

BLACK MONGOLS PART 2

(The following is an excerpt from the e-book [They Came Before Marco Polo](#))



Chinese artist Ren Bowen's 14th century painting of black Mongolian horsemen entering China.

During my research on this topic it became obvious the early writers on this history maintained a blatant unprofessional racial bias. As will be revealed, the race of the Khitan people has proven to be a disturbing topic for many American and European writers. When confronted with the evidence, many researchers have refused to accept the facts and have actually abandoned their own professional protocol in order to deny the truth. Their writings clearly demonstrate a discussion on the Khitans' race pose an apparent dilemma to these individuals. Many of the cited historians have chosen to either talk around the subject, gloss over it or ignore the topic entirely.

For example, the first comprehensive English work on the Liao dynasty and the subsequent Kara Khitai dynasty was the *Liao-Shih*. Karl A. Wittfogel has painstakingly translated this Chinese text into English. He published his resultant translation in *History of Chinese Society Liao*. In this work Wittfogel discusses the term *Qara* (black):

The Ch'tan were acquainted with this title as early as the first part of the eleventh century... When and how the formula Qara-Khitay originated is not clear. But whatever the specific meaning of the word 'qara' in the compound Qara-Khitay, the name manifestly fulfilled two functions: it emphasized the ties of the new state to the Ch'itan Liao and pre-Liao glory and at the same time, it set off the 'black' or western Ch'itan from their eastern [white?] ancestors.

Here Wittfogel postulates the reason the Khitans referred to themselves as "black" is to perhaps distinguish themselves from their "white" ancestors. Now Wittfogel knows this to be an absurdity. If such a situation was the case then one can subsequently argue modern black people refer to themselves as "Black" merely to distinguish themselves from their white progenitors. Wittfogel's argument also validates the ludicrous belief that Japanese, Chinese and Korean people referred to themselves by ethnic terms merely because they had European forefathers. This obviously perplexed gentleman is willing to

put forth any farfetched explanation behind the usage of the term. He has demonstrated a staunch willingness to give credence to any perspective except the one suggesting the Khitans were a black-skinned people.

The coupling of the appendage *Kara* (black) to the Khitans' state title has literally caused a mass cataclysm in the Asian studies world. Many far-fetched explanations for the term's usage have been proposed. For example, in *The Encyclopedia Sinica* Samuel Coulings says: "...Black K'tai, an important though short-lived empire of Central Asia before the coming of GENGHIS Khan... the term 'black' was added by Mohammedan authors either as implying inferiority to the original K'tai or because the K'tai were infidels."

These assertions by Coulings cannot be correct. When the Khitans initially arrived in Central Asia they uprooted and assimilated the Karakhanids. The Karakhanids were Muslims (or "Mohammedan" as Coulings prefers to use). If *Kara* implies being an infidel to the Islamic faith then why did this Muslim people apply the term to themselves? Secondly, the assertion that *Kara* implies inferiority to the "original" Khitans of China's Liao dynasty is simply inane. The Karakhanids were Muslims. The Liao dynasty (Coulings "original" Khitans) were not. It is highly doubtful that the Karakhanids (an Islamic people) would have perceived themselves to be inferior to a non-Islamic people (the Liao Dynasty). Here's a more plausible scenario for Coulings to consider: The Karakhanids were a black-skinned people; hence, the reason they referred themselves as *Karakhanids* (The Black Kings). And the Khitans were a black-skinned people who succeeded them. Henceforth, they referred to themselves as

Kara Khitai (The Black Khitans). Instead of acknowledging these peoples were Black Coulings has chosen to ignore simple logic.

In an attempt to deny the racial identity of the Khitans one tactic that is often used is to put forth an act of complete ignorance. E. Bretschneider wrote “The reason why they were termed Black Khidans [Khitans] by the Mongols is unknown”. Now Bretschneider is a noted scholar who has written quite extensively on the steppe culture. Yet he asserts it is a complete mystery as to why the term was applied to the Khitans. If Bretschneider is really the scholar he claims to be, and based on his works he is, then it is highly unlikely he was unaware of the applications of the term. *Kara* was used quite extensively in the steppe culture. For example, it was applied to locations, Genghis Khan dubbed his capital *Kara Korum* “the Black Camp”, *Kara Mouren* “the Black River” was the Mongol term for the Yellow River. The term was also applied to groups of people. There was a black-skinned Mongolian group who were referred to as *Karaitis* “Black Mongols”. Yet, in spite of these usages, Bretschneider feels it is a mystery as to why the term was applied to the Khitans.

In *History of the Moghuls of Central Asia* N. Elias has demonstrated complete racial bigotry:

As regards to the name Kara-Khitai, it appears to me that these people were regarded by the Turki-speaking nations of the west as northern Chinese, or Cathayans, though differing from them to some extent. The word “Kara”, though meaning “black”, is constantly used in Central Asia to denote a difference, a variety, and especially a lower variety ... in naming wild animals too, the word is made use of in this manner-to denote a variety. Thus the Kara-Khitai were, to the western foreigner, not the real, the true-bred (the “pakka”) Khatai, but a variety, or offshoot, of them, and therefore denominated by an adjective.

Hence, according to Elias, the Turks applied the term “Kara” to the Khitans to denote a

people who were different from themselves and represented a “lower variety” of mankind. Elias subsequently asserts the term was applied to wild animals thus, hinting the Khitans were viewed in a similar fashion. Unfortunately for Elias, in-depth studies contradict these observations. If “Kara” conveys a people viewed as a “lower variety” from the Turks then why did a Turkish population apply the term to themselves? The Karakhanids were an indigenous Turkish dynasty. N. Elias has conveniently chosen to ignore this fact. Studies also reveal the term *Kara* did not carry a negative connotation. The Turkish term *Karakhanids* translates as “the Black Kings”. In contradiction to Elias’ observations, the *Encyclopedia of Islam, Vol 4* defines “Kara” as: “The Turkish word for ‘black’ or ‘dark colour’ in general... It has, however, at the same time the meaning ‘strong, powerful’ and should be interpreted in this sense...” *The Dictionary of the Middle Ages* stated: “The term “Qarakhanid” (from the Turkic qara, ‘black’ [symbolically ‘the North’ or ‘great’], and khan which figures as the highest title in the state,...” Elias obviously needs to rethink his position and check his sources.

In Wittfogels translation of the *Liao-Shih* we have the passage:

In some context, ‘qara’ has also acquired an honorific connotation. Marvazi, who completed his work in 1120 believes that it was first used this way by a somewhat legendary Ethiopian slave; ‘He assumed the title QARA_KHAN, which no one had held before him...

Here we see the author’s unwillingness to acknowledge a Black presence on the Asian steppe unless such a presence can be portrayed in some sort of subservient role. Thus, we see the use of the description “Ethiopian slave”. Such a portrayal is false. There were no Black slaves occupying the Asian steppe during this referenced period.

Apparently, this individual is confusing the Asian steppe regions with Mississippi or Alabama during America's servitude period.

Although *The Encyclopedia of Islam* has great merit, it too has passages which are misleading. For example, in its' discussion on Kara it states: "In personal names, kara may refer to the black or dark brown colour of hair or to a dark complexion." This passage is only partially accurate. The author does admit the term refers to a dark complexion. However, stating it indicates a dark hair color is simply not true. People in Asia were unable to resort to hair color as a means of distinguishing one another because everyone in Asia has dark hair. Such a means of identification would have been ineffective and pointless. The above statements display the writer's inability to give objective unbiased reporting about history.

The above discrepancies merely demonstrate the cited historians inability to stomach the fact that Black people ventured into Asia, consolidated themselves and made pivotal impacts on Chinese and other Asian civilizations. The cited individuals stubbornly adhere to the assumption that Black people are by nature an inferior lot and therefore naturally incapable of such accomplishments. Hence, when factual evidence contradicts these assumptions the experts feel such findings are inaccurate in spite of how convincing or compelling they may be. As you have seen, many were willing to submit far-fetched notion as a counter argument behind the Khitans' use of the term "Kara" (Black). These proposed explanations are usually not well thought out and do not hold up to academic scrutiny.

Summary

Toward the end of the last Ice Age, Asia began to attract African migrants. Some of these migrants maintained a nomadic traditions as they subsisted on the Asian plains. These groups grew to become formidable warrior horsemen. The horsemen hordes became infamous in Roman, Persian and Chinese traditions. Several of these groups were Black. The Khitans were one such black group. They are distinguished by being the first horsemen group to establish a dynasty in China. After the demise of their Liao dynasty, the Khitans were able to successfully regroup and establish a subsequent empire in Central Asia. Denis Sinor in *Inner Asia: A Syllabus* writes:

The destiny of the Khitan people was truly remarkable. A Mongol speaking small people of hunters coming from Manchuria conquered and ruled over northern China for almost two centuries and, when finally ousted had still enough political vitality left to create and govern a great nomad empire in Inner Asia...