

Shinichi Ishida

**TERRITORIAL
DISPUTES IN
GEOGRAPHY AND
HISTORY TEXTBOOKS:
Descriptions in East Asia
and Southeastern Europe**

INTRODUCTION

“Most of the textbooks and history teaching in Southeastern Europe, as elsewhere, have been developed as part of the enterprise of creating nation states.”¹ As a result, they often have caused or even fomented dissension between neighboring countries. We have the same problem in East Asia – including Japan.

In this article, the characteristics and controversial points of territorial disputes which can be seen in school textbooks for history and geography shall

¹ Carras, Costa. Preface. In: Koulouri, Christina (ed.). *Clio in the Balkans. The Politics of History Education*, Thessaloniki: Center for Democracy and Reconciliation in Southeast Europe, 2002, p. 13.

be examined.² To begin with, an outline of this issue in East Asia, chiefly from the viewpoint of Japan will be given, followed by an examination of the case in Southeastern Europe, especially Croatia and its neighboring countries.

JAPANESE TERRITORIAL DISPUTES WITH ITS NEIGHBORING COUNTRIES IN EAST ASIA

Overview

In recent years, the relationships between Japan and its neighboring countries such as Korea and China have deteriorated. The situation has been getting worse since the Japanese Ministry of Education revised the Commentaries on Courses of Study or Guidelines for school textbooks for junior high school and high school in January 2014.³

One of the causes of the conflict is Japan's renewed manifestation of territorial claims and the objections against it. According to the Commentaries, history and geography textbooks are required to express such territorial claims. For example, the Commentaries mention that "the Northern Territories" (the Southern Kuril Islands), Takeshima (*Dokdo* in Korean, Liancourt Rocks in English), and the Senkaku Islands (*Diaoyu* Islands in Chinese) are inherent parts of the territory of Japan. Though many school textbooks (Social Studies for elementary school, History and Geography for junior high school, and World History, Japanese History and Geography for high school) have mentioned the problem of "the Northern Territories" since the 1970s,⁴ descriptions of Takeshima and the Senkaku Islands have only appeared in the textbooks quite recently.

In April 2015, the Japanese Ministry of Education announced newly approved textbooks for junior high school, which will be used in 2016. As a result, in addition to "the Northern Territories," Takeshima and the Senkaku Islands were described in all (eight) new textbooks for history for the first time,⁵

2 See also 石田信一「旧ユーゴスラヴィア諸国の国境問題——地理・歴史教科書を通じて」(Ishida, Shinichi. Territorial Disputes between the Yugoslav Successor States: Reflections in Geography and History Textbooks). 『跡見学園女子大学文学部紀要』(*Journal of Atomi University Faculty of Letters*), 50, 2015, pp. 1–18.

3 文部科学省 (Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, MEXT) (http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/new-cs/youryou/1351334.htm).

4 浪本勝年「教科書における千島・「北方領土」問題」(Namimoto, Katsutoshi. On the Kurile Islands and "the Northern Territorial Issue" in School Textbooks). 『立正大学人文科学研究所年報』(*Annual report of the Institute of Cultural Science, Risho University*), 20, 1982, pp. 123–135.

5 藤井譲治ほか50名『中学社会歴史的分野』(Fujii, Joji et al. *Social Studies for Junior High School: History*). Osaka: Nihon Bunkyo Shuppan, 2016, p. 265; 深谷克己ほか25名『中学社会歴史』(Fukaya, Katsumi et al. *Social Studies for Junior High School: History*). Tokyo: Kyōiku Shuppan, 2016,

whereas only one out of seven currently used textbooks which were approved in 2011 mentioned Takeshima and the Senkaku Islands.⁶ Some textbooks show detailed maps of the territorial evolution of Japan after WWII also depicting “the Northern Territories,” Takeshima and the Senkaku Islands. Naturally, in all (four) geography textbooks for junior high school, we can see the same territorial claims more clearly depicted as well in maps and pictures.⁷

Certainly, these Japanese government-approved textbooks and atlases often show a one-sided, official view on territorial disputes. However, the school textbooks and atlases in the neighboring countries such as Russia, Korea, and China have a similar tendency under the strict textbook authorization system. As we can see below, they reflect the official views of each country, including the controversial ones.

The Japanese-Russian Territorial Disputes in School Textbooks

The Government of Japan officially uses the name “the Northern Territories” for the Southern Kuril Islands, which are composed of the islands of Habomai, Shikotan, Kunashiri and Etorofu. It considers that the Northern Territories were taken unilaterally by the Soviet Union soon after WWII and remain under Russian administration to date. According to the Statement of the Prime Minister of Japan, S. Yoshida, at the Conference in San Francisco in 1951, Japan’s ownership of the two islands of Etorofu and Kunashiri of the South Kuril Islands was not questioned at all by the Czarist government, and the islands of Habomai and Shikotan were a

-
- p. 257; 伊藤隆・川上和久ほか25名『新編新しい日本の歴史』(Ito, Takshi, Kawakami, Kazuhisa et al. *New History of Japan*). Tokyo: Ikuhōsha, 2016, pp. 173, 273; 黒田日出男ほか9名『社会科中学生の歴史』(Kuroda, Hideo et al. *Social Studies: History for Junior High School Students*). Tokyo: Teikoku Shoin, 2016, pp. 246–247; 三谷博ほか8名『中学歴史日本の歴史と世界』(Mitani, Hiroshi et al. *Social Studies for Junior High School: Japanese History and the World*). Tokyo: Shimizu Shoin, 2016, p. 178; 坂上康俊・戸波江二・矢ヶ崎典隆ほか49名『新編新しい社会歴史』(Sakagami, Yasutoshi, Tonami, Koji, Yagasaki, Noritaka et al. *New Social Studies: History*), revised edition. Tokyo: Tokyo Shoseki, 2016, pp. 252–256; 杉原誠四郎・西尾幹二・藤岡信勝ほか11名『新版新しい歴史教科書』(Sugihara, Seishiro, Nishio, Kanji, Fujioka, Nobukatsu et al. *New History Textbook for Junior High School*), revised edition. Tokyo: Jiyūsha, 2016, pp. 272–273; 安井俊雄ほか25名『ともに学ぶ人間の歴史——中学社会歴史的分野』(Yasui, Toshio et al. *Learn History of Mankind Together - Social Studies for Junior High School: History*). Tokyo: Manabisha, 2016, pp. 195, 199.
- 6 笹山晴生・竹内裕一・中村達也ほか36名『中学社会歴史』(Sasayama, Haruo, Takeuchi, Yuichi, Nakamura, Tatsuya et al. *Social Studies for Junior High School: History*). Tokyo: Kyōiku Shuppan, 2012, p. 251.
- 7 水内俊雄ほか50名『中学社会地理的分野』(Mizuuchi, Toshio et al. *Social Studies for Junior High School: Geography*). Osaka: Nihon Bunkyo Shuppan, 2016, pp. 118–119; 坂上康俊・戸波江二・矢ヶ崎典隆ほか49名『新編新しい社会地理』(Sakagami, Yasutoshi, Tonami, Koji, Yagasaki, Noritaka et al. *New Social Studies: Geography*). Tokyo: Tokyo Shoseki, 2016, pp. 133–135; 竹内裕一ほか21名『中学社会地理』(Takeuchi, Yuichi et al. *Social Studies for Junior High School: Geography*). Tokyo: Kyōiku Shuppan, 2016, p. 131; 谷内達ほか17名『社会科中学生の地理』(Taniuchi, Toru et al. *Social Studies: Geography for Junior High School Students*). Tokyo: Teikoku Shoin, 2016, p. 127.

constituting part of Hokkaido (one of Japan's main islands).⁸ The Government of Japan declares that the Northern Territories are an inherent part of the territory of Japan, without ever having been a part of other countries' territory.⁹

In accordance with this official view of the Japanese Government and the Guidelines for school textbooks, one geography textbook for junior high school describes the Northern Territories Issue in a chronological table as follows:

The Northern Territories in the east of Hokkaido are composed of the islands of Habomai, Shikotan, Kunashiri and Etorofu. The Northern Territories are an inherent part of the territory of Japan where many Japanese once lived. However, the Soviet Union occupied them immediately after the end of WWII, and Russia has continued to occupy them after the breakup of the Soviet Union without any legal grounds. Negotiations between Japan and the Russian Federation are under way, but the return of the Northern Territories has not yet been realized.¹⁰

This textbook shows a map of the whole of the Kuril Islands including the Northern Territories with commentaries. A column article on them is published in this textbook, along with other maps and a photo of Mt. Chirip in Etorofu (Iturup).¹¹

In addition, all history textbooks for junior high school mention the problem of the Northern Territories without exception. One textbook gives the following detailed explanation:

The Northern Territories – Habomai, Shikotan, Kunashiri and Etorofu – are an inherent part of the territory of Japan, which was confirmed by the Treaty of Commerce, Navigation and Delimitation between Japan and Russia in 1855.

The Soviet Union occupied the Northern Territories in 1945 and continued the illegal occupation thereafter. Japan has been continuing negotiations with the Soviet Union (today's Russian Federation) for the return of them, but this has not been realized to date. Japan considers that a conclusion of the Peace Treaty is needed for the resolution of this issue, and it is continuing to engage in vigorous negotiations, based on the results achieved to date and the principles of law and justice.¹²

8 Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan: Northern Territories, Reference Room, Joint Compendium of Documents on the History of the Territorial Issue between Japan and Russia, IV. San Francisco Peace Treaty (<http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/europe/russia/territory/edition92/period4.html>).

9 Office of Policy Planning and Coordination on Territory and Sovereignty, Cabinet Secretariat: The Northern Territories Issue (http://www.cas.go.jp/jp/ryodo_eg/ryodo/hoppou.html).

10 坂上ほか『新編新しい社会地理』(Sakagami, *New Social Studies: Geography*), p. 133.

11 *Ibid.*, p. 135.

12 深谷ほか『中学社会歴史』(Fukaya, *Social Studies for Junior High School: History*), p. 257.

Incidentally, we can also see strange borderlines between Japan and Russia in the government-approved school atlases. One borderline is drawn between Etorofu (Itrup) and Urup, and another borderline is drawn between Shumushu, the northernmost island of the (Northern) Kuril Islands, and Cape Lopatka, the southernmost point of the Kamchatka Peninsula.¹³ The former in particular indicates the official view of the Government of Japan, while the latter suggests that the Kuril Islands Issue is still unresolved and that even Russia doesn't have legitimate control over these territories. In a similar fashion, a borderline is drawn down the middle (at a latitude of 50°N) of Sakhalin (Karafuto in Japanese) Island.¹⁴ The reason is almost the same as in the case of the Kuril Islands, i.e. because the portion of the island south of the 50°N meridian was under Japanese sovereignty before the end of WWII.

On the contrary, the Russian textbooks don't mention the existence of these territorial disputes between Japan and Russia. They describe the whole area of "the Northern Territories," the Kuril Islands, and Sakhalin as Russian territory.

The Russian history textbooks only mention the "liberation" of South Sakhalin and the Kuril Islands at the end of WWII, and they don't give any explanations of Soviet–Japanese relationships in this regard thereafter. For example, one history textbook narrates: "In the course of the landing operations [in August 1945], South Sakhalin and the Kuril Islands were liberated,"¹⁵ while another textbook states: "In the course of the landing operations of the Soviet Army, South Sakhalin and the Kuril Islands were occupied."¹⁶ Exceptionally, in one historical atlas for pupils (not a textbook), there is an explanation that "South Sakhalin and the Kuril Islands were given to the USSR as part of the decision made at the Potsdam Conference."¹⁷

The Japanese–Korean Territorial Disputes in School Textbooks

Japan and the Republic of Korea (South Korea) both claim sovereignty over Takeshima/Dokdo, a group of small islets in the Sea of Japan. The islets have been administered by South Korea since 1954 by the Korea Coast Guard.

13 帝国書院編集部編『中学校社会科地図』(Teikoku Shoin (ed.). *Atlas of Social Studies for Junior High School*). Tokyo: Teikoku Shoin, 2016, pp. 56, 176; 矢ヶ崎典隆ほか11名『新編新しい社会地図』(Yagasaki, Noritaka et al.. *New Social Studies: Atlas*). Tokyo: Tokyo Shoseki, 2016, pp. 48, 182.

14 Ibid.

15 Торкунова, А. В.. *История России. 10 класс. Часть 2* (Torkunova, A. V.. *History of Russia for 10th grade, Part 2*). Moskva: Prosveshchenie, 2016, p. 4.

16 Данилов, А. А.. *История. Россия в XX – начале XXI века, 9 класс* (Danilov, A. A.. *History for 9th grade. Russia in the 20th and at the Beginning of the 21st Centuries*). Moskva: Prosveshchenie, 2011, p. 129.

17 Максимов, И. И.. *Атлас школьника. История России с древнейших времен до начала XXI в.* (Maksimov, I. I.. *Atlas for Pupils: History of Russia from the Ancient Times to the Beginning of the 21th Century*). Moskva: Drofa, 2009, p. 207.

The Government of Japan officially declares that “Takeshima is indisputably an inherent part of the territory of Japan, in light of historical facts and based on international law. The Republic of Korea has been occupying Takeshima with no basis in international law. Any measures the Republic of Korea takes regarding Takeshima based on such an illegal occupation have no legal justification.”¹⁸

In accordance with the official view and the Guidelines for school textbooks, one geography textbook for junior high school states:

Takeshima on the Sea of Japan is an inherent territory of Japan, but the Republic of Korea occupies it illegally. Japan protests against this occupation, while it continues to make diplomatic efforts, calling for a settlement by international institutions.¹⁹

One history textbook for junior high school explains:

In 1952, the Republic of Korea unilaterally established its boundary and occupied Takeshima illegally, declaring that Takashima belonged to Korean territory. Japan protests and calls for taking the case jointly to the International Court of Justice, but the Republic of Korea refuses to do so.²⁰

On the contrary, the Government of (South) Korea asserts: “Dokdo [Takeshima] is an integral part of Korean territory, historically, geographically and under international law. No territorial dispute exists regarding Dokdo, and therefore Dokdo is not a matter to be dealt with through diplomatic negotiations or judicial settlement.”²¹

The Korean Government’s official view is reflected in the school textbooks in (South) Korea. History and social studies textbooks and atlases for elementary school, junior high school, and high school contain maps of Takeshima/Dokdo with detailed commentaries. One history textbook for high school gives the following description:

Dokdo, as an attached island of Ulleungdo, has been a part of our country since the Three Kingdoms Period of Korea. When the unlawful entry of fishermen from Japan increased in the middle of the 19th century, our government sent officials to Ulleungdo and forced the residents of the land to immigrate there. Then it raised Ulleungdo to the status of a county and placed Dokdo under its

18 Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan: Japan’s Consistent Position on the Territorial Sovereignty over Takeshima (<http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/takeshima/index.html>).

19 坂上ほか『新編新しい社会地理』(Sakagami, *New Social Studies: Geography*), p. 133.

20 黒田ほか『社会科中学生の歴史』(Kuroda, *Social Studies: History for Junior High School Students*), p. 247.

21 Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Korea: The Korean Government’s Basic Position on Dokdo (http://dokdo.mofa.go.kr/eng/dokdo/government_position.jsp).

jurisdiction. During the Russo-Japanese War, the Empire of Japan forcibly annexed Dokdo as a part of its territory. This was clearly an act of illegal annexation of the territory under international law.²²

Another history textbook for high school has a chapter entitled “Friction and Reconciliation in East Asia,” and explains territorial disputes in East Asia such as the problems of “the Northern Territories,” the Senkaku Islands, and the Spratly Islands (between China, Vietnam, Taiwan, the Philippines, Brunei, and Malaysia).²³ The information it gives regarding Takeshima/Dokdo is just the same as the official view of the Government of (South) Korea; mainly, that it is an integral part of Korean territory. Furthermore, the textbook gives detailed information of Japan’s standpoint and the counterargument by (South) Korea, and it sets pupils the task: “Let’s offer a counterargument to the problem of Japan’s claim.”²⁴

As we can see above, the official views or territorial claims concerning Takeshima/ Dokdo by Japan and South Korea are faithfully reflected in the respective school textbooks and atlases of both countries. Because diplomatic relations between Japan and (South) Korea have been deteriorating, we cannot expect any improvements or mutual concessions in the descriptions of Takashima/ Dokdo in the school textbooks of either country for the time being.

The Japanese-Chinese Territorial Disputes in School Textbooks

As for the Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands issue between Japan and China, the Japanese Government officially declares the following:

There is no doubt that the Senkaku Islands are clearly an inherent territory of Japan, in light of historical facts and based upon international law. Indeed, the Senkaku Islands are under the valid control of Japan. There exists no issue of territorial sovereignty to be resolved concerning the Senkaku Islands.²⁵

In accordance with the official view and the Guidelines for school textbooks, one of the above-mentioned geography textbooks for junior high school states:

Japan maintains effective control over the Senkaku Islands on the East China Sea as an inherent part of the territory of Japan. Though China

22 『検定版韓国の歴史教科書——高等学校韓国史』(*The Government-Approved History Textbook of South Korea: History of Korea for High School*, Japanese translation). Tokyo: Akashi Shoten, 2013, p. 188.

23 『東アジアの歴史——韓国高等学校歴史教科書』(*History of East Asia: History Textbook for High School in South Korea*, Japanese translation). Tokyo: Akashi Shoten, 2015, pp. 242–248.

24 *Ibid.*, p. 248.

25 Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan: Senkaku Islands Q&A (http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia-paci/senkaku/qa_1010.html).

claims territorial sovereignty over them, they are widely recognized as a part of Japan's territory by the international community.²⁶

One history textbook for junior high school explains it as follows:

The Government of Japan conducted its investigation of the Senkaku Islands with the greatest care from 1885 to 1895, and it incorporated them into its territory, confirming that they were not occupied by any country. Though China has claimed territorial sovereignty over them since 1971, the position of the Government of Japan that they are an inherent part of the territory of Japan is internationally recognized.²⁷

On the contrary, China claims that the Senkaku/Diaoyu islands are China's inherent territory. On the official website, China claims:

Diaoyu Dao and its affiliated Islands (hereinafter referred to as Diaoyu Dao) are an inseparable part of the Chinese territory. Diaoyu Dao is China's inherent territory in all historical and legal terms, and China enjoys indisputable sovereignty over it.

Any unilateral step taken by Japan regarding Diaoyu Dao will not change the fact that it belongs to China. China's position on Diaoyu Dao has been clear and consistent. China will firmly defend its national sovereignty and territorial integrity. China's resolve to uphold agreements made after the global anti-fascist war will not be shaken by any force. China has the confidence and ability to stand up to Japan's illegal acts, which have ignored historical facts and international legal principles. Yet, China remains dedicated to safeguarding and maintaining regional peace and order.²⁸

The Senkaku/Diaoyu Islands issue is not clearly described in China's history textbooks at the moment. Some geography textbooks, however, explain that Taiwan, Diaoyu Dao and its affiliated Islands have been integral parts of China's territory from ancient times, advocating China's territorial sovereignty over them. Unlike the descriptions in Japanese textbooks, Chinese geography textbooks mention that along with Taiwan, Diaoyu Dao and its affiliated Islands were annexed by Japan in 1895 as a result of the Sino-Japanese War.²⁹

26 坂上ほか『新編新しい社会地理』(Sakagami, *New Social Studies: Geography*), revised edition, p. 133.

27 黒田ほか『社会科中学生の歴史』(Kuroda, *Social Studies: History for Junior High School Students*), p. 247.

28 National Marine Data and Information Service: Basic Facts on Diaoyu Dao (<http://www.diaoyudao.org.cn/en/index.htm>).

29 Wang, Min (ed.). *Geography for 7th grade, Part 2*. Beijing: Zhōngguó dìtú chūbǎnshè, 2012, p. 72.

TERRITORIAL DISPUTES IN SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE

The Croatian-Bosnian Territorial Disputes in School Textbooks

In general, Croatian geography textbooks for secondary school (gymnasium) describe the formation and current problems of the border between Croatia and neighboring countries. Actually, border disputes and other unresolved issues between Croatia and other Yugoslav successor states have existed since their separation in 1991–92, while their origin can be traced to the late 1940's when the new communist authorities fixed the inter-republican borders of the Yugoslav Federation.³⁰

There are discussions between Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina on various sections of the border, which is also the longest border for each of the two countries. The most popular textbook among the Croatian ones, published by Školska knjiga, describes the situation of the Croatian-Bosnian border as follows:

Croatia has the longest border with Bosnia-Herzegovina. It is 1,011.4 km long and it comprises 42.6 % of Croatia's land borders. This border has been established as a result of the separation of the territory of Bosnia-Herzegovina from the Croatian state during the time of the Christian-Ottoman wars. The border was formed in stages, chiefly in the 18th century. ... The border between Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina was not formed ethnically, leaving many Croatian inhabitants on the other side of the border, especially in Herzegovina and Posavina. Croatia has some border disputes with Bosnia-Herzegovina among which the course of the river Una at Hrvatska Kostajnica, the Zavalja region (east of Plješevica), and the tip of the Klek peninsula in South Dalmatia are the most distinctive.³¹

Another geography textbook provides the item of information that “there are disputed areas between Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina dating back to the international recognition of these two countries, and a ratification of the Treaty on the State Border is to be expected in the future.”³²

30 See Zečević, Miodrag, Lekić, Bogdan. *Državne granice i unutrašnja teritorijalna podjela Jugoslavije*. Beograd: Građevinska knjiga, 1991; Degan, Vladimir Đuro. *Međunarodno pravo kao osnova rješavanja preostalih sporova na području bivšeg SFRJ*. In: *Adrias : zbornik radova Zavoda za znanstveni i umjetnički rad Hrvatske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti u Splitu*, No.12, 2005; 定形衛 『日ユーゴスラヴィアと国境線問題の諸相』(Sadakata, Mamoru. *Border Problems in the Former Yugoslavia*). 『名古屋大学法政論集』 (*Journal of Law and Politics*), 245, 2012.

31 Gall, Hermenegildo, Kralj, Predrag, Sljunjski, Robert. *Geografija 4: udžbenik geografije u četvrtom razredu gimnazije*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 2014, p. 38.

32 Feletar, Dragutin, Vuk, Ružica. *Geografija 4. Udžbenik iz geografije za četvrti razred gimnazije*. Samobor: Meridijani, 2014, p. 31.

In Addition, one Croatian history textbook describes the formation of the current borderline between Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina as follows, “The narrow littoral corridor of Neum was not incorporated into Croatia, even though this was to separate Dubrovnik from the other part of Croatia, and the corridor was inhabited by Croatian inhabitants only.”³³ This textbook also mentions the territorial gains and losses of the postwar Croatia in comparison with the prewar Banovina of Croatia. It explains that Croatia lost “Herzegovina, Central Bosnia, and Bosnian Posavina.”³⁴

In a similar manner, another textbook mentions: “In relation to the territories which belonged to the Banovia of Croatia and the Independent State of Croatia, Croatia lost Bosnia-Herzegovina (BH) and the littoral corridor at Neum, which belonged to BH, and by which Croatia was divided into two parts.”³⁵

In short, these history textbooks look on Bosnia-Herzegovina as a “lost” territory of Croatia and pay attention to the Neum corridor which separates Dubrovnik from the Croatian mainland.

On the other hand, the Bosnian school textbooks for history and geography usually don’t mention the existence of territorial disputes.³⁶ However, there are some exceptions. There was a history textbook for the Bosnian Muslims (published in 2007) which insisted that “Bosnia-Herzegovina ceded Sutorina (an outlet to the Sea at Herceg Novi) to Montenegro [after WWII], and that Bosnia-Herzegovina lost this outlet to the Sea without recognition by the peoples of Bosnia-Herzegovina and without authorization of its Parliament.”³⁷ Another history textbook of the Croats (published in 2010) also pointed out that “Bosnia-Herzegovina experienced its territorial change [after WWII]. Sutorina was given to Montenegro and Bosnia-Herzegovina lost its outlet to the Sea at Herceg Novi.”³⁸ In both textbooks, we can see the Bosnian (potential) territorial claim for the Sutorina region against Montenegro. In contrast, neither of them mentions the problem of the Neum corridor, another outlet to the Adriatic Sea, which some Croatian history textbooks regard as a disputed area between Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina.

33 Petrić, Hrvoje, Raguž, Jakša. *Povijest 4: udžbenik iz povijesti za 4. razred gimnazije*. Samobor: Meridijani, 2014, p. 170.

34 *Ibid.*, p. 171.

35 Akmadža, Miroslav, Jareb, Mario, Redelić, Zdenko. *Povijest 4: udžbenik za 4. razred gimnazije*. Zagreb: Alfa, 2009, pp. 167–168.

36 In Bosnia-Herzegovina, there are three kinds of school textbooks. Three constituent peoples, the Bosnian Muslims, the Serbs, and the Croats publish their own textbooks. The textbooks for the Serbs and the Croats tend to mention the connection with their respective “Homelands” (Serbia and Croatia), whereas those for the Bosnian Muslims underline the formation of the Bosnian state and its boundaries.

37 Valenta, Leonard. *Historija-Povijest za 8. razred osnovne škole*. Sarajevo: Bosanska riječ, 2007, p. 174.

38 Erdelja, Krešimir, Stojaković, Igor, Madžar, Ivan, Lovrinović, Nikola. *Tragom prošlosti 8: udžbenik povijesti za osmi razred osnovne škole*. Mostar: Školska naklada, 2010, p. 212.

The Croatian-Serbian Territorial Disputes in School Textbooks

The Danube border between Croatia and Serbia is in dispute, particularly in Baranja, along with some river islands.³⁹ In some cases, the Srijem/Srem region is also regarded as the subject of a dispute between the countries.⁴⁰

One Croatian geography textbook for secondary school describes the formation and current problems of the Croatian-Serbian border in detail as follows:

The state border with Serbia is 317.6 km long (13.4%), and it was recently formed. It was established after WWII at the cost of Croatia. Central and Eastern Srijem (between Ilok and Zemun), as well as Croatian historical territory which was part of Slavonia (County of Srijem) and the Military Frontier of Slavonia (Petrovaradin Regiment) since the beginning of the 18th century, were annexed to Serbia at the time. The Danube demarcates the northern part of the border with Bačka, but the borderline is not identical to its course. Because of the meandering of the river, a part of Croatian territory remains on the left bank and is, along with the river island Šarengradska Ada, regarded as a matter in dispute between Croatia and Serbia. After WWII, the border was demarcated on the principle of ethnicity, but many settlements where the Croatian or Serbian national minorities live remain on the opposite side.⁴¹

This textbook shows a detailed map of Šarengradska ada.

Another geography textbook mentions: "...there are some disputed border points between Croatia and Serbia, especially at Apatin and Šarengrad."⁴² This textbook also contains the following commentary: "...the border with Serbia on the Danube is still not entirely defined."⁴³

In addition, history textbooks mention the problems of internal divisions in the Yugoslav Federation and the predominance of Serbia in it as follows:

After the war, the unsolved problem remained – the definition of borders between the federal republics and demarcation of the border with Italy.

A combination of the historical and national rights of each nation was

39 See Štambuk-Škalić, Marina. Hrvatska istočna granica u dokumentima 1945–1947. *Fontes: izvori za hrvatsku povijest*, 1, 1995; Dimitrijević, Duško. A Review of the issue of the border between Serbia and Croatia on the Danube. *Megatrend revija: međunarodni časopis za primenjenu ekonomiju*, 9, 3, 2012; Dimitrijević, Duško. *Državne granice nakon sukcesije SFR Jugoslavije*. Beograd: Institut za međunarodnu politiku i privredu, 2012.

40 For the Serbian border disputes, see, Antić, Čedomir. The Borders of Modern Serbia (1804–1999). In: Nećak, Dušan (ed.). *Borders in Southeastern Europe: Culture and Politics between the 18th and 21st Century*. Ljubljana: Oddelek za zgodovino Filozofske fakultete, 2004.

41 Gall, *Geografija* 4, pp. 39–40.

42 Feletar, *Geografija* 4, p. 33.

43 Ibid., p.32.

adopted as the criteria for the demarcation line between the republics. The Federal Commission at the end of 1945 took the whole of Eastern and Central Srijem and a part of Western Srijem away from Croatia and gave them to Serbia.⁴⁴

Another Croatian history textbook also describes the formation of the current borderline between Croatia and Serbia in a similar fashion: “Croatia, due to national criteria, lost the whole of Eastern and Central Srijem and a part of Western Srijem in the interests of Serbia.”⁴⁵ On the other hand, it mentions that Baranja, which didn’t historically belong to Croatia, was incorporated into Croatia based on the criterion of national rights.⁴⁶ In any case, the Croatian geography and history textbooks regard Srijem as a “lost” territory of Croatia.

On the other hand, Serbian history textbooks underline the creation or existence of the Autonomous Province and Region in Serbia, which divides the Serbian population. One history textbook for secondary school describes the issue as follows:

Serbia assembled its territory in 1945, by annexing some districts of Sandžak, which was divided, and by incorporating Vojvodina and Kosmet, both of which were given special status. By the decision of the Presidency of the Peoples’ Liberation Committee of Vojvodina, however, Baranja, which was predominantly inhabited by Serbs, was taken away from Vojvodina and annexed to Croatia on May 16, 1945.⁴⁷

One history textbook for primary school by the same author and publisher describes these events in a similar manner.⁴⁸

Another history textbook for secondary school states: “Western Srem [Srijem] with Vukovar, Vinkovci, and Županja, as well as Baranja with the districts of Darda and Batina, were separated from Vojvodina.”⁴⁹ It also criticizes the Communist Party which made this decision and thus accepted the provision of the Cvarković–Maček Agreement and the territorial extension of the Independent State of Croatia.⁵⁰

44 Bekavac, Stjepan, Jareb, Mario. *Povijest 8: udžbenik za osmi razred osnovne škole*. Zagreb: Alfa, 2014, p. 137.

45 Petrić, *Povijest 4*, p. 170.

46 Ibid., pp. 170–171.

47 Đurić, Đorđe, Pavlović, Momčilo. *Istorija za treći razred gimnazije prirodno-matematičkog smera i četvrti razred opšteg i društveno-jezičkog smera*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike, 2010, p. 235.

48 Đurić, Đorđe, Pavlović, Momčilo. *Istorija za osmi razred osnovne škole*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike, 2010, p. 174.

49 Radojević, Mira. *Istorija IV. udžbenik za treći razred gimnazije prirodno-matematičkog smera, četvrti razred gimnazije društveno-jezičkog smera i opšteg tipa, i četvrti razred srednje stručne škole za obrazovne profile pravni tehničar i birotehničar*. Beograd: Klett, 2014, p. 355.

50 Ibid.

One popular geography textbook for secondary school has a section entitled “the Serbs in Croatia” comprised of four pages of very detailed narrative on the topic.⁵¹ However, it contains no descriptions of the border issue between Serbia and Croatia. It concentrates on the problem of Kosovo, showing the history of the Serbian-Albanian border.⁵²

The position of Baranja and Western Srem [Srijem] in these Serbian textbooks is described in a similar manner to that of Eastern and Central Srijem in the Croatian history textbooks. They also consider that they had “lost” their own (historical) territories.

The Croatian-Montenegrian Territorial Disputes in School Textbooks

Croatia and Montenegro have a border dispute over the Prevlaka Peninsula.⁵³ Jurisdiction over Boka Kotorska, the region around the Bay of Kotor, is also an item of controversy. One Croatian geography textbook describes this as follows:

Croatia shares its shortest state border with Montenegro. The border in Konavle region is 22.6 km long (1%), and it corresponds with the border of the Republic of Dubrovnik. Austrian Dalmatia (1815–1918) was extended southwards, and it contained Croatian historical territory in the Boka Kotorska region and the coastal area to Paštrovići near Bar. After WWII, Boka Kotorska was annexed to Montenegro with the Sutorina corridor. The Prevlaka Peninsula (the southernmost part of the Croatian mainland) was occupied by the Yugoslav Army for strategic reasons after the proclamation of Croatian independence.⁵⁴

This textbook also shows a detailed map of the Prevlaka region.

In addition, one history textbook explains the annexation of Boka Kotorska after WWII briefly as: “Croatia definitively lost Boka Kotorska, in the interests of Montenegro.”⁵⁵ Another history textbook regards Boka Kotorska as a Croatian historical territory, because it was a part of Dalmatia (with its capital in Zadar). It also mentions that Croatia lost Boka Kotorska.⁵⁶

51 Grčić, Mirko, Stanković, Stevan, Gavrilović, Ljiljana, Radovanović, Svetlana, Stepić, Milomir, Đurđić, Snežana. *Geografija za III razred gimnazije*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike, 2008, pp. 209–212. All geography textbooks in Serbia mention the Serbs outside of Serbia in detail.

52 *Ibid.*, p. 19.

53 See Pavić, Radovan. Analysis of “Protocol” about the Border between the Republic of Croatia and Montenegro. *Geoadria*, 15, 2, 2010; Jović Mazalin, Sandra, Faričić, Josip. Geografske osnove društveno-gospodarskoga vrednovanja poluotoka Oštre (Prevlake). *Ekonomska i ekohistorija: časopis za gospodarsku povijest i povijest okoliša*, 9, 1, 2013.

54 Gall, *Geografija* 4, p. 40.

55 Petrić, *Povijest* 4, p. 170.

56 Akmadža, *Povijest* 4, p. 167.

On the other hand, the history textbooks in Montenegro don't refer to the incorporation of the Boka Kotorska region into Montenegro (after WWII). Nor do they refer to the Prevlaka issue. However, one geography textbook for primary school explains the formation of today's Montenegro as follows: "After liberation, in the new socialist Yugoslavia, Montenegro (including the Boka Kotorska region) became one of the six republics (autonomous federal units) which had equal rights."⁵⁷ In this textbook, there are some inaccurate maps, in which the Croatian territory near Boka Kotorska has disappeared entirely.⁵⁸

The Croatian-Slovenian Territorial Disputes in School Textbooks

Border disputes between Slovenia and Croatia have existed since Slovenia gained independence from Yugoslavia in 1991. The most notable border issue is the division of the former Yugoslav territorial waters around the Bay of Piran.⁵⁹

One Croatian geography textbook describes the border between Croatia and Slovenia as follows:

The land border with Slovenia mostly also delineates the ethnic boundary between the Croats and the Slovenes. It is 667.8 km long (28.1%), and predominantly a natural one. ... The border in Međimurje was formed between the Drava and the Mura rivers, partly along the course of the Mura. It was established in 1920, and it was slightly corrected in 1945 at the cost of Croatia. The most recent part of the Croatian-Slovenian border is in Istria, which partly corresponds with the course of the Dragonja River. The line of demarcation was a result of the division of the Free Territory of Trieste in 1954, with a little correction at the cost of Croatia in 1956. Among the border disputes between Croatia and Slovenia, the Bay of Piran, Žumberak (the Sveta Gera Peak), and Međimurje (meander of the Mura) are the most important.⁶⁰

57 Tadić, Milutin, Nikolić, Gojko, Grgurević, Osman. *Geografija: udžbenik za deveti razred osnovne devetogodišnje škole*. Podgorica: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, 2010, p. 16.

58 *Ibid.*, pp. 103, 107.

59 There are many researches on this topic. See Darovec, Darko. Borders in Istria. In: Nećak (ed.). *Borders in Southeastern Europe*; Avbelj, Matej, Letnar Cernic, Jernej. The Conundrum of the Piran Bay: Slovenia v. Croatia – The Case of Maritime Delimitation. *The University of Pennsylvania Journal of International Law and Policy*, 5, 2, 2007; Vidas, Davor. *The UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, the European Union and the Rule of Law. What is going on in the Adriatic Sea?*. Lusaker: Fridtjof Nansen Institute, 2008; Klemenčić, Mladen, Topalović, Duško. The Maritime Boundaries of the Adriatic Sea. *Geoadria*, 14, 2, 2009.

60 Gall, *Geografija* 4, p. 39.

This textbook has a detailed commentary on “the conflict in the Bay of Piran”, which has been ongoing since the independence of Croatia and Slovenia, including Slovenia’s blockade of the EU accession negotiations of Croatia in 2008–09.⁶¹ It also shows a detailed map of the Bay of Piran, with the territorial claims (maritime borders) of both Croatia and Slovenia.

Another geography textbook also mentions the border disputes between Croatia and Slovenia such as the Bay of Piran (*Savudrijska vala* in Croatian), the Sveta Gera Peak, Međimurje (the meander of the Mura).⁶² Though it mentions that the international arbitral tribunal will settle the dispute regarding the Bay of Piran, Croatia withdrew from arbitration after alleged breaches of the arbitration rules committed by Slovenia in 2015.⁶³ Both geography textbooks make the assertion that Croatia ceded part of its territory to Slovenia in Međimurje and Istria after WWII.

In contrast, there are no descriptions of the border issues between Croatia and Slovenia in the Croatian history textbooks.

Similar to the Croatian and Serbian school textbooks, the Slovenian school textbooks make much account of the Slovenes outside of Slovenia. In connection with this, there are some descriptions of the territorial disputes between Slovenia and neighboring countries. In one history textbook for secondary school, there is a chapter entitled “The Slovene border and the Slovenes outside Slovenia,” including “Open border issues with Croatia.” It explains the border disputes between Slovenia and Croatia in detail. It mentions that there are points of dispute such as the border on the Mura River, the border at Razkrižje and Štrigova, part of the border in Bela Krajina and the Snežnik forests, the border on the Dragonja River, and the maritime border in the Bay of Piran.⁶⁴ The textbook also explains that Slovenia and Croatia entrusted the solution of the maritime border dispute to an international arbitral tribunal.⁶⁵

In one history textbook for primary school, there is a description of the border issue in the Bay of Piran.⁶⁶ Another history textbook for primary school also mentions the unsolved border problem with Croatia.⁶⁷

61 Ibid., p. 42.

62 Feletar, *Geografija* 4, p. 32.

63 “Termination of the Arbitration Process between Croatia and Slovenia: Causes and Consequences,” Republic of Croatia, Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs (<http://www.mvep.hr/en/other/termination-of-the-arbitration-process/>).

64 Gabrič, Aleš, Režek, Mateja. *Zgodovina 4. Učbenik za četrti letnik gimnazije*, Ljubljana: DZS, 2012, pp. 225–226.

65 Ibid., p. 226.

66 Razpotnik, Jelka, Snoj, Damjan. *Raziskujem preteklost 9. Učebnik za zgodovino v 9. razredu osnovne šole*, Ljubljana: Rokus Klett, 2013, p. 138.

67 Gabrič, Aleš, Rode, Marjan, Galonja, Tadeja, Dolenc, Ervin. *Koraki v času 9. Učbenik za zgodovino v 9. razredu osnovne šole*. Ljubljana: DZS, 2013, p. 99.

Moreover, in one geography textbook for primary school, there is a commentary entitled “How to resolve the border issues with Italy and Croatia.” It shows a brief history of the border dispute between Slovenia and Croatia since their independence in 1991, up to the arbitration agreement in 2009.⁶⁸ Another geography textbook for primary school also explains that the arbitral tribunal will settle the dispute on the Bay of Piran.⁶⁹

CONCLUSION

In general, school textbooks for history and geography in Croatia and other Yugoslav successor states explain the territorial evolution (increase and decrease) of each nation state. As an exception, the Croatian geography textbooks describe the current territorial disputes in detail. Unlike other Yugoslav successor states, Croatian history textbooks emphasize the territorial losses, such as Eastern Srijem (Serbia) and Boka Kotorska (Montenegro). It is worrying that the reference to unresolved territorial disputes in school textbooks may interrupt the reconciliation process in Southeastern Europe.

Moreover, the same seems to be true of Japan and its neighboring countries in East Asia. They often make one-sided assertions without objective analyses, which tends to provoke antipathy between the nations involved. Such situations related to school textbooks must be improved step by step through international academic exchanges and joint research activities.

68 Senegačnik, Jurij. *Geografija Slovenije. Učbenik za 9. razred osnovne šole*. Ljubljana: Modrijan, 2015, p. 122.

69 Verdev, Helena. *Raziskujem Slovenijo. Učbenik za geografijo v 9. razredu osnovne šole*. Ljubljana: Rokus Klett, 2011, p. 92.