



The Persistence of Eurocentric Bias in Historical Accounts

R. Murugan

¹ Research Scholar of History, Deptt. of History, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar -608002, Chidambaram, Tamilnadu, India

* Corresponding Author:

R. Murugan

murugankishoor880@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article History

Received 15th April, 2023
Revised 21st April, 2023
Accepted 23, May, 2023
Available Online 30, June, 2023

ARTICLE ID

HRJHA1200004

KEYWORDS

Eurocentrism, historiography, decolonisation, curriculum reform, historical bias



ABSTRACT

This study interrogates the enduring presence of Eurocentric bias in historical narratives, tracing its roots to colonial and imperial ideologies that shaped mainstream historiography. It explores how Europe has been positioned as the centre of global historical progress while marginalising the contributions, knowledge systems, and agency of non-European societies. Through analysis of textbooks, archives, academic discourse, and public memory, the paper reveals how these biases persist in both educational content and institutional structures. The study critically examines contemporary efforts to dismantle Eurocentrism, including decolonial scholarship, curriculum reform, and inclusive historiography. While notable progress has been made in challenging dominant narratives, the research highlights persistent structural and epistemological barriers. It calls for a fundamental reimagining of historical frameworks that transcend Western paradigms and embrace pluralistic, transnational perspectives. Ultimately, the paper advocates for a historiography grounded in multiplicity and historical justice, promoting a more balanced and equitable understanding of the human past.



INTRODUCTION

The writing of history is not a neutral act but a deeply political and ideological endeavour. Historical narratives play a crucial role in shaping collective memory, national identity, and cultural consciousness. However, these narratives have long been dominated by a Eurocentric perspective—a worldview that positions Europe as the epicentre of civilisation, progress, and intellectual authority. Rooted in the legacy of colonialism and imperial expansion, Eurocentrism has marginalised non-European societies by depicting them as passive, static, or historically insignificant. This biased lens has influenced not only academic historiography but also the content of school textbooks, museum displays, and media portrayals, thereby reinforcing global inequalities in knowledge production. Despite formal decolonisation and various postcolonial interventions, the ideological imprint of Eurocentrism remains embedded in mainstream historical discourse. This study critically examines how Eurocentric assumptions continue to shape historical understanding and what efforts—ranging from decolonial scholarship to curriculum reforms—have emerged to challenge these biases. It argues that confronting Eurocentrism requires more than surface-level inclusion; it demands a structural and epistemological rethinking of historical categories, methodologies, and frameworks. By highlighting the enduring influence of colonial ideologies and the importance of pluralistic approaches, this research underscores the necessity of reconstructing global history on more inclusive and equitable terms.

Research Objectives

The primary objective of this research is to critically examine the persistence of Eurocentric bias in historical narratives and to evaluate the impact of colonial ideologies on mainstream historiography. It aims to identify how these biases manifest in academic discourse, educational curricula, and public memory, while also assessing contemporary efforts—such as decolonial scholarship and curriculum reform—towards creating more inclusive, multi-perspective approaches to global history.

Methodology

This research adopts a qualitative methodology, employing critical content analysis of historical texts, academic literature, school curricula, and archival sources to identify patterns of Eurocentric bias. It also reviews case studies of textbook narratives and public memory practices to examine how colonial ideologies are reproduced or contested. The study draws on theoretical frameworks from postcolonial and decolonial scholarship to analyse both the structure and epistemology of historical writing, highlighting the ongoing challenges and possibilities for a more inclusive historiography.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The study of history is not merely an exploration of past events, but a profound exercise in shaping identities, cultures, and collective memories. The narratives we adopt and disseminate often reflect the priorities, prejudices, and power structures of those who record them.¹ One of the most enduring and pervasive influences on historical writing and teaching has been Eurocentrism—the ideological framing of European culture, values, and achievements as the central axis of global development and human progress. This perspective has not only defined how history has been written in the West but has also deeply affected the representation of other cultures, civilizations, and historical experiences in education, academia, and public discourse across the world.



The roots of Eurocentrism in historiography are deeply intertwined with the rise of European imperialism and colonialism. From the fifteenth century onwards, European expansion was accompanied by intellectual frameworks that legitimized conquest and subjugation.² Historians, often working in tandem with colonial administrators and missionaries, constructed narratives that positioned Europe as the pinnacle of civilization. The so-called "civilizing mission" rationalized domination over other peoples by depicting them as primitive, static, or devoid of significant historical agency. Ancient and rich civilizations such as those of India, China, and various African societies were either ignored or incorporated into global history only in relation to their contact with Europe. This selective historiography not only reinforced colonial hegemony but also marginalized indigenous knowledge systems and historical trajectories.

As main tools of knowledge and ideological spread, textbooks evolved into main vehicles for Eurocentric historical narratives. Especially in former colonies, textbooks imported from or inspired by European systems often highlighted the successes of Greek and Roman civilisations, the Renaissance, the Enlightenment, and the Industrial Revolution—each portrayed as distinctly European contributions to world growth. Before European arrival, the history of Asia, Africa, and the Americas were often written off as either marginal or meaningless. For instance, several African nations have colonial-era textbooks showing Africa as a continent devoid of history prior to European invasion. This false portrayal ingrained the belief that historical relevance results primarily from engagement with Europe, therefore depriving whole people of their own validity.³

Curricula and textbook materials have nevertheless been shaped by Eurocentrism even after colonial power was overthrown. Postcolonial educational reforms have sought to change historical narratives in places such India, South Africa, and several Latin American countries, although many institutions still battle the residual influence of Western viewpoints. Sometimes textbooks still favour European explorers, scientists, and intellectuals while neglecting or downplaying equally important contributions from non-European societies. For instance, the complicated maritime history of Southeast Asia, the Indian Ocean trade networks, and African navigation techniques remain under-represented even as European voyages of discovery are honoured. Particularly in the sphere of historical research, Eurocentrism has clearly affected intellectual discourse. Gatekeepers of legitimate knowledge creation have historically been Western colleges, journals, and publishing companies. Developed within European intellectual traditions, the epistemological underpinnings of history as a field—such as empiricism, positivism, and archive research—were sometimes seen as globally applicable norms. Consequently, histories depending on oral traditions, indigenous cosmologies, or non-Western ways of knowing have often been excluded or written off as unscientific. This has produced hierarchies within the academy wherein Western academics and theories—even in relation to non-European histories—are more likely to be quoted, published, and considered as authoritative.⁴

Eurocentric presumptions abound in the vocabulary of historical study itself. European experiences and timeframes determine ideas such "modernity," "civilisation," "progress," and even "revolution" most of the time. For instance, the Enlightenment marks the advent of logical thinking and personal liberty, while the concurrent reality of racial brutality and colonial exploitation is often overlooked or minimised. Such contradictions lead to a fractured knowledge of world history wherein the achievements of Europe take front stage while the sacrifices and contributions of others are pushed to the side. Another area where Eurocentrism has left a lasting impression is public memory—the



common knowledge of history among people and countries. National commemorations, museum displays, and monuments all often mirror and support prevailing historical narratives. Public monuments honouring colonial leaders, military triumphs, and imperial successes abound in many Western nations, however often pay little respect to the bloodshed and persecution accompanying these deeds. Celebrating leaders like Christopher Columbus, Cecil Rhodes, or Winston Churchill shows how Eurocentric memory sanitises or excuses colonial atrocities in the name of discovery, progress, or national pride.

Public memory, however, has lately become a place of debate and change. Movements as "Rhodes Must Fall" in South Africa and the United Kingdom, "Black Lives Matter" in the United States, and worldwide demands for the decolonisation of museums and curriculum have confronted the continuation of Eurocentric remembrance.⁵ These movements have sought more inclusive and truthful historical depictions and exposed the ways in which public venues and historical narratives support exclusion and inequity. Important first steps towards a more fair and balanced historical memory include the removal or recontextualization of monuments, the rewriting of instructional materials, and the inclusion of hitherto underprivileged voices. Still, the path to decolonise history is not without difficulties. Eurocentric viewpoints are still reinforced by institutional inertia, political opposition, and the worldwide predominance of Western academic and media outlets. Funding, validity, and accessibility are common obstacles for efforts to create and share different historical narratives. Moreover, the globalised character of modern education implies that Western-produced textbooks, online courses, and historical films still have disproportionate impact on how history is taught and seen all around.

Deeper issues include the epistemological presumptions supporting historical research itself. Decolonising history calls for a reevaluation of the concepts, issues, and approaches that characterise the field, not just for adding varied materials. Scholars such Dipesh Chakrabarty, Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, and Walter Dignolo have urged "provincialising Europe" and adopting "pluriversal" approaches to knowledge that honour many ways of knowing and being. Recognising their capacity to theorise, interpret, and narrate their own pasts on their own terms, such strategies aim to restore agency to historically underprivileged populations. Equally crucial are the necessity of transnational and comparative histories transcending the nation-state as the main focus of study. Historians may oppose Eurocentric narratives that show Europe as the exclusive source of modernity by stressing global linkages, migrations, and exchanges, therefore highlighting the interconnectedness of cultures. For instance, the history of science might be rewritten to incorporate the mathematical innovations of the Islamic Golden Age, the medical techniques of traditional Chinese medicine, and the astronomical knowledge of Mayan civilizations—all of which helped to advance humanity and affected European events.⁶

Systems of education all around have a crucial part in subverting Eurocentric historical accounts. Reform of the curricula should not only vary the materials but also promote historiographical awareness, critical thinking, and source analysis. Training for teachers should help them to lead conversations about historical bias, power, and viewpoint. Education may become a very effective weapon for advancing historical justice and cross-cultural understanding by enabling students to challenge accepted narratives and investigate other points of view. Accountable for influencing popular opinions of history is the media. For many individuals, historical information



comes mostly from historical films, documentaries, and digital media. These media have the ability to reach large audiences with complex and inclusive tales even as they might reinforce preconceptions and simplistic storylines. Media may challenge Eurocentric narratives and bring underprivileged histories into the mainstream, as shown by documentaries as Henry Louis Gates Jr.'s *The Great African Civilisations* or programs on the Mughal Empire, the Silk Roads, and indigenous history of the Americas.

Colonial and Imperial Ideas Rule Mainstream Historiography.⁷

Far from a disinterested digression of the past, the writing of history is an intrinsically interpretive effort moulded by the preoccupations, power structures, and current ideas. The deep-rooted ideas of colonialism and imperialism nevertheless have a great, sometimes subtle impact on popular history even if formal ends of empires and major academic initiatives towards decolonisation are officially ending. These ideas penetrate the very bases of historical activity, guiding which events are judged worthy of record, which people are praised or excluded, and via which interpretative lenses the past is interpreted. Operating at the level of epistemology, archive creation, narrative framing, institutional authority, and the residual presumptions ingrained within the historical discipline itself, the methods via which these ideas endure are complicated and intertwined. Engaging critically with historical narratives and facing the legacy of empire in our knowledge of the planet depends on an awareness of these dynamics.

The most basic mechanism is found in the epistemic legacy left behind from colonialism. A constellation of ideas supported colonialism: the inherent superiority of European civilisation ("White Man's Burden"), the idea of *terra nullius* (land belonging to no one), the teleological narrative of progress emanating just from the West, and the classification of non-European peoples as primitive, static, or incapable of self-governance. These concepts were ingrained in the approaches and classification systems of emerging academic fields, including history, not just in political discourse. Although the Enlightenment mission promoted reason, it often did so within a framework that positioned Europe as the height of human accomplishment, therefore indirectly devaluating other knowledge systems and historical paths. Mainstream history therefore evolved with a strongly rooted Eurocentrism. This shows up as the main force of historical change—Europe (and its settler-colonial offshoots)—persistently centring. Events are typically presented in connection to their influence on Europe or their part in a story of European supremacy and expansion. Modern history's major narrative shifts to the "Rise of the West," thereby obscuring the intricate internal dynamics and sophisticated successes of other areas or attributing their "advancement" entirely to European influence. Derived from the European experience, periodizing systems (Ancient, Mediaeval, Modern) are imposed worldwide and often distort the historical rhythms of other civilisations. This epistemic bias shapes what qualifies as a legitimate historical source (privileging written documents, frequently colonial administrative records, over oral traditions, material culture, or indigenous knowledge systems) and what topics are judged worthy of academic endeavour.

Archives' structure and management help to concretise and sustain this epistemic prejudice. Designed mostly by nations, colonial administrations, religious organisations, and elites, archives are not neutral repositories but active places of power. Colonial archives were painstakingly selected tools of control and rule. Through the prism of surveillance, punishment, or administrative classification, they methodically silence, distorting, or merely recording the voices and experiences



of the colonised while documenting the actions of the colonists - administrators, soldiers, merchants, missionaries. Rebellions were recorded as criminal behaviour; sophisticated social systems were reduced to crude tribal categories; rich cultural practices were written off as superstition. A great source imbalance results from the vast amount and accessibility of colonial archives relative to the dispersed, frequently repressed, or purposefully destroyed documents of indigenous people and anti-colonial activities. Often limited by time, money, and language ability, historians naturally depend mostly on these easily accessible colonial sources. This reliance creates stories from the ground up, therefore favouring the viewpoint, priorities, and interpretations of the coloniser. The "Archive" itself becomes a mechanism of omission, rendering great swathes of experience – particularly the intimate life, internal conflicts, intellectual traditions, and resistance strategies of colonised peoples – historically invisible or accessible only through the distorting filter of colonial observation and reportage. Though they are essential, attempts to "read against the grain" cannot entirely offset the fundamental prejudices ingrained in the very framework of the archive.⁸

Beyond sources, colonial ideas shape interpretative paradigms and story framing rather strongly. The great stories that shape public knowledge of history clearly show the traces of imperial justification. Though now seldom expressed so explicitly, the "Civilising Mission" cliché nevertheless quietly shapes colonial interactions. With the violence, exploitation, and cultural destruction handled as incidental "excesses" or the unfortunate cost of progress, rather than as the constitutive elements of the colonial project itself, colonial rule might be presented as bringing order, development, infrastructure, or modernity to apparently backward societies. The teleology of development downplays the catastrophic ruptures and alternative routes precluded by positioning colonialism as a necessary, if occasionally cruel, step on the road to modern nationhood or global integration. Often isolating the histories of colonised areas, historiographical compartmentalisation treats them as discrete "area studies" instead of integrated components of a globally linked system profoundly influenced by imperial exploitation and resistance. This hides the worldwide flows of wealth, labour, and ideas produced by empire and marginalises the great influence of colonialism on the metropole itself. Moreover, stories of response and victimisation usually limit the agency of colonised people. Their acts are seen mostly as reactions to European projects (resistance to invasion, adaption to colonial control) rather than as resulting from their own complicated internal dynamics, desires, and historical paths. While radical leaders of resistance organisations or indigenous intellectuals voicing different ideas can be ignored, demonised, or erased, figures who worked together typically take the stage. Often, the emphasis stays on military conquest and high politics, therefore overlooking the social, cultural, and environmental changes colonialism brought about on daily life.⁹

These prejudices are not just a question of intellectual inertia; they are fostered by institutional structures and power relations within the historical profession and allied disciplines. Gatekeeping mechanisms are created by the predominance of Western (especially Anglo-American) colleges, scholarly publications, publishing companies, and funding agencies. Funding, publication, and recognition as "rigorous" or "significant" are more probable for research goals, methodological preferences, and theoretical frameworks that fit accepted (and sometimes implicitly Eurocentric) conventions. The assessment of academic value often favours work based on conventional archive research in large Western or colonial repositories, therefore perhaps depriving research dependent on oral history, community-based approaches, or sources in non-European languages. Though gradually



shifting, the demographics of the professoriate in many Western universities still frequently mirror past patterns of exclusion, therefore determining which points of view are emphasised in courses and research supervision. Moreover, nationalist historiographies—even in post-colonial nations—can unintentionally copy imperial models. Sometimes new countries adopted the colonizer's territorial boundaries, administrative categories, and even elements of the "modernisation" narrative, so possibly marginalising minority groups or internal critiques inside their own borders. Other times, they built their histories in opposition to the coloniser. The temptation to produce cohesive national narratives can cause colonial cooperation to be sanitised or history challenging the legitimacy of the new state to be suppressed.

Perhaps the most powerful, but subtle, method of ongoing colonial impact is the absence of events and leaders. Mainstream historiography is determined in great part by what it excludes as by what it includes. Comparatively to the thorough documentation of European statecraft, wars, and intellectual revolutions, whole categories of experience and large geographic regions get little attention. Generally minimised, portrayed as isolated events, or hidden by euphemism language, the size and systematic character of colonial violence—genocides, famines brought on by resource exploitation, forced labour regimes, the harsh repression of rebellions—is generally overlooked. Pre-colonial cultures' great intellectual and cultural achievements—found in Africa, Asia, the Americas, Oceania—often find their place in anthropology or archaeology rather than included into the dominant historical narrative of "civilisation." Colonised peoples's contributions to world knowledge—in mathematics, astronomy, medicine, agriculture—are minimised or ascribed to outsiders. From Toussaint Louverture and Samory Touré to lesser-known local leaders and thinkers, figures who reflect resistance or provide strong criticisms of empire may be removed from textbooks or relegated to footnotes; colonial officials and explorers remain very prominent. Often disconnected from their historical roots in mainstream historical accounts, the ongoing legacies of colonialism—persistent economic inequalities, racial hierarchies, environmental damage, and contested borders—are handled as modern concerns rather than the direct results of imperial systems.¹⁰

Deconstructing these mechanisms is an ongoing and vital task. It requires historians to practice rigorous self-reflexivity, constantly interrogating their own positionality, the limitations of their sources, and the ideological underpinnings of their interpretive frameworks. It necessitates actively seeking out marginalized voices and alternative sources, embracing methodologies like oral history, subaltern studies, and community-engaged research to counter the silences of the colonial archive. It demands challenging Eurocentric periodization and categories, developing narratives that recognize the coevalness and interconnectedness of global histories without subsuming them into a Western-driven teleology. Critically engaging with the institutional structures of knowledge production – advocating for diverse hiring practices, supporting scholarship in marginalized areas, challenging funding biases, and promoting multilingualism – is essential. Ultimately, it involves recognizing that the historian's craft is not neutral; it is always implicated in relations of power. The enduring shadow of colonial and imperial ideologies in mainstream historiography is a stark reminder that writing history is not merely about recounting the past but also about contesting the narratives that shape our present and future.¹¹ Only through sustained critical engagement with these pervasive mechanisms can historiography begin to transcend its imperial inheritance and offer a more genuinely inclusive and complex understanding of the human past. The project is not one of simple addition but



of fundamental reimagining – a continuous effort to illuminate the vast territories of experience and significance that colonial ideologies have long consigned to the margins of history.

Evaluating Efforts to Dismantle Eurocentrism in Historical Narratives

The enduring legacy of Eurocentrism – the pervasive framing of world history through the lens of Western European experiences, values, and presumed superiority – continues to distort our understanding of the past. Its influence manifests in the marginalization of vast regions and peoples, the glorification of colonialism, and the presentation of Western modernity as the universal telos of human development. Challenging this deep-seated bias is not merely an academic exercise but a fundamental project for achieving historical accuracy, social justice, and a truly global consciousness. Contemporary efforts, spearheaded by decolonial scholarship, curriculum reform, and the broader push for inclusive historiography, represent a multifaceted and dynamic struggle to decenter Europe, amplify silenced voices, and promote pluralistic, multi-perspective narratives. Evaluating these efforts reveals significant strides alongside persistent challenges and unresolved tensions.¹²

Decolonial scholarship constitutes the most radical and theoretically profound challenge to Eurocentrism. Building on the foundations laid by postcolonial theory (Said, Spivak, Bhabha) and earlier anti-colonial thinkers (Fanon, Césaire), contemporary decolonial scholars like Walter Dignolo, Aníbal Quijano, and María Lugones argue that Eurocentrism is not simply a bias but the epistemological bedrock of modernity itself, forged through colonialism. Their work demands a fundamental rethinking of historical categories, methodologies, and the very purpose of history. Decoloniality seeks to "delink" from the Eurocentric paradigm by centering the knowledge systems, cosmologies, and historical experiences of those subjugated by colonialism – indigenous peoples, the formerly enslaved, and communities subjected to imperial domination. This involves rejecting the universal applicability of Western periodization (Ancient/Medieval/Modern), challenging the primacy of written state archives over oral traditions and embodied knowledge, and reframing events like the "Age of Discovery" as the onset of invasion and epistemicide. Projects recovering pre-colonial African state complexity, analyzing the transatlantic slave trade from the perspective of the enslaved, or documenting indigenous resistance movements exemplify this approach. The strength of decolonial scholarship lies in its systemic critique, exposing how knowledge production itself remains colonized.¹³ It forces a confrontation with the violence embedded in the foundations of the modern world and offers powerful theoretical tools for epistemic justice. However, its limitations include accusations of excessive abstraction, the practical difficulty of fully integrating radically different epistemologies into academic frameworks dominated by Western norms, and sometimes overlooking internal complexities and conflicts within colonized societies. Its radical stance also makes it a prime target for political backlash, often misrepresented as an attack on "Western civilization" rather than a critique of its imperial foundations.

Simultaneously, curriculum reform represents the most visible and contentious battlefield for challenging Eurocentrism. From primary schools to universities, movements demand the diversification of content and perspectives within history education. This translates into efforts to: integrate the histories of Africa, Asia, the Americas, and Oceania not as appendages to European history but as rich, dynamic subjects in their own right; center the experiences of enslaved peoples, indigenous communities, women, and LGBTQ+ individuals; critically examine colonialism, slavery, and their enduring legacies; and adopt global or transnational frameworks that highlight



interconnectedness rather than isolated national narratives. Initiatives like the Zinn Education Project in the US, the "Why is My Curriculum White?" campaign in the UK, and revisions to national history standards worldwide embody this push. The significance of curriculum reform is immense: it shapes the historical consciousness of future generations, fostering empathy, critical thinking about power structures, and a sense of belonging for students from marginalized backgrounds. When done well, it replaces simplistic myths with complex, multi-perspective understandings, as seen in nuanced teaching about the Haitian Revolution or the global dimensions of World War I. Yet, the challenges are formidable. Reform often faces intense political resistance, framed as "unpatriotic," "divisive," or promoting "critical race theory" (a frequent misnomer for any critical examination of race and history). Legislative bans on teaching about systemic racism or "divisive concepts" directly target these efforts. Furthermore, implementation is plagued by tokenism – adding a few non-European figures or events without fundamentally restructuring the narrative arc – and curricular overload. Teachers often lack adequate training, resources, or support to navigate complex, contested histories. The gap between progressive academic scholarship and what reaches the classroom remains significant, and reforms can be easily rolled back with political shifts.¹⁴

Curriculum reform and decolonial research are grounded on the more general inclusive historiography. From social history "from below," gender history, subaltern studies, ethnic studies, and the history of sexuality, it covers a spectrum of analytical techniques devoted to recovering marginalised voices and experience. This involves meticulous archival work "against the grain," seeking traces of agency and perspective in sources created by oppressors; embracing oral history to capture lived experiences excluded from official records; utilizing material culture and archaeology; and collaborating with descendant communities. The successes are notable. Decades of labour have provided rich histories of slave communities, women's involvement in revolutions, indigenous environmental knowledge, and the cultural creation of colonial peoples, demonstrably augmenting and rectifying the historical record. Projects digitising underprivileged archives enhance access. More complex scholarly monographs, museum exhibits aiming for many points of view, and public history initiatives centred on community histories clearly show the influence. Still, inclusive history has its own critics. Sometimes it becomes compartmentalised, with histories of underprivileged groups living in parallel silos instead of being fully included into popular narratives. By concentrating only on victimisation or resistance, one runs the danger of ignoring the whole complexity of the internal dynamics, intellectual traditions, and agency beyond response of these civilisations. Moreover, the institutional systems of academia—funding objectives, publication gatekeeping, tenure decisions—can still favour conventional (usually Eurocentric) themes and approaches, therefore limiting the full acceptability and influence of inclusive work.¹⁵

Examining these initiatives taken together shows a difficult terrain. Positively, they have clearly changed schooling and historical research. Eurocentrism's presumptions are continually questioned; it is no more a default with no objections. Written and taught is a much more varied, rich, and linked global history. Once invisible, marginalised voices increasingly demand attention and are changing accepted narratives. Decolonial theory's theoretical rigour offers a strong structure for comprehending the sources of historical prejudice. Still, major challenges exist. Strong and well-organised, resistance uses political clout to impede change—especially in education—by stifling policies. Modern research still lags behind widely used teaching strategies. Often replacing thorough



structural restructuring is tokenistic inclusion. Decolonial demands for epistemic delinking present conceptual and practical difficulties within Western academic institutions. Moreover, the effort is not monolithic; conflicts between many strategies (e.g., postcolonial vs. decolonial, integration vs. autonomy for neglected histories) occur.

The road ahead calls for ongoing, multi-level participation. Along with strong teacher preparation and resource creation for applying pluralistic curriculum, it requires constant support for academics doing decolonial and inclusive work. It calls for brave protection of academic freedom against political repression. Most importantly, it entails accepting really global and relational understandings instead of just adding marginalised points of view towards a basic reconceptualisation of historical frameworks, periodisation, and causation. The intention is not to substitute one master story for another but rather to encourage a historiography fit for plurality, complexity, and the natural tension of many truths coexisting. Though the revolution against Eurocentric prejudice is far from over, the vitality and need of these modern initiatives are indisputable. Built on the awareness that the fabric of human history is spun from innumerable threads, each vital to the whole, they reflect a continuing battle not only for a more truthful past but also for a more fair and equitable present and future. The work is ongoing, controversial and crucial.

CONCLUSION

The persistence of Eurocentric bias in historical narratives reflects a deep-rooted legacy of colonial and imperial ideologies that continue to shape how history is written, taught, and understood. Despite the formal end of colonialism, dominant historiographical frameworks still prioritise European experiences and achievements while marginalising the voices, knowledge systems, and historical contributions of non-European societies. This bias is not merely a matter of content but is embedded in the very categories, periodisations, and methodologies of the historical discipline. Textbooks, archives, academic institutions, and public commemorations all contribute to the reproduction of these skewed narratives. While significant efforts have emerged to challenge and reform this bias—such as decolonial scholarship, curriculum changes, and inclusive historiography—many of these initiatives face institutional resistance, limited resources, and political pushback. Real decolonisation of history requires more than the inclusion of marginalised voices; it demands a rethinking of how history itself is constructed and legitimised.

REFERENCES

1. RM Bhat, P. Rajan, and L. Gamage, “Redressing Historical Bias: Exploring the Path to an Accurate Representation of the Past,” *Journal of Social Science*, 2023.
2. CB McCullagh, “Bias in Historical Description, Interpretation, and Explanation,” *History and Theory*, 2000.
3. TJ Luce, “Ancient Views on the Causes of Bias in Historical Writing,” *Classical Philology*, 1989.
4. GM Trevelyan, “Bias in History,” *History*, 1947.
5. IS Lustick, “History, Historiography, and Political Science: Multiple Historical Records and the Problem of Selection Bias,” *American Political Science Review*, 1996.
6. Y Vella, “Teaching Bias in History Lessons: An Example Using Maltese History,” *History Education Research Journal*, 2020.
7. A Mukharji and R. Zeckhauser, “Bound to Happen: Explanation Bias in Historical Analysis,” *Journal of Applied History*, 2019.



8. S Lang, "What Is Bias?" *Teaching History*, 1993.
9. K. Iordanou, P. Kendeou, and M. Zembylas, "Examining My-Side Bias During and After Reading Controversial Historical Accounts," *Metacognition and Learning*, 2020.
10. C. Robertson, "In Pursuit of Life Histories: The Problem of Bias," *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 1983.
11. M. Romanowski, "Problems of Bias in History Textbooks," *Social Education*, 1996.
12. JD Mackie, "Bias and the Historian," *Library Review*, 1935.
13. AN Boyce, "Bias in History," accessed from wiredspace.wits.ac.za.
14. R. Sandwell, "Reading Beyond Bias: Using Historical Documents in the Secondary Classroom," *McGill Journal of Education*, 2003.
15. JB Isacoff, "Writing the Arab-Israeli Conflict: Historical Bias and the Use of History in Political Science," *Perspectives on Politics*, 2005.