

Eurocentrism in World History Textbooks: The Case of Canada*

Tahir Nakip**

Eurocentrism in World History Textbooks: The Case of Canada

This paper investigates how Eurocentrism affects World History textbooks, using examples of Edmonton universities which include the University of Alberta, Concordia University College, Grant MacEwan University and the King's University College. In this way, the grave implications of Eurocentrism for the study of World History is demonstrated as well as the impact that this set of beliefs might exert on a field of history which aims to overturn Eurocentrism and privilege cross cultural encounters and global approaches to the past is discovered.

Key words: World History textbooks, historiography, Eurocentrism, Orientalism.

Are the world history textbooks used in Canadian universities Eurocentric? Do Canadian students in university-level World History courses really study World History or are they studying European perspectives on that history? In this paper I investigate how Eurocentrism affects World History textbooks, using examples of Edmonton universities, including the University of Alberta, Concordia University College, Grant MacEwan University and the King's University College. In this way, I demonstrate the grave implications of Eurocentrism for the study of World History and discover the impact that this set of beliefs might continue to exert on a field of history which aims to

* I would like to thank Professor Randolph Haluza-Delay, Professor William Van Arragon, and Professor Mark Sandle for their guidance and direction and also Dr. Timothy Pearson for sharing his ideas and editing this paper.

** MA in History at Marmara University, BA in Politics, History and Economics at King's University College (thrnkp@hotmail.com).

overturn Eurocentrism and privilege cross cultural encounters and global approaches to the past. The textbooks provide a way of measuring the extent of Eurocentrism's continuing influence. So the question is "What impact does Eurocentrism have on World History?"

European historians, according to Bruce Mazlish, "from the nineteenth century to the middle of the twentieth century" studied national histories. This approach, which developed out of the French Revolution, mirrored the establishment of nation-states. The Industrial Revolution and imperialism assisted in the emergence of the nation-state as a way of structuring social, cultural and political relations in world societies. After World War II, however, World History emerged in reaction to previous modes of historical writing that had focused on the nation-state as the subject of history. To differentiate their approach from older national histories, world historians describe their field using two interchangeable terms, "world" and "global". According to the new World History perspective, "civilization" is "the last stage of every culture", thus, civilizations ought to be the subjects of history, rather than nations.¹ In this view, the main topic of history shifts from micro-level historical research to macro-level studies.

Attempts by world historians to define the meaning of "world" and "global" illustrate the diverging views that exist around current efforts to develop a non-Eurocentric history. In an earlier study, Mazlish defines "'world' in the Middle English sense of 'human existence', referring to the earth, people, animals, plants and all things" and continues:

Historically, the discovery of the so-called "New World" is seen by many historians to mark a new period in the history of the world. Historians use the term "world" for the classification of peoples. Furthermore, in the social sciences the First, Second, and Third Worlds are ranked at different levels of development.²

The classification of peoples and civilizations in such a way hinders the writing of a non-Eurocentric World History. The term "global", meanwhile, is meant to establish a politically unbiased discourse about civilizations. Pamela Crossley claims global historical approaches involve the effort to develop major explanations without emphasizing either Eurocentric or non-Eurocentric

1 Bruce Mazlish, "Terms", in *World Histories*, ed. Marnie Hughes-Warrington (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 24-26.

2 Bruce Mazlish, "Crossing Boundaries: Ecumenical, World, and Global History", in *World History: Ideologies, Structures, and Identities*, ed. Philip Pomper, Richard E. Elphick and Richard Pamela T. Vann (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1998), 46-47.

historical accounts.³ Mazlish adds that the meaning of “global” includes “the notion of standing outside our planet.” Global History compromises both “the history of globalization” and the “global process” as major historical issues, especially in reference to political, social and economic events from 1750 to the present.⁴ The textbooks I examine in this paper adopt both Global and World History approaches.

As for Eurocentrism, the term refers to the purported superiority of Europe over the rest of the world. It is the assumption that since Europe grew richer and more powerful than all other societies it is “superior” to them; its perspective, therefore, ought to be privileged over all others. Eurocentrism in history refers to the presumed centrality and dominance of Europe in global historical affairs. It influences religious, cultural and political patterns of world history. According to J. M. Blaut, the four major categories of religion, race, environment and culture shape Eurocentric ideology. Histories based on this ideology claim that white Christian Europeans developed a progressive and innovative culture in a supportive natural environment. The fertile land allowed Europe to flourish faster than non-European societies.⁵ Europeans went on to develop feudalism, science, capitalism, democracy and the modern nation state, to name just a few significant historical achievements. Today, colonialism and globalism successfully continue to support and promote European societies over non-European ones in the modern world. However, at the root of assumptions and explanations of European superiority, racism and religion have been replaced by culture and values. In short, the assumption is that Christian and white European cultural values produced a unique model of development that non-European societies simply could not replicate.

Eurocentrism encompasses beliefs that assume the superiority of the Europeans over the non-Europeans through two main arguments related to the “Western mind” and “European spirit”. The former, as Blaut asserts, is that Europe naturally progresses and modernizes because it is “historical” and therefore changes over time; the latter is that non-Europeans are intrinsically stagnant, traditional and backward, and therefore “ahistorical”. Accordingly, the “European mind” leads in creativity, invention, rationality and honourable behaviour or ethics. “Conversely, the non-European world is empty and lacks ‘rationality’ including intellectual and spiritual factors.”⁶ Likewise, John

3 Pamela Kyle Crossley, *What is Global History?* (Malden, MA: Polity, 2008), 4-8.

4 Mazlish, “Crossing Boundaries”, 47.

5 J. M. Blaut, *Eight Eurocentric Historians* (New York: The Guilford Press, 2000), 1.

6 J. M. Blaut, *The Colonizer’s Model of the World: Geographical Diffusionism and Eurocentric History* (New York: The Guilford Press, 1993), 14-15.

Hobson claims that some historians imagine the West as inherently sanctified with unique virtues, such as rationalism, productivity, liberal-democracy, independence, progressiveness and dynamism. Non-Europeans then become the opposite of the West: irrational, lazy, unproductive, despotic, corrupt, dependent, childlike and immature, backward, stagnant and unchanging.⁷ Eurocentric accounts of the history of the world advance the assumption that only Western societies are capable of progressive development, whereas non-Western societies are passive objects of world historical processes.

Critiques of Eurocentrism in World History

According to Eurocentric accounts of the history of the world, history itself began with Ancient Greece, continued with the European agricultural revolution and the rise of Italian city-states. After a period of darkness, Europeans rediscovered Greek ideas in the Renaissance and advanced new knowledge in the Scientific Revolution. The Enlightenment and the rise of democracy led to industrialization and the capitalist modern world. In other words, Europeans constructed the modern world without cultural or political contributions from anyone else. Consequently, Europeans, as the only civilized peoples, determined global standards of civilization. According to Brett Bowden, civilization is the key concept that has shaped domestic and international affairs and divided societies into “civilized” and “uncivilized”. He adds that there is an assumption that civilization is the essential process of history and that all societies become civilized at the end of the process.⁸ Eurocentrism assumes that Europe is the origin of this civilization and therefore responsible for the construction of law and order in the rest of world.

Many historians have critiqued this grand narrative of Western and global civilization. Preiswerk and Parrot, for example, argue against the assumption that civilization was Greek in origin. Eurocentric thought creates a monopolistic concept of civilization rather than a pluralist one.⁹ The context of Eurocentric ideas often cause methodological problems, encountered by social scientists, history teachers and students of World History in macro-historical projects. As Mark Donnelly and Claire Norton write, “Eurocentric history only makes sense, that is, we can only write a narrative of linear

7 John M. Hobson, *The Eastern Origins of Western Civilization* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 7-8.

8 Brett Bowden, *The Empire of Civilization: The Evolution of an Imperial Idea* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009), 9-13, 28.

9 Roy Preiswerk and Dominique Perrot, *Ethnocentrism and History* (New York: Nok Publishers International, 1978), 68-69.

European progress and domination, if we take the current politico-economic situation as the finishing point of history.”¹⁰ For example, some historians of World History might mistakenly ignore the contributions of non-European civilizations as the subject of history. Indeed, some historians of World History have defined civilization in some World History textbooks in remarkably Eurocentric terms. For example, John P. McKay, Bennet D. Hill, John Buckler, Patricia B. Ebrey and Roger B. Beck in their world-history textbook say that

peoples living in Western Europe developed numerous communities uniquely their own but also sharing some common features. They mastered such diverse subjects as astronomy, mathematics, geometry, trigonometry, engineering, religious practices and social organization. But the earliest of these peoples did not record their learning and lore in systems of writing; consequently their lives and customs are largely lost to us. Early peoples living elsewhere confronted many of the same basic challenges as those in Western Europe [sic], and they took the important step of recording their experiences in writing.¹¹

When such scholars mention “early civilizations”, they emphasize European civilization in a Eurocentric sense. The first question they ask students in the chapter titled “Early Civilization” is “What were the fundamental Neolithic contributions to the rise of Western Civilization?”¹² They then conduct students through this Eurocentric question, producing a Eurocentric account of civilization.

Others, however, pay attention to the appearance of Eurocentric terms and try to highlight them. For instance, Mazlish emphasizes the Eurocentric meaning of civilization, asking “why the *concept* of civilization –as opposed to “being civilized” or “not being barbarian”– did not emerge until the late eighteenth century[?]”¹³ He goes on to argue that with imperialism and colonialism Western civilizations tried to homogenize non-Western societies. Europeans claimed that they were civilizing non-European Barbarians when they started to colonize non-European lands in the late eighteenth century. Thus, Eurocentric thought produced a unique terminology, which labeled non-Eurocentric civilization as uncivilized. As argued by Edward Said in his famous

¹⁰ Mark Donnelly and Claire Norton, *Doing History* (New York: Routledge, 2011), 139.

¹¹ John P. McKay et al., *A History of World Societies* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2007), 3.

¹² McKay et al., *A History of World Societies*, 3.

¹³ Bruce Mazlish, *Civilization and Its Contents* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2004), 5.

book, Orientalism produced the conflict between the Orient and the Occident. “Orientalism”, Said writes, “is a style of thought based upon an ontological and epistemological distinction made between ‘the Orient’ and (most of the time) ‘the Occident’”¹⁴ In the oriental discourse of Said, Orientalism is “a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient”¹⁵

Method and Data

The methodology of this paper draws on Lewis and Humphrey’s 2005 study of the impact of environmental research on introductory sociology textbooks.¹⁶ However, whereas they examine how well introductory textbooks reflect major topic developments in environmental sociology, my study centres on three questions about the impact of Eurocentrism on the teaching of World History at the first-year university level. What are the major topics of interest to historians of World History? What indicators of Eurocentrism exist in the field of World History? And, how well are these indicators reflected in World History textbooks? Overall, then, I am concerned with the impact that Eurocentrism concepts and theories have on commonly used World History texts.

To understand the presence of Eurocentrism in World History textbooks, I have examined twenty-three such texts, consisting of thirty volumes. I selected these books based on World History courses taught at the University of Alberta, Concordia University College, the King’s University College, and Grant MacEwan University, all located in Edmonton, Alberta.¹⁷ The aim of the study is not to generalize all World History textbooks; instead, I am interested in what is represented in the textbooks used in classrooms today in Canada. When selecting the textbooks, I only focused on those whose titles include the terms “world history”, “global history” or “civilization”; I considered neither the name of authors nor their contents. Also, I made sure to use the latest edition of each textbook.

The publication years of the texts included in the study range from 1965 to 2011. The 1960s represents a tipping point for assumptions about European and American superiority in the international political field. Jack Zevin and David Gerwin claim that “this change began in the 1960s and has been

14 Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979), 2.

15 Said, *Orientalism*, 3.

16 Tammy L. Lewis and Craig R. Humphrey, “Sociology and the Environment: An Analysis of Coverage in Introductory Sociology Textbooks”, *Teaching Sociology*, 33/2 (2005): 154-55.

17 These textbooks are published in the USA and taught to world history students. I could not observe any regional specifications for Canada.

growing ever since. The many different histories contrast often in focus and methodology, offering rich new findings and insights for our lesson planning and teaching, but it is difficult to get a grip on the totality of news and views.”¹⁸ This date range helps us to see the development of World History writing over several recent decades. For example, more recent World History textbooks tend to include new themes such as cross-cultural interactions, mass-migration, multiculturalism, global terrorism and global diseases in accordance with the political mood; these are not present in older texts.

World History textbooks often consist of two volumes. The first volumes generally begin with ancient civilizations and proceed through to the fifteenth century. The second volumes often start at 1500 and continue to the present. Around 1500 Europeans began to explore the “New World”, and this change seems to account for most divisions in textbook structure. The colonization of the lands inhabited by so-called “primitive” peoples promoted scientific, cultural, economic and political changes in Europe and around the world. Many historians of World History regard 1500 as a turning point in the progression of history. Table 1 shows the prevalence of key Eurocentric indicators such as this one in each text; findings which allow for a deeper analysis of the degree to which Eurocentrism impacts World History textbooks.

Examples of Eurocentrism in University Textbooks

Sixteen indicators appear regularly in each text. An explanation of each indicator follows in table 1.

Table 1. Definition of Eurocentric Concepts and Themes

| | |
|---|---|
| Gregorian Dating | The Western/Christian dating system dates all historical events with the Gregorian calendar, which is based on the birth of Christ. |
| Eurocentric Periodization Model (classical, medieval, early modern and modern periods) | The periodization of world history is divided into “classical”, “medieval”, “early modern” and “modern”, which correspond roughly to Ancient Greek Civilization and the Roman Empire as the core of European historical development, the Middle Ages, the Age of Discovery, and the Scientific and Industrial Revolutions in Europe. This model predicts that all civilizations precede along the same historical path. |

¹⁸ Jack Zevin and David Gerwin, *Teaching World History as Mystery* (New York: Routledge, 2011), 24.

| | |
|--|---|
| The Age of Discovery | The period from the early fifteenth century to the early seventeenth century during which Europeans explored the Americas, Oceania and the western side of Africa, establishing direct contacts with the Americas, Africa, Asia and Oceania and mapping the planet. This term excludes voyages made by Muslim, Chinese and other sailors at this time and before. |
| Discovery of Cape of "Good Hope" | This term refers to Bartholomeu Dias's 'first' discovery of the Cape of Storms in 1487-8, ignoring the Arab navigator Shihab al-Din Ahmad Ibn Majid's voyage from the Cape to the Mediterranean in the mid-fifteenth century and local indigenous knowledge of the Cape. |
| Globalization after 1500 | The process by which European ways of life spread across the world after 1500 and the Age of Discovery |
| Imperialism | The practice, theory and attitudes of a (European) dominating metropolitan centre ruling a distant territory. |
| Colonialism | The expansion of European influence beyond Europe, and the establishment of settlements in foreign land. |
| The Scientific Revolution | The sweeping change in the investigation of nature and the view of the universe which took place in Europe in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. |
| The Industrial Revolution | The complex set of economic, demographic and technological events that began in Western Europe and resulted in an industrial economy. |
| Islamic Threat and Evil in Middle Ages | Christian European invention of Islam as a threat and evil in order to construct a "Christian European identity". Islamic world labelled as anti-Europe and anti-Christ, in cooperation with the Devil. Leads to Crusades against the Seljuk Empire and other Muslim Turkish Empires. |
| Islamic Threat and Evil in Pre-modern Age | The re-emergence of medieval Christian crusading mentality, especially a Spanish monarchy obsessed with removing Islam from the Iberian peninsula. Targeting the leader and protector of Muslim societies, the Ottoman Empire, which represented the image of the horrific Turk, in order to establish a homogeneous Europe. |
| Islamic Threat and Evil in Modern Age with Islamism and Fundamentalism | The assumption of a Muslim identity at the center of Muslims' political practice. Islamism refers to attempt to establish an Islamic order. Fundamentalism is seen to be at the root of terrorism. |
| Westernization | The process by which other cultures adopt Western styles or ways of life. |

| | |
|-----------------------------|---|
| Progress and Linear History | The assumption that Enlightenment thinkers create better societies and people by discarding outmoded traditions and embracing rationalism. |
| The Age of Democracy | The period after the French Revolution which emphasized the concepts of human rights, freedom and democracy as the best governmental system against “oriental despotism”. |
| The Mercator Projection | A world map projection that represents European superiority on the world map. For example, Scandinavia is about a third the size of India. Greenland appears twice the size of China. Europe is placed at the top of the map. |

The majority of World History textbooks which I examined still use the Christian Gregorian calendar to date historical events. People from past to present have used many different calendars to organize time. As E. G. Richards points out, Babylonians, Egyptians, Indians, Chinese and Arabs have all produced their own calendars. Yet, most historians continue to use the Gregorian calendar. This Eurocentric calendar divides history into two eras; “Before Christ” (B.C.) refers to events that occurred before the birth of Jesus, and “Anno Domini” (A.D.), Latin for “in the year of the Lord,” refers to events after Jesus’s birth.¹⁹ Eurocentric consciousness roots itself in non-European communities by way of the Gregorian calendar, which is a Christian and European calendar.

Periodization models that display a global consciousness are one of the key elements of World History writing. Periodization which might present the author’s perspective on history therefore may be a crucial issue in World History. According to Crossley, the Eurocentric periodization model consists of “classical,” “medieval,” “early modern” and “modern” times, successively related to Ancient Greek Civilization as the core of European civilization, the historical development of the Roman Empire, the Age of Discovery, and the Scientific, Industrial and French Revolutions in Europe.²⁰

In total, 16 out of 23 textbooks I examined apply a Eurocentric periodization model that draws on a “tripartite” division into an ancient age, a middle age, and a new age. The periodization used in many of the textbooks follow distinctly European markers. For example, John P. McKay, Bennet D. Hill,

19 E. G. Richards, *Mapping Time: The Calendar and Its History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 45.

20 Crossley, *What is Global History?*, 9.

John Buckler, Patricia B. Ebrey, and Roger B. Beck use the term Middle Ages in their textbook. They use “the term Middle Ages” to describe “the period in European history from about 500 to 1350.” They add “between about 1050 and 1350, Europeans displayed enormous intellectual energy and creative vitality. That later period witnessed the beginnings of ideas and institutions that not only shaped the Western world but subsequently influenced societies around the world.”²¹ They divide world history according to the periodization of European history. Palmira Brummet, Robert B. Edgar, Neil J. Hackett, George F. Jewsbury, Alistair M. Taylor, Nels M. Bailkey, Clyde J. Lewis and T. Walter Wallbank use the term “early modern times” for world history. They say “the economic structure of western Europe went through a Commercial Revolution in early modern times. The quickening of town life abetted the rise of a new and forceful middle class, whose members were the chief supporters of the system of economic individualism known as capitalism.”²² They believe early modern times began at the end of the fifteenth century and continued into modern times in world history. They recognize the early modern times through European patterns of economic structure.

Stearns et al. apply Eurocentric periodization in their textbook. They follow a linear historical approach and also equate certain periods with the term “civilization”. For example, the title of Part II in their work is “The Classical Period, 1000 B.C.E. – 500 C.E.: Uniting Large Regions,” subtitled, “Classical Civilization: China.” In it, they generalize historical events under the term civilization.²³ Likewise, in their view, the transformation of the West between 1450 and 1750 produced modern Europe and its competitors, such as Indian societies in Latin America, the Ottomans and the Asias. In “The Path of Conquest” they claim that Spanish expeditions in central and south America comprised “the women, missionaries, administrators, and artisans who began to form civil society.”²⁴ However, conquest involves violence. Stearns et al. describe Hernan Cortes as an “educated man” from a “civilized European society.”²⁵ They seem to suggest to readers and students of history that European conquest set up civilizations in uncivilized lands.

21 McKay et al., *A History of World Societies*, 347-48.

22 Palmira Brummet et al., *Civilization: Past and Present* Vol. II (New York: Longman, 2000), 352.

23 Peter N. Stearns, Michael B. Adas and Stuart B. Schwartz, *World Civilizations: The Global Experience*, Vol. II: *1450 to Present* (New York: Harper Collins, 1996), 32.

24 Stearns et al., *World Civilizations*, II, 412.

25 Stearns et al., *World Civilizations*, II, 412.

On the other hand, Stearns et al. mention that nomadic Turkic groups established Muslim empires including the Ottomans, the Safavid and the Babur. “Warrior leaders” of Muslim empires fought each other and non-Muslims. However, Ottoman warrior leaders tolerated non-Muslim subjects. Ottomans rivalled the Shi’i Muslim Safavid Empire. They add that “The Sunni-Shi’a split, which, as we have seen, arose early in the history of Islamic civilization, fuelled often violent rivalries between Ottomans and Safavids.”²⁶ According to these authors, military power, including violence, played a key role in the development of the Ottoman Empire, but the aim of European expeditions to the Americas was to form a civil society. Their ideas depend on the Eurocentric prejudice that nomadic societies are incapable of forming a civil society, while only “civilized” European societies can establish a civil society.

Some historians of World History, however, promote new periodization that undermines the centrality of European history as a universal history. Dipesh Chakrabarty rejects the notion that European history is a “universal human history”.²⁷ Marshall Hodgson’s hemispheric interregional approach to World History breaks decisively with Europe-centered approaches to periodization. Hodgson believes that modernity might be a cultural level specific to European society. Yet, all periods, including the pre-modern, can be discussed with equal weight in World History. However, progressive or Eurocentric history produces, in a sense, modernity or the rise of the modern West.²⁸ “Hodgson’s periodization of world history”, A. W. Green explains,

is divided into two great compartments: the first, the agrarian age, extended from the earliest farming communities (7000 B.C.E.) to about 1800 C.E.; the second, the technical age, commenced around 1800 C.E. Within the agrarian age, a secondary periodization was adopted, beginning with Sumerian civilization: the preaxial epoch (3000-800 B.C.E.); second, the axial epoch (800-200 B.C.E.); and the postaxial epoch (200 B.C.E. to end of the agrarian age).²⁹

Hodgson focuses on the Eastern hemisphere before 1800 and skips over considerations of the Western hemisphere. He clearly rejects Eurocentric

26 Stearns et al., *The Global Experience*, 458.

27 Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000), 3.

28 Marshall G. S. Hodgson, *Rethinking World History: Essays on Europe, Islam, and World History* (New York: The Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge, 1993).

29 A. W. Green, “Periodization in European and World History”, *Journal of World History*, 3/1 (1992): 43-44.

aspects of history. He rejects emphasizing only European civilization and the Roman Empire, calling the fall of the Roman Empire “a turning point of world history” and mentioning “the Dark Ages” as a period of history.³⁰ Hodgson implies that historians should write unbiased World History and evaluate each civilization in its historical context. E. Burke III affirms that “a major purpose of Hodgson’s interregional approach was to resituate modernity and to unhook it from Western exceptionalism.”³¹

J. H. Bentley, the founding editor of the *Journal of World History* and a member of the World History Association, offers another way of making a non-Eurocentric World History. He thinks that a focus on cross-cultural interactions in World History provides an unbiased approach as compared to Eurocentric accounts. Bentley claims that from ancient times to the present, cross-cultural interactions have provided political, social, economic and cultural advances for all communities in the world. Furthermore, historians might prefer an approach that emphasizes cross-cultural interactions rather than ethnocentric periodization which constructs history according to the experiences of a particular civilization.³² He divides World History into six stages: “(1) early complex societies between 3500 and 2000 B.C.E.; (2) ancient civilizations between 2000 and 500 B.C.E.; (3) the classical civilizations between 500 B.C.E. and 500 C.E.; (4) the post-classical age between 500 and 1000 C.E.; (5) trans-regional nomadic empires between 1000 and 1500 C.E.; and (6) the modern age from 1500 C.E. to the present.”³³ A focus on cross-cultural interactions helps not only to eliminate ethnocentric perspectives, but also allows one to properly understand non-European civilizations. Bentley proposes topics such as mass migrations, campaigns of imperial expansion and long-distance trade as World Historical subjects that have significantly shaped cross-cultural connections and cultural regions. He argues that “the migrations of Indo-European, Bantu, Germanic, Turkish, Slavic, and Mongol peoples have profound effects across the boundary lines of societies and cultural regions.”³⁴ Bentley assumes that all civilizations affect one another and contribute to human values.

30 Hodgson, *Rethinking World History*, 42.

31 E. Burke III, “Marshall G. S. Hodgson and the Hemispheric Interregional Approach to World History”, *Journal of World History*, 6/2 (1995): 246.

32 J. H. Bentley, “Cross-Cultural Interaction and Periodization in World History”, *The American Historical Review*, 101/3 (1996): 750.

33 Patrick Manning, “The Problem of Interactions in World History”, *The American Historical Review*, 101/3 (1996): 780.

34 Bentley, “Cross-Cultural Interaction”, 752.

Although Bentley's periodization looks non-Eurocentric, historians need to be aware of which civilization is producer and which civilization is consumer within the cross-cultural interactions that shape his investigations. Manning highlights the ideology behind the cross-cultural interaction model in the notion of diffusion and dominance. "Great" European civilization still tends to dominate non-European cultures culturally and politically, which then appear unable to transform themselves.³⁵

Another common Eurocentric assumption in World History, John Hobson points out, is that Bartholomeu Dias, the Portuguese explorer, was the first sailor to reach the Cape of "Good Hope" in 1487-1488.³⁶ Since the Ottoman Empire controlled the Middle East, reaching the Cape of "Good Hope" was a crucial achievement for Europeans pursuing open access to the riches of the East. It was the turning point that created a capitalist Europe. Europeans sought to improve trade by paying less transit tax to land-based rulers when they shipped goods from east to west. However, Hobson claims that Bartholomeu Dias and Vasco da Gama were in fact "the last discoverers" of the Cape of Good Hope. Various Eastern peoples, including Javanese, Chinese, Indians, Ethiopians and Arabs had all traveled from the Indian Ocean to the Atlantic Ocean many times before the Europeans. For example, the Muslim Chinese admiral Cheng Ho sailed the east coast of Africa at the beginning of the fifteenth century.³⁷ There is also evidence that some Chinese sailors had rounded the Cape as early as the eighth century. The Arab navigator Ahmad Ibn Majid sailed westwards from the Cape to the Straits of Gibraltar before entering the Mediterranean Sea in the mid-fifteenth century.³⁸ Muslims discovered many parts of the world before Europeans sailed the Atlantic and Indian Oceans. Consequently, the claim that Dias was the first becomes a good indicator of Eurocentrism in history texts. Regarding Ibn Majid's book about the Indian Ocean, Giancarlo Casale writes:

Without question, these [portolan charts, "Catalan" world maps and Ptolemaic geographies] were primitive resources for understanding the Indian Ocean when compared with contemporary Arabic works like Ibn Majid's *Kitāb al-Fawā'id fi Usūl al-Bahr wa'l-Kawā'id* ("Guidebook to the Principles of Navigating the Sea"). Yet until the sixteenth century, they

35 Manning, "The Problem of Interactions", 773.

36 Hobson, *The Eastern Origins*, 21.

37 Hobson, *The Eastern Origins*, 144.

38 Hobson, *The Eastern Origins*, 137-38.

defined the worldview of the Ottomans to the same extent as those of explorers from Portugal and Spain.³⁹

A third common Eurocentric assumption is that Europeans held scientific and military superiority in “the age of discovery,” constructing “huge” ships to sail the world’s oceans. Hobson compares the ships of Cheng’s fleet with Da Gama’s ships. While, “the longest Da Gama ship was approximately 85 feet in length, the largest Cheng ship was near 500 feet long and 180 feet wide. Whereas the shipping capacity of Columbus’s flagship was 100 tons, the shipping capacity of Cheng’s largest ship was 3100 tons.”⁴⁰ Non-Europeans in fact built large ships before Europeans learned how to construct similarly sized ships.

This narrative of Europe’s ships forms part of the common assumption in World History that globalization emerged after 1500 as a result of European “discoveries”. Akira Iriye prefers the term “international/global” to refer to “interrelations among nations whether diplomatic, economic, or cultural”, but suggests that historians of World History differ on the crucial “economic, technological, and other changes that defined globalization.” Iriye focuses on the “the large-scale transnational movements of people” from Europe to North America and migrations from Southeast Asia to the Pacific around the 1850s, rather than on “the rise and fall of the Vienna system of international relations.”⁴¹ Unlike Iriye, Hobson argues that “globalism” meaning “internationalism” dates from 500. He points out that Persians, Arabs, Africans, Javanese, Jews, Indians and Chinese maintained a global economy from 500 to about 1800. Rulers kept transit taxes low in order to assist global trade. A series of interlinked empires, such as the T’ang Dynasty of China (661-907), the Muslim Umayyad and Abbasid Empires (661-1258) and the Ottoman Empire (1299-1914) created a stable environment and global connections within which trade developed.⁴² So concepts such as “international” and “global” need to be understood in terms of intercultural connections that encourage the economic, cultural and political development of world societies, rather than just in terms of the development of European societies. Jerry H. Bentley, Herbert F. Ziegler and Heather E. Streets write:

39 Giancarlo Casale, *The Ottoman Age of Exploration* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2010), 22.

40 Hobson, *The Eastern Origins*, 144.

41 Akira Iriye, “Global History,” in *International History*, ed. Patrick Finney (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 320-22.

42 Hobson, *The Eastern Origins*, 32-35.

During the early modern era, several global processes touched peoples in all parts of the world and influenced the development of their societies. One involved biological exchange: plants, animals, and human communities crossed the world's oceans and established themselves in new lands, where they dramatically affected both the natural environment and established societies. Another involved commercial exchange: merchants took advantage of newly established sea lanes to inaugurate a genuinely global economy. Yet another process involved the diffusion of technologies and cultural traditions: printing and gunpowder spread throughout the world.⁴³

In this account, Europeans do not dominate world affairs. "Nevertheless," Bentley, Ziegler and Streets continue, "European peoples played a more prominent role in world affairs than any of their ancestors, and their efforts helped foster the development of an increasingly interdependent world."⁴⁴ They add that globalization was "a process that widened the extent and the forms of cross-cultural interaction among the world's peoples."⁴⁵ This approach shows how Europeans were a part, not the centre, of new processes.

One of the most common Eurocentric assumptions is that Britain initiated the Industrial Revolution in the middle of the eighteenth century. According to John Hobson, however, the Chinese first realized an industrial revolution six hundred years earlier. "Many characteristics that we associate with the eighteenth-century British industrial revolution had emerged by 1100."⁴⁶ For example, China produced 13,500 tons of iron in 806, 90,400 tons in 1064, and 125,000 tons in 1078 in gross annual production. By comparison, Britain produced 76,000 tons in 1788.⁴⁷ Europe as a whole did not produce more iron than China until 1700. Hobson writes, "but the striking statistic here is that as 1700, Britain had an equivalent figure of 160:100 [measured as a ratio of the value of iron to rice], which was perhaps about a third higher than the price found in the north-east Chinese markets of eleventh century."⁴⁸ The Chinese knew how to directly cast iron, but the British did not. The Chinese produced steel, which is derived from cast iron, in the second century BCE,

43 Jerry H. Bentley, Herbert F. Ziegler and Heather E. Streets, *Traditions and Encounters: A Brief Global History* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 2008), 354-355.

44 Bentley et al., *Traditions and Encounters*, 355.

45 Bentley et al., *Traditions and Encounters*, 561.

46 Hobson, *The Eastern Origins*, 50.

47 Hobson, *The Eastern Origins*, 51.

48 Hobson, *The Eastern Origins*, 52.

but the British only developed steel in the modern period.⁴⁹ Eurocentrism creates the myth that the British Industrial Revolution was the first of its kind in world history; industrialism, however, is not a uniquely European achievement.

According to William J. Duiker and Jackson J. Spielvogel, “the Industrial Revolution created the technological means, including the new weapons, by which the Western world achieved domination of much of the rest of the world by the end of the nineteenth century.”⁵⁰ Although, the Industrial Revolution was not a unique event, this textbook accepts European domination after the Industrial Revolution in non-Western societies. Its authors ignore the contribution of non-Western societies to the Industrial Revolution in Europe.

Islam has long played a central role in determining how Europe defines itself in relation to the rest of the world. The Crusades in the Middle Ages contributed to cultural interactions between Muslims and Christians. In the Middle Ages, Christians constructed Islam as a threat to Europe and Christendom, and the result has been the spread of Islamophobia from that time to the present. There was no political unit known as Europe and no harmonious “European identity” in the Middle Ages. According to Hobson, Pope Innocent III described Prophet Muhammad as the “Beast of the Apocalypse” in his crusading appeal of 1213.⁵¹ Political and economic conflicts –Crusades (1096-1272)– arose from the fact that Christian sacred places were under the control of Muslims, and the result was the construction of Islam as a threat and a notion of Muslims as evil. Mazlish adds:

The New World explorations, in contrast, were maritime in nature, and it was as sea powers that the Atlantic nations defined their identity, which then merged with that of Central Europe as it attempted to oppose the Turks with a “European” identity... As expansionists, the Western nations could both define their own “civilization” and export it to uncivilized others.⁵²

Today medieval prejudices continue due to a deliberate misinterpretation of the notion of jihad which has resulted in the representation of modern

49 Hobson, *The Eastern Origins*, 51-53.

50 William J. Duiker and Jackson J. Spielvogel, *Essential World History* (Toronto: Wadsworth Thomson Learning, 2002), 459.

51 Hobson, *The Eastern Origins*, 108. Daniel Martin Varisco gives the date of his appeal in “The tragedy of a comic: fundamentalists crusading against fundamentalists” *Cont Islam* 1 (2007): 207-230, DOI 10.1007/s11562-007-0019-6 (p. 218).

52 Mazlish, *Civilization and Its Contents*, 9.

Islam as evil and a threat, and all Muslims as ultraconservative, fundamentalist, Islamist, radical and pro-Islamic. Many world history textbooks label Muslims as terrorists. The Crusades in the Middle Ages provided a historical background about the enemy of Christians. McKay, Hill, Buckler, Ebrey, and Beck say that “He [Pope Urban II] urged Christian knights who had been fighting one another to direct their energies against the true enemies of God, Muslims.”⁵³ They explain the historical background of the Crusades with Pope Urban’s explanation about Muslims. William J. Duiker and Jackson J. Spielvogel say:

Although left- and right-wing terrorist activities declined in Europe in the 1980s, international terrorism remained rather commonplace. Angered over the loss of their territory to Israel, some militant Palestinians responded with a policy of terrorist attacks against Israel’s supporters... Militant governments, especially in Iran, Libya, and Syria, assisted terrorist organizations that made attacks on Europeans and Americans.⁵⁴

These Eurocentric accounts convey to students the notion that Muslims were terrorists in the past, and modern Muslim states support terrorist activities. Brummet, Edgar, Hackett, Jewsbury and Molony discuss American electoral crisis and terrorism together. They say “after removing Taliban from control in Afghanistan, President Bush and his advisers turned their attention to Iraq, where they deemed that Saddam Hussein had close relations with al-Qaeda and possessed concealed stores of chemical and biological weapons, or weapons of mass destruction.”⁵⁵ The American government did not find any sign of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, nor did they find any al-Qaeda terrorist militants, yet in international relations, they labeled Muslims as terrorists.

Albert M. Craig, William A. Graham, Donald Kagan, Steven Ozment and Frank M. Turner explain Islamism and politics together. They say “where government after government of Muslim-world countries has failed to provide social services such as housing, medical care, education and jobs, the Islamist groups have succeeded under the banner of a just, moral Muslim societal ideal.”⁵⁶ They describe Islamist Muslims as being opposed to secularists in

53 McKay et al., *A History of World Societies*, 355.

54 Duiker et al., *Essential World History*, 703-04.

55 Palmira Brummet et al., *Civilization: Past and Present* (New York: Pearson Longman, 2008), 994.

56 Albert M. Craig et al., *The Heritage of World Civilizations*. Vol. C: *Since 1700* (Toronto: Prentice Hall, 2003), 1008.

Middle Eastern countries.⁵⁷ They classify Muslim societies into two distinct groups: secularist and Islamist. This classification does not help students to understand who Muslims are in Muslim societies, and produces a bias about Muslim cultures.

Some historians of World History resort to the Mercator projection of global geography, which supports Eurocentric versions of world history. According to Candice Goucher and Linda Walton, the Mercator world map draws all European “discoveries” –the Americas, the Straits of Magellan and Asia, for example– into a new world system shaped by Europeans.⁵⁸ John Hobson adds that the Mercator projection produces a Eurocentric image of the world. “The landless of the southern hemisphere is exactly twice that of the landmass of the northern hemisphere, but, on the Mercator projection, the landmass of the north occupies two-thirds of the map...Scandinavia is about a third size of India...Greenland appears almost twice the size of China”.⁵⁹ In contrast, the Peters projection represents countries according to their actual surface area on the globe.⁶⁰ In another non-Eurocentric projection, the Hobo-Dyer projection, Europe occupies only the left corner of the map, on the periphery of the World.⁶¹ British atlases, especially from the nineteenth century, tend to use the Mercator projection, overstating landmasses in higher latitudes and minimizing the size of India.⁶² For example, Canada in accordance with the importance of the British Empire and the spread of Christian faith was displayed in a Eurocentric sense in Edmund McClure’s *Historical Church Atlas* of 1897. Although Europeans produced more maps than other societies, there was little effort in the nineteenth century to understand other societies in cartographic terms.⁶³ Eurocentric maps produced Eurocentric perceptions of world geography, thus maintaining the Eurocentric focus of history. Students who continue to use the Mercator Projection in world history courses may come to think that Europe is the central part of the world, and has been the main actor in world history. Eurocentric maps produce Eurocentric historical consciousness and identity.

57 Craig et al., *The Heritage of World Civilizations*, 1008-9.

58 Candice Goucher and Linda Walton, *World History: Journeys from Past to Present* (New York: Routledge, 2008), 262.

59 Hobson, *The Eastern Origins*, 5-6.

60 Hobson, *The Eastern Origins*, 6.

61 Hobson, *The Eastern Origins*, 6.

62 Jeremy Black, *Maps and History: Constructing Images of the Past* (London: Yale University Press, 2000), 64.

63 Black, *Maps and History*, 64.

Eurocentrism continues to find its way into maps published in contemporary World History textbooks. Brummett compares McNeill's maps in his textbook, *A World History*, with Hodgson's maps in *The Venture of Islam*. McNeill shows the Ottoman space as predominantly religious and bordered by European history, whereas Hodgson centres Asia instead of Europe on his maps.⁶⁴ Maps not only show us geographical borders, cartographic images, models and techniques, but also demonstrate the ideological perspectives of their designers. Of fourteen world maps in Candice Goucher and Linda Walton's textbook only three can be described as non-Eurocentric.⁶⁵ Trevor R. Getz, Richard J. Hoffman, and Jarbel Rodriquez use two world maps, both of which are Eurocentric Mercator Projections in *Exchanges: A Global History Reader*, Volume 1, *to 1500*.⁶⁶ In the second volume, they use three world maps, and all maps are Eurocentric Mercator Projections.⁶⁷ Of three world maps in William J. Duiker and Jackson J. Spielvogel's textbook, two are Eurocentric Mercator Projections,⁶⁸ and only one is non-Eurocentric.⁶⁹ The Mercator Projection is the most common Eurocentric world map in the textbooks that I examine in this paper.

Assessing the Texts

Tables 1 and 3 present sixteen Eurocentric concepts and themes found in textbooks used in the courses that I have identified. Fifteen out of twenty-three textbooks include more than eight key Eurocentric indicators, making them very Eurocentric. Seven out of twenty-three textbooks have less than eight Eurocentric indicators, making them somewhat Eurocentric. And only two texts have two indicators (Gregorian dating and the Mercator projection). Trevor R. Getz, Richard J. Hoffman and Jarbel Rodriquez's textbook and Candice Goucher and Linda Walton's textbook are the least Eurocentric, or might be identified as non-Eurocentric, according to the criteria I have adopted here. Nine out of twenty-three textbooks focus on "Islamism" and

64 Palmira Brummett, "Imagining the Early Ottoman Space: From World History to Piri Reis", in *The Early Modern Ottomans: Remapping the Empire*, ed. Virginia H. Aksan and Daniel Goffman (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 21-22.

65 Goucher and Walton, *World History*, 6, 282, 315.

66 Trevor R. Getz, Richard J. Hoffman and Jarbel Rodriquez, *Exchanges: A Global History Reader*, Volume 1, *to 1500* (New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2009), 21, 284.

67 Trevor R. Getz, Richard J. Hoffman and Jarbel Rodriquez, *Exchanges: A Global History Reader*, Volume 2, *from 1450 to the Present* (New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2009), 10, 154, 209.

68 Duiker et al., *Essential World History*, 430, 645.

69 Duiker et al., *Essential World History*, 4.

“Fundamentalism” in the modern age more than on “Islamic threat and evil” in the medieval and pre-modern age. This means “Islamophobia” still effectively exists in Eurocentric world history textbooks.

All World History textbooks can be classified into two categories: non-Eurocentric and Eurocentric, except for two, that by Getz, Hoffman and Rodriquez and that by Goucher and Walton. Getz, Hoffman and Rodriquez explain events through a discussion between Eurocentrism and non-Eurocentrism. For example, they prefer non-Eurocentric subtitles, such as “Debating the Great Opening: 1450-1600”, in which they discuss three different theories about Western European merchants and mariners in the late fifteenth century.⁷⁰ They write:

The most simplistic argues for the ‘superiority’ of western European inhabitants or societies, whether in political organization, economics, or culture –an approach called eurocentrism [sic]. The second suggests instead merely divergent choices: that the inhabitants of India, China, and Europe poured their resources into different strategies for dealing with the shared problem of resource and land allocations. The third approach is more integrative. It suggests that it was global [sic] relationships, rather than factors within Europe or any other region that propelled western Europeans in a direction different from others.⁷¹

This approach markedly differs from Eurocentric ones that offer subtitles such as “The Age of Discovery”,⁷² “Scientific Revolution”,⁷³ “Industrial Revolution”⁷⁴ and “Imperialism”.⁷⁵ Getz, Hoffman and Rodriquez first criticize concepts related to World History, then explain events using the comparative method. They think that World History is much more than just comparative history or “big” history. Societies are connected rather than merely compared. They provide both primary and secondary sources in their textbooks. Some sources focus on economic approaches, philosophical understandings and political explanations. In other words, these textbooks advocate for an interdisciplinary approach in order to understand World History. Furthermore, Getz, Hoffman and Rodriquez critique the origins and development of the notions of civilization. In “Interrogating the Origins and Development of Civilization and City-state Societies” they pay attention to

70 Getz et al., *Exchanges*, II, 11-75.

71 Getz et al., *Exchanges*, II, 8.

72 Duiker et al., *Essential World History*, 313.

73 Bentley et al., *Traditions and Encounters*, 394.

74 McKay et al., *A History of World Societies*, 691.

75 McKay et al., *A History of World Societies*, 773.

geographical and environmental aspects of civilization referencing articles by Fernand Braudel and J. N. Postgate to explain how the term ‘civilization’ might be evaluated from different perspectives. They define civilization as societies that involve human communities, values and political institutions.⁷⁶ They critique Eurocentric theories forwarded by other historians of World History who understand civilization according to a notion of progress.

McKay, Hill, Buckler, Ebrey and Beck claim that “writing is the primary reason that modern Western people look to the ancient Near East as the richest source of their origins.”⁷⁷ In the sense of progress, the origin of Western civilization is the ancient Near East civilization.

Goucher and Walton’s textbook likewise offers multidisciplinary interpretations of World History. For instance, subtitles include “Human Migration: World History in Motion”, “Finding Family in World History” and “Making a Living: World Economies, Past and Present”. This textbook includes European history, but not as a central topic and without Eurocentric periodization. It develops, instead, thematic frameworks. For example, Goucher and Walton explore the development of civilization through a framework of human migrations that starts with *Homo sapiens* and proceeds to modern human beings. They prefer to use the word “planet,” which includes human beings, the environment, animals and plants, to the term “world”, which offers only human beings as the main subjects of history. For them, “the most significant migration event of world pre-history is the colonization of the planet.”⁷⁸ While in some texts the word “colonization” represents European expansion to the “New World”, in this text the term encompasses the activities of all human beings on the planet from the first human to the modern people.

On the other hand, Bulliet et al. begin with the appearance of human beings on the planet and adopt an evolutionist approach in their textbook. The title of the first chapter is “Nature, Humanity and History: The First Four million Years”, which explores human evolution and primitive cultures. Also they appeal to *The Descent of Man* by Charles Darwin for an understanding of human evolution based on genetic mutation.⁷⁹ “As a result of this new work,” they write, “it is now possible to trace the evolutionary changes that produced modern humans during a period of 4 million years.”⁸⁰

76 Getz et al., *Exchanges*, I, 10.

77 McKay et al., *A History of World Societies*, 4.

78 Getz et al., *Exchanges*, I, 4.

79 Richard W. Bulliet et al., *The Earth and Its Peoples: A Global history*, 2nd ed. (New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 2011), 6.

80 Bulliet et al., *The Earth and Its Peoples*, 6.

To write a non-Eurocentric World History textbook is very challenging. It is necessary to have a broad perspective on history. For example, although Bentley adopts a non-Eurocentric periodization approach, he also uses some Eurocentric titles and very Eurocentric content, without criticizing these concepts in his textbook. His perspectives and discourse remain Eurocentric. I found ten out of sixteen Eurocentric indicators in his textbook, such as the Scientific Revolution, the Mercator projection, the Industrial Revolution, and Islamic threat and evil in modern age as Islamism and fundamentalism.

The most common Eurocentric indicators in the textbooks I examined were imperialism, colonialism, and the Industrial and Scientific Revolutions. Many historians of World History mention these issues in their accounts of the “making of Europe” and “the expansion of Europe”, but none of them refers, for example, to the Ottoman Empire and its colonies as an “imperialist empire” in World History. Although, the Ottomans dominated the Balkans, the Middle East, North Africa and parts of Eastern Europe, the Ottoman Empire was not, apparently, an imperialist empire according to these texts. Also, many historians of World History refer to the “Industrial Revolution” in England as the first Industrial Revolution in the world, completely ignoring an earlier “Industrial Revolution” in China.

All the World History textbooks I examined explain non-European civilizations, but only Getz, Hoffman, and Rodriguez, and Goucher and Walton do so as subjects of history in their own right. Eurocentric textbooks focus on European history rather than non-European history.

Some historians, such as Oliver Johnson, use primary sources, but these tend to be overwhelmingly European. For example, Johnson, in his first volume, uses thirty-four primary sources, but only nine are non-European. Even these primary sources, however, do not break the Eurocentric perspective. Johnson’s textbooks are still Eurocentric. He evaluates barbaric civilizations through the interpretation of Antoine-Nicolas de Condercet’s *The Progress of the Human Mind*, which pre-supposes the superiority of European civilization. “The progress of these people [savage nations]”, Condercet writes, “will be less slow and more sure than ours has been because they will borrow from us that illumination which we have had to discover and simple truths and infallible methods which we have obtained only after many errors they need only grasp our discoveries and developments as they appear in our writings.”⁸¹ Johnson prefers to use European primary sources about the pro-

81 Oliver A. Johnson, *Sources of World Civilization*, Volume 2, since 1500, 2nd ed. (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 2000), 191.

gress of civilization in order to impose European superiority. Many historians of World History⁸² claim that the field should include both European and non-European civilizations, cultural, economic and political relations in a global sense with comprehensive and comparative methods, but then go on to impose a single interpretation of history which is Eurocentric.

Goucher and Walton do not use Eurocentric subtitles, which helps to eliminate Eurocentric periodization and linear perspectives in their textbook. They talk about an “Industrial Revolution” in England only after they explain the technological development of iron in China. Goucher and Walton show that “by the Song dynasty (960-1279) the technological and production levels of the iron industry in north China equalled that of the early stages of the Industrial Revolution in England over five hundred years later.”⁸³ They do not see the Industrial Revolution in England as a turning point in World History. Also, they discuss the “Industrial Revolution” under the title “Technology, Environment, and Transformations”, which offers a broader context than just that of a changing European economy. In comparison, Bulliet et al. claim that “revolutions reshaped the world between 1750 and 1870.”⁸⁴ The Industrial Revolution began in 1750 in Britain, thus, in their view Europeans were the first revolutionaries in the world. Getz, Hoffman and Rodriquez, on the other hand, critique what they call the “European Miracle”; the idea that Europeans were the first revolutionaries in the world. They do not see the Industrial Revolution in England as the starting point of a new historical period.⁸⁵

Table 2 presents the contradiction between Eurocentric and non-Eurocentric terms and facts as discussed above.

Table 2. Eurocentric Construction of World History

| Patterns of European Civilization | Patterns of Non-European Civilizations |
|---|--|
| Progressive Linearity | Regressive Cycle of Stagnation |
| Productive Economic System | Unproductive Economic System |
| Rational Democratic State | Oriental despotic State |
| Civilised | Barbaric, Savage |
| Independent | Dependent |
| Separation of public and private realms | Fusion of public and private realms |
| Scientific | Superstitious |

82 For example, Jerry Bentley, Herbert F. Ziegler and William H. McNeill.

83 Goucher and Walton, *World History*, 36.

84 Bulliet et al., *The Earth and Its Peoples*, 569.

85 Getz et al., *Exchanges*, II, 76.

Conclusion

World History offers a distinctive view of the past, but sometimes continues to advance a Eurocentrism that may result in university courses which advance a similar historical consciousness. A university student in the multicultural city of Edmonton might come away from one of these classes with only a basic understanding of non-European societies rooted in a Eurocentric historical model and ways of thinking that mark Western civilization as the role model in social and political development. Thus, this conclusion supports the need to eliminate Eurocentrism in World History.

Although World History textbooks incorporate many human civilizations, there is no consensus among historians of World History about how to represent non-European civilizations in general. However, some tend to represent non-European civilizations in a hierarchical relationship with Europeans, emphasizing European superiority, while others try to adopt non-Eurocentric periodization and offer critical analysis of Eurocentric concepts and themes. If many of the textbooks are not well supplemented with non-Eurocentric pedagogy, Western societies will continue to struggle to overcome aspects of Eurocentrism, such as racism and Islamophobia, and will fail to eliminate prejudices about non-Europeans.

In general, however, the teaching of World History offers a way to challenge racism and ethnocentrism in historiography by studying different cultures and civilizations, as well as by creating multicultural consciousness among the general public. Eurocentric histories contributed to the construction of modern nation-states based on assumptions of Western superiority. Imam Feisal Abdul Rauf claims that European states, such as Britain, France and Spain applied these policies in order to create Christian and white colonies. They spent a great deal of effort to homogenize identities and assimilate non-Western cultures according to European values and principles. As a result, world societies shifted from multiculturalism to monoculturalism.⁸⁶ Eurocentrism strives toward monoculturalism, which inflects the way in which some historians of World History continue to write their textbooks, upholding the view of Eurocentric history.

World History, however, is meant to examine interactions among civilizations and the broad human community. The definition of Global History includes international communications and cultural interaction instead of

86 Imam Abdul Rauf Feisal, "Why Multiculturalism?" in *Exchanges: A Global History Reader, Vol. II: From 1450 to the Present*, ed. Trevor R. Getz, Richard J. Hoffman and Jarbel Rodriquez (New Jersey: Pearson & Prentice Hall, 2004), 336-37.

nation-state histories. However, many historians of World History replicate Eurocentric perspectives. Only a few, like Marshall Hodgson and Jerry Bentley, accept non-Eurocentric periodization. World historians can write World History by seeking a larger sense of identity in order to eliminate the superiority of any civilization.

Table 3. Eurocentric Concepts and Themes in Each Text

| EUROCENTRIC CONCEPTS and THEMES | Andrea and Overfield (2001) | Bentley and Ziegler (2011) | Brummet, Edgar Hackett et al. Vol. I-II (2007, 2003) | Builliet, Crossley, Headrick (2001) | Craig, Graham, Kagan et al. (2009) | Duiker and Spielvogel (2002) |
|---|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Eurocentric Gregorian Calendar | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| Eurocentric Periodization (classical, medieval, pre-modern, and modern) | x | | x | | x | |
| The Age of Discovery | x | x | x | | x | x |
| Discovery of Cape of “Good Hope” | | | x | | x | x |
| Globalization after 1500 | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| Imperialism | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| Colonialism | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| The Scientific Revolution | x | x | x | | x | x |
| The Industrial Revolution | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| Islamic Threat and Evil in Medieval Age | | | | x | x | |
| Islamic Threat and Evil in Pre-modern Age | x | | | | | |
| Islamic Threat and Evil in Modern Age as Islamism and Fundamentalism | | x | x | | x | x |
| Westernization | x | x | x | | x | x |
| Progress and Linear History | x | | x | | x | x |
| The Age of Democracy | x | x | x | | x | x |
| The Mercator Projection (World Map) | | x | x | x | x | x |
| TOTAL | 12 | 11 | 14 | 7 | 15 | 13 |

| EUROCENTRIC CONCEPTS and THEMES | Getz, Hoffman, Rodriguez Vol. I-II (2009) | Goucher and Walton (2008) | Johnson Vol. I-II (2000) | Kishlansky (1999) | Lockard (2008) | McNeill (1997) | Mckay, Hill, Buckler et al. (2007) | Mitchell and Mitchell Vol. I-II (2010) | Palmer and Joel (1965) |
|---|---|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|------------------------------------|--|------------------------|
| Eurocentric Gregorian Calendar | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| Eurocentric Periodization (classical, medieval, pre-modern, and modern) | | | x | | x | x | x | x | x |
| The Age of Discovery | | | x | | x | x | x | | x |
| Discovery of Cape of "Good Hope" | | | x | | x | x | x | | |
| Globalization after 1500 | | | x | | | x | x | x | |
| Imperialism | | | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| Colonialism | | | x | | x | x | x | x | x |
| The Scientific Revolution | | | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| The Industrial Revolution | | | | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| Islamic Threat and Evil in Medieval Age | | | | | | | | | |
| Islamic Threat and Evil in Pre-modern Age | | | | | | | | | |
| Islamic Threat and Evil in Modern Age as Islamism and Fundamentalism | | | | | x | x | x | x | |
| Westernization | | | | | | x | x | | x |
| Progress and Linear History | | | x | x | | x | x | | x |
| The Age of Democracy | | | x | | x | x | x | | x |
| The Mercator Projection (World Map) | x | x | | | x | | x | | |
| TOTAL | 2 | 2 | 10 | 5 | 11 | 13 | 14 | 8 | 10 |

Nakip: Eurocentrism in World History Textbooks

| EUROCENTRIC CONCEPTS and THEMES | Ralph, Lerner, Meacham et al. (1997) | Reilly Vol. I-II (2007) | Riley, Gerome, Lembright et al. Vol. I-II (2006, 2002) | Sherman, Grunfeld, Markowitz et al. Vol I-II (1998) | Spodek (2006) | Stearns (2002) | Stearns (2008) | Stearns, Adas, Schwartz (1996) | TOTAL |
|--|---|-------------------------|---|---|---------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|-------|
| Eurocentric Gregorian Calendar | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | 23 |
| Eurocentric Periodization (classical, medieval, pre- modern, and modern) | x | x | x | x | | x | x | x | 15 |
| The Age of Discovery | x | x | | | | x | | x | 14 |
| Discovery of Cape of "Good Hope" | x | | | | | x | | x | 10 |
| Globalization after 1500 | x | x | | x | | x | x | x | 16 |
| Imperialism | x | | x | x | x | x | x | x | 20 |
| Colonialism | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | 20 |
| The Scientific Revolution | x | x | | x | | x | x | x | 18 |
| The Industrial Revolution | x | x | | x | x | x | x | x | 19 |
| Islamic Threat and Evil in Medieval Age | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| Islamic Threat and Evil in Pre-modern Age | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| Islamic Threat and Evil in Modern Age as Islamism and Fundamentalism | | x | | | | | x | | 10 |
| Westernization | x | x | | x | | x | | x | 13 |
| Progress and Linear History | x | | | x | | x | x | x | 14 |
| The Age of Democracy | | | x | x | | x | x | x | 15 |
| The Mercator Projection (World Map) | | x | | | | | x | x | 12 |
| TOTAL | 11 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 4 | 12 | 11 | 13 | |

Dünya Tarihi Ders Kitaplarındaki Avrupamerkezcilik: Kanada Örneđi

Bu makale Edmonton'daki (Kanada) Alberta, Concordia, MacEwan ve King's üniversitelerinde okutulan Dünya Tarihi ders kitaplarını inceleyerek Avrupamerkezciliđin Dünya Tarihi ders kitaplarını hangi düzeyde etkilediđini ortaya koymaktadır. Bu şekilde, Oryantalist tarih yaklařımını benimsemiř bazı dünya tarihçilerinin, Avrupamerkezci tarih kavramlarını kullanarak dünya tarihi çalışmalarını ve geçmiře dair küresel yaklařımları hangi ölçüde Avrupamerkezci tarih perspektifine eklediđi de gösterilmeye çalışılmaktadır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Dünya tarihi ders kitapları, tarih yazıcılıđı, Avrupamerkezcilik, Oryantalizm.
