



## BIAS IN HISTORIOGRAPHY

**Qazi Atiya Parveen**

**Associate Professor, Department of History ,  
Government College Gulbarga.**

### INTRODUCTION

"Historians soul is like a bee for he collects all the good of our opulent time and never touches poison".

-Gooch

### WHAT IS HISTORIOGRAPHY?

Historiography refers to both the study of methodology of historians and the development of history, as a discipline and also to a body of historical work and a particular subject. The Historiography of a specific topic cover how historians have studies that topic using particular sources, techniques and theoretical approaches scholars discussed historiography topically such as Historiography of British empire or the Historiography of early Islam, or the Historiography of China as well as different approaches and a genres such as political history, or social history. Beginning in the 19<sup>th</sup> century with the ascent of academic history, a body of historiographical literature developed the extent which historians are influence by their own groups and loyalties such as to their nation state is a much debateable questions it is commonly held that before down of modern age. Indian did not poses any historiography of any value and the study of Indian history. It was-by-foreigner. Indian scholars in the past covered a very wide range almost all the aspects of human activities were covered by the Indians and bias visible in their writing. But when we came to history as we understand it today we are highly disappointed. According to Prof.Srinivas Iyenagar. If chronology is the eye of the history of ancient India, history will have always to be blind" the history is philosophy in motion, Indians could never be excelled (suppressed) if history is the record of the growth of human minds Indian do rurally have history through its shape and patrton may not tally with text book the research interest of historians change over time and in recent decade their has been a shift away from traditional diplomatic, economic and political history towards never approaches, especially social and cultural studies. From 1975 to 1995 the proportion of professors of History in American Universities identifying with social history rose from 31% to 41%, while the proportion of political historians fell from 40% to 30%. In the history departments of British Universities in 2007, of the 5723 faculty members, 1644 (29%) identified themselves with social history while political history came next with 1425 (25%).



### BIAS IN HISTORIOGRAPHY

History is not free from Bias, it is visible everywhere, because of it is too much interpretation of the subject its rapid developing due to the influence of opneme politicians particularly in westem countries Kiston Clark opinious that impartiality is found in brief disruption. History is not free from bias and prejudices

there was no great historian in Ancient India hence there was no written history, which is free from bias. In the words of Alberuni the Hindus do not pay much attention to the historical order of things. They are very careless in relating to the chronology, succession of the kings and when they are pressed for information and at the loss of not knowing what to say, they invariably take to tale-telling.

Some historians concentrate his attention, more to interpretation and analysis of giving importance to the evidences, partially is clearly visible in his writing.

### CAUSES OF BIAS IN HISTORY:

Butterfield writes that impartiality is impossible in history and his claim of its achievement is a great blunder. David Thompson also writes that the feeling of bias cannot be uprooted from the historian. Few of the important reasons for bias in history are as follows.

### SOCIO-RELIGION CAUSE:

Socio-religious cause is also important for bias in history. Historians do not go against the environment or society. Historians have to write according to situation and circumstances i.e. A person who is very popular in society, historians have to think for writing his history. It means historians have to go through the society. Therefore Goach a prominent historian mentions that his expression of the writer made of flesh and bones is clearly visible in his work. Though a historian is a member of such society, in spite of this he cannot write according to his wishes hence bias and partiality also we know the tendency of bias is developing. All the historians belonging to different religions, i.e., Hindus, Muslims, Christians all of them present illogicality of their respective religion, because they have a feeling of bias in them. So bias is visible everywhere in their writings.

### CHOICE OF TOPIC:

Before choosing the subject it is usually said that it would be preferable for a historian to check a topic has already been worked upon and about the references to avoid respective work, topic banks and clearing houses of research subjects should be set up. A subject can be worked upon at various levels different scholars can work the same subject in different ways depending upon new formulations and data available to them i.e., there are dozens of works done on the position of women in ancient India. There can be no great harm in working on the same subject over again provided there is fresh treatment involved choosing a topic is a very difficult task if a historian fails to select a subject properly he will not be able to justify his work. Auck shot writes that history writing is a result of the bias of a historian as the nature of collection of data is selective. Sir J.N. Sarkar and Farookhi have contrasting views about the religious policy of Aurangzeb similar contrast is seen in the writing of western and Indian scholars also regarding the event of 1857. Besides it there appears no similarity in the writing of Roman Catholic and Protestant scholars because of their different religious concepts.

### ONE SIDE OBSERVATION:

Partiality and bias make a historian to be aware about his limitations, a historian cannot go beyond the boundaries he may write the history of India or any country he should be careful about it i.e., the discipline and criticism of Akbar and his policies by Badauni is an evident proof of his partiality and bias towards the emperor. G.M. Travely admitted that bias is visible in a historian, whenever a historian writes a history of a great man, a great administrator, or a great king, a great warrior he has to be liberal and polite in his writing and his thinking, a historian cannot make a negative thinking he has to think partially and sympathetically in his writing. Ranier is of the opinion that unemotional impartiality is not merits but demerits in history. Man is a social animal. Man cannot leave without society and cannot go against society so man or a historian has to go through the society or beyond the society i.e., historians who interpret the event according to their own choice i.e., a famous historian has to give much stress on the major cause for the defeat of India in 1857 mutiny. Because of different attitudes among the historians bias is sure to exist.

### ROLE OF HISTORIANS:

Historians try to describe fact on the basis of records history is depend upon sources, it may be literary or archeology E.H.Cars too write that facts do not speak themselves but historian make them to speak. They also give significance to the will of 3 historian the fact is that historian gives more importance to his personal attitude, bias is visible in his descriptions. According to Ashok Mehta, R.C.Majumdar J.Nehru etc picordeng to hold their opinion regarding 1857 war it was just a sepoy mutiny According to V.D.Savarkar. Dr.S.N.Sen says that it was not a mere sepoy mutiny. It was the first war of India's independence because of different attitude among the historians bias is sure to exist.

Ace to Scots history is based on interpretation and not on facts and give much importance to their personal attitude and bias is visible in history. A prominent scholar relates that we fail to find unanimity among scholars of history because of their different attitudes which prove to be helpful in the development of bias in the historian.

Historian can not write their description with out bias due to number of causes Form he has not free from society, religious , political pressure etc. From ancient to Medieval period historian attached to the court they were in binding. They had no right to write government or monarch. against govt. monarch was absolute they never permitted to them to write their independently so bias is visible in their writing.

Butterfield rightly remarks that impartiality is impossible in history and the claim of its achievement is completely hollow and false,

Historian translated and point out the events on the basis of contemporary needs. It is highly impossible to bring out bias from history, because in early history and description bias is visible due to confusion of data what they understand the sources material on that source base history is to be written i.e., war between about Harshavedha and Pullekeshi II. scholar hold their different opinion so about the date . But data and sources are in confusion, so historians cant write he has to And observed And search for day sources and source provide information so bias is visible in his writing i.e., the battle of Talkte Historian hold different opinion regarding location, here also bias is visible.

It is also expected from the historian that they should present a true account of the events of the past to free from bias a historian should be avoid their personality impression in history writing history is not imaginative. Historian should produced their description on the basis of true record and historian adopt impartial view about the past particularly socio , religious , history. In ancient and medieval period historian was like a bounded labour had no right to write against ruler king they always under the king and kingship. But in present days also we cant expected from a historian to express his thought without bias or partiality. Historian has to avoid bias and partiality in their writing , if a historian is given importance to bias and partiality the aim of history is not fulfill. Data talk with historian it's a duty of historian to collect, correct data and observe keenly like Scientist how they make experiment in their laboratory to find out the truth. The feeling of bias comes in history because of writers own positions and its effects in his writings.

### HOW TO REMOVE BIAS FROM HISTORY?

1. Walsh mentions that history should be written with different point of view so that bias could be removed from history.
2. Acton hold his opinion in this connection that bias should not be included in evaluation. A historian should collect the self explanatory data for his writing.
3. Historian should write their description without partiality and free from prejudices. Historian should produced their description on the basis of authentic record which he has collected from various sources, they do not need any external light for their writing.

### CONCLUSION:

In short historian should be clear and correct in their duties without touching the poisonous elements of history. Historian should accept only good and write aspect of history. Writer should be free from bias and partiality in his writing to provide good and sweet picture of society.

**REFERENCES:**

1. Marc Ferro-The Use and Abuse of History
2. International Security Volume PP.34-43 at P.42 online at JSTOR
3. Teachers of History the University of UK 2007-listed by Research Interest.
4. N.Jaya Palam-Historiagraphy P.No.116
5. N.Subrahmanian-Historiagraphy P.No.27
6. Dr.K.L.Khurana Concepts and Methods of Historiagraphy