that can contribute to negative thinking about others. One of the most important examples of this is the Balkans and Eastern Europe. The tendency among nations in the Balkans and Eastern Europe to see themselves as victims of centuries of foreign oppression is quite intense, and this is reflected in history textbooks. This perception is intensely found in history textbooks in Serbia, Greece, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Poland and Ukraine (Janmaat, 2007). Similarly, Ottoman and Turkish perceptions are presented as negative features in Armenian textbooks (Deveci Bozkuş, 2014).

At this point, the comparison of history textbooks is seen as an important field of study (Toivanen, 2015). With this study, it is aimed to comparatively examine the ways in which the results of the World War I, which has an important place in the shaping of world history and in which the countries examined within the context of this study had conflicts of interest, are handled in high school history textbooks of Turkey, Azerbaijan, Russia and Greece.

METHOD

In this study, document analysis, one of the qualitative research methods, was used as a method. Yıldırım and Şimşek (2013) expressed this method as the process of examining written materials containing various bits of information about the phenomenon and/or phenomena intended to be investigated.

Data Collection Tools

Within the scope of this study, the textbooks dealing with the consequences of the World War I in the high school level history courses of 4 countries (Turkey, Azerbaijan, Russia and Greece) were examined. For this reason, history textbooks in Russia (10th grade), Greece and Azerbaijan (11th grade) and Revolution History and Kemalism textbook in Turkey (12th grade) were examined.

Data Collection Process

The internet addresses and access dates of the textbooks examined within the scope of this study are as follows.

- Textbook titled "Secondary Education Turkish Republic Revolution History and Kemalism 12" taught in Turkey: It was obtained online from <https://www.eba.gov.tr/> on 20.02.2020.
- Textbook named "General History-11" taught in Azerbaijan: Obtained online from https://www.e-derslik.edu.az/player/index3.php?book_id=274#books/274/units/unit-1/page2.xhtml on 20.03.2020.
- "History of Russia" textbook taught in Russia: Obtained online from <https://s.11klasov.net/6502-istorija-rossii-10-klass-v-3-chastjah-gorinov-mm-danilov-aa-i-dr.html> on 25.02.2020.
- Textbook titled "History of the Modern and Contemporary World (from 1815 to the present)" taught in Greece: Obtained online from http://ebooks.edu.gr/ebooks/v/pdf/8547/5306/22-0081-02_Istoria-tou-Neoterou-kai-Sygchronou-Kosmou_G-Lykeiou_Vivlio-Mathiti/ on 08.03.2020.

Subsequently, whether the textbooks were currently taught in these countries was confirmed by contacting people living in those countries, and the textbooks were translated into Turkish by language experts who knew the languages of the countries. After the translation processes, certain pages were randomly checked by other people who know the relevant language and it was tried to prevent mistakes during the translation phase.

FINDINGS

In this research, Turkey, Azerbaijan, Russia and Greece were examined in terms of the results of the World War I in history textbooks.

Findings Obtained from the Textbook Taught in Turkey

The conclusion of the World War I in the textbook "Turkish Republic Revolution History and Kemalism" taught in Turkey started with the Bolshevik revolution in Russia in 1917, and ended with the USA's entry into the war and the withdrawal of the Central Powers from the war.

"One of the most important developments in 1917 was the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia. With the increase of economic troubles along with social and political problems in Russia, the Bolsheviks

took power by making a coup d'état (November 7, 1917). The Bolshevik administration which came to power withdrew from the war by signing the Brest Litovsk Treaty with the Central Powers on March 3, 1918. The Bolshevik administration made public all the secret treaties of the Tsarist government. Thus, secret treaties in which the Ottoman Empire was shared were also revealed. The Allies closed the gap with the USA created by the withdrawal of Russia. At the beginning of the war, the neutral USA was selling arms and ammunition to the Allies. After American merchant ships (p.41) were sunk by German submarines, the USA declared war on Germany (April 2, 1917). When the United States joined the war, they sent forces to Europe to help their allies. Thus, the war was soon concluded in favor of the Allies. By participating in World War I, the USA also left the Monroe Doctrine for the first time (Çevik, Koç & Şerbetçi, 2019, p.42).

In June 1917, Greece's participation in the war alongside the Allies increased the pressure on the Central Powers. Bulgaria was defeated as a result of a joint attack by British, French and Serbian forces. Bulgaria withdrew from the war with the Thessaloniki Ceasefire Agreement (September 29, 1918). With Bulgaria's withdrawal from the war, Britain and France prepared to take action on Istanbul and the Straits. The Ottoman State demanded a ceasefire in the face of this danger and signed the Armistice of Moudros with the Allies (October 30, 1918). The Austro-Hungarian Empire signed the Armistice of Villa Giusti and withdrew from the war (November 3, 1918), with increasing internal turmoil. Germany also withdrew from the war by signing the Rethondes Armistice Agreement (November 11, 1918) in the face of the heavy attack of the Allies on the Western Front. Thus, the World War I, which lasted for four years, came to an end (Çevik, Koç & Şerbetçi, 2019, p.42)."

When the developments after the end of the war are examined, it is seen that the effects of the war, the National Struggle Process, Wilson's Principles, Paris Peace Conference, secret agreements involving the sharing of the Ottoman Empire and peace treaties signed by other states are included in the textbook.

"Britain was the most profitable state from the war. Germany, Austria-Hungary, Russia and the Ottoman Empires dissolved at the end of the war. New national and independent states such as the Turkish Republic, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Hungary were established in these lands. The understanding of colonialism left its place to the understanding of mandate and patronage. New political regimes such as Socialism in Russia, Nazism in Germany, and Fascism in Italy emerged. In World War I, chemical weapons and war vehicles such as submarines and tanks were used for the first time. Millions of people lost their lives. In order to protect world peace, the League of Nations was established. The conditions of the peace treaties signed with the defeated states at the end of World War I were very severe (Map 1.7). These harsh conditions were one of the most important reasons for the outbreak of World War II. (Çevik, Koç & Şerbetçi, 2019, p.42).

Treaty of Istanbul (March 18 - April 10, 1915): It was signed between England, France and Russia. The Straits, Thrace up to the Midye-Enez line, the Gallipoli Peninsula, the Kocaeli Peninsula up to the Sakarya River, and Imbros and Bozcaada were to be left to Russia after the war. Treaty of London (April 26, 1915): The Triple Entente Powers signed this treaty with Italy in order to attract Italy to their side. According to this agreement, Antalya, Rhodes and 12 Islands would be left to Italy. The Sykes-Picot Treaty (April 26, 1916): With this treaty, places close to the Caucasus border, namely Van and Erzurum provinces and the eastern parts of Trabzon and Bitlis provinces; Sivas, Harput (Elazığ) and some of Diyarbakır provinces would be left to Russia. Adana and Beirut provinces, most of Aleppo, Harput and Diyarbakır provinces, a part of Damascus and Sivas provinces and the entire Jebel-i Lebanon district would be left to France. Southern Iraq, including Baghdad and Basra provinces, would be left to Britain. At the request of Russia, the Eastern Black Sea coasts and Eastern Anatolia up to Trabzon would be left to Russia. Treaty of St. Jean De Maurienne (April 17, 1917): According to this agreement made between England, France and Italy, Antalya, Menteşe District and a part of Konya province, as well as İzmir and its north would be left to Italy (Çevik, Koç & Şerbetçi, 2019, p.43).

The delegation appointed by the Istanbul Government under the chairmanship of Navy Minister Rauf Bey went to the Port of Moudros on Lemnos Island. On October 27, 1918, negotiations for a ceasefire began between Admiral Calthorope, representing the Allied States, and the British on the armoured warship *Agememnon*. As a result of the negotiations, the Moudros Armistice Agreement, which was held in 25 articles, was signed (October 30, 1918).

Some articles of the Moudros Ceasefire Agreement are as follows:

1. The Straits will be opened to the Allies, access to the Black Sea will be free, and the fortifications in the Black Sea and Çanakkale will be occupied by the Allies.
2. Ottoman armies will be demobilized; the vehicles, equipment, weapons and ammunition of the army will be seized by the Allied Powers.
3. All prisoners of war held by the Ottoman Empire and all Armenians held captive or imprisoned will be released, but Turkish prisoners of war held by the Allies will not be returned.
4. Allies will have the right to occupy any strategic point in the face of a situation threatening their security (Article 7).
5. If there is any confusion in the six eastern provinces (Erzurum, Van, Bitlis, Sivas, Harput, Diyarbakır) called Province-i Sitte, the Allies will have the right to occupy them (Article 24).
6. The Taurus Tunnels will be occupied by the Allies.
7. All ports and shipyards will be under the control of the Allies.
8. Radio, telegraph and cables (communication lines) other than government communication will be under the control of the Allies.
9. Ottoman forces in Iran and the Caucasus will withdraw to the borders before the World War I.
10. After meeting the needs of the country in coal, fuel and similar resources, the Allies will be provided with ease of purchase.
11. Ottoman forces and officers in Syria, Iraq, Hejaz, Yemen, Asir, Tripoli and Benghazi will surrender to the closest Allied Command.

By having the Ottoman Empire sign the Armistice of Moudros, the Allies obtained the legal basis for occupying the Ottoman lands, which they shared with secret treaties. When the articles were examined, the Ottoman Empire was open to all kinds of invasions. In order to prevent the Ottoman Empire from resisting the invasions, all measures were taken and the Ottoman Empire was made vulnerable. In particular, Articles 7 and 24 of the Moudros Ceasefire Agreement paved the way for the Allies to occupy the places they wanted in the Ottoman lands (Çevik, Koç & Şerbetçi, 2019, p.45).

Immediately after the signing of the Moudros Armistice Agreement, England entered Mosul and occupied the Ottoman lands for the first time despite the ceasefire (November 3, 1918). The occupation of Mosul was followed by the occupation of Iskenderun. With the British occupation, France also occupied Adana and its surroundings. Greece and Italy also began occupation

movements to capture the places promised to them. On November 13, 1918, the Allied Navy came to Istanbul and anchored in front of Dolmabahçe Palace. Thus, the capital of the Ottoman Empire was actually occupied (Çevik, Koç & Şerbetçi, 2019, p. 46).

In 1917, the president of the USA, Woodrow Wilson, who joined the war alongside the Allies, announced a 14-item declaration claiming that he was observing the interests of both side (Çevik, Koç & Şerbetçi, 2019, p. 47).

On January 18, 1919, the Paris Peace Conference was convened. The purpose of the conference was to discuss the principles of peace with states that lost the war. Thirty-two states attended the conference. The USA, Britain, France, Japan and Italy were the states that were influential in the conference. The main purpose of US President Wilson, who attended the conference personally, was to ensure the establishment of the League of Nations. After the decision to establish the Organization of the League of Nations was taken at the conference, US President Wilson left Paris and returned to his country. Thus, England and France survived the US pressure to realize their plans (Çevik, Koç & Şerbetçi, 2019, p. 47). "

... Agreements that ended the World War I were signed with the Central Powers other than the Ottoman Empire. With these treaties, heavy political, military and economic conditions were imposed on the Central Powers, which lost the war, by the Allies, which were the winners of the war. (Çevik, Koç & Şerbetçi, 2019, p.48)

According to the Treaty of Versailles signed with Germany:

1. Germany will give back all the lands previously taken from France and Belgium.
2. All of Germany's colonies will be shared between Britain, France and Japan.
3. In Germany, compulsory military service will be abolished, and the German army will be reduced to 100,000 people. The navy will be limited. Germany will be banned from building submarines and fighter planes.
4. Germany will pay war reparations (under the name of repair debt) (Çevik, Koç & Şerbetçi, 2019, p.48)

According to the Treaty of Saint Germain signed with Austria:

1. The Austria-Hungarian Empire disintegrated. Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia became independent. Galicia will be left to Poland; Croatia to Yugoslavia, Tyrol and Trieste to Italy and Bukovina to Romania.
2. They will not unite with Germany without the permission of the League of Nations.
3. In Austria, compulsory military service will be abolished and the Austrian army will be limited to 30,000 people.
4. Austria will pay war reparations.

According to the Treaty of Neuilly-sur-Seine signed with Bulgaria:

1. South Dobruca will be left to Romania, Gümülcine and Alexandroupolis to Greece and Tzaribrod and Srurmitsa to Yugoslavia.
2. Compulsory military service will be abolished in Bulgaria. Their army will be limited to 25,000 people, and they will be banned from forming naval and air forces.
3. Bulgaria will pay war reparations.

According to the Treaty of Trianon signed with Hungary:

1. Presburg region will be ceded to Czechoslovakia, Bosnia and Herzegovina to Yugoslavia, Transylvania to Romania and Burgenland to Austria.
2. In Hungary, compulsory military service will be abolished, the army will be limited to 35,000 people, and the formation of naval and air forces will be prohibited.
3. Hungary will pay war reparations (Çevik, Koç & Şerbetçi, 2019, p.49).

Findings Obtained from the Textbook Taught in Azerbaijan

In the "General History" textbook taught in Azerbaijan, the conclusion of the World War I started with the USA's entry into the war and Russia's withdrawal from the war, and the surrender agreements made by the Allies were briefly included.

"Germany and its allies were defeated in 1918 due to their military-technical and economic backwardness and lack of reserve military forces. As a result of the blockades, their economy weakened and their military supplies dwindled. Bulgaria surrendered in September 1918, the Ottoman Empire in October, and Austria-Hungary on November 3. On November 11, Germany signed an agreement to surrender in the Compiègne forest. Thus ended a terrible war for European history. Europe's social and economic life suffered greatly. Europe's dominance in the world economy and politics began to weaken (Agalarov et al., 2018, p.43)"

The post-war developments were discussed in a separate unit under the title of "1918-1945 World Countries". Especially in this unit, under the title of "Versailles-Washington system", "Paris Peace Conference, Wilson principles, treaties with Alliance states and Washington Conference" are included. In addition, it is seen that other developments and newly established states are also included under this heading.

"After the terms of the peace treaties were prepared, they were presented to the defeated states as ultimatums. The conference was first signed with Germany and the Versailles Peace Treaty (Agalarov et al., 2018, p.52).

The Treaty of Versailles was supplemented by treaties signed with other defeated states. In 1919, the Treaty of Saint-Germain-en-Laye was signed with Austria, the Treaty of Neuilly-sur-Seine with Bulgaria, and in 1920, the Treaty of Trianon with Hungary.

As a result of the conference, borders changed, especially in Europe and the Middle East. German, Austro-Hungarian, Ottoman and Russian empires collapsed. As a result of the disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, new states were established on its territory: Austria, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Serbia-Croatia-Slovenia kingdoms (later Yugoslavia). In addition, the independent Polish state was restored. While recognizing the right of peoples to self-determination, a new problem arose for national minorities. Thus, the issue of national minorities and nationalism remained a threat to peace after the war. One of the important outputs of the conference is the organization of interstate relations. The aim was to create the League of Nations. However, the defeated states and Soviet Russia were not accepted into this organization.

The Allies wanted to resolve the "Eastern question" decisively. The disagreement between Britain and France over the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire delayed the signing of an agreement with this state. In the Treaty of Sèvres signed with the Ottoman Empire in 1920, more severe conditions were foreseen... "(Agalarov et al., 2018, p. 53).

Results of the Paris Conference. The Paris Peace Conference was not aimed at achieving lasting peace, but at punishing the defeated states. Condemned to war, Germany was forbidden to use military force. Part of German territory lost entire colonies and was subject to extremely severe economic sanctions. They also had to pay war reparations. These and other difficult conditions of the Treaty of Versailles led to the mobilization of nationalist political groups in Germany in the 1920s.

A double standard was introduced in the application of the principle of "Article 14" on which the Treaty of Versailles and other treaties signed with the defeated states were based. While these principles were applied to some extent in Europe, they were not applied to peoples in Asia, Africa, and some American countries. The peoples of India, who fought in the British army in the war, were not granted independence. The promises made to the Arabs during the war to rebel against the Ottoman state were not fulfilled. Iraq and Egypt remained under British control on the basis of a mandate. Syria was handed over to France. Part of China and Korea remained in Japan. The policy of isolation, the non-inclusion of the United States in the League of Nations, and the exclusion of Soviet Russia also showed the weakness of the Versailles system. All these contradictions later led to new conflicts that continue to this day.

Washington Conference. Following the resolution of the problems in Europe, Africa and the Middle East, a conference was held in Washington in 1921-1922 to normalize relations in the Far East and the Pacific (Agalarov et al., 2018, p.54).

Findings Obtained from the Textbook Taught in Russia

In the textbook "History of Russia" taught in Russia, the conclusion of World War I is included under the title "The Russian Empire in the World War I" within sub-headings "4. The courage and heroism of Russian soldiers", "5. Russia's economy during the war" and "6. Power and society during the war" In addition, at the end of the chapter, a brief summary of the general assessment of World War I is included.

In the 4th subtitle, both a general evaluation of the war was made and the Russian soldiers who were heroic during the war were included. In the 5th and 6th chapters, it is seen that instead of a general assessment of World War I, a Russia-oriented evaluation is made. Content related to these subheadings in the textbook and to the outcome of the war is given below.

A general evaluation of the war was made under the title of "4. The courage and heroism of the Russian soldiers" and the stories of the Russian soldiers who performed heroic deeds during the war were included.

"Firstly, unlike previous wars, which were fought primarily by professional armies, millions of soldiers participated in the World War I. In Russia, during the war years, 15.5 million people were recruited into the active army, which made it popular. Millions of families mourned the dead, and many were injured and mutilated...

... It was P. N. Wrangel who manifested himself in a battle near the German village of Kauschen in August 1914. Lieutenant N. Nechaev lost an eye a year before the war due to a rocket explosion. This did not prevent him from returning to the active army and successfully fighting in the war. Military pilot Yu. V. Giliper shot down about ten enemy aircraft, lost a leg, but continued to fly on missions. M. L. Bochkareva saved 48 soldiers and was awarded the Order of St. George, 4th class (Gorinov et al., 2016, p.21). ... Muskovit, aged 16, was promoted to non-commissioned officer as a result of the destruction of an enemy patrol and the capture of an enemy machine gun and was awarded the Order of St. George, 4th class.

The Great War also showed examples of mass heroism. One of the most striking was the defense of the fortress of Osovets, which stood in the way of the German offensive. Its siege began in January 1915 and lasted 190 days... On August 6, 1915, the Germans attacked the fortress with chemical weapons... About 60 Russian soldiers who survived the chemical attack stood up to greet them with a bayonet attack. They all had horrific marks of exposure to poisonous gas on their hands and faces. Three German regiments fled in dismay. This attack went down in history as the "attack of the dead"... (Gorinov et al., 2016, p.22)."

Under the title of "5. Russia's economy during the war", only the effect of the war on Russia's economy is discussed rather than the effect of the war on the countries' economy in general. Under this heading, the increase in military equipment produced and the effects of the war on the Russian economy are included.

"The events of 1915 at the front showed that Russia was not ready for a long war. However, at the beginning of 1916, it was possible to reverse the situation in many respects and rebuild the economy on the basis of war... The production of coal and oil increased, and the volume of production of machine-building and chemical products increased significantly... In August 1916, rifles were produced 11 times more compared to August 1914... (Gorinov et al., 2016, p.22).

The decisive role at this turning point was played by the unification of the efforts of the state, the industrial bourgeoisie, rural and urban communities and cooperatives. In 1915, on the initiative of the big industrialists, special institutions were created to centralize and mobilize all available resources in the country for the needs of the front... A single day of the war in 1914 cost the treasury 10 million rubles, in 1915 it cost 24 million rubles, and in 1917 it cost 50-65 million rubles." (Gorinov et al., 2016, p.23).

Under the heading "6. Power and society during the war", the impact of the war on the social structure of Russia is discussed .

"The protracted war sharply worsened people's lives. The rise of the industry working for defense led to an increase in prices, due to a decline in the production of consumer goods. The blockage of railways by military traffic led to cuts in the supply of food to major cities.

... The strike movement, which had eased in the first period of the war, began to gain strength again. Quite often, political demands began to be heard along with economic demands.

There was also unrest in the villages. About 12.8 million peasants went to the front... although the production of agricultural products during the war practically did not decrease, the peasants... were not in a hurry to bring grain to the market... With the problems that were growing behind, discipline in the army gradually decreased... desertion became widespread.

... In December 1916, the monarchists killed Rasputin, but the situation did not change. The revolutionary crisis was growing in Russia. Social frustration and supply problems were on the rise in other warring countries as well. At the end of 1916, Germany invited the Allies to sit at the negotiation table" (Gorinov et al., 2016, p.24).

A general assessment was made in "Summary" section, and the reason for Russia's entry into the war, the heroism of the Russian soldiers and the authority vacuum that emerged as a result of the military defeats were discussed.

"Summary

Russia joined the World War I to limit Germany's expansion in Europe and the world and to protect its interests. Like other warring countries, it was not ready for a protracted armed struggle. The victories of the Russian army and the heroism of soldiers and officers were highly appreciated by their contemporaries. The defeats of the Russian army and the loss of authority of the ruling circles led to a new confrontation between the authorities and society (Gorinov et al., 2016, p.25)."

Findings Obtained from the Textbook Taught in Greece

In the textbook "Modern and Contemporary World History (From 1815 to the Present)" taught in Greece, the conclusion of World War I is discussed under the title "The Management and Outcome of the War". The end of the war was examined in the context of the Macedonian Front, then the surrender of the Central Forces was expressed in order, and the effects of the war on human history were included. Subsequently, the Wilson Principles were mentioned and the effects of these principles on Austria-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire were briefly discussed.

"MANAGEMENT AND OUTCOME OF THE WAR (1914–1918)

Macedonian front and the end of the war: In the autumn of 1918, first Bulgaria and a short time later, Austria, which was unsuccessful in the war it started against the Ottoman Empire and Serbia, was defeated and surrendered. Czechs, Poles, South Slavs, and Hungarians were liberated and embarked on the process of establishing a national state. It was also the end for Germany. On 11 November, a ceasefire was signed and artillery was silenced on the western front.

Results of the war: Thus, after great catastrophes, great political and social upheavals, the World War I ended. Of the 65 million men conscripted during the war, more than 10 million died on the battlefields and 20 million were wounded. Casualties among civilians were not less than those of the fallen soldiers (Koliopoulos et al., Undated, p.80).

The moral value of war is more difficult to calculate. The projection of victory as the lofty goal that justifies all means has upended the core values of Western civilization. The war weakened practices and values such as parliamentary democracy*, liberal ideals, and a free economy. Situations such as state intervention in the economy* and military intervention in politics intensified (Koliopoulos et al., Undated, p.81).

The war also led to the revision of many of the principles and dogmas that had hitherto governed international relations. U.S. President Woodrow Wilson's declaration of the right of peoples to self-determination, published in January 1918, gave the conflict an ideological content and accelerated the destabilization and disintegration of Austria-Hungary, Europe's two multinational empires. The cost of the war turned out to be much higher than the countries could have predicted in 1914... The Allies made concessions against Austria and the Ottoman Empire in order to win Italy and Greece, without provoking uprisings that benefited neither the losers nor the winners (Koliopoulos et al., Undated, p.81)."

"Paris Peace Conference (1919-1920)

In the Paris Peace Conference, the winners pledged to redraw the map of Europe and the Near East, from the Baltic to the Persian Gulf.

Treaty of Versailles: In the peace treaty signed between Germany and the victorious powers (Treaty of Versailles - June 28, 1919), the views of France prevailed. The main terms of the treaty were regional, military and economic. Germany lost Alsace and Lorraine, which were annexed by France, as well as several smaller territories annexed by Belgium and Poland. The eastern bank of the Rhine River was demilitarized at a depth of 50km and occupied by the Allies. Germany had to pay war reparations.

Peace treaties with other defeated powers were Austria (Treaty of Saint-Germain, September 10, 1919), Bulgaria (Treaty of Neuilly, November 27, 1919), the Ottoman Empire (Treaty of Sèvres, July 28 / August 10, 1920) and Hungary (Trianon, June 4, 1920), the countries that mainly claimed their own territory were Italy, Greece and Romania, and the countries considered allied countries were Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Poland... The Treaty of Neygi affirmed Greek sovereignty over the territories up to the Turkish-Bulgarian border between Evros and Nestos, but the region was temporarily placed under joint allied rule until a Greek-Turkish peace treaty was signed. With the

Treaty of Sèvres (28 July/10 August), Western and Eastern Thrace were ceded to Greece. Apart from the Dodecanese islands, the Aegean islands were also recognized as Greek sovereignty. Greece was also given the temporary administration of the Smyrna region. With the same treaty, Istanbul and the Straits became a neutral zone under the control of an allied committee. But this was short-lived and buried under the remnants of the Asia Minor Catastrophe." (Koliopoulos et al., Undated, p.85).

CONCLUSION

In the textbook taught in Turkey, the conclusion of World War I was started with the Bolshevik revolution in Russia in 1917, and ended with the entry of the United States into the war and the withdrawal of the alliance states from the war. When the developments after the end of the war are examined, it is seen that the effects of the war are briefly included, and then the National Struggle process that started in Anatolia, the Wilson Principles, the Paris Peace Conference, the secret agreements involving the division of the Ottoman Empire and the peace agreements signed by other states are discussed.

In the textbook taught in Azerbaijan, the process leading to the outcome of World War I started with the discussion of the US entry into the war and Russia's withdrawal from the war and ended by including the dates of the surrender agreements made by the Allies. However, the names of the treaties made were not included. This situation can be expressed as a deficiency. The post-war developments were included in the chapter "1918-1945 World Countries" under the sub-heading of the Versailles-Washington system by referring to the Paris Peace Conference, the Wilson Principles, the treaties made with the Central Powers and the Washington Conference.

In the textbook taught in Russia, the outcome of World War I was mostly discussed as the process leading to the Bolshevik revolution in Russia in 1917. Especially with the 4th sub-heading "The courage and heroism of the Russian soldiers", the heroism of the Russian soldiers was discussed. In the following headings of "Russian economy during the war" and "Power and society during the war", the effects of the war on the Russian economy and society in the period leading up to the revolution were included. The issues of agreements with the post-war situation were not discussed.

In the Greek textbook, the conclusion of World War I was discussed in the context of the Macedonian front, and then the agreements made by briefly referring to the process ending with the withdrawal of the Allies from the war were included. At the end of the section, the effects of World War I on the world, Wilson's Principles and the problems between countries were mentioned.

In the textbooks taught in the countries examined within the scope of the study; namely Turkey, Azerbaijan and Greece, it is seen that the titles of similar content, "Versailles - Washington System, Paris Peace Conference and Wilson's Principles" take place in the process from the beginning of the World War I to its end. In the Russian textbook, this issue was structured as a process in which the heroism of Russian soldiers during the war was explained. The section also includes the economic difficulties posed by the war and the process leading to the

Russian revolution. The ceasefire agreements signed at the end of the war were mentioned in the textbook taught in Turkey by giving a name/date on a country basis. In the textbook taught in Greece, the withdrawal of Germany from the war was included as November 11, 1918, but the dates of withdrawal from the war of other states were generally given as "in the Autumn of 1918". While a history-based understanding is preferred in Azerbaijan without the names of the ceasefire agreements, it is seen that neither the ceasefire agreements nor their dates are included in the textbook taught in Russia. When it comes to the peace treaties made after the war, both the treaties and their contents were included in the textbooks taught in Turkey and Greece, and only the names of the agreements were included in the textbooks taught in Azerbaijan (except for the Sevres Agreement), and It is seen that the peace treaties signed at the end of World War I were not included in the Russian textbook.

ETHICAL TEXT

"In this article, journal writing rules, publication principles, research and publication ethics rules, and journal ethics rules were followed. Responsibility for any violations that may arise regarding the article belongs to the author(s). This article is not included in the scope of studies that require ethics committee permission.

Author(s) Contribution Rate: The contribution rate of the authors to this article is 50%, 50%.

REFERENCES

- Agalarov, P., Hatamov, P., Guliyev, N., Cabbarov, H. & Hüseyinov, E. (2018). *Genel tarih 11*. Bakü: Şark-Garb. Retrieved from https://www.e-derslik.edu.az/player/index3.php?book_id=274#books/274/units/unit-1/page2.xhtml.
- Alves, E. J., Moura, G. G., & Carlos, R. D. A. (2013). Analysis of the approach of paleontology in geography textbooks in Ituiutaba, Minas Gerais, Brazil. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 8(18), 1684-1688. <https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2013.1418>.
- Carretero, M., Jacott, L., & López-Manjón, A. (2002). Learning history through textbooks: Are Mexican and Spanish students taught the same story? *Learning and Instruction*, 12(6), 651-665. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-4752\(01\)00036-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0959-4752(01)00036-6).
- Çevik, A. Koç, G. & Şerbetçi, K. (2019). *Ortaöğretim Türkiye Cumhuriyeti İnkılap Tarihi ve Atatürkçülük 12 ders kitabı* (İkinci Baskı), Devlet Kitapları. Retrieved from <https://www.eba.gov.tr/>.
- Cohen, D. A. (2004). Comparative history: Buyer beware. In D. A. Cohen, & M. O'Connor (Eds.), *Comparison and History: Europe in Cross-National Perspective* (pp. 57-70). Newyork, London: Routledge.
- Commeyras, M., & Alvermann, D. E. (1994). Messages that high school world history textbooks convey: Challenges for multicultural literacy. *The Social Studies*, 85(6), 268-274.
- Deveci Bozkuş, Y. (2014). Ermeni tarih ders kitaplarında Türk imgesi. *Yeni Türkiye Dergisi, Ermeni Meselesi Özel*, 1(60), 3384-3428. 10.37609/akya.826.

- Fuchs, E. (2014). The history of textbooks: Research trends in a field of textbook-related research. *International Journal for the Historiography of Education*, 4(1), 63-80.
- Gorinov, M.A., Danilov, A.A., Morkukov, M.Y., Semenenko, İ.S., Tokareva, A.Y., Haustov, V.N., Hlevnyuk, O.V. & Şestakov, V.A. (2016). Rusya Tarihi- Genel Eğitim Kurumları için Ders Kitabı 10. Sınıf, Prosveşenia Matbaası. Retrieved from <https://s.11klasov.net/6502-istorija-rossii-10-klass-v-3-chastjah-gorinov-mm-danilov-aa-i-dr.html>.
- Grever, M., & Van der Vlies, T. (2017). Why national narratives are perpetuated: A literature review on new insights from history textbook research. *London Review of Education*, 15(2), 286-301.
- Hamada, T. (2003). Constructing a national memory: a comparative analysis of middle-school history textbooks from Japan and the PRC. *American Asian Review*, 21(4), 109-144.
- Haupt, H. G. (2007). Comparative history—a contested method. *Historisk Tidskrift*, 127(4), 2-21.
- Havekes, H., Arno-Coppen, P., & Luttenberg, J. (2012). Knowing and doing history: A conceptual framework and pedagogy for teaching historical contextualization. *History Education Research Journal*, 11(1), 72-93.
- Janmaat, J. G. (2007). The ethnic ‘other’ in Ukrainian history textbooks: The case of Russia and the Russians. *Compare*, 37(3), 307-324. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03057920701330180>.
- Joseph, S. (2011). What are upper secondary school students saying about history?. *Caribbean Curriculum*, 18,1–26.
- Keleşzade, G., Güneşli, A., & Özkul, A. E. (2018). Effectiveness of history teaching based on social constructivist learning and development of historical thinking skills. *Education & Science/Eğitim ve Bilim*, 43(195), 167-191. DOI: 10.15390/EB.2018.7479 .
- Koliopoulos, I., Svolopoulos, K., Hadjivassiliou, E., Nimas, T. & Scholnaki-Helioti, H., (Tarihsiz). *Modern ve çağdaş dünyanın tarihi (1815’ten günümüze)*. Diofantos Bilgisayar Teknolojisi Enstitüsü.
- Lerch, J. C., Russell, S. G., & Ramirez, F. O. (2017). Wither the Nation-State? A Comparative analysis of nationalism in textbooks. *Social Forces*, 96(1), 153-180.
- Paxton, R. J. (1999). A deafening silence: History textbooks and the students who read them. *Review of educational research*, 69(3), 315-339.
- Rautiainen, M., Räikkönen, E., Veijola, A., & Mikkonen, S. (2019). History teaching in Finnish general upper secondary schools: Objectives and practices. *History Education Research Journal*, 16(2), 291-305. <https://doi.org/10.18546/HERJ.16.2.09>.
- Reese, W. J. (2010). *History, education, and the schools*. Palgrave Macmillan New York. <https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230104822>.
- Şahingöz, M., & Bilalli, S. (2018). Balkanlar’da eğitim kurumlarında okutulan tarih ders kitaplarında “Osmanlı-Türk” imajı. *Cumhuriyet Tarihi Araştırmaları Dergisi CTAD*, 14(28), 163-182.
- Sakki, I., & Pirttilä-Backman, A. M. (2019). Aims in teaching history and their epistemic correlates: a study of history teachers in ten countries. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 27(1), 65-85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14681366.2019.1566166>.

- Şimşek, A. (2008). Tarih öğretiminde sorgulamacı yaklaşım çerçevesinde soru sorma becerisi ve lise tarih ders kitaplarının durumu. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi* 5(1), 1-15.
- Şimşek, A., & Cou, E. Y. (2019). Güney Kore tarih ders kitaplarında Türk ve Osmanlı algıları. *Bilig*, 89, 143-170. <https://doi.org/10.12995/bilig.8907>.
- Taylor, T., & Macintyre, S. (2017). Cultural wars and history textbooks in democratic societies. In T. A. Smith & R. Tatalovich (Eds.), *Palgrave Handbook of Research in Historical Culture and Education* (pp. 613-635). Palgrave Macmillan, London.
- Toivanen, M. (2015). Rethinking historical comparisons-global history and the narrative of Chinese failure. *Journal on Theory, Historiography and Uses of the Past* 1(1), 89-111.
- Van Drie, J., Braaksma, M., & Van Boxtel, C. (2015). Writing in History: Effects of writing instruction on historical reasoning and text quality. *Journal of Writing Research*, 7(1). 123-156. <https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2015.07.01.06>.
- Van Nieuwenhuysse, K. (2019). Empire and Imperialism in Education Since 1945: Secondary School History Textbooks. In: Ness I., Cope Z. (Eds.) *The Palgrave Encyclopedia of Imperialism and Anti-Imperialism*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-91206-6_40-1.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2013). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri*. Seçkin Yayınevi.