

CERTAIN THOUGHTS OF MODERN CHINESE RESEARCHERS ON TURKISH PERCEPTION

Автор бұл мақалада қазіргі қытайлардың түрік мәдениеті мен тарихы, сондай-ақ, бүгінгі таңдағы түріктер туралы түсінікті талдауға және де түріктердің қытайларды қабылдауына қатысты нәтижелерді салыстырмалы түрде синтездеуге тырысады.

В данной статье автор анализирует восприятие турецкой истории, культуры и современных тюрков китайскими исследователями, и пытается достигнуть синтеза путем сравнения результатов, полученных от китайского восприятия тюрков.

There is an uninterrupted connection between Turkish history and classical and modern Chinese historiography starting from ancient periods way before Huns, who were the ancestors of Gokturks named as “Tujue” by Chinese, which was the very first nation, given them the name “Turk” in history. The most detailed information starting from the most ancient periods on ancient Turks beginning from North Di period, which needs to be accepted as ancestors of Huns, considering the records in regards to them found in classic Chinese history resources are presented to us in Chinese Year Books and this is even more important than having lived in same geographical regions and adopted the same life style. Historical records about the people of North Di, Huns, Dingling People, Gaoche People and Tiele People are found recorded only in the Chinese Chronicles such as Historic Memoirs (Shi Ji), Hun Dynasty Book (Han Shu) and Next Hun Dynasty Book (Hou Hanshu) and the other resources found on various Turkish groups recorded with various names in different periods are as little as none except for the Chinese.

1. Introduction

It will be appropriate to provide a brief explanation on the meaning born by the words “Turkish perception”, and its boundaries, used in our study before explaining the reason behind our decision on executing a research concerning Turkish perception of Modern Chinese researches. Historians studying in Middle Asia Turkish History in Turkey believe that Turks of Turkey have come from Tujue Turks and Gokturks, according to them, are descendents of Huns. According to Layos Ligeti, who is one of the leading Hungarian Sinologists of western world, due to similarities of names, warrior type life style and some chronological reasons pushed western scientists about some 200 years ago to thinking that Xiongnu People mentioned in Chinese resources are Huns in major migration of tribes in reality. [1] As briefly mentioned above; Turkish tribes have taken different names in different periods and geographical regions starting from periods before the period of Han Dynasty (B.C. 206 – A.C. 220).

Turkish perception concept in our study contains Huns, Dingling People, Gaoche People, Tiele People, Gokturks, Tuqishi, Qarluqs, Uyghurs, Ottomans, and Turks of Turkey.

Scientists, starting from the first quarter of 20th Century in Chinese research societies and universities, who have been assigned to many societies, primarily to Social Studies Academy and Central Nations University found in Beijing, Northwest University in Xian, Northwest Minority Nations Institute in Lanzhou capital of Gansu state and Lanzhou University, are unsatisfied with making extensive researches in areas of Turkish history and culture and are closely monitoring the results of other countries’ academic studies regarding to the areas in question. Consequently, modern Chinese researches have a Turkish perception containing particular specifics for approximately the past 90 years.

In our study, we will make an attempt on proving the course of adopting the Turkish perception, which emerges in historic researches of modern Chinese researches, within a course of time that begins from Huns and goes all the way to the Uyghur period, with various examples and explanations. It is inevitable for us to limit our research with the Turkish perception seen in modern historiographers in China because Turkish perception is such broad topic to be crammed into an initial bulletin framework. While making evaluations about this subject we are going to try making certain comparisons between China and Chinese perception in Turkey and views of our Chinese colleagues on Turkish history, culture and Turkish people and perceptions formed by those views. Certain fundamental parallelisms and differences stand out between Turkish perception in China and Chinese perception in Turkey. We will attempt in proving the root causes of positive and negative perceptions formed in their minds and courses of Turkish perception development of modern Chinese researchers after revealing the differences between perceptions of both parties for each other and source of parallelisms between the perceptions of Turkish and Chinese researchers for one another.

Revealing the causes forming the foundation of Turkish perception by reaches in China, where the most intensive researches have been performed on various areas of Turkish history shall provide enlightening information to us on the subject of resources and methods of thinking regarding to Turkish people for both Chinese researchers and Turkish men. The reason why we decided to conduct a research within the frame that we have just outlined above is to prove the factors, together with giving examples, causing Chinese men to think positive or negative about Turks and their Turkish culture and history.

Considering the abundance of the experiences that the intellectual researchers, who are now the modern representatives of Chinese nation that we once had neighborhood relationships of more than 2000 years, on Turkish civilization and culture; Turkish perception of modern Chinese researches in question is a very broad subject, without a doubt requires conducting a very wide academic research. We, in our study, will attempt to make a general review by analyzing the subject with its outlines.

II. Turkish Perception Originating from Approaching to Ancient Turkish History in China

It is easily understood, upon examination, that the political relationship of Huns with Chinese in general, follows a significantly negative pattern since the time of Huns stepping onto the historic stage. Main causes of that negative course of graphic, which made itself be sensed between Huns and Chinese, were the powerful armies, traditions and effective war techniques possessed by Huns and they were perceived by Chinese as enemies, who can become a rival in the end by becoming so powerful to take on China, which possessed a much larger geographical territory than the Huns. Those characteristics, which were valid for the Hun period, were also valid for the history of Gokturks and Uyghurs periods, which were forming the two most important periods of Turkish history. Chinese, who developed firm relationships with Huns in cultural area as well as political and economical areas during the periods of Gokturks and Uyghurs, had a more negative perception on Turks due to reasons we have attempted to explaining in general above. With the occurrence of tribal migration, which has been one of the most significant events of the history of ancient, middle and inner Asia, some of the most populated Turkish noble groups, who were leaving the lands found in North and Inner Asia that they have lived since the most ancient times, began traveling in the direction of North and reached all the way to Balkan region while the other groups preferred going into the direction of the areas remaining within the Chinese borders today.

Modern Chinese researchers mostly carried negative and sometimes objective perceptions about Turks due to the reason of Turkish people's history of existence has been as old and long as at least the Chinese Historiography in their country.

Should it be necessary to tell the truth; phenomenon of objectivity in science of history has been a rather significant concept. Since, the concept in question varies significantly according to perceptions of nations. Such that, Huns and Gokturks, who were continuing to live their moorland nomad lives within the neighborhood of Chinese people being qualified as "barbarians" by Chinese due to historic reasons may be perceived as normal when looking through the eyes of a Chinese researcher and also be perceived as an objective opinion since it is going to be perceived as style of thinking in accordance with the historic facts. However, Turkish men will have an opinion that Chinese are looking subjectively into the Turkish history since he is going to perceive that Chinese are approaching to this subject, which is his own history, in a biased fashion.

Certain parallelisms stand out between the viewings of Chinese of the most ancient groups descending from nobles of Turks and viewpoints of many western researchers. Prof. Dr. John K. Fairbank, who one of the well recognized 20th Century, China specialist from U.S.A., made emphasis onto Mongols rather than the Huns among the migrating nation in the short section, which he named "Migrant Conquests", of his research filled with strong analyses and evaluations. According to Fairbank, Mongols were the most famous among the tribes seen around the borders of China during various times of history. In the history of settlement in China, military forces of barbarian tribes living high on mountains have always been a great big threat to farming society that preferred living on planes. Invasions of North China by barbarians were such powerful movements, rather many of the states and dynasties in China have been of foreign origin [2].

Prof. Fairbank's above opinions require being criticized in two aspects. First point is that Fairbank has also characterizes Huns, who are one of the leading nomad tribes that live in North of China, as barbarians; just as many other western historians and Sinologists have done. It is important to state that such characterization forms only as result of a bad perception. Neither Chinese nor western modern researchers, bring any explanation to according to what solid measures that they have accepted the northern nomads as barbarians in any shape or form. Reasons for those types of viewpoints, in our opinion, are the prejudices, which are sometimes formed with the influences of the researches of classic or modern Chinese researchers and other times developed within their own inner worlds. In this regard, there is a clear similarity between the Turkish perception in China and Turkish perception in western countries.

The other point of Prof. Fairbank's that requires being criticized is the fact that he displays Mongols as the most important tribe among the nomad tribes, which lived in Northern neighborhood of China. Huns have been so effective as to influence China in political, economical and cultural areas in periods in which the term of Mongol was not yet heard of along the history of China and classic Hun period. We are not implying, by expressing our opinions, that tribe of Mongols had no significant impact on Chinese continent or social and communal live of China. They have never established a dynasty of their own in history of China as Mongols have during the Yuan (1271-1368) period however, scientific researches on subjects of intense political, economical and cultural relationships of Huns with Chinese, as it is expressed before, have nearly become an academic discipline that can be named "Hunnology" on its own. Therefore, it looks as though it is rather an

inconsistent opinion to argue that Hun period and consequently the Hun tribe had less of significance over the history of China.

Researching history of Turks is much harder than researching histories of other civilizations that lived in any region of world because while a nation continued living in a certain geographic area it also began building its history; Turks however, reigned in a very large geographical area and anthropologic descriptions on historic Turkish states and societies are in a rather complex condition. Whether in Chinese yearbooks or western resources, Turks have been depicted rather in the form of Mongols. According to Turkish historian Prof. Dr. İbrahim Kafesoğlu [3], there is no connection between Turks and Mongols in terms of language association and ethnology. Portraying Turks as Mongoloids in ancient times can be explained through vastness of Mongol factor in Turkish states during that period of time since the race association between the two tribes has been demolished in the end of examining the anthropologic materials obtained in the excavations performed especially in Middle Asia.

III. Turkish Perception Emerging from Style of Approaching to Social Lives Of Ancient Turks in China (Huns-Gokturks Period)

Due to the fact that the modern Chinese scientists shown more interest into research areas of Huns in comparison to Gokturks and Uyghurs; we found it more appropriate to provide more space in examining their opinions about Hun society.

A. Hun period

Chinese resources providing information on structure and character of Hun society do not contain direct information; therefore researchers make various assumptions associated to the structure of Hun society from certain other information found in resources.

We were unable to find any book that has been written about the Hun society belonging to period before the establishment of China in our researches conducted in some of the leading libraries of China; although a few, there are brief researches written in the form of articles available.

Researches of mainly the three historians on this subject, which have been written in 50s of 20th Century, stand out the most. Names such as Ma Changshou, Hu Junpo, Lu Simian, Feng Jiasheng, Ou Yangxi and finally Lin Gan come first in line among the historians, who conducted researches in this area. However, while some of the researchers that we have mentioned were directly examining the structure of Hun society the others have touched upon the subject indirectly and stated their opinions on the subject of characteristic of the societal structure of Huns. Being influenced by the trends of thought, which were in demand in old Soviet Union, they used a Marxist point of view when examining Hun society structure.

Let's try an examine opinions of those scientists on Hun society:

Ma Changshou has examined the structure of Hun society rather in detail in his article named "Lun Xiongnu Buluo Guojia de Nuli Zhi (About the Slavery System of Hun Tribe State)". According to Lin Gan, Ma Changshou has scientifically examined with the influence of historic materialism for the first time. [4]

Following are the opinions of Ma Changshou regarding to structure of Hun society: "structure of Hun society is based on slavery system. Hun society forms a typical slave society of Asia moorlands and it houses animal breeding under the roof of animal breeding economy of nomads by slave masters who have nomadic slaves. There were approximately 700.000 slaves in Hun society; therefore it is revealed that the fifty percent of the population, considering the fact that total population of Hun society as being formed of 1.500.000, was formed of slaves. While Huns' soldiers were keeping busy with making bows and arrows, slaves used to undertake the manufacturing activities of state. History of Hun state consists of occurrences of struggles between slaves and slave masters." [5] The point that Ma Changshou emphasized in this article of his is that Hun society was the most characteristic slave society of Asian moorlands.

Ma Changshou, who is acknowledged as one of the first generation modern historians of People's Republic of China, and all of his opinions, which we have quoted above, are not absolutely acceptable. First of all, as we have highlighted in the section that we have examined the points of views of the Chinese historians on Hun history, slavery system is seen mostly in settled societies dealing with agriculture. Settled societies had the need for many number of slaves since they were carrying out wide range of agricultural activities. It is impossible to accept and it is illogical to argue as the Chinese researches do that major amount of slaves were working in Hun society, which performed economic activities based on nomadic animal breeding and continuously alternated their living surroundings from summer pastures to winter pastures maintaining a nomadic lifestyle. In addition, there is also no logic and proof for arguing that Huns' economy was based on slave trading besides the nomadic animal breeding. Because settled societies who were dealing with agriculture may have immediate need for

slaves so that they can use them in planting the fields and harvesting however there is no logical explanation to why and how Huns should have the need for populated amount of slaves within a nomadic animal breeding lifestyle. One wonders if they, mainly Chinese historian Ma Changshou, were trying to state that Hun slave masters were being economically involved in purchasing and sale of slaves when they stated the fact that Huns were a typical slave society. Yet there aren't any information supporting such opinions in Chinese resources containing the entries on the subject of history of Huns.

Ou Yangxi, another Chinese historian, who conducts studies on Hun society, approaches with uncertainty to the idea of Huns being slave society and emphasizes the fact that Huns had a feudal structure by stating that San-Yun was top ruler of Hun state and other authorities found under San-Yun hierarchically formed the sub-groups of this feudal system. [6]

Even though opinions of Ou Yangxi are not as illogical as opinions of Ma Changshou; both scientists have based their opinions on political foundation yet were unable to provide logical and strong evidences since the theories were lacking a scientific foundation.

Through claiming that half the population of Huns society being formed of slaves, Chinese historian implies that slaves were commonly used in Hun society. We are not in any stating that there were no slaves in Hun society whatsoever, we are stating that according to conditions of those times, victorious side in battles took captive of the soldiers or part of civilians of the losing side and used them in their works however, this is not a characteristic belonging only to Huns but was observed being practiced by all other states of that period. We believe however, it is a groundless argument to claim well populated amount of slaves were always being used in Hun society.

One of the points of Ma Changshou need being criticized the most regarding to structure of Hun society is observing the struggles that occur between slaves and slave masters of Hun history as historic events. For a historian, who devoted most of his life to historic researchers, to acknowledge great Hun history, which made major impacts on the entire Asian history including China, in the areas of army, social, economical and cultural, to being consisting of struggles transpiring between slaves and slave masters, is as wrong as looking at the history of Hun civilization existed approximately 2.000 years ago from today with spectacles of political opinions formed about 150 years ago.

With these opinions of his, Ma Changshou was nearly trying to prove Communism was prevailing in Hun society. Whereas, it is essential for historians to carry out their assignments by taking into consideration of the conditions of the time in which the nation and state existed when evaluating the states and nations they examine. If we were to look at the Hun history as being formed of the struggles between slaves and slave masters; where are we to place all the relationships in martial, political, economical and cultural areas that they intensely had with the Chinese? Since it is impossible to disregard all those historic factors; the best thing to do is to disregard those opinions, which have been driven out solely by the political concerns and completely groundless.

The other interesting argument of Ma Changshou concerning the Huns is in the direction that Huns' ruling class did not increase the producing potential all the way up to Wu-huans and Xian-beilers, so that they were turned into slave societies. Huns, who have not been able to complete their economic development, tries, according to Ma Changshou's stated claims, getting stronger by invading smaller tribes and states based only on slaves and slave controlling methods, so that they are once again able to perform activities of production in areas once they used to live and Hun slave masters combined the slave tribes together and forced them into work and collected taxes from them and mercilessly forced slaves into doing such activities [7].

Ma Changshou's opinions here are in a state of crying out for being criticized and corrected. Isn't it logically impossible for societies in history, just as Huns, who have not been able to improve their own economy, to try and close this gap through depending on slaves, when nation itself is having difficulties in meeting its own needs let alone feeding a rather populated group of slaves on such fragile economy? In addition we don't believe in the existence of such state, which can continue to develop and maintain itself on the basis of taxes and workforce received from the slaves they own in history. Such examples of historiography, specific to those periods in which the Communism was practiced in the harshest way, try pushing even the social and economic lives of Hun history and try fitting it into small political opinions molds.

Another Chinese historian conducting research regarding to social structure of Huns is Ou Yangxi. Opinions of Ou Yangxi placed in the article he published with the name of "Xiongnu Shihui Fazhan (Development of Hun Society)" in the 4th edition of Donghua Education University Magazine in year of 1958; differ from the opinions of Ma Changshou. Chinese historian Ou Yangxi believes those 700.000 slaves mentioned above were formed from slaves obtained by Huns for more than 100 years, not in a specific period and production organ and organ that carried out the martial works worked together in Huns society and people performing the production activities came from the among the ordinary free people. According to him slaves performed the house works [5]. As it is going to be understood from this fact, Ou Yangxi's opinions show serious difference from much more significant matters of Ma Changshou. Two important historians cannot agree on not whether or not there was slavery in Huns but the subject of their numbers. It is also quite an

interesting thing to claim that the slaves of Huns performing only the house works. It must be rather hard to prove, in a society preferring a nomadic animal breeding life style, how they employed that many slaves too.

Third historian conducting studies on the structure of Hun society Lin Gan in his article named "Xiongnu Shihui Zhidu Chutan (Pre-analyses on Structure of Hun Society) published in June of 1962 stresses upon the numbers of slaves seen in Huns diligently just as Ma Chanshou and Ou Yangxi upon reciting the known economic life viewed in Hun society. According to Lin Gan, the number of slaves owned by Huns is 300.000 and forms one fifth of the entire country population. Due to owning such crowded number of slaves, state of Huns made slaves work in works of animal breeding, agriculture and hand crafted materials [5].

As can be seen, it is understood that the opinions of Lin Gan on this matter are also clearly enforced. We believe that argument of people of nation, which existed approximately more than 2.000 years ago from today to be employed only in works of making weapons and entrusting the most important sectors of country into the hands of their slaves is once again doesn't make any sense and against the rules of common sense. Underlying purpose of all these inconsistent opinions is not to provide objective information on Hun society in light of scientific measures and evidences but to prove that Hun society was based completely on slavery system.

Another Chinese researcher Gao Jingxin also argues in his article, which he wrote in 1962, that it has entered into slave society as of Qin-Han period and state of Hun formed its wealth through extortion of assets owned by the slaves they owned therefore reached prosperity; however can not provide any logical or scientific evidences to his groundless arguments [8].

In a textbook written for Chinese university students, edited by one of the leading representatives of modern Chinese historiography, Uyghur origin historian Jian Bozan, attendance of more than a few hundred people formed of similar rank officers, relatives and members of family to the funeral of someone belonging to ruler class in Hun society, is reviewed as an evidence which proves that the Hun society have reached into stage of slavery. [9] It is understood that Jian Bozan, who wrote the chapters on Hun of the book, has also reached to these conclusions as result of specific pressures, just as the other Chinese historians, whose opinions have been mentioned briefly above. Because arguing that a society has a slave society system by taking into consideration the number of people attending the funeral of a Hun authority, belonging to the ruling class, seems quite groundless in terms of scientifically.

Starting from the years in which the People's Republic of China were established in 1949; this country has also handled the Huns history with a Marxist view just as histories of the other minorities and this habit continued for very long time. However, the keen and harsh history perception carrying the characteristics of iron curtain period has been observed to go towards the positive direction in works of researched published in China for the past 10-15 years. New generation Chinese researchers have begun thinking in a more scientific fashion on the subject of the type of social structure Huns had. One of the new generation Chinese historians, Ma Liqing for example, in her book that she published 6 years ago and in which she puts emphasis on material-culture history of Huns, questions the opinion of Huns being a slave society in a serious form, talks about the historians, who do not agree with the idea of Huns being a slave society; however, she doesn't reveal which idea she supports definitely either. The meaning we have taken from the words of Miss Ma Liqing is in the direction that she accepts the idea that the social structure of Huns is in the form of half patriarch and half feudal social structure [10].

It is also interesting that some of western researchers, aside from significant number of Chinese researchers, had also felt the need for using the word barbarian when indicating nomadic neighbors of Chinese. Toby E. Huff in his broad researched titled, Islamic World; emerge and rise of Modern Science in China and west, expressed the fact that they owned a written observation of one thousand years that they thought may be belonging to non-Chinese barbarians in 7th Century A.C [11].

Toby Huff does not touch upon any subjects about the cultural relationships between Huns, Gokturks and Uyghurs which were nearer to them when examining such broad subject as emerge and rise of modern science in China; however, makes very long explanations about the scientific relationships between Chinese and Arabs. It is necessary to look for the reason of no mentioning any one of those classic and modern Turkish societies, who co-existed with the Chinese for the past 2000 years when examining long history of Chinese science, in Toby's lack of Chinese language knowledge as a historian or sinologist. Because when Toby was writing this study in question, he had to refer to second and third hand resources due to being unable to use the first hand Chinese resources. If he would have read the Chinese resources from its original source language he would have felt the need, to at least mention the Chinese-Turk interaction.

B. Gokturks period

Based on Chinese resources, it is possible to say that Gokturks are the descendants of Huns. Not necessarily as much as Huns, researches on Gokturks in China are rather in demand. A specific Gokturk perception has formed in the country in question connected to the abundance of Gokturk researches in China. However, points of our Chinese colleagues view of Gokturk History and culture, paint almost a complete opposite picture of the point of view in Turkey. Turkish historians state that Gokturk state, from time to time, had as much as political power as Chinese state of that period and established close relations in mainly

political, diplomatic, economic and cultural areas with China. Despite the fact that these relationships require both sides to be influenced from one another in areas mentioned, Chinese researchers prefer bringing up mainly how Gokturks were influenced by Sui (581-617) and Tang (618-907) dynasties, instead of talking about a mutual interaction.

Suppose due to the fact that certain parts of the territories on which the Gokturks have live are now remain within borders of China and many number of Turkish societies, coming from Gokturk race live in this country; Chinese historians see Gokturks as one of China's ancient nomadic tribe. [12] The meaning that they have accepted Gokturks as one of ancient minority communities of China is driven out of that perception. Seeing Gokturks, who had a state of their own for more than approximately 1500 years and completely different cultural structure than the Chinese, as minority community of China; don't comply with the historical facts.

Opinions of Chinese scientists, who worked in the field of Gokturk researches, on character of Turkish society at the time in question carry the same characteristics generally with the ideas we have attempted to explain in the above section. Chinese historian Ma Changshou, who published the first book in the area of Gokturk history in China, titled "Tujueren He Tujue Hanguo" argues on the subject of Gokturk society structure characteristic being based on slavery just as he claimed previously about the Hun society. [13] Since Ma Changshou's opinions on Gokturk society being based on slavery system is same as the opinions expressed on the subject of the structure of Hun society, we wanted to remain away from unnecessary repetitions.

When the battles that took place between Gokturks and Chinese are being explained whether in researches published in China or textbooks studied in Chinese universities, it is argued that Gokturks massacred the Chinese and took numerous Chinese as prisoner of war. [14] It is understood that Chinese historian, who qualifies killing, which exists, although sad, in the nature of all wars, as massacre; doesn't look at killings that happen many of times in Turkic country as massacre.

C. Turkey in China and China in Turkey

When we introduced our short research we mentioned that there were certain parallelisms between Turkic perception in China and Chinese perception in Turkey. We have been observing that the parallelisms mentioned here have been built mostly upon a foundation of negative opinions. Despite the fact that this phenomenon has maintained its validity for a long time; it is essential to highlight those negative perceptions shall incline towards a positive image as long as the political, economical and cultural relationships between the two sides gain speed and provide opportunities for both sides to see and review in person. It will be beneficial to make explanations that will clear up the picture here. If it is necessary to approach the subject objectively there are two main reasons for both sides to have negative perceptions of one another and they are as follow:

a. Both sides approach each other with prejudice. Whether it is China or Turkey, both sides receive the source of their prejudice about the other side from history. Major damages done to the other side over the victory of China in the end of the long battles entered into with the Chinese during periods of Huns and Gokturks are not limited to the history books but are transforming into a negative image of China in the minds of many Turks.

As the most significant reason of bad perception formed against China in Turkish people, are the emphasis made over the negative subjects in the researches. However the same goes for the publications released in China. For example, we have stressed upon the fact that these two Turkish states during both in Huns and Gokturks period have gotten so big for long time, as political power, to be able to measure up with China. However, the modern Chinese researchers have recorded the gifts given to them by Turks as extortion yet recorded the gifts given to Turks by Chinese as gifts even during the periods when both sides were equal. Reason behind it all is the influence of great big and proud Chinese psychology in every period of history and wish of seeing themselves superior over Turks. A Chinese cavalry man in the history museum found in Xi'an capital of Shaanxi State is depicted as running over a Hun soldier underneath his horse.

Using printed and visual publication organs provides rather effective results according to the point of view you have to make any country or nation you desire to be perceived as you wish them to be perceived. Reflecting Chinese in negative fashion on historic matters in magazines addressing very young readers and being published by private organization approximately 30 year ago let to an effective Chinese perception to form in our country.

For example, I might say that we, as children, who are going to elementary school in the beginnings of 70s, also had bad perception of Chinese due to this magazine called Tarkan for children, which was narrating the historic events with images of Chinese as cruel and as antagonist; it was published weekly. In 80s however, we began having bad perception of Japanese, since Chinese were being reflected onto movie screens as the most innocent people in their struggles against certain western powers or the

Japanese in the adventurous Chinese movies made in Hong Kong. The fact that we want to emphasize here is that artwork presented in an influential and perfect way has caused a positive perception in our country.

b. Due to the reason of having adequate amount of information to know one another; both sides form an opposite side perception in their minds, which is far from real measures in. However, those negative perceptions based on such lack of knowledge usually cannot hold its effect for long time. today's well advanced information technology allow both Chinese and Turks to receive the necessary information just by visiting the other side in person and without any mediators thanks to the well improved relationships in various areas and turn those negative perceptions into positive ones. However such transformations of perception are not as easy as it sounds. Especially when subject is China, language becomes a major obstacle for the Turkish. Language for Chinese however, doesn't constitute a serious obstacle. Due to the fact of placing significance on training manpower in all areas, instead of using second or third hand translations, Chinese people go directly to their local specialists, who have trained in our country and proficient in Turkish language to understand Turkish people and Turkey. And consequently obtain the information and experience they need first hand and effectively. For example, while Chinese people are using Turkish effectively in area of diplomacy due to having established a diplomatic relationship with our country since 1971; Turkish people always prefer using English in their relationships with Chinese people today.

In order to obtain valid, up-to-date and valuable information on China; we need to place importance on our relations with China by the leadership and support of government's concerning institutions since researches of China have become one of the most popular fields of study in all of western countries. As it is stated by the Sinology researcher U. Rifat Karlova, a young man very promising to make great scientific researches, considering his recent studies associated with China; Turkish perception in China is underdeveloped. It is necessary to conduct extensive researches and studies in this field. [15] When the numbers of those extensive researches increase; Chinese people shall develop perceptions, which do not base on prejudgments and more transparent with the Turks.

Conclusion

We, here in our brief research attempted to make an analysis mostly about the Turkish perception of modern Chinese researchers due to the close relationships between Chinese and Turks providing detailed information on Turkish history and culture for a time more than 1000 years beginning from the most ancient ages of Turkish history and aside from Turks being members of the northern culture just as Chinese originally. Despite the fact that we focused mostly on the history area studies of modern Chinese researches we disregarded to review the Chinese perception in Turkish people. We should have had done that since both the nations generally have negative perception of the opposite side. However, it is beneficial to emphasize on the point that Chinese people know more about us than what little we know about them. Because while they are training Turkish speaking specialists in many fields, we have attempted to understand Chinese people from the results of researches conducted in second languages such as English, German and French. So much so that, Turkish diplomacy see no harm in using English as long as Chinese side didn't employ a Turkish speaking translator in all its relations with the Chinese despite the fact that Chinese people today use Turkish language effectively in diplomacy. Due to the fact of having one of the largest countries of the world in all periods of history; Chinese people perceive the histories of communities that existed within the borders of today's China during the various times of history as a part of the history of their own country. With affects of pride, which originates from the past, Chinese researches have a negative Turkish perception in general. These negative perceptions of Chinese researchers, presenting works of studies in areas such as social characteristics of historic Turkish states, political, economical and cultural relationships of Turks and Chinese, are understood clearly from the expressions that they use in their writings.

These negative perceptions of Chinese researchers on Turks have recently changed significantly. One of the most important reasons for this change is that Chinese people have gotten to know Turkish people more closely due to relationships developed in many areas and it is possible to attribute this to permanent information that they have obtained personally. Same conditions apply for Turks. Gradually increasing number of Turks had the opportunity to visit China and began to approach Chinese people more positively due to having heavy economic and cultural relationships with China.

Aside from broad and gigantic commercial potential, in order to be able to benefit from rich information and culture reserve of China, to express ourselves more effectively and accurately to Chinese people, we need to understand and know Chinese people more accurately and present ourselves to them as we are; in addition we need have an exact Chinese perception and leave a positive perception of

ourselves on them. All of those above depend on the effectiveness of the investments to be made into the cultural areas as well as the economic areas of both countries. If we, the Turkish people, want Chinese people to have more positive perception about us, we have to monitor China, Chinese history and culture through the first hand materials and train specialists, who are going to introduce us to them accurately as soon as possible.