

THE SIEGE OF PEKING AS RECORDED IN
THE LONDON TIMES

by

David Chi-hsin Lu, A. B.

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

in the

GRADUATE SCHOOL

of the

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

1932

378.7M71

XL958

cop. 2

THE SIEGE OF PEKING AS RECORDED IN
THE LONDON TIMES

by

David Chi-hsin Lu, A.B.

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

in the

GRADUATE SCHOOL

of the

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI

1932

496380 60

7-6-44 g. Office of Dean of School of Journalism

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To Professor Roscoe B. Ellard for suggesting the title, to Dean Frank L. Martin and Dean F. F. Stephens for their valuable assistance, and to Dr. Carl T. Pihlblad and Miss Lola Anderson for reading the manuscript and aiding with corrections.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----------------|
| Preface | I-VI |
| Chapter I History of China's Foreign Relations | |
| Part I | 1- 9 |
| Part II | 10-24 |
| Chapter II Causes leading to the Boxer Rebellion | |
| Part I | 25-31 |
| Part II | 32-38 |
| Part III | 39-48 |
| Chapter III News service during the Siege of | |
| Peking | 49-74 |
| Chapter IV Contrast of News Reports with Historical | |
| Records | |
| Part I | 75-95 |
| Part II | 96-135 |
| Part III | 136-151 |
| Part IV | 152-159 |
| Part V | 160-182 |
| Part VI | 183-194 |
| Part VII | 195-196 |
| Part VIII | 197-202 |
| Part XI | 203-211 |

Chapter V Conclusions

212-213

Bibliography

214-215

PREFACE

Thirty years ago a miniature "World War"--The Boxer Rebellion--ended in China. It was not China's war, in fact, but a war between the Manchu Court against the eleven Powers of the world. The leading journals in Europe and America displayed reports of this international struggle with prominence, and it was the talk of the civilized world for nearly four months. In this particular period the Siege of Peking took place; the ancient Chinese capital was isolated and communications of all kinds were suspended for weeks. What was thought to have happened in Peking, and which in most cases never happened, continued to be the salient news of the day and gripped the world in a state of horror for many days. What effects on the minds of the readers and the influence it produced in the leaders of foreign countries, cannot be estimated.

This thesis is a comparative study of the news reports regarding the Siege of Peking during the Boxer Rebellion of 1900, as published in the "London Times", and the alleged facts as recorded by

II

the historian and official reports.

The purpose of this research is to show: First, that the Boxer Rebellion was not a national war waged by China as a whole, neither was it merely an anti-foreign and anti-Christian movement, but that it was a conflict with many difficult and underlying problems; second, to prove by historical and official data that many of the alarming reports as recorded in "The London Times" were erroneous; third, to show how difficult it was to obtain news, to get it confirmed and to have it accepted as authentic; finally, to show how generally such unfounded reports are believed in Europe and America.

No attempt has been made to give a description or explanation of the Boxers and their organization. They are called by various writers the "Association for Justice and Harmony" or the "Fist of Patriotic Union", or other names. To the Chinese they are generally known as the "I-ho-chuan", or "Tuan-fei", the latter name meaning "fist-bandits". The present study does not permit a study of the Boxers' customs and practises, but suffice it to say here that their aims were patriotic. Their one belief

III

was to purge the country of all foreigners and their institutions--especially the Christian Church. The Boxer movement was never well organized, equipped, or disciplined. However, the number of Boxers increased during the famine when thousands of discontented farmers and restless peasants and brigands joined their forces. As early as 1899 the Boxers were already active in North China and assumed an important part just before the siege of the Peking legations. After the Taku forts were taken by the foreign gunboats and the foreign legations were isolated from the outside world, the Boxers gradually faded away in the background while the Imperial troops came to play the leading role.

This work does not attempt to cover the whole Boxer Rebellion period, but only the Siege of Peking, beginning from the reports of the international action to the day that the legations were relieved. Efforts have been made to go into later issues of "The London Times", including the whole of August and some days of September to clear up certain points of the conflicting reports as they appeared in previous issues.

In Chapter I a brief outline of the

historical background of the early contacts between Europeans and China has been given chiefly because this whole episode was a problem directly or indirectly leading up to the trouble.

In the second chapter, on the cause of the rebellion, the study endeavored to point out some of the salient factors, generally recognized today, which were responsible for the rebellion. Such reasons were not presented in the press but only created in the minds of the casual readers the idea that this was a movement against foreigners and western civilization. This chapter is also included to give those who are interested in the subject some light on the problem as they read through the reports that are quoted.

Chapter III deals with the news service, news sources and methods of transmission. This includes the period before the Siege of Peking and after the city was isolated. This material has been taken from the contents of the London "Times" together with the material in the "United States Foreign Relations Series", 1900. Several pages have been devoted especially to Conger's message which attracted world-wide attention, to show how difficult, even for official reports, it was to get news out of

Peking during the isolation period, to have it confirmed and to have it generally accepted as authentic.

The fourth chapter, which comprises the main body of the research, is an analysis of the various reports, regarding the Siege of Peking, of the "London Times". It begins with the May 22 issue, when international action was first published. The work was intended to cover the reports of the siege, but this preliminary period has been included to give a better understanding of the background. The last issue of the "Times" examined was dated September 14, which brings to light the problems of the Baron von Ketteler murder.

It must be emphasized that this chapter does not follow the siege in a chronological order, but has taken the outstanding news reports during this time and followed their individual developments. No attempt has been made to include the erroneous reports of the Tientsin Massacre which occurred during this period. The work is confined to the news directly affiliated with Peking, the foreign ministers and the relief expedition.

In pointing out the errors of the reports as published in the "Times" regarding the conditions

VI

in Peking during the siege, the "United States Foreign Relations Series", 1900, Morse's "International Relations of the Chinese Empire", three volumes, and the Ching Shan Diary have been taken to support the alleged facts. The Ching Shan Diary is accepted by leading authorities and is regarded as authentic.

Each part in Chapter IV is prefaced with a brief statement of the facts as recorded in these references and is followed with excerpts of the telegrams and dispatches as published in the "London Times".

THE SIEGE OF PEKING AS RECORDED IN
THE LONDON TIMES

CHAPTER I
HISTORY OF CHINA'S FOREIGN RELATIONS

PART I
EARLY RELATIONS WITH THE WEST

The history of China's foreign relations, from the very beginning to the present day, has been a sequence of unhappy events. China had not always been isolated from the West but had admitted Europeans, according to Chinese records, into the empire as far back as the reign of Hwangti (2697 B. C.).¹ And throughout the ancient and middle ages, there was a

1. Koo, Status of Aliens in China, p.13.

continuous flow inward and outward of foreign explorers and traders across the sea and overland. Missionaries from India and Europe visited the Chinese capital and came into contact with the officials in the provinces, while the Hebrews established a colony in Kaifungfu, Honan Province. The first Chinese embassy was sent to Parthia in 120 A.D. and the Chinese court received a tribute-bearing mission from the King of Shan, a country southwest of China, which is now known to have been the Roman Orient.²

During the medieval period travelers to the Chinese Empire included Marco Polo in 1274, John de Corvino in 1288, Ibn Batuta, the Moor, in 1342. Following after these came Greeks, Persians, Nestorian and Buddhist pilgrims.³

In this early period the Chinese government had no policy of seclusion and confinement in China. In fact, Europeans entered the empire over land frontiers and sea ports, and moved freely within the

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid, p.15-17.

territory without discrimination or restrictions.

These travelers and traders were given various privileges and protection by the emperor, who treated them on an equal footing with his own subjects.⁴

Nor were these early visitors merely passing through the country. The Chinese authorities gave them official positions and permitted them to reside in the country. Marco Polo, a Venetian, was appointed to the office of Prefect of Yangchow while John de Corvino, a Romish missionary, was given the right to build a Catholic church and preach the gospel.⁵

The beginning of the sixteenth century witnessed a marked change in the attitude of the Chinese government toward aliens within its territory. It was from this time that China began a policy of seclusion, which lasted for some 250 years. Measures were passed to prohibit foreigners from entering the country, while others were kept under surveillance, their privileges becoming more restricted. By examining the history from this period down to the

4. Ibid, p.18-19.

5. Ibid, p.19.

Opium War of 1842, one can understand the reasons for this abrupt change of attitude on the part of the Chinese government.⁶

In 1517, Fernao Perez de Andrade, a Portuguese subject, was one of the first foreigners of a western maritime power to attempt to open direct commercial relations with the Chinese court. He conducted himself in a conciliatory manner and consequently was well received by the Chinese authorities at Canton, where he cast anchor. A year later China became known to the Portuguese traders as a land of fortune and a movement was started toward the Oriental port. But these adventurers were greedy, getting all they could from the natives without due return; they were haughty, and despotic, insolent and licentious, which led the local officials to oppose them. From 1545 to 1549 the natives attacked them and consequently the Peking court limited these foreign traders to Macao, where all European trade with China in the South was transacted.⁷

6. Ibid, p.21.

7. Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol.I, p.41.

The Spanish were the next to come into contact with the Chinese. In 1575, two priests acting as envoys from the Philippine Islands came to Canton and were received with courtesy. The Spanish in trying to stimulate trade with the Chinese found themselves outwitted. Instead of the influx of Spaniards into Chinese territory, thousands of Chinese landed in Manila. By 1603 there were 20,000 settlers on the islands. The Spanish officials there became alarmed and took measures to restrict their coming.

The Dutch followed in the footsteps of the Spaniards. The first attempt to establish trade relations was made in 1604, but it met with no success. The Dutch tried to use force in gaining a foothold on Macao but were defeated by the Portuguese who were jealous of the newcomers. The Dutch had to content themselves by withdrawing to Formosa. In 1655 a Dutch embassy was sent to Peking but only obtained the right to "send an embassy once in eight years and that four ships might accompany each such embassy". Other missions were sent in 1664 and 1795, but met with the same results.⁸

8. Ibid, see Chap.III.

The first attempts to establish trade relations by the English were made under Captain John Weddell, who arrived in Canton in 1637. Other British vessels followed in later years and by 1689 the East India Company, a British organization, dispatched her first ship to China and established a factory in Canton.⁹

In 1792 the first British mission, under Lord Macartney, went to Peking to negotiate a treaty with the Peking court. No settlement was reached on either diplomatic or commercial relations. The second British embassy, that of Lord Amherst, was dispatched in 1816 with the object of establishing for the East India Company trade upon an equal footing, free from local hindrances, and to demand reform in the habitual procedure of the Canton authorities. Again the British mission met with no success.

The French had dispatched ships to Canton in 1660. In 1728 they had established a factory at Canton, but their trade through the eighteenth century was meager.

The American traders first entered China in 1784. Other American vessels followed and came

9. Ibid, p.51.

to the port of Canton. For more than fifty years American trade in China increased and came second in importance to that of Great Britain.¹⁰

Russia, because of her territorial continuity with China, came into contact with the Peking court both politically and commercially. The first three embassies despatched by the Czar in 1567, 1619, and 1653 were not successful because they failed to kowtow as required by the emperor whenever he gave an audience. Russian caravans followed in 1658, 1672 and 1677. Because of frontier boundary problems the Chinese came into conflict with the Russians. On August 27, 1689, "the first treaty in which the Chinese had ever been concerned since the foundation of the empire" was concluded with Russia at Nerchinsk. This treaty defined the boundaries between the two empires, arranged for transfrontier trade, and introduced the first system of extraterritoriality, which provided "if any of either nationality committed acts of violence on the foreign side of the frontier, they

10. Ibid, p.58-59.

were to be sent to their own side of the frontier and delivered to the officers of their own nations, who will inflict on them the death penalty as punishment for their crimes.

The first Russian ambassador, after the treaty of Nerchinsk, was sent to Peking in 1693. Other Russian ambassadors reached Peking in 1727. The first Chinese envoy was sent from Peking to St. Petersburg. By the Treaty of the Frontier, signed at Kiakhta in 1727, a Russian mart was established there and provisions also were made for the procedure of extradition and punishment of criminals. In 1806 two Russian ships entered the harbor at Canton to trade. But the Peking court ruled that the treaty with Russia only provided for frontier trade and was not permission to trade at Canton.

Other maritime powers having trade contacts with China during this time included Sweden, Denmark, Prussia, Austria, Italy, Peru, Mexico, Chile and Germany but their trade relations were only on a small scale and never gained great importance.¹¹

11. Ibid, p.59-62.

Foreign trade continued in the South but was restricted to the port of Canton and subjected to the regulations and customs of the local officials. While European traders were endeavoring to push their trade further, the Chinese officials gradually tightened their restrictions on them. There was in the beginning no objection to the merchandise these aliens brought to China or the products they took with them back to their home countries. But when the East India Company began to expand on the opium trade introduced by some early foreign traders, it brought into existence many minor conflicts and planted the evil which led to the Opium War between China and England in 1840-42. Boycotts on British trade preceded the war, British-owned opium was confiscated, British ships ordered out of Canton, and finally open hostilities broke out on November 3, 1839. It was a conflict between the Cantonese and England, for the Peking government could not lend any material assistance. The Cantonese lost one "battle" after another and the dispute was settled in the Treaty of Nanking, August 29, 1842.¹²

12. Ibid, p.296-297.

PART II

FOREIGN RELATIONS FROM THE OPIUM WAR, 1842,
TO THE BOXER REBELLION, 1900.

The Treaty of Nanking, signed in 1842 by China under threat of assault on the city of Nanking by the British, was the entrance of China into world politics. By this agreement, in addition to \$21,000,000 indemnity which China had to pay England, the island of Hongkong was ceded, and five ports, including Canton, Amoy, Foochow, Ningpo and Shanghai, were opened for British residence and trade. The following year another treaty was signed at the Bogue between Great Britain and China. This treaty provided for trade and general regulations.¹³

The United States immediately followed England to establish diplomatic and commercial relations. The American commissioner, Caleb Cushing, was given these instructions: "Our minister is authorized to make a treaty to regulate trade. Let it be just. Let there be no unfair advantage on either side."¹⁴ This treaty, known as the Treaty of

13. Ibid, Chap. XI

14. Letter Pres. Tyler to Emp. China. July 12, 1843.

From William, Middle Kingdom, p.565, cited in Morse,

Int. Rel of the Chinese Emp., Vol.I, p.322.

Wanghai, was signed on July 3, 1844, and marks the first official relations between China and the United States.¹⁵

The French government, eager to establish trade relations with China, sent Monsieur Theodose M. M. J. de Lagrene to see the officials at Peking. Subsequently the Treaty of Whampao was signed on October 24, 1844. In addition to commercial privileges, the French government obtained the right to establish Roman Catholic missions.¹⁶

Belgium, Sweden and Norway, followed one after the other to try their fortunes in the Chinese empire. They each succeeded in getting treaties more or less on the same conditions of the American agreement.¹⁷

The Portuguese, who were among the earliest traders, did not let the other powers leave them behind. On August 22, 1849, the Macao governor, M. Amaral, was murdered by Chinese. The Portuguese,

15. Morse, Int.Rel of the Chi. Emp., Vol.I, p.329-330.

16. Ibid, p.331.

17. Ibid, Chap.XII.

immediately, began to drive out the Chinese officials, then residing on the island regulating the trade, back to the mainland. The Portuguese assumed sovereignty over Macao in 1850 but this was not recognized by China until 1887.

Shanghai was opened to foreign trade late in 1843 under the Treaty of Nanking. Foreign consuls were first stationed there, and the practise of establishing "foreign settlements" was inaugurated. In 1845 the British drew a boundary line where British subjects were to reside, and at first paid an annual rent to the local Chinese authorities. France followed England's example, and in 1849 established a restricted area for French residents. The American consul in 1848 attempted to establish his official residence within the British settlement, but was met with prompt opposition from the British authorities. To find a place for Americans to reside another settlement was established. This American settlement was later amalgamated with the British settlement. All these settlements grew rapidly and the foreign authorities stopped paying their annual rent and introduced a system of self-government, free from the jurisdiction of the local Chinese authorities.¹⁸

18. *Ibid.*, p.346-350.

Friction between Chinese and British subjects in Canton, where the people were still hostile toward foreigners after the Opium War, continued and resulted in minor conflicts. The outrage on the British lorcha "Arrow" occurred in 1856. Other minor incidents added fuel to the fire and the two nations again drifted into a critical situation. Meanwhile a French missionary was murdered in the South. The French officials, put the responsibility on the Chinese officials. In London, British officials conferred with the French ambassador, and a line of action in concert was agreed upon. At the same time, the United States and Russia had difficulties with China regarding their subjects and commercial regulations. These four powers sent an expedition to the North with the object of compelling the Imperial court to yield to their demands. This so-called Second China War was concluded at Tientsin, where China signed several additional agreements with

Britain, France, America and Russia in 1858.¹⁹

The following year, when the British and French envoys came to exchange ratifications of the Tientsin Treaty, the Chinese authorities refused them entrance into Peking. Hostilities broke out again and the joint expedition of France and Britain marched on to Peking. Before entering the capital the British and French troops looted and burned the beautiful summer palace five miles west of the city.

The Peking Convention of 1860 was signed and the Tientsin Treaty of 1858 ratified. China agreed to permit foreign envoys to reside permanently in Peking. Foreigners were given the right to travel in the interior and were subject to the jurisdiction of their national authorities only. Christianity was brought under treaty protection and missionaries were permitted the right to hold property in the interior, a right that was not given to other classes of foreigners. Each treaty included the most-favored-nation clause. In addition to the heavy indemnity

19. Campbell, China, p.12.

which China had to pay England and France, eleven new ports were opened.²⁰

In the meantime, the Taiping Rebellion was breeding in the South, which spread rapidly for the next five years. The movement led by Hung Hsiu Chuan professed to be a quasi-religious crusade against "the wicked Tartar rulers". It moved steadily northward and in 1852 Hung's followers captured the Wuhan district, and in 1853 Nanking. The crusaders continued to move northward, apparently with the object of taking the capital. They were met at the southern part of Chihli Province, and from then the tide began to turn. The troops of the Imperial government pushed them back towards Nanking and in 1858 the rebellion collapsed.²¹

Denmark and the Netherlands, from which early traders had come to the Chinese empire, approached the Chinese authorities for commercial agreements and in 1863 signed separate treaties. These two treaties provided for them the privileges as

20. Morse, Int.Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol.I, Chap.XXVI

21. MacNair, Modern Chinese History, Chap.IX, The Taiping Rebellion.

embodied in the treaties contracted between England, America, France, and Russia, and included the "most-favored-nation" clause.²²

The successive troubles between the Chinese and missionaries in 1843, in 1847, in 1851 and in 1857 and in the 1870 Tientsin massacre, when a Catholic church was destroyed, gave France the desired opportunity to extract further privileges and concessions in the Middle Kingdom. After three years of fighting China was again forced, at the mouth of the gun, to sign a treaty, this time at Saigon, June 5, 1862. France was given Saigon and obtained the "full and entire sovereignty" over Cochinchina, and established a protectorate over Cambodia. In 1874 the King of Annam entered a treaty with France in which he transferred his allegiance from China to France. Furthermore, France came to control the relations of all foreign powers, including China, with the Annamese government. Tongking was placed under French administration.²³

22. Morse, Int.Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol. II, p. 117.

23. Ibid, Chap. XVII.

The Chefoo Convention of 1876 growing out of the conflicts with British subjects settled the Burma-Yunnan frontier trade regulations between China and England. Further rights were given British subjects while Ichang, Wuhu, Wuchow, and Pakhoi were opened as treaty ports and six other ports on the Yangtze River opened as "ports of call" for steamers. In 1890 and 1895 other conventions were signed between China and England which opened Samshui and Kongmoon as treaty ports.²⁴

China's relations with Japan, from the very beginning, have never been friendly. And this hostile attitude between the two Oriental countries has remained until the present. As early as 1873 Japanese officials urged the government to engage in a war of conquest with China.²⁵ Their main object at the outset was not merely for commercial treaties and privileges, but for territorial gains. The first treaty, signed September 13, 1871, was the opening 26 period of official relations between the two countries.

24. Ibid, Chapter XIV.

25. Ibid, p.28.

26. Ibid, p.8.

Japan did not gain much from this treaty, and was naturally dissatisfied. But the time was not ripe and the question of conquest was withheld.

Japan's first move was to establish friendly relations with Korea, China's eastern vassal state. As Japanese interest in Korea grew in 1876 to 1894 she came into conflict with the Chinese and various troubles followed. War finally broke out, and again China was defeated. By the Treaty of Shimonoseki, signed April 17, 1895, China recognized the independence of Korea and ceded Liaotung, Formosa, and Pescadores Islands.²⁷ Shasi, Chungking, Soochow and Hangchow were added to the treaty port list.²⁸ The following year another treaty was signed giving extraterritorial rights to Japan and the privilege of the "most-favored-nation clause".

Events after the Sino-Japanese war followed in rapid succession. When Germany seized Kiaochow in Shantung Province on pretext of two German missionaries

27. Liaotung later retroceded to China.

28. Ibid, p.44-45.

being murdered on November 1, 1897, the signal for the "Battle for Concessions" was on.²⁹ China was forced, as a result of the murders, to cede Kiaochow and the city of Tsingtao to Germany in addition to a heavy indemnity.

Watchful Russia was not slow to act. Always longing for an "ice-free" port for her fleet, Russia immediately took this opportunity while China was negotiating with Germany over Kiaochow, to send her fleet to "winter" at Port Arthur. Following this action two more treaties were signed by China at the point of the gun, when Port Arthur and Dalny were leased to Russia for twenty-five years and additional grants for railroad privileges were made.³⁰

France in her turn now made demands. On April 13, M. Hanotaux announced to the world that the Chinese government had agreed to the following provisions: (1) the lease of Kwangchow-wan to France as a naval base for 99 years and (2) the right to construct a railway from Tongking to Yunnanfu.³¹

29. Campbell, China, p.40.

30. Morse, Int. Rel. of Chi. Emp., Vol.III, p.105-107.

31. Ibid, p.112.

England accepted these changes with suspicion. So she made another move. A 25-year lease on Weihaiwei was obtained in the North to balance the power with Russia. In the South England obtained another lease for Kowloon for 99 years to check France.³²

The Powers were not satisfied with their territorial achievements. To safeguard their newly acquired ports and cities, they forced China to accept the non-alienation declarations and spheres of influence article inserted into each treaty. England was given the assurance that "no territory in the Yangtze valley would be alienated to any foreign power and to maintain the existing British control of the maritime customs administration so long as the trade of Great Britain preponderated."³³

France received China's promise "not to alienate any territory in the three provinces of Kwangtung, Kwangsi, and Yunnan nor to cede the island of Hainan and to accept the nomination of a Frenchman

32. Ibid, p.118-119.

33. Campbell, China, p.38.

to control the Chinese posts should these be separated from the maritime customs.³⁴ Japan, having taken Formosa in 1895 demanded that no territory in the province of Fukien be alienated to a foreign power. When Germany was negotiating with the Chinese government over Kiaochow, and the Russian fleet was ordered to winter at Port Arthur, two other British cruisers put in the same port in January, 1898. Russia immediately instructed her ambassador to London to demand the British cruisers' withdrawal.³⁵ The German emperor was fully aware of the importance of political influence and prestige in the affairs of the Orient. Minister von Bulow's speech in the Reichstag at that time can represent the policy of the German emperor. He said: "Mention has been made of a partition of China. Such a partition will not be brought about by us at any rate. All that we have done is to provide that, come what may, we ourselves shall not go empty-handed".³⁶ Thus, through her possession of Kiaochow and Tsingtao, Germany declared

34. Ibid, p.39.

35. Ibid, p.37.

36. Hsia, Studies in Chinese Diplomatic History, p.128.

Shantung to be within her sphere of influence.

Nor were the Powers through. Taking advantage of their rapidity and smoothness in getting commercial privileges and territory, several nations began to section off the best parts of the treaty ports which one nation alone could not monopolize. Concessions were obtained at Newchuang by Russia, at Tientsin by Germany, at Amoy and Foochow by Japan, at Hankow by France, Japan, Russia, Germany and Belgium.³⁷

While the "Battle for Concessions" was going on in China the United States was occupied with her own troubles in the Philippines. Although she did not have any desire to obtain territory in the Chinese empire, she was determined to possess a position for her trade on the same basis with the other powers. During this land-grabbing movement, the United States continued her own policy of equal opportunity for all powers alike. But when American nationals were rigorously excluded from the development of railways and mines in the so-called spheres,³⁸ the American government saw that action must be taken

37. Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol.III, p.122.

38. Ibid, p.126.

if she desired to maintain a position for her citizens.

During the period from September 6 to November 17, 1899, John Hay, secretary of state, addressed identical notes to England, France, Germany, Russia, Japan and Italy asking for the assurance that:

1. A country will in no way interfere with any treaty port or any vested interest within a so-called sphere of interest or leased territory it may have in China.

2. That only the Chinese government shall collect duty and according to the Chinese treaty tariff.

3. That no preferential harbor dues or railway charges should benefit its own subjects.³⁹

All the powers were approached separately; therefore they were obliged to send individual replies. While England accepted the principles without reserve, the replies of the other powers were guarded and qualified. However, Secretary Hay regarded them as official consent and declared to the world the now

³⁹. Correspondence in U.S. For. Rel., 1899, p.128.

famous "Open Door Policy".

The year immediately preceeding the outbreak of the Boxer Rebellion was comparatively quiet, as far as foreign aggression was concerned. This year, on the other hand, was fully occupied with internal troubles. While the foreign powers were settling down to see what they had actually obtained, the Reform Movement was born in the Imperial Court at Peking. The only important foreign contact this year was additional agreements entered into with Germany, Russia, France, Belgium and Mexico in regard to commerce and railways.

Such were the conditions of China's foreign relations at the outbreak of the Boxer Rebellion. The richest regions in the land, the most important sea-ports, the main peninsulas, the strategic cities in the thirteen most densely populated and richest provinces of the country were practically controlled by foreign powers.

CHAPTER II

CAUSES LEADING TO THE BOXER REBELLION.

PART I

FOREIGN AGGRESSION

The Boxer Rebellion frequently has been called China's anti-foreign uprising. Although this may partly be true, it cannot strictly be called a national uprising; for it was only a war between the Manchu Court and the eleven world powers. It was not a mere conflict over commercial privileges, but also in a measure a conflict in national traditions, in religion, in international practices; in other words, a conflict of Chinese and western civilization. It was the culmination of more than sixty years of foreign aggression and international misunderstanding, and although China was defeated in all military engagements with the powers and subjected to humiliating and heavy penalties after the war, the Boxer Rebellion, tragic and unsuccessful as it seems, preserved the Chinese nation from further partitioning.

In the early, non-treaty period, when China had no official contacts with the foreign powers, there existed a spirit of cordiality and

co-operation between the Chinese and European travelers and traders. During the Middle Ages aliens were admitted into the country and were given various privileges and adequate protection by the Chinese officials. These Europeans were subjected to Chinese jurisdiction and as long as they obeyed Chinese law there was no friction of a serious nature. As traders from the West to China increased a move to expand the trade and to obtain commercial privileges on European methods were pushed forward. The Chinese government holding to its ancient traditions did not readily accept these new demands. During the sixteenth century the Chinese government adopted a new policy of restriction and isolation, and it was at this time that China became known to the outside world as having a closed door policy.¹

The alien merchants who came to China during this period did not make a favorable impression on the Chinese people. They were greedy and put their pecuniary interests before everything else. They came only anxious to accumulate a fortune to take

1. See Chap.I, p.2-3.

back to their native land. The sailors and adventurers who thronged the sea ports took all they could get from the natives. They were crude and committed various crimes and outrages. As a whole, they were all insistent on the removal of trade restrictions, but the native officials continued to treat them in accordance with traditional policies of the Chinese government. The British, Spaniard, Russian, and Portuguese traders all groveled for favors, carrying on their private expeditions, intimidating the native inhabitants, harrying the coast and committing every act of brigandage and uncivilized warfare, burning, killing and robbing the defenseless villagers.²

These contacts and actions prejudiced the minds of the Chinese people. They placed all foreigners without distinction who came to China in the same category. And this became the reason for the Manchu Court's placing a rigid restriction and careful vigilance on sea ports and frontier towns.

2. Clements, The Boxer Rebellion, p.19.

The Opium War of 1840-42 when China was defeated by England ushered in a new era in China's relations with the Western world.

It marked the official opening of the country to European trade, the simultaneous growth of Chinese hostility towards aliens. If the powers were bent on having restrictions removed, the Peking court put up a stronger, if not more stubborn, effort to keep them out. China was ignorant of the practice of international affairs and was evasive in living up to the treaty stipulations. The Europeans at the same time failed to sympathize with the prevailing conditions in China. The conflicts in 1856 and again in 1860 not only saw the Europeans obtain what they wanted by force but also saw them obtain additional privileges which were not demanded at the outset.

The British and French demonstrated their aggression in marching troops into Peking, the heart of China's official circle, where for centuries China had tried to prevent foreigners from entering. They burned and destroyed the summer palace, a few miles out of the city, an action which never can be justified and which constitutes one of the greatest acts of vandalism committed on Chinese art

and culture by the Europeans. And all this was done merely to "uphold the Treaty of Tientsin".

The period following this episode was apparently comparatively peaceful with diplomatic and commercial intercourse officially established. However, within, there was not an altogether too friendly feeling existing, for the hostile attitude toward Europeans continued to grow. Nor is China to blame, for the Europeans, after successive military victories, believed they could with similar regularity continue with their aggressive policy. But the victory of the Manchu troops over the Taiping Rebellion gave new life and confidence to the Peking court.

The Sino-Japanese War was not a national war but one between the Manchu Court and the island empire.

The defeats in 1842, in 1859, in 1860 and in 1885 witnessed the powers gradually gaining additional commercial privileges, sea ports, and territories. But the defeat in the Sino-Japanese War produced two changes. First, China lost one battle after another and gave up her authority over

Korea. Secondly, the defeat exposed China's utter helplessness to the outside world, a humiliation which she still feels today.³ Japan from that time rapidly came to the forefront in the family of nations. Furthermore, the defeat paved the way for further aggression and conquest.

But the climax of foreign aggression was yet to come. Two years prior to the Boxer outbreak, the powers engaged in a competitive land-grabbing movement. With their plunder and ruthless spoliation they took away from China, or at least dominated, the most important cities and sea ports, they marked off the richest regions in mineral resources, mines, rivers, railways and harbors for their own interests.⁴

The powers knew well, after 1895, that China could offer little if any resistance. And after Germany took Kiaochow, the other powers plunged into the land-greed competition. Each power explained that the action was for the "balance of power", while China's sovereignty was completely ignored. Such

3. Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol. III, p.55-56.

4. Clements, The Boxer Rebellion, p.36.

agreements known as "unequal treaties" have handicapped the development of a republican government in China even to the present day.

John Hay, secretary of state of the American government, fortunately for China, declared his "Open Door" policy at a timely moment. It was a time when European aggression in China was at its height. One cannot doubt the moral effect it had on the Powers, for if it did not materially assist in preserving the Chinese empire, it did, theoretically, check the unrestrained aggression of the Europeans. It left the country open for equal commercial and economic opportunities, without distinction.

No country in world history had ever been subjected to such a series of defeats and humiliations. Flanked on four sides by "barbarians" and "foreign devils", her military and naval forces defeated, her territory taken, and with a weak government that had only nominal control over the vast empire, the Chinese government was left helpless at the outbreak of the Boxer Rebellion.

PART II

THE MISSIONARY PROBLEM

That the extermination of Christians was one of the chief causes of the Boxer Rebellion has been advanced by various writers. True in a sense though this may be, there is no evidence of a distinctly religious animosity in this disturbance, for it is still doubtful whether there has been sufficient growth of the Christian Church in China to generally excite the fear of the natives. Missionaries are attacked, not as religious teachers, but as foreigners and Chinese Christians are robbed and murdered because they "sui yang kwei tsi" or follow the foreign devil, and not because they have changed religions.⁵

Mr. Conger, then American minister at Peking, wrote to the United States' secretary of state that "their (Boxers') antipathy is not directed entirely against Christians, but against foreigners generally".⁶

It is still difficult to separate the missionary problem from foreign aggression. The

5. Llewellyn, The Chinese Boxers, in National Geographic Magazine, p.284, July 1900.

6. U.S. For.Rel., p.222, 1900.

early Roman Catholic missionaries who arrived in China about 1530 and the Dutch protestants who followed in 1627 were accorded freedom to travel and to teach their religion. But after 1858 when treaties gave missionaries in explicit terms and under the protection of gunboats the right to preach their religion, to build churches and to reside in the interior, the attitude of the Chinese government and people turned against them, and then conflicts between foreigners and Chinese that followed indicated that "it is nearly always the missionary who is at the bottom of a Celestial outbreak".⁷

In 1869 Prince Kung once remarked to Sir R. Alcock: "Take away your opium and your missionaries, and you will be welcomed". Another time Wensiang said to him: "Do away with your extraterritoriality clause, and merchants and missionaries may settle anywhere and everywhere, but retain it and we must do our best to confine you and our trouble to the treaty port".⁸

These two utterances of Chinese officials

7. Krausse, China in Decay, p.377.

8. Hart, These from the Land of Sinim, p.68.

represent clearly the attitude of the Chinese government. It is apparent that there was no specific grievance against the missionaries. However, having come early in the sixteenth century, and being foreigners, the missionaries have always been placed in the same class with opium merchants and the extra-territoriality clause.

H.B. Morse says:

The equality of nations had, with great reluctance been accepted by China; and there remained only opium, the merchant, and the missionary, to disturb the equanimity of the Chinese officials. The merchant even when restricted to residence within the limits of a treaty port interfered through his treaty rights with the taxing powers of the officials; even in the case of his own goods, it was felt as a hardship that the taxing authorities were debarred from levying dues which might be levied on Chinese owned goods; and when, as too often happened, he lent the cloak of his name to purely Chinese trade, to the feeling of hardship was added a sense of indignant resentment; and this feeling was an effectual bar to any extension of the merchant's privileges into the interior. The missionary, even in treaty ports, was unpopular; he introduced a ferment of thought, of the rights of man, of indignation at the decisions of the unjust judge, of reprobation of the corruption of the mandarin state of the empire; and this ferment of thought was one to leaven the mass of Asiatic submission and blind acceptance of authority. The populace, too, resented his teachings. He divided families, he interfered with the rites of ancestral worship; he taught that the Buddhist and Taoist ceremonials which were imbedded in their life were heathen, and that the principles of Confucius were not entitled to the epithet "holy" which was their traditional title for the Master; he required his converts to cease to contribute to the upkeep of village and of family worship, and all this for a

"foreign religion", which none but his converts accepted as in any way superior to the various religions prevalent in China. The later results of the work done so quietly by the missionary were not then manifest; and, at the outset, he was to the officials a busybody and a firebrand, and to the people a disagreeable innovator.

Although much of this may be true, there are some missionaries, however, who have been outstanding in the missionary field and who have been helpful to the natives. While many, no doubt, had good intentions, and many actually did benefit the Chinese people in educational and medical work, they were missionaries and foreigners just the same and were, therefore, placed in the evil category, denounced and attacked without exception.

No matter how good a defense may be given of the missionary, the seizure of Kiao-chow by Germany because two German missionaries were murdered in Shantung and other similar cases cannot but give the impression that missionaries were forerunners of imperialism. The case as a privileged character is so clear when the Chinese officials made an attempt

to enforce native laws on the missionaries, the British government informed the Chinese government that it would not allow "their affairs to be subject to the intervention of the officials of any government other than the British government."¹⁰

The people and officials alike hated these missionaries who had penetrated into their villages. In various localities magistrates issued proclamations against Christianity and missionaries. Uprisings against missions, burning of churches, and imprisonment of Christian converts, were not uncommon. In 1868 missions in Taiwanfu, Chefoo, Yangchow, Hankow and other cities were attacked and destroyed. In 1870 the so-called Tientsin Massacre occurred and a Catholic church was destroyed.¹¹

This hostile feeling continued to grow and in 1890 riots broke out in Foochow, Chungking, Chinkiang, Yangchow and Wuhu. Placards against missionaries charged them with "bewitching the children by the use of drugs". Rumors circulated among the villagers

10. Ibid, Vol.III, p.160.

11. Ibid, see Chap.XII.

that these missionaries and immoral priests and sisters murdered orphans were generally believed and created a feeling of fear and hatred.¹²

These disturbances and uprisings against missionaries were not part of a national movement; nor were they instigated by the central government. The Peking court, in fact, on hearing of these riots gave stringent orders to the provincial authorities to repress the disorders and to give full protection to the Christian missionaries,¹³ but on the other hand, it held the missionaries responsible for the riots by having claimed to exercise over their converts a jurisdiction which properly belonged to the Chinese authorities.¹⁴ There is no doubt that the central government was eager to maintain peace and order in the country.

These misunderstandings and conflicts

12. Ibid, Vol.II, See Chap.XI.

13. U.S. For. Rel., 1891, p.409.

14. U.S. For. Rel., June 23,1891, Mr. Denby to Mr. Blaine, p.411.

added to the hostile attitude of the Chinese and a climax was reached when the Boxer Rebellion attempted to drive out the foreigners, regardless of religion, from the country. From the beginning of the outbreak this was the avowed object. It was no sudden turn in affairs but a natural outgrowth of the general anti-foreign feeling.¹⁵

15. Llewellyn, The Chinese Boxers, In National Geographic Magazine, 1900, p.283.

PART III

CHINA'S INTERNAL CONDITIONS

China has long enjoyed her own civilization without intervention from the West. She has had her own system of government and has felt contented with her own conditions. The people were the subjects of the Emperor and obeyed all edicts and regulations proclaimed by him. Nominally, the whole empire was under his control and while he ruled from the Peking court in the North, his progressive Cantonese in the South obeyed him. The whole country lived through a comparatively peaceful time till the coming of the Manchu regime.

It was unfortunate for China that she had to come into official contact with the West under the Manchu regime. Had it begun during the Tang or Ming dynasties, probably China's foreign relations would have been a different and more happy story. These Manchus, a small tribe from Manchuria, then an outlying territory of the Empire, overran the Ming rulers and set up the Ta Ching Dynasty in Peking in 1644.¹⁶

16. Martin, The Lore of Cathay, p.408.

The Manchus, who came to play China's role in the most important time of her foreign history, were ignorant of both Chinese affairs and of international conditions. One diplomatic blunder followed another. No efforts were made to readjust the situation until it was too late.

China's struggles were never on a national scale. The first war with England in the South was conducted by the Cantonese. No tangible assistance was given by the Peking government. The southerners were defeated, but the concessions were given by the Manchus. In the war of 1856, 1858, and 1860 the conflicts between the powers and China were really with the Manchu Court. The Cantonese, who had already disliked these semi-foreign Manchus, were never too friendly to the Peking government. Nor were the physical conditions favorable, for the lack of modern transportation facilities and the long distance made it impossible at that time to render efficient support.

The defeat in the Opium War (1840-42) did not reverse the policy or habits of the Manchu rulers. They maintained the status quo of several centuries ago, and were more stringent on keeping

foreigners out of the country. But the Sino-Japanese War of 1894 turned the tables. Again, this was not a national affair. The Chinese, particularly the Cantonese, regarded it as the affair of the Manchu regime; its disasters were their disasters, its mistakes their mistakes. However, the defeat was disastrous to the whole nation; it exposed China's utter weakness to the world--a humiliation which is still remembered to this day.

From this period to the Boxer Rebellion, when the Powers waged their "Battle for Concessions", more injustice was done to China within these five or six years than during the one hundred years preceding. This impending break-up of the empire and the deep humiliation inflicted on the regime, created a movement for reform. The educated class saw how Japan had rapidly come to the front in the family of nations. Various reform clubs were organized, but it took a Cantonese, Kang Yuwei, the "Erasmus of the movement", to put life into the campaign.¹⁷

Emperor Kwang Hsu, the occupant of the imperial throne at this time while the Empress

17. Clements, The Boxer Rebellion, p.25.

Dowager Tz'u Hsi was in retirement, lent a ready ear to the suggestions of reform. The leaders of the reform party, including Weng Tung-ho, imperial grand tutor, and Pan Tsu-yin, an accomplished scholar, launched the movement in the South and began to move steadily northward. Although they were able to set up an organization in Peking they were faced with the opposition of the northern party who supported the Empress Dowager and the Manchu nobles and clansmen.¹⁸ Against this element the Reform Party was in constant conflict from the beginning.

The first reform decrees were issued by the emperor in the summer of 1898. In the eyes of the conservative Manchu family, the measures were drastic. High officials were dismissed and sent back to their native homes; imperial clansmen were advised to go abroad to travel. From June 20 to September 16, the emperor issued thirty-eight decrees. The people were encouraged to study modern arts, science and agriculture; prizes were offered to inventors and authors. The western military system

18. Morse, Int.Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol.III, p.134.

was adopted and the archaic banner drill discarded; the old literary examination system was abolished and in its place the Peking University was established. Secondary schools were founded in district cities; temples were converted into school houses; bureaus for mines and railways were established. The Six Boards at Peking were abolished, a governmental budget was introduced. Journalists were encouraged to write on political subjects to enlighten the people and officials, while laws of the empire were to be reformed.¹⁹

The leaders of this movement were, no doubt, sincere. Every decree struck at the root of each evil and unsound policy. But they did not stop here. They felt that the freedom of the Empress Dowager would menace the success of the campaign, and plans were made to imprison her. But unfortunately this plan was discovered. Scenting the danger, the Empress Dowager, on September 23, one hundred days after the reform movement started, struck back. A coup d'etat was carried out by the northern party,

19. Ibid, See Chap.VI, The Hundred Days of Reform.

known as the "palace revolution". The emperor was imprisoned but Kang Yu-wei escaped. The period of anti-reformation that followed put back the hands of the clock of enlightenment that must be the salvation of the empire.

The reasons for the failure of the reform movement are many. One writer says:

In attempting too much, the reformers accomplished practically nothing at all. Their ideal structure was top-heavy, and, built upon no foundation worth speaking of, was crushed by its own weight. Their mistakes were many; one blunder followed another; no adjustment was offered to harmonize the existing conditions. Old China was completely discarded in this craze for the modern order, and institutions and customs which heretofore had been the backbone of the national existence, were henceforth to be regarded, if not as entirely useless, at least as of secondary importance. Undoubtedly the main reason why the movement collapsed was the poor judgment played by Kang Yu-wei and the emperor. In their zeal for innovation and change, they struck too deeply at the root of the "things Chinese", at institutions conservative to a fault and the most difficult in the world to modify or change. The edicts, covering as they did a great variety of subjects, military, political, educational, social and civil were presented to the nation in helter-skelter fashion, in headlong haste, and their acceptance and observance could have been possible only through a complete revolution in Chinese life, manners and thought, a breakaway in two months from the civilization of two thousand years. No attempt was made to placate opposition or to allay prejudices; the reformers rode rough-shod over many, in fact, almost all, of those cherished ideals which had become an atavism with the Chinese centuries ago. They entirely forgot time and place, and exhibited, through that, unconsciousness of existing conditions to be met and overcome before success is assured which seems typical of most idealists when placed in

a position of authority.²⁰

The deplorable economic conditions added to the difficulties of the already over-burdened government at that time. Agrarian and taxation troubles brought on acute distress in various provinces. In 1898 drought resulted in bad harvest. Thousands of small farmers whose sole existence depended upon their crops were forced to resort to banditry as a means of livelihood. Discontented and restless peasants joined the secret societies, the time when the Boxer Society was beginning to grow. The Yellow River overflowed again, covering thousands of acres of fertile farm land, destroying many villages and driving a multitude of people from their homes.²¹

Mr. Conger, American minister to Peking, informed the state department on December 7, 1899: "The season has been a poor one--crops have failed. On account of drought great poverty and want prevail."²² Again he wrote on May 8, 1900: "...the people are very poor...the whole country is swarming with hungry, discontented, hopeless idlers and they....are

20. Clements, The Boxer Rebellion, p.56-57.

21. Ibid, p.71-72.

22. U.S. For.Rel., 1900, p.77.

ready to join any organization offered."²³

A state of general unrest soon followed. Rice riots occurring in the Southern provinces spread rapidly to Manchuria and other northern cities.²⁴ As a result of these outbreaks, it was inevitable that foreigners, residing in the interior, and their property, were affected. The Likin question, an internal taxing system, which has always been a bone of contention between China and Europe, came up at this time to share in the chaotic conditions. The evils of contraband trade in opium became acute.²⁵

Another reason for the so-called anti-foreign uprising was undoubtedly the conflict of Oriental and European ideals. The Manchu rulers then had very little, if any, knowledge of foreign affairs and civilization. They were self-contented; at times conceited. They held to the ancient idea that the Chinese emperor was the "son of Heaven" and that other sovereigns were not equal in rank with him.

23. Ibid, p.122.

24. Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol.III,
p.160-170.

25. Clement, The Boxer Rebellion, p.72.

They refused to admit foreign ambassadors to reside in Peking, the heart of their official power.

The question of foreign envoys in Peking had always been strongly opposed by the Chinese, and more strongly, if not more stubbornly, insisted upon by Europeans. The Manchu officials protested on the grounds that there would be the possibility of collision and misunderstanding owing to the ignorance of foreign affairs among the members of the central government. It specially stated "that in the present state of rebellion in China, it was very desirable not to give any ground for misgivings in the minds of the people." If the demands for ambassadors in Peking were enforced it would be "an injury to China and in many more ways than we can find words to express, as causing the Chinese government to 'lose prestige in the eyes of the Chinese people'".

The more rights and privileges the Europeans demanded, the more jealously did the Chinese guard their doors. However, times had changed and the Manchus failed to meet the situation. Furthermore, the Europeans did not understand the Chinese characteristics and traditions and they underestimated China's strength by the results of the superficial Sino-Japanese War.

The emperor and official classes refused to recognize the equality of other nations and insisted on treating Europeans as the subjects of vassal nations and their envoys as tribute bearers. Every foreigner who wanted to have an interview with the emperor must perform the kowtow, a custom which was regarded as highly humiliating to the European envoys. All early attempts to obtain an audience with the emperor or to negotiate directly with high officials failed. When Lord Macartney was finally permitted to enter Peking for the first time, the flag which waved from the mast of the ship that bore him and his attendants up the Peiho bore the inscription : "Tribute-bearers from the country of England".²⁶

26. Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol.I, p.53-54.

CHAPTER III

NEWS SERVICE DURING THE SIEGE OF PEKING

The report published in the "London Times" May 22, 1900, of the concerted action of the foreign envoys in Peking, when a diplomatic note was presented to the Tsungli Yamen asking the Chinese officials to suppress the Boxers' anti-foreign propoganda, marked the beginning of an event which attracted international attention and kept the world for eighty-four days in the state of intense suspension, indignation and apprehension. Most of the news of the Boxer trouble that was circulated in Europe and America after May 22 and for the first fourteen days of June had come directly from Peking and Tientsin. But such news became more alarming each day warning the world that a storm was brewing on the horizon.

After June 14 no direct news from Peking reached London for more than one month. Reports concerning the besieged legations and foreigners, which came through indirect routes, were slow and unreliable and often supplemented by wild imaginations and rumors.¹

1. Times, June 7, 1900.

Although the cutting of the telegraph wires was reported on June 6, it was apparent that some messages continued to come directly from Peking, for reports from the "Times" correspondent at Peking, dated June 8, were published in London on June 9 and 11.² On June 9 Daziel's Agency at Shanghai reported that "all foreign telegrams from Peking are being delayed"³ which implied that the telegraph wires were still functioning. This proves that the first report of the cutting of the line was either fictitious or that there were other means of communication. While Daziel's Agency reported on June 12, from Shanghai, that the "...telegraphic means of communication being stopped", the "Times" was able to publish on June 13 a report from Dr. Morrison, dated June 12 at Peking, concerning the murder of M. Sugiyama.⁴

On June 12 a second message came from Dr. Morrison at Peking stating "all Tientsin wires cut"⁵ and two days later the British foreign office at London also announced "all Tientsin wires cut".

2. Times, June 9 and 11, 1900.

3. Times, June 11, 1900.

4. Times, June 13, 1900.

5. Times, June 12, 1900.

However, Dr. Morrison's last telegram from Peking, dated June 14, was published in London on June 18. No more direct telegrams were received in Europe from him or any other persons in Peking until August 2.⁶

However, Reuter's correspondent at Shanghai discredited the above reports when he sent the following despatch to London: "Innumerable rumors are afloat, but nothing authentic has been received..in well informed circles it is believed that the line to Tientsin is not really interrupted, but that Chinese telegrams only are allowed to pass..telegrams are passing direct between Peking and Europe through the Asiatic lines and Peking news is therefore looked for from the West...."⁷

Conger's message from Peking dated June 4, which was received by Mr. Hay at Washington September 24 also held the same belief that the lines were not interrupted. In his message he reported "telegraph line cut" but added, "We still, however, have the government telegraph line, which does not follow the railroad, intact."⁸

6. Times, June 18 and August 2, 1900.

7. Times, June 20, 1900.

8. U.S.For. Rel., 1900, p.141.

News apparently was still able to be transmitted by telegraph for "sixty hours after the seizure of the forts (at Taku, June 17)the telegraph (was) open for Chinese despatches...."⁹ Further evidence that the telegraph lines were working after Morrison's June 14 message was revealed in the reports of the seizure of the Taku forts on the morning of June 17 which was published on the same day at 3 o'clock in the afternoon in an extra of the "Hupao", a Chinese newspaper in Shanghai.¹⁰

Reports and rumors of every description and from all the leading European capitals relative to the conditions in Peking literally flooded the press in all sections of the world. News which leaked out of Peking by various means was published immediately without confirmation. However, as early as June 7, Reuter's correspondent at Tientsin warned that "the situation is difficult to understand and reports received are so conflicting..."¹¹ On June 12, the

9. Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol.III, p.218.

10. North China Herald, June 20, 1900; cited in

Morse, Intl Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol.III, p.219.

11. Times, June 9, 1900.

day when the third report of the cutting of the telegraph wires reached London, Baron Czikkann, Austrian minister at Peking, in a statement to the "Neue Freie Presse", warned of the necessity of receiving reports from China, and especially from Shanghai, with due caution, representing them to be, in many cases, exaggerated. He went so far as to say that the missionaries, particularly those of England and America, circulated false reports for their own purposes.¹²

Messages also were transmitted through an indirect route which often found the text of the report elaborated when it reached its final destination. One telegram, reaching St. Petersburg from Kalgan, north of the Chinese wall, was sent indirectly to Irkutsk via Kiakhta.¹³ The "Times" correspondent reported from the Russian capital on June 18 that "the only news here is that published by the newspapers from English sources..." and added that "the telegraph dispatches of the German consul at Chifu are regarded with skepticism in the Asiatic department. It is thought that the torpedo boat

12. Times, June 13, 1900.

13. Times, June 18, 1900.

mentioned in the consul's message will probably have heard that in Taku or elsewhere the news already telegraphed to London via Hongkong of the taking of the legation as a rumor...." ¹⁴ From Berlin the "Times" correspondent said that "the direct news from China is exceedingly meager" and that "it is a pity that German newspapers do not refrain from publishing leading articles at present on subjects of which there appears to be very little knowledge in most unofficial circles in this country."¹⁵

St. Petersburg continued to look to London and other European capitals for tidings of what was going on in China on June 20. The despatch to the "Times" on that day reported that "not only, however, is the Russian press entirely dependent upon Western Europe for information concerning that great Asiatic neighbor with whom Russian writers claim that their country has a paramount right of dealing, but the papers are equally uninformed, from any direct source of the views of their own government on the Chinese crisis..."¹⁶

14. Times, June 20, 1900.

15. Times, June 22, 1900.

16. Times, June 22, 1900.

Three weeks passed and wild rumors continued to come from the European capitals. Shanghai, which no doubt is the center of international rumors of the Far East, was accurately described in the message of Mr. Goodnow, United States consul at Shanghai, sent to New York on July 13. It said in part: "Of confidence there is, in fact, none here; of hope little, of purely sensational news, an over-supply."¹⁷

The "North German Gazette" in an editorial on July 16 admitted that "no authentic report has yet been received" but added that such alarming news about the legations has "reduced our hopes to a minimum...."¹⁸

However, the rest of the German press regarded the telegrams which have reached Europe as sufficient confirmation of the sad news. Passionate expression was given to the "horror" which was felt at the outrage that had been committed against "humanity" and against the most sacred principles of international law.¹⁹

17. Times, July 14, 1900.

18. Times, July 18, 1900.

19. Times, July 18, 1900.

In Vienna the papers believed the reports to be true and gave some particulars of the "Austrian victims" of the "massacre". In Paris it was regarded that the report of the death of the French minister, M. Stephen Pichon at Peking "is, unfortunately, almost certain..." 20

During all this period most of the foreign officials and correspondents in China received with skepticism or else discredited Chinese reports. Late in May Reuter's correspondent at Peking added to his despatch that "the news purports to be official, but coming as it does from purely Chinese sources, requires confirmation".²¹ On June 25 Reuter's despatch from Berlin stated that "the reassuring communication from the Chinese minister here that the German minister in Peking is safe is hardly treated seriously. No official notice will be taken of the document".²²

The "Times" correspondent at Shanghai

20. Times, July 18, 1900.

21. Times, May 28, 1900.

22. Times, June 26, 1900.

informed his paper that "it is impossible to trace the source of, or to verify such reports, which are chiefly of native origin."²³

At St. Petersburg Colonel Artamonoff expressed the opinion that "it is impossible to believe the Chinese assurances...."²⁴ while the correspondent at Berlin reported that "the innumerable contradictory reports which have been distributed by the Chinese... have been received with the utmost scepticism here.."²⁵

In Rome the same attitude toward Chinese reports was evident. Because the Canton viceroy refused to transmit a message from the Italian consul at Hongkong to the Italian minister at Peking, it was "generally interpreted here as conclusive proof of the falsehood of the Chinese optimistic statements.. is considered additional untrustworthiness of the Chinese assurances..."²⁶

The first news of the Allies entrance into Peking came from Berlin. The "Times" correspondent

23. Times, June 28, 1900.

24. Times, July 27, 1900.

25. Times, July 28, 1900.

26. Times, July 30, 1900.

wired on August 17 the following: "The semi-official telegraph dated August 15 has been received here from Shanghai saying: 'According to an apparently trustworthy Chinese report from Tsinanfu (Shantung Province), the Allied troops have entered Peking and relieved the ministers.' "27 And although this report was "accepted as authentic" by the press in Berlin, the second message stated that "...as is only natural, the fact that it comes through Chinese sources causes a certain amount of misgiving...."28

In Berlin Count von Bülow, the German secretary of foreign affairs, practically lost the confidence of the Chinese envoy when he informed the Chinese legation at the German capital on July 18 that "it could no longer be permitted to despatch code or cipher telegrams (and) plain telegrams must be laid before the secretary of state for his approval before being sent off."29

The reports, prior to June 14, regarding the Boxer uprising in and around Peking came chiefly

27. Times, August 18, 1900.

28. Times, August 18, 1900.

29. Times, July 19, 1900.

through four sources in the Chinese capital, namely the legations, the press associations and special correspondents, individual messages and the Tsungli Yamen, the Chinese foreign office.

The legations supplied their governments regularly with reports regarding the trouble in and around the city. But after Peking was isolated these reports did not reach the European and American capitals for a long period. The last telegram from Mr. Conger, American minister at Peking, was sent June 11. His last message dated June 15 was received at the State Department on September 25.³⁰ The next telegram that reached Washington on July 20 was dated July 16.³¹

Reuter's Agency and the "Times" own correspondent at Peking supplied the European press with despatches prior to the isolation of the city but these were subsequently suspended for a long period. The last despatch from the "Times" correspondent prior to the isolation was dated June 14 and published

30. U.S. For. Rel., 1900, p.154.

31. Ibid, p.156.

in London four days later. The next message from the correspondent was published on August 2.

The press associations having offices in China during the Boxer Rebellion are: Reuter's Agency, Laffan's Agency and Dalziel's Agency. The Indo-European Telegraph also transmitted some news from China to Europe. There were innumerable correspondents stationed principally at Shanghai, Taku, Chifu, Tientsin, Peking, Hongkong, Vienna, Berlin, St. Petersburg, Paris, London, Washington, New York City, Brussels, Rome and other cities. These were the main sources which supplied reports, some facts, and a large amount of rumors to the press in all sections of the world.

There were other "official" reports which emanated from foreign consuls, generals, and admirals in Taku, Tientsin, Chifu, Shanghai, Hongkong and other Chinese cities. Some of these reports were received from Peking and transmitted to Europe and America. They were released to the press agents in Europe by the foreign offices, navy departments and war departments. These reports were, in many cases, "pick-ups" of floating rumors, generally unreliable and later proved to be utterly

false.

One source where "official" Chinese reports were released was the Tsungli Yamen at Peking, which during the isolation of the city was able to get news to Shanghai and Tientsin. Other official Chinese news emanated from the various viceroys in Central China, the governor of Shangung and Sheng's Yamen at Shanghai.

The individual reports "leaking out" of Peking through foreigners were conflicting and varied in their content. Nevertheless, they were gathered by the press agents and put on the wire, to Europe. Other individual reports came from missionaries, "a Chinaman" or "Chinese who were in the service of foreigners" and the like.

The methods of transmission were by telegrams, and postal service. The telegraph companies were the Western Union Company, the Commercial Cable Company and the Chinese Telegraph Company.

Many of the telegrams sent by Conger to the State Department bore no dates. It was believed at Washington that such dates were lost through transmission. Many of Mr. Hay's telegrams were sent in cipher through the Chinese minister who thought

he might be able to get it to Mr. Conger through Sheng at Shanghai.³² Some of these telegrams sent by Conger to Mr. Hay reached Washington via Chefoo (Chifu) and required six days.³³ Other official dispatches from China had to go from Nanking, Shanghai, Paris and on to London.

Many of the reports coming through either by news agents or officials often bore the uncertain marks of "trustworthy", "reliable", "official intelligence", and other such quotations. News often came through by runners and couriers, others by a "British steamer from Niuchwang" and even "a Japanese torpedo-boat".

After the first report of the cutting of the telegraph line, reports continued to come through by telegraph from Peking, but apparently with more difficulty. It was only on June 14 that the last message sent by the "Times" correspondent came through from Peking. After that date all telegrams were suspended for a time.

32. U.S. For. Rel., 1900, p.155.

33. Ibid, p.160.

Reuter's correspondent at Washington reported to the "London Times" on July 20 the following message:

United States State Department issued the following statement--The State Department received a telegram from Goodnow, United States consul-general at Shanghai, saying the governor of Shantung informs me he has received today a cipher message from Conger of the 18th instant. A few minutes later Wu appeared at the State Department with a telegram from the Taotai Sheng, dated July 20, which had been received by Wu at 8:30 and read as follows: "Your telegram was forwarded and, as requested, I send reply from the Tsungli Yamen as follows: 'Your telegram of the 15th day to this moon (July 11) received.' The State Department telegram has been handed to minister Conger and runs as follows: 'In British legation under continued shot and shell from Chinese troops. Quick relief only can prevent general massacre.' "

Later. The officials in the State Department think that Mr. Conger is using term 'Chinese troops' in his dispatch meaning the rebellious troops.

The officials point out further that the bombardment of which Mr. Conger speaks did not begin, according to all accounts, until July 7, for although the legations have been besieged and attacked before that date, it was not with artillery. 34

With no reports in the newspapers of the "repairing" of the telegraph line, Mr. Conger was able to send messages to the State Department on July 21, August 3,5,9,11,14,16 and 17. The last

34. U.S. For. Rel., 1900, p.156; Times, July 21, 1900.

message was a full report of the whole siege.³⁵

Mr. Conger's message dated July 16 immediately caused much comment and confusion in Europe and America. The "Times" published a report from Paris dated July 22 that "scarcely any here believes in the authenticity of the telegram from Mr. Conger to the United States government....The Berlin correspondent of the Rhenish organ thinks it possible that the Chinese found the key of the American official cipher when they plundered the American legation."³⁶ "However, the State Department adheres to the belief that Conger's d@spatch is authentic and is convinced that it has everything to gain and nothing to lose by reposing confidence in Wu Ting-fang."³⁷

On July 23 Reuter's d@spatch from Washington reported that the "State Department received d@spatches from all quarters of globe showing foreign officials do not believe the Conger telegram to be genuine. Goodnow also disbelieves in the

35. Ibid, p.156-160.

36. Times, July 23, 1900.

37. Times, July 23, 1900.

authenticity of the telegram." The report went on to say that "nevertheless the State Department adheres to its belief in the authenticity of the measure." 38

Another attack on the Chinese government regarding the "forged" Conger message came through Laffan's Agency at Washington dated July 29. It stated that "evidence multiplies that Chinese officials possess the United States official code book. Mr. Hay told Wu Ting-fang yesterday that he (Mr. Hay) was convinced that the Conger message was a forgery." 39

The "New York World" published the following statement, reported by Reuter's correspondent at New York to London: "The Conger d@spatch is now known to be a forgery. The State Department has absolute proof that it was codified by Sheng and Yuan Shi-kai. Wu Ting-fang, the Chinese minister, is incredulous." 40

While these accusations were going back and forth, Mr. Hay sent another telegram through the Chinese minister to Conger dated July 21. It said: "D@spatch received. Authenticity doubted. Answer

38. Times, July 24, 1900.

39. Times, July 30, 1900.

40. Times, July 30, 1900.

this, giving your sister's name...." ⁴¹ By asking for the name of Conger's sister the Secretary of State intended to test the report of the "stolen" code book. The four telegrams that came after he sent this message to Peking were delayed in transmission, but they all reached Washington. Not one of these messages mentions the name of Conger's sister. However, the message sent from Peking, dated August 11, and received at the State Department on August 16 was regarded as a reply to the department's instructions of July 21. This despatch, like the previous ones, did not contain the name of Conger's sister. ⁴²

Nothing appeared in the "Times" after the relief of Peking to clear up the "mysterious code book" or the "Conger message". However, on August 3, Wu Ting-fang, Chinese minister at Washington, wrote to Mr. Hay the following:

....I am glad to learn that you have received official confirmation from Mr. Consul Fowler of the absolute genuineness of Mr. Conger's much-discussed cipher telegram of the faith of the Chinese officials concerned in the transmission of the message, which has been openly or tacitly impugned by some journals,

41. U.S. For. Rel., 1900, p.156.

42. Ibid, p.156-159.

especially those in Europe, but it thoroughly vindicates and justifies the stand you took in accepting from the beginning the authenticity of the dispatch, an act which exerted wide and strong influence in dispelling doubt and distrust..." 43

Thus ended one of the most interesting episodes regarding official dispatches during the Boxer Rebellion.

After Peking was isolated on June 20,⁴⁴ the reports concerning the foreign colony at Peking reached Europe and America chiefly through foreign admirals at Taku or through foreign consuls and correspondents at Chifu, Tientsin and Shanghai. Some reports were relayed from Port Arthur and Chemulpo.⁴⁵ And at Chifu many of the reports and information were "solely derived from vessels which arrived at that port from Tientsin".⁴⁶ Chinese news reaching London also came indirectly from Berlin, Paris, St. Petersburg, Brussels, Tokio, Rome, New York City, Washington and Vienna.

43. U.S. For. Rel., 1900, p.282.

44. Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol.III, p.233.

45. Times, June 28, 1900.

46. Times, June 20, 1900.

The reports during the siege of Peking were generally received with skepticism and doubt, although some of them came through "official sources". The following day after the despatches from Berlin announcing the murder of Baron von Ketteler and the destruction of the Peking legations, there appeared in the "Times" a communication from Berlin that "there was no confirmation" of the report circulated by Laffan's Agency nor had any "official report" of similar nature been received in London.⁴⁷

While confirmation was lacking from Berlin "gloomy apprehensions appeared to be universally entertained..." in the German capital.⁴⁸ In Tokio more alarming rumors were afloat representing the foreign ministers in Peking to have been murdered. It was also rumored that Admiral Seymour, who left Tientsin on June 10 to relieve the besieged foreigners in Peking and who had beaten a hasty retreat to Tientsin sixteen days later, was killed. This report was sent to Vienna and relayed to London by the "Times" correspondent who added in the despatch that

47. Times, June 19, 1900.

48. Times, June 19, 1900.

the report is "possibly a garbled and exaggerated version..." Reuter's despatch from Yokohama also said in a similar tone that the rumor is "generally viewed with suspicion." 49

Foreign consuls and correspondents in Chinese cities other than Peking were also doubtful of the reports that they received and which they sent abroad without confirmation. On June 23, a Shanghai message from Taku via Chifu reported that the "feeling of suspense" with regard to the situation of foreign residents in Peking has become acute owing to the "total absence of information" as to the movements of the relieving forces.⁵⁰

Chinese officials and diplomats abroad were equally ignorant of conditions in Peking. For on June 24 the Chinese minister at Berlin handed the German foreign office a message from China that "the German minister is well and safe..."⁵¹ Another Chinese assurance was published in the "Times" June 25 saying that the "foreigners in Peking were safe

49. Times, June 20, 1900.

50. Times, June 23, 1900.

51. Times, June 25, 1900.

on June 20 but that all the legations have been burned except the British, Austrian and Belgian".⁵² From New York it was reported that the telegrams from the viceroy of Nanking to the Chinese minister at Washington assured that "all foreign ministers are well".⁵³ These reports were accepted as truthful by Mr. Hay.⁵⁴

In Berlin a different attitude was taken toward the Chinese assurances. The communications reporting the safety of the German minister at Peking were "hardly treated seriously".⁵⁵ However, Reuter's correspondent at Paris reported that the French consul at Shanghai had sent a telegram to the effect that the "foreign ministers and the Europeans in Peking were safe and well on the 19th..." But Mr. Goodnow, the United States consul at Shanghai, reported that nothing was certainly known about conditions of Peking. This contradicts the previous despatches that all foreigners in Peking were safe on the nineteenth.⁵⁶

52. Times, June 25, 1900.

53. Times, June 25, 1900.

54. Times, June 26, 1900.

55. Times, June 26, 1900.

56. Times, June 26, 1900.

On June 26 the Chinese minister at Berlin again informed the German officials that the "foreign representatives and embassies at Peking are safe and uninjured".⁵⁷

A surprising report from Shanghai was published in London on June 28 when it was rumored that the foreigners left Peking escorted by native troops, and added "it is impossible to trace the source of or to verify such reports which are chiefly of native origin".⁵⁸

Further assurances were reported to the London foreign office. From Shanghai Reuter's reported that "intelligence from an official source states that the legations in Peking were safe on the 25th instant..." and that "...all is well at Tientsin". The Nanking viceroy at Shanghai received instructions from Peking to inform foreign consuls that the legations in Peking were safe and were arranging peace terms.⁵⁹

Another dispatch in similar tone with those

57. Times, June 27, 1900.

58. Times, June 29, 1900.

59. Times, June 29, 1900.

published in the "Times" on June 28 was made public on June 29 when the report from Reuter's Chifu correspondent sent a telegram to the effect that the foreign ministers have been ordered to leave Peking and are proceeding to Tientsin by an outside route.⁶⁰

From New York it was known that Wu Ting-fang gave Mr. Hay the following despatch from Li Hung-chang, dated June 28 at Canton. It said: "Legation minister, having left Peking, are now twelve miles from Tientsin with Seymour."⁶¹ This despatch from Reuter's office added that the officials in the American State Department "were inclined to doubt this report".

While these conflicting reports were published in the "Times" another telegram from Shanghai reported that "nothing was definitely known of the whereabouts of the foreign ministers" but that the "Chinese rumors continue to assert" that they have left Peking under escort of native troops.⁶²

More startling reports continued to reach

60. Times, June 29, 1900.

61. Times, June 29, 1900.

62. Times, June 29, 1900.

Berlin, and on one occasion a special news sheet was circulated on the streets concerning the reports of the legations. This report appearing in the "Times" June 29 was sent by a special correspondent. It said: "According to official telegram received here and in St. Petersburg, Admiral Seymour has been relieved and is now in Tientsin. The foreign ministers from Peking, among them the German minister, Baron von Ketteler, were in Admiral Seymour's camp and are also now in Tientsin". The facts were, the foreign ministers never left Peking during the siege, the Seymour's relief columns never made any contacts with Peking, but beat a hasty retreat sixteen days after they left Tientsin on June 10. And Baron von Ketteler was murdered nine days previously in Peking. These reports indicate the absolute ignorance of facts by the "officials", both Chinese and foreign, in China and abroad.⁶³

During this period it was extremely difficult to get accurate news about the legations and this fact is well stated by Kennedy Jones when he says:

Before publishing the message, it was shown to the foreign office; their reply was they had no news for three weeks and they feared that something

63. Times, June 29, 1900.

of the kind might have happened. We interviewed every available person likely to possess special information; there was, of course, no confirmation, but all admitted its extreme probability. Finally we decided to publish the cablegram....

He further stated that "not having a good correspondent at Shanghai, we appointed one on the strong recommendation of a leading Chinese house in the city. He was paid at the usual rates; there was no pecuniary inducement to send faked news, and he was urged to be reliable." 64

64. Jones, Fleet Street and Downing Street, p.313-315.

CHAPTER IV
CONTRAST OF NEWS REPORTS WITH
HISTORICAL RECORDS

PART I

NEWS REPORTS PRIOR TO THE ISOLATION OF PEKING

(May 22 to June 18, 1900)

The reports of Boxer disturbances around Peking were received at the foreign legations as early as January, 1900. Early in May letters in the form of warnings were being sent by missionaries and Monseigneur Favier, Roman Catholic bishop of Peking, to the envoys, asking for help. Editorials appearing in the "North China Herald" of Shanghai, and the "Peking and Tientsin Times" of Tientsin were of the opinion that a movement to expel the foreigner from North China would soon break out.¹

The Boxer Rebellion as an international problem was first brought to the attention of the world on May 22, 1900, when the "London Times" published the report, received from Peking Reuter's Agency, of the presentation of the first note from the diplomatic body to the Tsungli Yamen, asking

1. Morse, Int.Rel. of the Chi.Emp., Vol.III, p.194-195; U.S. For.Rel., 1900, p.84-94.

the Chinese authorities to suppress the Boxer's anti-foreign propaganda.²

Reports had reached Peking on May 25 that the Boxers had attacked and destroyed the houses of converts of an American mission at Pachow, sixty miles south of Peking.³

On the same day, Reuter's correspondent sent the first "alarming" report abroad saying that "...seventy soldiers were killed...and many refugees, both Protestants and Catholics are fleeing to Peking for protection". However, the despatch added that the "government (Chinese) is making some attempt to check the movement in Peking...." ⁴ This, in fact, referred to the decrees issued by the Imperial Government on May 17 and May 24, ordering the Peking police to consult and report on the best way to check Boxer activities.⁵ Two days later the same agency sent another report, dated Peking May 27, stating that "....seventy soldiers....killed is largely fictitiousinvestigation shows that, as a matter of fact

2. Times, May 22, 1900; U.S. For. Rel., 1900, p.129.

3. Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol. III, p.196.

4. Times, May 28, 1900.

5. Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol. III, p.198.

one officer...was killed by Boxers...but no soldiers were killed".⁶

On May 28 "word came that the railway was attacked, two bridges and two stations burned on the Paotingfu line; and that Fengtai, on the Tientsin line, only ten miles from Peking, was being burned with all the machine shops, and that no trains were running between Peking and Tientsin." ⁷

Dr. G. E. Morrison, the "Times" own correspondent, who remained in the Peking legations throughout the siege, sent his first warning to the "Times" on May 29. The message, no doubt, referred to the conditions which were reported to Peking the day previous. He said: "Dangerous excitement prevailing in Peking legations..Fengtai burned, damage 10,000 pounds." ⁸

The day that the destruction of the Peking Tientsin railway was reported in Peking, the foreign envoys decided to order up the legation guards. After negotiating with the Tsungli Yamen, they were

6. Times, May 28, 1900.

7. U.S. For. Rel., 1900, p.132-133.

8. Times, May 30, 1900.

finally given permission on May 31, and on the same day 451 armed men, representing England, the United States, Italy, Russia, Japan and France arrived in Peking.⁹ Meanwhile, Reuter's correspondent at Tientsin reported to London that one French gunboat, thirty Japanese and a hundred United States' marines had arrived there.¹⁰ Two days later, another report announced that seven Russian, one Italian and two French gunboats were arriving at Taku.¹¹ The first group of legation guards which arrived in Peking on the evening of May 31 was reported to the "Times" by its correspondent on June 1.¹² The second group of guards, composed of Germans and Austro-Hungarians, who arrived in Peking on June 3,¹³ was reported to the "Times" on the same day, but the report was published on June 5.¹⁴

It is apparent through the newspaper reports

9. Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol. III, p.198.

10. Times, May 30, 1900.

11. Times, May 31, 1900.

12. Times, June 2, 1900.

13. Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol. III, p.198.

14. Times, June 5, 1900.

appearing in the "Times" that these foreign guards were not opposed when they arrived in Peking, for the dispatches said "the gates were kept open, the streets were orderly, and every facility was given by the Chinese government,"¹⁵ and that the "presence of foreign troops has already produced a markedly good effect, and the bearing of the Chinese towards foreigners is much better than has been the case during the last few days...no trouble is anticipated."¹⁶ Another report said that when the German and Austrian guards arrived they "were received by a respectful crowd of Chinese".¹⁷

The alarming conditions continued to grow. The Boxers around the Chinese capital were becoming more active. But the "Times" correspondent wrote that these reports are "still unconfirmed", and that "no evidence is yet forthcoming to confirm the reports...that some missionaries have been murdered between Tientsin and Paotingfu". He later added that

15. Times, June 2, 1900.

16. Times, June 4, 1900.

17. Times, June 5, 1900.

"all the murders of missionaries in the province till now, which have been reported to the legations, have proved fictitious..."¹⁸

On June 4, eight foreign envoys at Peking sent telegrams to their governments that "we may at any time be besieged here, with the railway and telegraph lines cut".¹⁹ The Boxers had from June 6 absolute control over the whole country surrounding the city. On the next day Americans began to gather in the Methodist compound and in the legations. On June 8, conditions were so ominous that a request was sent to the Tsungli Yamen asking for additional guards which was refused. The next day the situation became threatening and the American and British ministers wired their admirals to open up the railway communications and a movement in force was made on Peking. After June 10 the wires were interrupted and nothing was heard from Tientsin, where an international force, under Admiral Seymour had started for the relief of the foreigners in Peking.²⁰

18. Times, June 5, 1900.

19. Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol. III, p.201;
U.S. For. Rel., 1900, p.141-143.

20. Ibid, 1, p.203-204; Ibid, 2, 144-145.

On the day telegraphic communications to Tientsin ceased, the burning of the college of the American Board Mission at Tung-chow, together with the homes of the native Christians was reported to Peking.²¹

Much destruction was in evidence on June 9, when the Boxers burned the foreign property in and around Peking.²² On June 11, the Japanese chancellor, M. Sugiyama, was killed outside the Yungtingmen gate.²³

During this time newspaper correspondents were kept busy. The "Times" correspondent sent another report on June 6 of the cutting of the railway and the telegraph lines and added that it was "difficult to obtain information".²⁴ Reuter's correspondent at Tientsin was equally ignorant of the facts for he too sent a message the following day saying that "the situation is difficult to understand and reports received are conflicting."²⁵

21. Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol. III, p. 204-205.

22. Ibid.

23. Ibid.

24. Times, June 7, 1900.

25. Times, June 10, 1900.

Although the telegraph wires were reported "cut" messages from Peking apparently were continuing to be transmitted by telegraph; for on June 8, both correspondents of the "Times" and Reuter sent messages which appeared on June 11 in London. Such news intimated that the conditions around Peking were going from bad to worse; but neither of the reports coincide. Dr. Morrison reported that "within three days seventy-five native Christians, well known men, who had been trained for years by the American missionaries, had been massacred near Tung-chau, many of them burned alive. The intimidation of Christians continued within Peking itself, and most of the missionary compounds are closed, the missionaries being collected under the protection of the legation guards." Reuter's correspondent sent in a different story altogether. Instead of "seventy-five native Christians...massacred...near Tungchau", he reported that "yesterday (June 7) the village of Tungchau, thirteen miles from Peking, was burnt and twenty native Christians were killed...." ²⁶ On the same day, the British minister reported to his government

26. Times, June 11, 1900.

that "...on that day (June 9)...the Boxers...burned the premises of the American missionaries and massacred many of their converts (at Tungchau)".²⁷

From Tientsin Reuter's correspondent reported that "accurate information, however, is difficult to obtain..."²⁸ And Dalziel's Agency reported on June 9 from Shanghai that "all foreign telegrams from Peking are being delayed...All foreigners in the volunteer corps (in Peking) are under arms and guns are mounted. ...the approaches to the legation street are surrounded by howling Chinese mobs and undisciplined soldiery.." ²⁹ While Reuter's correspondent at Shanghai reported that "Tungchow has been burned, but that the missionaries are safe" ³⁰, Reuter's Peking correspondent sent a message saying that "the North China College at Tungchau, valued at 70,000 taels, has been abandoned. Over forty converts of the college were killed and two chapels were burned..."³¹

While the missionaries were being assembled

27. Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol. III, p. 203.

28. Times, June 11, 1900.

29. Times, June 11, 1900.

30. Times, June 11, 1900.

31. Times, June 12, 1900.

in the Methodist compound in Peking on June 7, the "Times" published a report to that effect on the following day in London, and this was supported by Reuter's despatch the next day which further stated that the "mission compounds were all abandoned at dusk last night, and the missionaries are collecting at the American Methodist Mission station, where there are 40 British and Americans surrounded by 300 native pupils...guarded by 10 American marines and awaiting reinforcements from the warships to take them to the coast...Sir Claude MacDonald has sent 12 marines and Mr. Conger 20 to guard the Methodist Mission compound where all the denominations of the Protestants are gathered. The Roman Catholics are collected to the north of the cathedral in the west of Peking...the business classes among the Chinese are much alarmed at the constantly increasing streams of Boxers.." 32

While these reports were being received in Europe, the "Times" correspondent at Shanghai, on June 11, appeared less alarmed when he sent the following despatch: "In absence of trustworthy

32. Times, June 12, 1900.

information the wildest rumors are being circulated by the Chinese", but he added that the "Kansu troops have attacked the foreign guards in the capital.." 33

Dr. Morrison reported the death of M. Sugiyama, chancellor of the Japanese legation, from Peking on June 12, and further stated, "All Tientsin wires cut." He blamed the Chinese government with the "present isolated position of Peking".³⁴

Daziel's despatch from Shanghai, dated June 12, said "...The complete isolation of Peking continues, telegraphic, postal and railway means of communication being stopped."³⁵

Meanwhile, there was some dissension among the members of the imperial council. Those friendly to the foreigners and who advocated a policy of caution, were headed by Junghu and Prince Ching, while opposing them were all the high officials of the Manchus, the most outstanding of them being Prince Tuan. At a secret conclave held at the palace

33. Times, June 12, 1900.

34. Times, June 13, 1900.

35. Times, June 13, 1900.

on June 4 it was proposed that the Boxers should not be crushed, since they were loyal to the dynasty, and if properly armed would be useful auxiliaries.³⁶

On June 13, Reuter's dispatch revealed the situation that the "foreigners in Peking are unable to leave the legations" and "Prince Tuan and General Tung have resigned". From Shanghai, the "Times" correspondent reported: "A Tientsin telegram states that the Tsungli Yamen has been dissolved and reorganized under Prince Tuan..." The report continued to say that General Tung's troops were engaged in a serious fight between the relief expedition near Peking.³⁷ The facts were that the relief expedition was absolutely blocked at Langfang and was never anywhere "near" Peking,³⁸ while Prince Tuan never resigned, but was appointed president of the Tsungli Yamen conjointly with Prince Ching.³⁹

The Boxers continued to enter Peking and destroyed schools, hospitals and other buildings, and even the cemeteries of the foreign community

36. Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol. III, p. 200-201.

37. Times, June 15, 1900.

38. Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol. III, p. 214.

39. Ibid, p. 203.

were broken into and desecrated.⁴⁰

While Peking was thus beleaguered, news was totally lacking from Tientsin where foreigners were in an equally perilous situation. The Boxers entered that city on June 14, a day later than at Peking, and commenced their destruction in like fashion.⁴¹ The "Times" correspondent at Shanghai sent a message on June 16 which was published two days later in London. It said "...telegraphic communications with the north ceased early this morning" and "the last message received from Tientsin said that fighting had begun".⁴² No news of the trouble in Tientsin was sent from Peking, and the report of the destruction of Tientsin is just as much a mystery as the massacre of Peking which will be dealt with in a later discussion.

The admirals at Taku felt that the trouble at Tientsin and the increasing number of Boxers near the river mouth presented a dangerous condition. On June 16 a meeting was held and an ultimatum was sent to the commanders at the Taku-forts, asking

40. Ibid, p.205.

41. Ibid, p.205-206.

42. Times, June 18, 1900.

that they be delivered to the foreign admirals before 2 a.m. June 17. No answer was given, and the following morning the allies attacked the forts and captured them.⁴³

The "Times" correspondent at Shanghai sent a message to the London office on June 18 announcing that the Taku forts had been taken by foreign troops and added that the Chinese fired on the foreign ships.⁴⁴

The American Admiral Kempff at Taku had taken no part in the capture of the forts. Reuter's correspondent at Taku wrote, on June 27, that Admiral Kempff opposed the policy of attacking the Chinese army unless it began hostilities. "It is now admitted," he went on, "that the Powers, by attacking the forts here June 17, turned the Chinese into allies of the Boxers. This, the Americans believe, might have been avoided, and Admiral Kempff is holding aloof from all hostilities beyond those necessary for the rescue of Americans."⁴⁵

43. H.C. Thomson, China and the Powers, p.35, cited in Morse, Intl.Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol.III, p.207.

44: Times; June 19, 1900.
45: Times; July 2, 1900.

After the Taku forts were seized, the Chinese government troops joined forces with the Boxers and for the first time openly attacked foreigners.⁴⁶

Meanwhile, Admiral Seymour, with the relief expedition, was hemmed in between Peking and Tientsin and finally returned to Tientsin on June 26 with the loss, in a force of 2066, of 62 killed and 238 wounded.⁴⁷

On June 19, the Empress Dowager called the princes and ministers into conference. Prince Tuan, Grand Councillor Chi-hsiu and Sub-chancellor Na-tung, then showed her a dispatch, which they said had been received from the foreigners, "bluntly demanding her immediate abdication, the removal of the heir-apparent and the restoration of the emperor", and, moreover, asking for 10,000 foreign troops to come to Peking to keep the place in order.⁴⁸ The forged dispatch purporting to come from the diplomatic body,⁴⁹ fired the wrath of the old Buddha beyond control.⁵⁰

46. Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol. III, p. 211.

47. Savage-Landor, China and the Allies, Vol. I, p. 85-111.

48. Ching Shan Diary, June 20, p. 265.

49. Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol. III, p. 219.

50. Ching Shan Diary, June 20, p. 265.

Late that afternoon the members of the diplomatic body received identical despatches from the Tsungli Yamen giving them the information of the ultimatum delivered by the admirals, and requiring the envoys, with their families, their staffs, and guards, and all foreigners to leave Peking for Tientsin within twenty-four hours. They were also told that troops had been provided to escort them on the journey.⁵¹ This offer the envoys refused and demanded that a conference be held with the officials of the Tsungli Yamen on the next day.⁵²

On June 20 no reply had been received from the Chinese officials. The envoys decided to cancel the conference, but the German minister, Baron von Ketteler, decided to go alone to "point out to the Chinese ministers the enormity of their offence against the law of nations, and the consequences which must result from their attack on the sanctity of ambassadors..." A quarter of an hour later he was reported killed.⁵³

51. U.S.For. Rel., 1900, p.162.

52. Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol.III, p.222.

53. Ibid, p.222-223.

The news of the murder struck with horror the envoys and the foreign community. Foreign missionaries and their converts began to move into the legations. Approximately twenty-four hours after the dated request to leave Peking, "the legation quarters and the Pehtang were swept by a storm of rifle shot". From this time the foreign community, including 473 civilians, 451 foreign guards and some thousands of Chinese converts, were subjected to constant assaults by the Boxers and by Chinese imperial troops.⁵⁴

Strange as it may seem, the "London Times" on June 18 published the alarming reports of events, some of which did not take place until June 20. The last direct communication from Dr. Morrison was sent from Peking on June 14 and was published four days later in London. There was after that no direct message from him till August 2, when a message that was written on July 21 appeared in the "Times".⁵⁵

The June 14 despatch said:

54. Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol. III, p. 224-225.

55. Times, June 18 and August 22, 1900.

A serious anti-foreign outbreak took place last night when some of the finest buildings in the eastern part of the city were burned and hundreds of native Christians and servants employed by foreigners were massacred within two miles of the Imperial Palace...the Boxers burned the Roman Catholic East Cathedral and the large buildings of the eastern part of the city occupied by the foreign employes of the maritime customs...If the troops reinforcing the foreign guards fail to arrive today further riots are to be expected ...It is believed that no European has been injured. 56

In this issue of the "Times", June 18, also appeared other reports of similar nature, coming indirectly from other cities. From Shanghai, June 16, the "Times" correspondent reported that the telegraphic communications with the North had ceased and that "fighting had begun". Reuter's correspondent from the same city reported "10,000 Imperial Chinese troops between Peking...have been disbanded and have joined the Boxers". From Berlin Reuter reported that "on the evening of the 13 instant the Boxers marched into Peking, destroyed several mission stations, and made an attack on the foreign legations, which, however, was repulsed with the aid of a Maxim".⁵⁷

56. Times, June 18, 1900.

57. Times, June 18, 1900.

These reports, alarming though they may be, only tended to inform the outside world of the "coming of the storm". The London evening papers of June 16 contained telegrams of the Laffan News Agency from Tientsin saying that "the German minister in Peking has been murdered". But in this same issue of the "Times", June 18, came the more "shocking" news which was relayed from Berlin by the "Times'" own correspondent to London on June 17. The dispatch said:

The German semi-official agency issued the following communique: The London evening journals published a dispatch communicated to them by the Exchange Telegraph Company from Laffan's Agency dated June 16, Hongkong, according to which a telegram from Tientsin reports that all the legations in Peking have been wrecked, and that the German minister has been killed. We sent you this intelligence and can only add that in well-informed quarters here no confirmation of its contents has been received, and that the representative of Laffan's Agency in Tientsin is at present the only authority for the news. We must leave to you whether your opinion of the trustworthiness of Laffan's Agency warrants you in attaching credence to the intelligence. 58

Immediately telegraph wires were set busy in Paris, St. Petersburg, Berlin and Vienna, regarding the above report. Reuter's Berlin dispatch

said: "...The German consul at Chifu telegraphs this morning that the latest news received there by steamer made no mention whatever of the reported destruction of the European legations or the murder of the German minister." ⁵⁹ From St. Petersburg Reuter reported that "the Russian government has received no confirmation whatever of the alleged destruction of the legations in Peking and the murder of the German minister". The "Times" correspondent at Vienna sent a despatch to London on June 17 saying that "last night's official information made no mention of any loss of life on the European side". On the same day another wire from the "Times" Paris correspondent said: "A report from Hongkong of the assassination of the German minister at Peking and demolition of the foreign legations is not generally accredited." Later in the day the same correspondent sent a second despatch supporting his first message saying: "A telegram from the French consul at Hongkong received today made no mention of the alleged murder of the German minister

59. Times, June 18, 1900.

or the destruction of the legations at Peking." 60

Such were the conditions in and around Peking from the early part of May till June 20. And such were the reports published in the "London Times" from May 22 till June 18. The message from Mr. Morrison, the "Times" correspondent at Peking, on June 14, was the last message published in the same issue. For a long period nothing was heard from him directly or from anyone else at Peking.

60. Times, June 18, 1900.

PART II

THE PEKING MASSACRE

The alleged destruction of the Peking legations, circulated by Laffan's News Agency and published in the "London Times" on June 18, was the most alarming and unfounded report during the Boxer Rebellion. It attracted international attention and kept the rest of the world in a state of suspense for nearly two months. And when the siege was lifted on August 14, it was found that only the Belgian, Austrian, Italian, Dutch and most of the French legations were burned,⁶¹ instead of "all" the legations.

The legations were actually first attacked on June 20 at 4 p.m. when Chinese troops for the first time joined the Boxers in Peking.⁶² During the siege, which lasted from June 20 to August 14, the legations were subjected to a generally constant and furious fusillade. But in this period there were three truces, on June 25, July 18 to July 28, and August 3 to August 4.⁶³

61. U.S. For. Rel., 1900, p.165.

62. Hart, These from the Land of Sinim, p.32.

63. Morse, Int.Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol.III, p.233.

The foreign community, during its isolation, concentrated in the British legation, and there defended itself for eighty-six days.⁶⁴ While conflicting reports of the foreigners' safety continued to fill the European press and the additional reports of the "general massacre"⁶⁵ were printed, it was found after the allies entered Peking that in addition to the death of Baron von Ketteler, the German minister, killed on June 20, there was actually a total of 75 foreigners killed and 179 wounded.⁶⁶ The other ministers and their families were safe.

The "London Times" during this period received reports from every conceivable source and from all sections of the world with regard to the conditions of the besieged legations and foreigners. Two days before the legations were isolated, it published the report circulated by Laffan's Agency on June 18 that the "legations in

64. U.S. For.Rel., 1900, p.163.

65. Times, July 6, 1900.

66. Morse, Int.Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol.III, p.280.

Peking have been wrecked".⁶⁷ The reports appearing in the "Times" after June 18 were so confusing and conflicting that they afford an interesting study.

The following reports regarding the legations appeared in the "Times" on June 18, the same day that the legation was reported "destroyed".

On June 17 the "Times" correspondent at Paris wired: "No official telegrams have been received here from China since Friday, June 14...(and)...the demolition of the foreign legations is not generally accredited..."⁶⁸

Reuter's despatch from St. Petersburg on the same day revealed that the Russian capital was just as ignorant of the conditions in Peking as other capitals and that "no confirmation whatsoever of the alleged destruction of the legations in Peking..." had been received.⁶⁹

67. Times, June 18, 1900.

68. Times, June 18, 1900.

69. Times, June 18, 1900.



From Berlin Reuter's message said that the German consul at Chifu wired that the "latest news received here by steamer made no mention whatsoever of the reported destruction of the European legations..."⁷⁰

On June 19 the "Times" published a story from a correspondent in Berlin. It said:

...There was no confirmation of the report circulated by Laffan's Agency...nor had any official report of a similar nature been received in London.. Early this morning (June 18) a telegram was received from Chifu to the effect that a Japanese torpedo-boat reported that the legations in Peking have been taken..."⁷¹

Reuter's correspondent reported from Berlin on the same day that the Japanese consul at Chifu reported "...nothing whatsoever about the foreign legations at Peking being taken..." had been received. And although there was no confirmation of the previous reports, "gloomy apprehensions appeared to be universally entertained" in the German capital.⁷²

On June 21 the correspondent at Vienna

70. Times, June 18, 1900.

71. Times, June 19, 1900.

72. Times, June 20, 1900.

reported the "situation in China is growing worse" and added that the report from Yokohama representing the "foreign minister in Peking to have been murdered and Admiral Seymour to have been killed, is possibly a garbled and exaggerated version..."⁷³ And although this report emanated from Yokohama, Reuter's correspondent affirmed from that city that such news is "generally viewed with suspicion."⁷⁴

Foreign correspondents at Taku, Chifu, and Shanghai, although being comparatively near Peking, did not know about the true conditions in the Chinese capital. On June 21 the "Times" correspondent at Shanghai received a message from Taku via Chifu reporting that "...The feeling of suspense with regard to the situation of the foreign residents in Peking has become acute owing to the total absence of information as to the movements of the relieving forces." At Shanghai the absence of news from Peking was looked upon as ominous, and grave fears still

73. Times, June 22, 1900.

74. Times, June 22, 1900.

existed for the safety of the capital.⁷⁵

The Chinese diplomats abroad were equally ignorant of the facts in their home country. The Chinese minister at Berlin informed the German foreign office on June 24 that "the German minister is well and safe..." This report was sent by the "Times" correspondent at Berlin on the same day.⁷⁶ From Shanghai the "Times" despatch reported on June 22 that Sheng's Yamen declared that "information" had been received to the effect that the "foreigners were safe on June 20 but that all the legations had been burned except the British, Austrian and Belgian".⁷⁷ In like manner, the Chinese minister transmitted a message received from the Nanking viceroy to American officials that "all foreign ministers are well", and Mr. Hay accepted this as authentic.⁷⁸

The next day Reuter's message from Berlin stated that "the reassuring communication from the Chinese minister here that...Peking is safe is hardly

75. Times, June 23, 1900.

76. Times, June 25, 1900.

77. Times, June 25, 1900.

78. Times, June 25, 1900.

79. Times, June 26, 1900.

treated seriously" and that "no official notice will be taken of the document" received from China.⁷⁹

At Paris Reuter's correspondent reported that the French consul at Shanghai sent the following telegram to Paris on June 25: "The foreign ministers and the Europeans in Peking were safe and well on the 19th..."⁸⁰ The "Times" correspondent at New York reported on the same day that Mr. Goodnow, the United States consul at Shanghai telegraphed that "nothing is certainly known about conditions of Peking".⁸¹

Another message was sent by the "Times" correspondent at Berlin on June 26 reporting that the Chinese embassy there stated that it had received from Nanking confirmation of the report that the foreign representatives and embassies at Peking "are safe and uninjured".⁸²

While these reports of uncertainty were

79. Times, June 26, 1900.

80. Times, June 26, 1900.

81. Times, June 26, 1900.

82. Times, June 27, 1900.

being received in Europe the "Times" published a report on June 28 which brought a ray of hope to the gloomy apprehensions of the people of the West. The correspondent at Shanghai sent a report on June 26 saying that the rumor is persistent that "the foreigners have left Peking escorted by native troops" but added that it is impossible to trace the source of or to verify such reports, which "are chiefly of native origin". He further stated that "there is no cause for immediate anxiety and that it is regrettable that many existing sources of information in the North display a tendency to exaggerate the facts...." ⁸³

Chinese assurances continued to reach Europe. The London Foreign Office received from the Nanking viceroy a telegram to the acting British consul at Shanghai reporting that the foreign legations in Peking were as usual receiving every "protection" from the imperial government. ⁸⁴ Reuter's

83. Times, June 28, 1900.

84. Times, June 29, 1900.

reported from Shanghai that "Intelligence" from an "official" source states that the legations in Peking "were safe on the 25th instant...(and)... all is well at Tientsin".⁸⁵ A later message from Reuter's Shanghai correspondent on the same day said that "...Liu, the Nanking viceroy, received instruction from Peking to inform foreign consuls here immediately that the legations are safe and are arranging peace terms".⁸⁶ But from Chifu, an altogether different report was received. Reuter's correspondent there reported one day earlier than the Shanghai dispatches that the "foreigners and ministers have been ordered to leave Peking and are proceeding to Tientsin by an outside route".⁸⁷

Berlin, the center of rumors in Europe, again reported something startling. The "Times" correspondent put on the wires the following message dated June 28: "Admiral Bendemann, German commander of the German cruiser squadron at Taku wires on June 26: 'Ministers of the Powers are with the landing

85. Times, June 29, 1900.

86. Times, June 29, 1900.

87. Times, June 29, 1900.

corps.' " 88 The "landing corps" apparently referred to the relief troops, sent out from Tientsin under Admiral Seymour on June 10, which beat a hasty retreat to Tientsin sixteen days later.

But such "good news" received better attention for on the same day a special news sheet appeared on the streets of Berlin containing the following reports sent by the "Times" correspondent to London on the same day. It said:

According to official telegram received here and in St. Petersburg, Admiral Seymour has been relieved and is now in Tientsin. The foreign ministers from Peking, among them the German minister, Baron von Ketteler, were in Admiral Seymour's camp, and are also now in Tientsin. 89

From New York Reuter's agency reported on June 28 that Wu Ting-fang, Chinese minister at Washington, gave Mr. Hay the following telegram received from Li Hung-chang, dated from Canton, June 29: "Legation ministers, having left Peking, are now 12 miles from Tientsin with Seymour." Reuter's added, however, that the officials in the State

88. Times, June 29, 1900.

89. Times, June 29, 1900.

Department are inclined to doubt it.⁹⁰

To shatter these hopeful reports, the "Times" correspondent sent the following despatch from Shanghai. It said "...Nothing definite is known of the whereabouts of the foreign ministers. Chinese rumors continue to assert that they have left Peking under escort of native troops" ⁹¹

On July 1, according to a report published in the "Times", the foreigners were not "proceeding to Tientsin by an outside route", nor were they "with Seymour's camp" nor "12 miles from Tientsin"; but back in Peking defending themselves. The "Times" correspondent at Shanghai sent on June 27 the reports that the Nanking viceroy telegraphed Sheng an assurance that "the legations were all well on the 25th". It added that a military correspondent at Tientsin wrote that the British legation was the refuge of all the Europeans and was holding out."⁹² Reuter's reported on July 1 from Shanghai that the "legations, not specified, were not destroyed on June 23". These two reports were evidently the only

90. Times, June 29, 1900.

91. Times, June 29, 1900.

92. Times, July 1, 1900.

ones approaching the truth that had been published in the "Times" since May 22.

Following the two reports came another from Rome, which said that the Italian foreign office had received a despatch from the cruiser *Elba*, at Taku, dated June 30, saying that the "German minister in Peking reports" that "all legations have been burned except the English, French and German. All diplomatic corps members have taken refuge in British legation." 93

The most important development of this early period of the siege was the publication in the "Times" July 3 of a message written by Sir Robert Hart on June 24. It was taken to Tientsin by carrier to the German consul. It said: "Foreign colony besieged in legation. Situation desperate. Make haste." 94

This revealed to the world, for the first time, the actual conditions of the besieged foreigners in the Peking legations.

93. Times, July 1, 1900.

94. Times, July 3, 1900.

This report revived the hopes of the outside world. But it was only short lived; for on July 6 the "Times" published a despatch from Reuter's Shanghai correspondent which presented a horrible picture to the hopeful readers. The message, dated July 4, said:

It is stated on good authority that three Chinese who were in the service of foreigners in Peking have escaped from the capital. They report that all the foreigners, to the number of 1000 including 400 soldiers, and 100 members of the Chinese customs staff, held out in the British legation until ammunition and food were exhausted. The legation was burned and all the foreigners were killed. 95

This report was believed immediately in Rome. The correspondent reported that:

The impossibility of saving the Europeans in Peking and the practical certainty of their awful fate have created a painful stupor throughout Italy. Keen regret is felt that the Marquis Salvago Raggi, one of the ablest younger Italian diplomats, and Don Livio Caetani, son of the Duke of Caetani di Sermoneta, attache at the Peking legation, should end so tragically their promising careers. 96

While this feeling and "keen regret" was being entertained in Italy, the "ablest younger Italian diplomats" were still living in Peking.

95. Times, July 6, 1900.

96. Times, July 6, 1900.

The following day a telegram was received in Berlin from Melchers and Company at Shanghai which said, "We have grounds for believing that all the foreigners in Peking have been massacred." And what "grounds" they were, the telegram did not mention.⁹⁷

Another belated message from Reuter's Tientsin correspondent, dated June 29 and published in London on July 7, said that the best informed people in Tientsin "considered the position of the foreigners (in Peking) almost hopeless...."⁹⁸

Then came on July 9 another assurance from Chinese officials. This news came from the correspondent at Brussels who reported that a telegram received there from Shanghai said: "According to a high Chinese official, two legations in Peking were holding their own on July 2...(and)..members of diplomatic body were safe..."

The message further assured that "...the loyal troops under the command of Prince Ching are stated to have attacked the rebels at Peking..."⁹⁹

97. Times, July 7, 1900.

98. Times, July 7, 1900.

99. Times, July 9, 1900.

At Washington Reuter's reported that Wu Ting-fang received a telegram from Sheng at Shanghai dated July 8. It said: "...On July 5, two legations at Peking were still preserved and all ministers were safe. Rebellious troops and rioters made attacks but suffer many losses."¹⁰⁰

Another "hopeful" message was received from Berlin on July 11. It stated that the German consul at Chifu sent a telegram saying that the governor of Shantung addressed an official dispatch to foreign consuls at Chifu according to which he had received news dated July 4 to the effect that "all foreign ministers were 'out of danger'" and the rebellion was abating.¹⁰¹

Reuter's Agency at Shanghai the following day transmitted another rumor saying that "It is reported that a Chinese merchant has received a letter from Peking dated June 30, stating that the legations had been demolished and the foreigners killed..."¹⁰² And while the "legations had been demolished and the foreigners killed" appeared in

100. Times, July 10, 1900.

101. Times, July 12, 1900.

102. Times, July 12, 1900.

the London papers, the following day "Gen. Tung Fu-hsiang (was) bombarding the legations..." 103

The "Times" correspondent "found" another more "detailed" story of the destruction" of the legations. On July 13 he sent the following story published two days later in London. It said:

Native soldiers, reports say, and Boxers, gathered and attacked the legations at night, July 6, bombarding the whole section and after a gallant fight, during which the ammunition gave out, all the foreigners were killed. 104

But the Chinese authorities gave a story exactly contradictory to the above report. This message was relayed from Brussels to London by Reuter's correspondent on July 15. It said:

Sheng communicates a telegram from the governor of Shantung, dated July 7, saying the European troops, who were defending the legations in Peking made a sortie, killing 200 soldiers of Tung Fu-hsiang forces. The Boxers were not able to capture the legations by assault and placed two guns in position to make a breach in the defense. 105

In Paris there was no confirmation of the news of the massacre of the ministers in Peking, "but

103. Times, July 14, 1900.

104. Times, July 15, 1900.

105. Times, July 15, 1900.

it is accepted here at last as certain and has naturally filled Paris with horror".¹⁰⁶ On July 16 the "Temps" received from Shanghai via Malta a telegram dated the same day saying that the governor of Shantung "confirms" the bombardment and capture of the legations in Peking and all the Europeans have been massacred by the Boxers and the regular troops.¹⁰⁷

As usual, Rome was the first to believe these alarming reports. The correspondent of the "Times" there on the following day wired, "The news of the massacre in Peking inspires unbounded horror and a strong desire for revenge in Italy."¹⁰⁸

From Russia the "Times" correspondent at St. Petersburg only wired that "there is no official confirmation here of the massacre of foreigners in Peking..."¹⁰⁹

At Shanghai "no authentic news of the situation in Peking has transpired later than that of...July 3" and the "Times" correspondent added that

106. Times, July 17, 1900.

107. Times, July 17, 1900.

108. Times, July 17, 1900.

109. Times, July 18, 1900

"many rumors are in circulation in the native and foreign press regarding the tragedy..."¹¹⁰

A more enlightening report was received from the Belgian officials at Brussels on July 18. Reuter's reported that "M. de Cartier de Marchienne, Belgian charge d'Affaires, telegraphed from Shanghai on July 18, according to information derived from Chinese sources, "the foreigners in Peking have taken refuge in Prince Ching's palace".¹¹¹

Another "message" was received in Shanghai on July 18 and was immediately communicated to London. It stated that the British consul at Tientsin sent a telegram saying that a Japanese consular messenger who left Peking on June 30 reported that on that day the legations were bombarded with heavy Krupp guns and the defenders were hard pressed... But the accuracy of this report was denied at Sheng's Yamen.¹¹²

Officials in Paris received on July 19 the following despatch from the French consul at

110. Times, July 19, 1900.

111. Times, July 19, 1900.

112. Times, July 20, 1900.

Shanghai, dated July 18: "The governor of Shantung telegraphs that the ministers and their families are still safe, but that the danger is very great." 113 This report contradicts the story published on July 16 in the "Temps" of the alleged "confirmation" received from the governor of Shantung that "all the Europeans have been massacred by the Boxers and the regular troops". It is more bewildering that if such a "confirmation" should be released by the governor of Shantung that the "Times" and Reuter's correspondents should have failed to have "covered" the story and let the "Temps" reporter "scoop" them.

The following day the "Times" correspondent at Shanghai wired:

I was informed today by a native official and a member of the Hunan party that in Nanking viceroy's yamen the belief is generally considered genuine that a majority of the foreign residents in Peking had escaped destruction on July 9. It is further believed that while part of General Weih's troops certainly joined the Boxers in attacking the allied troops at Tientsin, a considerable number followed Gen. Weih to Peking where they were successful in assisting Prince Ching and Yung-lu to protect the legations. 114

113. Times, July 20, 1900.

114. Times, July 21, 1900.

Officials at Washington received the following message on July 20 from Fowler, United States consul at Chifu, parts of which were relayed to London by Reuter's Agency. It said: "The Governor of Shantung states that the newspaper accounts of the massacre in Peking are founded entirely on rumors." Another telegram received from Fowler later in the evening stated that the governor of Shantung had just received "definite information" that all the ministers in Peking were "well". And furthermore the Chinese authorities were engaged in devising measures for their rescue and protection.¹¹⁵

An Imperial edict from Peking dated July 18 reached Shanghai on July 21. Parts of the edict were transmitted to London by the "Times" correspondent; the contents referring to the foreigners in Peking said that "all ministers, with the exception of ~~Brown~~ von Ketteler, are safe", which is a frank admission of the Chinese authorities and the first "official" information with regard to the German minister's death.¹¹⁶

115. Times, July 21, 1900.

116. Times, July 23, 1900.

Another telegram from Yuan Shih-kai at Tsinanfu, Shantung Province, on the same day was received by the British consul at Shanghai in which it said that Yuan "holds definite information that the foreign ministers are unharmed..."¹¹⁷

On July 23, the "Times" published information received from Washington Reuter's Agency concerning the legations. The information was transmitted to American officials by Wu Ting-fang, received from Sheng at Shanghai. It said: "All ministers safe (July 18)...all ministers are fortunately unharmed." ~~kkk~~

Russian official circles were not optimistic and intelligent regarding the Peking conditions. On July 21 the "Times" correspondent sent the following despatch:

Impossible to obtain any kind of information from Russian official sources which would tend to confirm or contradict the horrifying reports of the fate of the foreign colony in Peking. No direct news from relatives or friends..If the Russian government has any information at all it takes good care to keep it secret. 119

Laffan's Agency remaining in the background

117. Times, July 23, 1900.

118. Times, July 23, 1900.

119. Times, July 24, 1900.

for a short time emerged again with a story from Brussels, which the agency claims to come directly from Peking. It was sent to London on July 23. It said:

Belgian minister for foreign affairs reports telegram received from Belgian charge d' Affaires, M. de Cartier de Marchienne, dated July 23.. 'Li Hung-chang absolutely assured me that the foreign ministers are safe and promised to obtain direct communication with M. Joostens, our minister.'

120.

Other Chinese assurances were sent abroad on the same day. Mr. Goodnow cabled to Washington on July 23 saying, "Tuen wires me that an official of the Tsungli Yamen saw all the foreign ministers on July 18. None of them were injured and no attack at that time was being made." This was communicated by Reuter's Agency at Washington to London.¹²¹

While the above report reached Washington Reuter's correspondent at New York sent a dispatch received in that city from the New York "Herald" Chifu correspondent who wired on July 21 via Shanghai the following message:

120. Times, July 24, 1900.

121. Times, July 24, 1900.

The captain of a British steamer from Niuchwang reports that a Chinaman arrived there on the 19th and asserted that he had escaped from Peking on the 12th on which day the British legation was destroyed and the foreigners were butchered. 122

The above report was based on "a Chinaman" who escaped from Peking. But such reports were put on the wires to Europe apparently without verification. The "New York Herald" correspondent at Chifu also reported on the same date with his other despatch that "a telegram from governor of Shantung received the 20th instant, says that he has received information the foreign ministers are well and authorities are devising means for their rescue and protection".¹²³

In the same issue of the "Times" was published a report from Sir Halliday Macartney, English secretary to the Chinese legation at London through the Exchange Telegraph Company. It said: "The Peking legations are safe and about to proceed to Tientsin."¹²⁴

The "Times" correspondent at St. Petersburg sent a despatch on July 24 to London. It said:

Chinese legation here received telegram from Tsungli Yamen;--"Today the 18th of July, by order of the Tsungli Yamen, our officials visited the foreign ministers and found them all well and

122. Times, July 24, 1900.

123. Times, July 24, 1900.

124. Times, July 24, 1900.

uninjured. The minister for foreign affairs gave orders to supply the legations with food and everything else they might require. The minister (Tsunqli Yamen) further proposed that the foreign ministers should remove to Tientsin under an escort of Imperial troops, when they will be safe from all danger. 125

The form, contents and cipher of this despatch are such as to convince the Chinese legations of its perfect authenticity.¹²⁶

The "Times" correspondent at Rome was apparently confident of the reports he had received or heard for he wired to London, "I learn that the foreign detachments in Peking suffered heavy losses...The ministers are safe." He further stated that "...on the 18th instant the Peking ministers were adequately protected by the Chinese government...all except Ketteler were safe."¹²⁷

More encouraging reports were communicated to the American officials by the Chinese minister at Washington. Reuter's Agency reported that "Wu received a telegram from Sheng, says ministers in Peking are to be sent under escort to Tientsin and that the Imperial government has also supplied them

125. Times, July 25, 1900.

126. Times, July 25, 1900.

127. Times, July 25, 1900.

with food in addition to protecting them." 128

While the Foreign Office at London received a telegram from the British consul at Tientsin, dated July 21, saying that a letter postmarked July 4 from Sir Claude MacDonald, British minister at Peking, asking for help, further messages from Berlin assured that "the foreign ministers were living on July 26.." 129

On July 27 the "Times" published a short narrative received from St. Petersburg, giving an individual's summary of the conditions in the Chinese capital. The despatch from St. Petersburg said:

M. Pokotiloff, director of Russian Chinese Bank of Peking sends message dated, June 15, Peking,.. on the morning of June 13 one of the anti-Christian brigands was seized in legation street and arrested by the German legation, which was the signal for a great movement. About six in the evening the anti-Christians set fire to the American church in one of the adjoining streets. The Europeans raised the alarm.. the anti-Christians attempted to burn and attack several parts of the European quarters..to burn unprotected European houses and churches in other parts of the town...succeeded in burning the Russian Orthodox mission...many Catholic and Protestant churches and houses of Europeans were burnt and plundered. We are not giving in a regular state of war..... Peking, June 18,...We are living in a state of siege and are taking precautions against attacks by anti-Christians and the Chinese soldiers..... 130

128. Times, July 25, 1900.

129. Times, July 25, 1900.

130. Times, July 27, 1900.

Another message from the same correspondent from Russia stated that Colonel Artamonoff expressed the opinion that it is impossible to believe the Chinese assurances that the ministers in Peking are still alive and well.¹³¹

On July 28 the "Times" published a report dated July 26 from a correspondent at Shanghai saying that the British consul-general there has no information regarding the message dated July 4, which is stated by the press to have been received by the Tientsin consul from Sir Claude MacDonald.¹³² But from Brussels Reuter's correspondent reported that the minister of foreign affairs published a despatch from the Belgian vice-consul at Tientsin, which was dated July 25, via Chifu, stating that on July 4 the British minister wrote to the consul that "the foreigners in Peking were reduced to eating horse-flesh..."¹³³

From Berlin the report that "the legations were still being defended on July 9" was published

131. Times, July 27, 1900.

132. Times, July 28, 1900; Times, July 25, 1900.

133. Times, July 28, 1900

in the London papers on July 28. 134

Further hopeful news was being communicated by Laffan's Agency from Washington. On July 27 it sent the following message to London:

Sir Chih Chen Lofengluh has just received a telegram from Sheng under date Shanghai July 27; An imperial decree issued on July 24. It is fortunate that eleven foreign representatives, with the exception of Baron von Ketteler, are found in safety and unharmed....." 135

Berlin, as usual, was still "certain" and "uncertain" about conditions which it had heard through press reports. The "Times" correspondent reported:

Innumerable contradictory reports which have been distributed by the Chinese as to the state of affairs in Peking have been received with the utmost scepticism here.....It is regarded as just possible that some of the ministers and other Europeans are still alive..... 136

Rome was also entertaining a gloomy feeling over conditions in Peking. This came through the experience of the Italian consul at Hongkong whose message to the Italian minister at Peking was refused transmission by the Canton viceroy. Because of this

134. Times, July 28, 1900.

135. Times, July 28, 1900.

136. Times, July 28, 1900.

rejection, it was "generally interpreted..as conclusive proof of the falsehood of the Chinese optimistic statements..is considered additional untrustworthiness of the Chinese assurances....¹³⁷

AS mysterious as the first report of the murder of the German minister and the destruction of the legations at Peking, Laffan's Agency again circulated a report from Tientsin on July 24 that "...the attack on the legations ceased on the 14th afternoon....." ¹³⁸

This report in the same manner set the newspaper correspondents busy transmitting news, rumors and other information from all sections of the world, concerning the cessation of hostilities in Peking.

The facts were on July 14 a note signed "Prince Ching and others" came to the legations by a messenger inviting the ministers to the Tsungli Yamen, but the ministers refused to go. However, a period of correspondence was started, which for a time caused a cessation of artillery firing and

137. Times, July 30, 1900.

138. Times, July 30, 1900.

lessened greatly the rifle firing.¹³⁹ It was during this truce that Mr. Conger sent his first telegram since June 11, to the state department, dated July 16. It was received at the American capital on July 20. This direct communication from Peking revealed two things, first, that the foreign ministers were still alive; and second, that the foreign colony demanded immediate relief.¹⁴⁰ This news relieved the fear and pessimistic views of the millions of people who were constantly scanning the news reports from day to day.

These correspondences were in the form of negotiations, on the subject of withdrawal to Tientsin. They were continued till July 29 when the resumption of hostilities began again.¹⁴¹

Because of the difficulty of getting news out of Peking, the first report of the siege reached Tientsin on July 24, ten days after the cessation of hostilities. It was immediately sent to London by Laffan's on the same day and was published in the

139. U.S. For. Rel., 1900, p.166; Warse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol. III, p.252-253.

140. U.S. For. Rel., 1900, p.156.

141. Sir. C. MacDonald to Lord Salisbury, Sept. 20, China, No. 4, 1900, p. 33, cited in Warse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol. III, p. 259

"Times" on July 30.¹⁴² Individual reports came out of Peking and in the leading cities of Europe such reports varied in their contents.

On July 31 the "Times" published a despatch received from the British admiralty. This despatch was sent by Bruce at Taku via Chemulpo, dated July 30, saying that he had received a message which stated that "...since July 16 armistice, but cordon strictly drawn..all women and children in British legation..¹⁴³"

On the same day the foreign office in London issued a notice saying that a telegram had been received from the British consul at Tientsin dated July 27 in which he (British consul) said that a letter from the Japanese colonel in Peking, dated July 22, stated that no firing on the legations "since July 17". Other messengers who were able to reach Tientsin reported that the legations were not fired on between July 15 and July 17.¹⁴⁴ These two announcements were published in the "Times" on July 31.

142. Times, July 30, 1900.

143. Times, July 31, 1900.

144. Times, July 31, 1900.

From Berlin the exact dates of the "truce" did not coincide with the previous reports. The "Times" correspondent reported on July 30 that the German consul at Tientsin sent a telegram stating that a letter dated July 21 was received from Herr von Below, at the German legation, Peking, in which he stated that "...the legation buildings have been severely damaged by artillery but are still held by us..(and)..attacks of the Chinese troops have been suspended since the 16th..."¹⁴⁵

Reuter's Agency also sent a message from Berlin, which was published in the "Times" the same day the "Times" correspondent's story appeared. Reuter's message said that semi-official telegrams from Tientsin dated July 25 state American missionary messenger returns from Peking, says that between July 15-17 the legations were not fired upon. And that the Empress Dowager issued an edict ordering the bombardment to be stopped entirely.¹⁴⁶

During the month of August reports

145. Times, July 31, 1900.

146. Times, July 31, 1900.

concerning the legations and foreigners continued to occupy an important place in the European press. Also messages, apparently, were coming slowly from Peking.

The "Times" correspondent at Tientsin on July 28 sent a despatch saying that messages dated July 21, which took one week to reach Tientsin from Peking, had been received in the port city from Sir Claude MacDonald, Sir Robert Hart, Mr. Conger, Mr. Bredon, Dr. Morrison and others. The message also said that Dr. Morrison had been slightly wounded but was then convalescent.¹⁴⁷

Laffan's Agency at Tientsin sent another report dated July 27 stating that the American consul at Tientsin had received a message from Conger at Peking, in which it said: "Since July 16th by agreement there has been no firing. We have provisions for several weeks, but little ammunition..we are all safe and well."¹⁴⁸ Laffan's message also added that Sir Robert Hart reported that the customs staff and their families are safe. Other missionaries report

147. Times, August 1, 1900.

148. Times, August 1, 1900.

that all Americans in Peking and Tungchau are safe. Individual messages, however, state that the truce began on July 17, after twenty-six days of fierce assault.¹⁴⁹

"Temps" unfounded "confirmation" of the "Peking massacre" published in the "Times" July 17 was followed by another "confirmation" published on August 1. It says that the "Shanghai correspondent of the 'Temps' confirms" the news of safety of the ministers but adds that only the German, Russian, American, English and Japanese legations remain intact.¹⁵⁰

The "Times" on August 2 received its first direct report from Dr. Morrison, the last one written on June 14 and published on June 18. This message was written on July 21, apparently during the so-called truce and took eleven days to reach London. It said:

There has been a cessation of hostilities since July 18...they have discontinued firing..... conditions of the siege are improving..The force

149. Times, August 1, 1900.

150. Times, August 1, 1900.

besieging the legations consists of Imperial soldiers under Yung-lu and Tung Fu-hsiang..their gallantry consisted in bombarding for one month defenseless women and children cooped up in the legation compounds, using shell, shrapnel, round shots and expanding bullets...All the ministers and the members of the legations and their families are in good health, and the general health of the community is excellent... 151.

Sir Claude MacDonald also sent a message to the British Admiral on the same day Dr. Morrison despatched his. It was from Reuter's office at Paris on August 2 and published in the "Times" the following day. It said: "The Chinese troops supplied with artillery attacked the legation from June 22 to July 16. From that date an armistice was agreed..we refused yesterday to leave Peking and to start for Tientsin.." 152

Newspaper correspondents in St. Petersburg, Tientsin and New York reported the advance of Russian and Japanese troops on to Peking.¹⁵³ These reports were published in London on August 3.

The fact was on August 3 the foreign commanders were holding conferences at Tientsin regarding

151. Times, August 2, 1900.

152. Times, August 3, 1900.

153. Times, August 3, 1900.

the march to Peking and the advance actually moved out of Tientsin on August 4 at 3 p.m.¹⁵⁴

Reuter's Agency reported from Washington on August 3 that a telegram from Mr. Fowler, United States consul at Chifu, was received at the capital saying that the governor of Shantung had requested him to inform Mr. Hay that a telegram from the Tsungli Yamen dated July 30 stating that the various ministers and members of the German legation and other foreigners were well and there was no distress.¹⁵⁵

From Brussels Reuter's correspondent reported that a telegram from the Belgian vice-consul at Tientsin, dated August 4, states that the members of the Belgian legation in Peking are in good health.¹⁵⁶

On August 7 the "Times" published an announcement from the Exchange Telegraph Company which stated that a message had been received from the Tsungli Yamen dated July 30 which says: "Foreign ministers all well...." ¹⁵⁷

154. Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol. III, p. 268.

155. Times, August 4, 1900.

156. Times, August 6, 1900.

157. Times, August 7, 1900.

While these reports relieved the suspense for a short time, another alarming report published on August 8 created a new sensation. For from Shanghai, the "Times" correspondent wired that the Japanese military attache's message received there August 1, stated that the Boxers and Chinese troops were preparing to resume their attacks on the legations.¹⁵⁸

The British foreign office received another telegram from MacDonald, dated August 3. It said: "Shell and cannon fire ceased July 16, but rifle fire is from Chinese positions held by government troops and Boxers and has continued intermittently ever since." ¹⁵⁹

On the same day that the above announcement was published in the "Times", Reuter's Agency at Washington reported that the State Department had received a telegram from Conger on the night of August 7. It said: "We are still besieged. The situation is more precarious. The Chinese government is insisting on our leaving Peking which means certain death. Rifle fire is kept upon us daily by Imperial

158. Times, August 8, 1900.

159. Times, August 9, 1900.

troops...." 160

The pessimistic atmosphere entertained in Rome of the "practical certainty" of the "awful fate" of the foreigners in Peking and the "keen regret" of the loss of Marquis Salvago Raggi, who was "one of the ablest younger Italian diplomats", was finally changed on August 8 when it was reported that the Italian ministers in Peking, Marquis Salvago Raggi sent a telegram to the minister of foreign affairs informing him of the conditions in China.¹⁶¹

Reuter's Agency at Vienna reported on the same day that a telegram from the Austrian legation at Peking had been received saying: "Truce July 16 the Chinese attacks have not been severe. The Chinese government wishes to induce us to leave for Tientsin under a safe conduct, but until now we have not fallen in with this offer." 162

The French minister at Peking, M. Pi~~ch~~on, also wired M. De~~cl~~assé at Paris saying that they had

160. Times, August 9, 1900.

161. Times, August 9, 1900.

162. Times, August 10, 1900.

declined the Chinese offer to leave Peking. This message did not have any date.¹⁶³

From Shanghai the "Times" correspondent reported on August 9 that the commissioner of customs at Shanghai had received a telegram from Sir Robert Hart dated July 27, stating that all was well, though the position was still dangerous.¹⁶⁴

Another message from the French minister at Peking communicated from Paris by the "Times" correspondent to London on August 12 informed the French officials that "...the Chinese troops from June 20 to July 7 have besieged us, exposed us to rifle fire and bombarded us". The message added that "four legations are burned down, French legation three quarters destroyed...on July 17 the bombardment ceased....." ¹⁶⁵

August 17 the "Times" published a telegram sent by Conger to the state department at Washington communicated to London by Reuter's Agency. It was dated at Peking August 11 and said that they had had

163. Times, August 10, 1900.

164. Times, August 11, 1900.

165. Times, August 13, 1900.

only rifle firing since July 17 with frequent desperate attacks.¹⁶⁶

On August 18 Reuter's correspondent at Hongkong reported the surprising news that Sir Robert Hart with his staff had left Peking under Chinese escort. But after the siege Reuter's reported again from Shanghai that Sir Robert Hart "is living in a temple in Peking which he occupied in the sixties!"

On August 20 the "Times" published Mr. Morrison's second direct message since May 14. It was dated August 4 at Peking and said: "...Since the siege began on June 20 no stores of any kind have been permitted to enter the legation. The government is endeavoring to reduce the garrison by starvation.." ¹⁶⁷

The message added that the Chinese with fiendish inhumanity are trying to starve the Christians into surrender, when there will be a general massacre. ¹⁶⁸

Suddenly on August 22 the "Times" published a report from Reuter's agency at Shanghai which said: "Yuan Shi-kai, the governor of Shantung, is dead." ¹⁶⁹

166. Times, August 17, 1900; U.S. For. Rel., 1900, p.159.

167. Times, August 20, 1900.

168. Times, August 20, 1900.

169. Times, August 22, 1900.

But five days later there appeared in the "Times" another despatch from the same reporter which said: "It transpires that it is the nephew of Yuan Shih-kai who is dead and that the report of Yuan Shih-kai's death rose through a confusion of names." ¹⁷⁰ Yuan Shih-kai, in fact lived many years after his reported death and became president of the Chinese republic in 1912 when he was elected by the National Assembly of China.

On August 18, two months after the first report of the destruction of the legations was communicated from Berlin to the "Times", another despatch from the same correspondent announced the entrance of the allied troops into Peking. The despatch was dated August 17 saying that a semi-official telegram dated August 15 had been received at Berlin from Shanghai which states: "according to an apparently trustworthy Chinese report from Tsinanfu, the allied troops have entered Peking and relieved the ministers."¹⁷¹

Characteristics of the other reports that have appeared in the newspapers in European capitals, the news of the entrance of the allied troops into Peking followed a similar trend.

170. Times, August 27, 1900.

171. Times, August 18, 1900.

PART III

THE MURDER OF BARON VON KETTELER

As mysterious as the report of the "Peking massacre" was the news of the murder of Baron von Ketteler, German minister at Peking.

On June 14, six days before the murder occurred, a report was current in Tientsin, emanating from Peking, that a foreign envoy had been killed.¹⁷² On June 17 the head of the telegraph administration at Chefoo received a telegram from London that "it is rumored here that the German envoy has been murdered in Peking."¹⁷³ How this "report" and "rumor" ever got around has never been discovered.

To understand the facts of the background it is best to cite narratives of the event by two authorities. The first is by Mr. E. H. Conger, American minister at Peking, who sent a report to the State Department dated August 17. In referring to the Ketteler case he says:

The morning of the 20th, at 8:30, the ministers met at the French legation ready to proceed in a body to the Tsungli Yamen as soon as notified that the prince would be there. Not receiving any

172. Tel. Tientsin, June 14, North-China Herald, June 20, 1900; in Morse, Int. Rel. of Chi. Emp., Vol. III, 224.

173. Tungwen Hupao, Shanghai, June 17; cited in Ibid.

word by 9 o'clock, the German minister, Baron von Ketteler, who had personally notified the yamen that he was coming there on business, started with his interpreter, commissioned to tell the prince and ministers that the corps was patiently waiting to hear from them.

Upon arriving almost to the yamen he was brutally murdered, shot through the head by a man (so says his interpreter, whose chair immediately followed) wearing the insignia of a Chinese official. The interpreter, Mr. Cordes, was at the same time seriously wounded, but succeeded in escaping to the American Methodist Mission compound, which was guarded by American marines. Two mafocs accompanied the baron, one of whom immediately ran to the Tsungli Yamen and returned with some of the secretaries to the place, to find the official chairs demolished but the minister's body taken away. 174

Mr. Conger's message stated also that the body was found on August 16, and "buried in a rough coffin near where he fell, and today (August 17) was decently interred in the German legation".

Another authoritative report of the murder of Ketteler was written by Herr Cordes, interpreter for the German legation. He stated that the two sedan chairs had just passed a small police station on the main street on the way to the yamen when he glanced to the left and saw a Chinese soldier in uniform, with his rifle at his shoulders and with it following the movements of the envoy's chair and evidently aiming at his head. Herr Cordes shouted a warning

and at the same time the soldier fired, killing the envoy instantly. The chairs were dropped by the frightened bearers, and Herr Cordes started upright and was then severely wounded in the thigh which had been brought to the level formerly occupied by his head. He ran away through side streets, followed by many shots, but not actively pursued, and escaped to the American party in the Methodist mission, where his wounds were attended to.¹⁷⁵

The murder was committed by Enhai, a Manchu bannerman, who reported his own act and for it claimed a special promotion.¹⁷⁶ After the siege he was arrested by the Japanese, tried by the Germans and executed. The baron's body was carried into the yamen and there was placed in a coffin by order of Yuen Chang, and buried hastily.¹⁷⁷ It was exhumed on August 16 and decently buried the next day in the German legation.

175. Herr Cordes' own narrative, cited in Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol. III, p. 223.

176. Memorial to throne from censorate; Bland and Backhouse, Empress Dowager, p. 305, cited in Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol. III, p. 223.

177. Ching Shan Diary, June 20th, p. 271.

Similar to the report of the "Peking massacre", the murder of Baron von Ketteler found wide variations in all sections of the world. And it was only on September 14, three months after Mr. Morrison's last message before the siege, that the facts were known in London.

On the same day, June 18, that the news of the destruction of the Peking legations was circulated in Berlin, the news that the "German minister has been killed" was made known. This report was circulated by Laffan's News Agency dated June 16 from Hongkong. 178

The "Times" correspondent at Paris reported that a despatch from Hongkong states that "the assassination of the German at Peking...is not generally accredited..." Reuter's correspondent at Paris also sent a despatch on the same day saying that "a telegram from the French consul at Hongkong received today makes no mention of the alleged murder of the

178. Times, June 18, 1900 .

German minister...." ¹⁷⁹ From St. Petersburg
 Reuter's correspondent reported that the Russian
 government has received no confirmation of the
 alleged murder of the German minister. ¹⁸⁰

Dalziel's Agency at Shanghai sent on the
 same day the following despatch: "...The position in
 Peking is precarious. The Chinese here persistently
 assert that a foreign minister and many foreigners
 have been killed...." But another message from
 Berlin Reuter's office said that "the German consul
 at Chifu telegraphs this morning that the latest
 news received there by steamer made no mention
 whatsoever of the reported...murder of the German
 minister..." ¹⁸¹

The following day nothing definite was
 known in Berlin about the fate of the German
 minister. The "Times" correspondent wired on June
 18 that "...there was no confirmation of the report
 circulated by Laffan's Agency...nor had any official

179. Times, June 18, 1900.

180. Times, June 18, 1900.

181. Times, June 18, 1900.

report of a similar nature been received in London.¹⁸²
 The following day another report was sent by the correspondent saying that "...nothing is known of the fate of the German minister in Peking" and added that "gloomy apprehensions appear to be universally entertained...." ¹⁸³

From Vienna the "Times" correspondent reported, on June 21, that despatches arriving there revealed the "situation in China is growing worse" but added that the report representing "the foreign minister in Peking to have been murdered..a possible garbled and exaggerated version...."¹⁸⁴

Reuter's correspondent reported from Shanghai on the same day that the absence of news from Peking was "looked upon as ominous" and that "grave fears still exist for the safety of the capital." ¹⁸⁵

In Yokohama the "rumors circulated...of the murder of foreign ministers in Peking" were generally

182. Times, June 19, 1900.

183. Times, June 20, 1900.

184. Times, June 22, 1900.

185. Times, June 23, 1900.

viewed with suspicion, according to a despatch sent by Reuter's to London.¹⁸⁶

While grave fears and gloomy apprehensions were being entertained in European capitals, the "Times" correspondent at Berlin three days later sent a despatch saying that the Chinese minister informed the German foreign office that "the German minister is well and safe..."¹⁸⁷

The next day Reuter's Berlin correspondent reported that "the reassuring communication from the Chinese minister here that the German minister in Peking is safe is hardly treated seriously..."¹⁸⁸ While official Chinese assurances were being circulated in Shanghai, Berlin, and London other surprising reports mentioned that the "foreign ministers had left Peking" for Tientsin.¹⁸⁹

On June 28 "official" reports were received in Berlin giving a hopeful picture of the previous reports. The "Times" correspondent reported that

186. Times, June 22, 1900.

187. Times, June 25, 1900.

188. Times, June 27, 28, 29, 1900.

189. Times, June 29, 1900.

Admiral Bendemann, German commander of the German cruiser squadron at Taku wired on June 26 that the "ministers of the Powers are with the landing corps". But it is apparent that the German admiral failed to mention whether the German minister was with the landing corps. On the same day there appeared on the streets of Berlin a special news sheet announcing that "according to official telegram received here and in St. Petersburg...the foreign ministers from Peking, among them the German minister Baron von Ketteler...are also now in Tientsin." ¹⁹⁰

Reuter's correspondent at New York wired to London that Wu Ting-fang, Chinese minister at Washington, had given Mr. Hay a telegram received from Li Hung-chang at Canton, dated June 28. The telegram said that the "legation ministers having left Peking, are now 12 miles from Tientsin with Seymour"¹⁹¹. But again, this telegram failed to mention anything about the German minister.

However, the same day that these encouraging

190. Times, June 29, 1900.

191. Times, June 29, 1900.

reports were published in the "Times" there also appeared a less uncertain report from the Shanghai correspondent which said that "...nothing definite is known of the whereabouts of the foreign ministers".¹⁹²

On July 1 the "Times" published a despatch dated June 27 received from a Shanghai correspondent which said that "official information confirms the news that the German minister was murdered by native troops on June 18".¹⁹³ In the same issue were two other reports from Reuter's correspondent at Shanghai. One said that the "German minister was attacked at Peking while on his way to the Tsungli Yamen where he died from injuries he had received". The other stated that the British consul at Chifu telegraphed that "the German minister in Peking was murdered by native troops on June 18..."¹⁹⁴

In Rome the Italian foreign office received a despatch from the cruiser Elba, at Taku, dated June 30, which said that the "German minister in Peking

192. Times, June 29, 1900.

193. Times, July 1, 1900.

194. Times, July 1, 1900.

reports that all legations have been burned except the English, French and German..." apparently indicating that the German minister was still living at that date.¹⁹⁵

In Paris the correspondent of the "Times" reported that "the news of the assassination of the German minister in Peking has arrived tonight and created a painful sensation".¹⁹⁶

Another report from Berlin reaching London said that the German foreign office had received a message from the German consul at Chifu which said: "Our minister in Peking murdered on June 18th." ¹⁹⁷ The message also added that a messenger from Peking sent by a missionary reported that Minister von Ketteler was murdered "on his way to the Tsungli Yamen..." ¹⁹⁸

On July 2 Reuter's correspondent sent the

195. Times, July 1, 1900.

196. Times, July 1, 1900.

197. Times, July 3, 1900.

198. Times, July 3, 1900.

following message:

Vice-admiral Bendemann sends from Taku, June 30 a telegram: 'German legations in Peking besieged...learned from bearer of letter that on June 16th the German minister while proceeding from the legations to the Chinese government buildings without a military escort, was attacked by Chinese troops wounded in four places and died in government buildings.....'

This message went on to say that the "confirmation" of the "death" of the German minister in Peking was received in Berlin with "indignation". It is felt, the message continued, that the honor of Germany is now engaged in an eminent degree and at all cost the German Empire must "see the matter through". 199

When these "official" reports were being published in Europe Reuter's Chifu correspondent gives a "detailed" picture of the aftermath saying in a despatch dated July 3 that "the body of the German minister in Peking was rescued by German soldiers who burned the Tsungli Yamen".²⁰⁰

The "Times" on July 6 published the

199. Times, July 3, 1900.

200. Times, July 5, 1900.

"horrifying" report of the general massacre in Peking, which apparently included the German minister, if he was still alive, and this news was received through Reuter's Agency at Shanghai. Taking on "good authority" from three Chinese who were in the service of foreigners in Peking and who escaped from the capital, this correspondent communicated their statements that "...all the foreigners, to the number of 1000, including 400 soldiers, and 100 members of the Chinese customs staff, held out in the British legation until ammunition and food were exhausted. The legation was burned and all the foreigners were killed..." 201

The first correct date of the murder of the German minister at Peking was published in the "Times" on July 7. The report was communicated from Berlin by a correspondent who said:

German consul at Tientsin telegraphed July 1--'An authentic letter dated June 20 from the British minister in Peking, Sir Claude MacDonald, to the British consul here'. It confirms the news that the German minister Baron von Ketteler, was shot on June 20 by Chinese soldiers on his way to the Tsungli Yamen...he (British minister) thinks the Baron was

201. Times, July 6, 1900.

202
killed on the spot but his body has not been found..

Another report from Tientsin came through Reuter's Agency supporting the above despatch. It said: "Two carriers arrived from Peking..They confirmed the report of the murder of the German minister..." 203

Nothing further was reported from July 12 to July 23 concerning the fate of the German minister. During this time conflicting reports of the "Peking massacre" kept reaching the European press. Another confirmation, however, regarding the German minister was published in the "Times" again on July 23. This despatch was communicated from Washington dated July 21, which said that Wu Ting-fang presented a telegram received from Sheng stating that "the German minister was killed by anarchists" and that "measures are being taken to punish the guilty parties...."204

Further Chinese acknowledgement of the death of the German minister was received from Shanghai on the same day. The "Times" correspondent said that

202. Times, July 7, 1900.

203. Times, July 10, 1900.

204. Times, July 23, 1900.

the text of the Imperial edict received at Shanghai from Peking dated July 18 states that "...all ministers, with the exception of Baron von Ketteler, are safe".

From Rome came a semi-confidential message from the "Times" correspondent who wired to London on July 24 saying that he had learned that the ministers are safe and that the Italian consul at Hongkong sent a message to Rome which said in part: "...on the 18th instant the Peking ministers were adequately protected by the Chinese government. All except Ketteler were safe." 205

Three days later Laffan's Agency at Washington reported that a telegram had been received from Sheng at Shanghai dated July 27 saying that an imperial decree issued three days ago announced the safety of the foreign representatives "with the exception of Baron von Ketteler...." 206

No further developments in the reports of the murder of the German minister at Peking appeared

205. Times, July 25, 1900.

206. Times, July 28, 1900.

in the "Times" till August 1. The despatch that was published came out to Peking during the truce and was sent to London by Laffan's Agency on July 27. Referring to the German minister the despatch said that individual messages state that "...On June 19th the Tsungli Yamen broke off relations and on June 20 China declared war. The German ambassador, Baron von Ketteler, and Mr. Francis James, an English professor were murdered..."²⁰⁷ It is queer to say that of all the despatches published in the "Times" regarding the murder, not one of them had previously mentioned a "Mr. Francis James".

All through the month of August nothing further was published about the reports of the death of Baron von Ketteler. It was apparent that the outside world accepted his death report as certain. After August 14 when the legations were relieved, the first news concerning the German minister was published in the "Times" August 30. This despatch was sent by Reuter's correspondent at Peking dated August 18 four days after the allied troop's entry

207. Times, August 1, 1900.

into the Chinese capital. It said:

Baron von Ketteler's body was found.....
it shows that the story told by the Tsungli Yamen
that it had been carefully deposited in a house
and looked after, like most of the statements made
by the Chinese, was absolutely false....208

On September 4 the "Times" published a
story sent from a Berlin correspondent which said:
"Herr von Below telegraphed from Peking August 18:
'The body of Ketteler was found the day before yester-
day (August 16), and was buried today in the grounds
of the legation.' " 209

Reuter's correspondent at Peking sent the
last story concerning the German minister's murder.
It was dated September 7 and was published in London
one week later. It said;

The Japanese have arrested assassin of
Baron von Ketteler, the German minister. He confessed
his guilt and has been delivered to the German
commander. The murderer was arrested while trying to
sell an initialed watch to a Japanese officer. At first,
he only admitted having taken away the body, but
subsequently confessed that he was the murderer and
that the Imperial authorities had ordered the murder. 210

208. Times, August 30, 1900.

209. Times, September 4, 1900.

210. Times, September 14, 1900.

PART IV

ADMIRAL SEYMOUR AND THE RELIEF FORCE

Admiral Seymour's international relief force, including 2066 men, started from Tientsin for Peking on June 10.²¹¹ But they never reached Peking.

At Yangtsun, a city twenty miles from Tientsin he met the forces of General Nieh, where the international forces "exchanged friendly greetings".²¹² They continued on up the Peking-Tientsin railway line and reached Langfang, forty miles from Tientsin on June 12. Here they were attacked by Boxers for several days while they attempted to repair the railway. The advance was brought to a standstill and was "isolated with no transport or means to advance, and cut off from our base behind".²¹³

The international force was absolutely blocked on June 16. They decided to retreat back to Tientsin, and there, if possible, to organize an advance by river. The expedition was held at Langfang till June 25 when it was relieved by a body of troops, chiefly Russian, from Tientsin.

211. U.S. For.Rel., 1900, p.151.

212. Seymour, My Naval Career, p.344, in Morse, Int.Rel. of the Chi.Emp., Vol.III, p.213.

213. Ibid, p.346 cited in ibid, p.213.

They all returned to Tientsin on June 26 with 62 killed and 238 wounded.²¹⁴

The following are excerpts from the "London Times" beginning from June 14, regarding Seymour's relief expedition.

The "Times" published a message from the foreign office at London saying that the international forces under the British Admiral found the Boxers in considerable strength near the railroad at Langfang on June 11 and engaged them. The Boxers fled leaving about 35 killed. The official announcement added that all the Tientsin wires were cut.²¹⁵

Reuter's correspondent "with the foreign expeditionary forces" sent a message from Tientsin on June 11 and June 12 that 2000 men were with Admiral Seymour to reopen Peking.²¹⁶

On June 21 the "Times" published a telegram received from a correspondent at Shanghai dated June 20. It said: "A despatch by Sheng's Courier Service

214. Savage Landor, China and the Allies, Vol. I, p.

85-111.

215. Times, June 14, 1900.

216. Times, June 14, 1900.

confirms the statement that Admiral Seymour's force arrived in Peking on the 17th...." Other reports from Chinese sources credited by the foreign officials at Shanghai stated that Admiral Seymour, with the foreign expedition forces had reached Peking. The message added that the foreign officials at Shanghai were "totally ignorant" of affairs in the north and that there is practically no trustworthy postal news.²¹⁷

While Admiral Seymour was reported to have made his "triumphant" entrance into Peking another report published on the following day said that Admiral Seymour had been killed. But the correspondent of the "Times" at Vienna added that the report "is possibly a garbled and exaggerated version", while the Reuter's Agency at Yokohama reported that the rumor of the death of Admiral Seymour is generally "viewed with suspicion".²¹⁸

Five days later the "Times" published a despatch from a correspondent at Berlin dated June 26. It reported that German official telegrams

217. Times, June 21, 1900.

218. Times, June 22, 1900.

reported that the German consul at Chifu said that Admiral Seymour was "20 kilometers distance from Tientsin" and that "the ministers of the Powers were with him" and that he was "hard pressed by the Boxers and by Chinese troops".²¹⁹ But from the Imperial governor of Kiaochau a message dated June 25 said that according to Chinese accounts "Admiral Seymour has arrived in Peking".²²⁰ This "message" did not give the date Admiral Seymour "arrived" in the Chinese capital. These two telegrams are not reconcilable since the admiral must doubtless have entered Peking first before he could succeed in bringing away the diplomatic representatives. The Berlin correspondent further stated that anxiety continues to be felt regarding the diplomatic corps in Peking and of Admiral Seymour's expedition, but that reports show that Admiral Seymour, with "2500 men" representing all nationalities, left Tientsin on the 10th and reached Langfang two days later and

&

219. Times, June 27, 1900.

220. Times, June 27, 1900.

has not been heard of since then.²²¹

According to reports appearing in the "Times" on June 28, it was uncertain whether the international forces were in Peking or still blocked at Langfang. The London Foreign office received a telegram from W.R. Carles, consul at Tientsin, which was not dated and forwarded from Chifu on June 27. Referring to the relief column it said: "Admiral Seymour is believed to be at Pei-tsang, about nine miles to the north of Tientsin."²²²

The second report appearing in the same issue of the "Times" was communicated from Berlin on June 27. It said that a telegram from the German consul at Chifu stated: "Admiral Seymour's forces have been surrounded 14 kilometers from Tientsin, 62 of his troops have been killed and 200 wounded; he is very hard pressed by the enemy..and..asks for 2000 men..."²²³

The third report came from Reuter's Agency at Washington dated on the same day. It said that a telegram had been received from Kempff at Chifu. It

221. Times, June 27, 1900.

222. Times, June 28, 1900.

223. Times, June 28, 1900.

said: "Peking foreign ministers and guards reported to be with Peking relief expedition intrenched eight miles from Tientsin..." 224

On June 29 the "Times" published the following reports regarding the conditions of the international forces. The four reports do not agree.

Reuter's correspondent at Chifu reported on June 28 that "Admiral Seymour has been relieved. He failed to establish communications with Peking."

Reuter's St. Petersburg correspondent sent on the same day the following report, being a telegram received at the ministry of war from Vice-admiral Alexieff, via Port Arthur. It stated:

During the night between the 25th and 26th instant, a detachment consisting of four companies of Russians under the command of Lieutenant-Colonel Schrinisky, and the same number of foreigners, relieved Admiral Seymour and brought 200 wounded from his forces to Tientsin. 225

The following report on the same subject, which is supposed to be "official" is entirely without foundation and untrue. It was transmitted to London

224. Times, June 28, 1900.

225. Times, June 29, 1900.

by a correspondent at Berlin on June 28. It is part of a telegram sent by Admiral Bendemann, commander of the German cruiser squadron at Taku sent on June 26. It says: "Ministers of the Powers are with landing corps..." A second report sent by the correspondent is taken from a special news sheet appearing in Berlin on the same day he sent his above despatch. It says:

According to official telegram received here and in St. Petersburg, Admiral Seymour has been relieved and is now in Tientsin. The foreign ministers from Peking, among them the German minister, Baron von Ketteler, were in Admiral Seymour's camp, and are also now in Tientsin..226

From New York Reuter reports that Wu Ting-fang has given Mr. Hay a telegram received from China dated June 28. It says that "the legation ministers having left Peking, are now 12 miles from Tientsin with Seymour". 227

The "Times" correspondent at Shanghai wired the following message: "A telegram from the British consul at Chifu states that Admiral Seymour has been relieved and has returned to Tientsin." 228

226. Times, June 29, 1900.

227. Times, June 30, 1900.

228. Times, June 30, 1900.

Other "reliable" reports were published in the "Times" on June 30. The "Times" correspondent at New York reported on June 29 that the telegram received from Admiral Kempff at Washington says, "Peking relief expedition now in Tientsin with 300 sick and wounded. Ministers and Peking party not with them. No news from them." 229

In Berlin news was that the relief party had been rescued but nothing was certain as to the actual conditions. The "Times" correspondent communicated a telegram from the German consul at Chifu received in Berlin which says: "Seymour relieved. No further details and nothing to show whether the foreign ministers are with him...." 230

The London war office received the following telegram from Colonel Dorward, at Chifu dated June 28: "Seymour relieved. All British troops now in Tientsin." Another telegram from the British consul at Tientsin dated June 29 to the foreign office said: "Admiral Seymour and his forces reached Tientsin June 26
231
together with the force which had gone to his relief."

229. Times, June 30, 1900.

230. Times, June 30, 1900.

231. Times, June 30, 1900.

PART V

CHINESE AID AND LEGATIONS' FOOD PROBLEM

As early as November 11, 1899, the Tsungli Yamen had received communications from the legations calling on the Imperial government to protect the missionaries and foreigners whose lives and property were threatened in the provinces of Shantung and Chihli. And for the following six months similar notices were sent by the envoys to the Imperial court.²³² But in spite of the assurances of the Chinese administration in the form of imperial decrees and proclamations, already-chaotic conditions continued to grow worse.

The first joint diplomatic note was presented by the foreign envoys at Peking to the imperial government on May 21, 1900. In this note the ministers demanded the Chinese officials take strict measures to suppress the rioters and Boxers, and concluding their six points, the note added that the diplomatic corps "expects a satisfactory reply to

232. U.S. For. Rel., 1900, p.78.

this demand without unnecessary delay".²³³

On May 24, 29 and 30, other imperial decrees were promulgated with orders given to "act immediately and vigorously arrest the leaders and chiefs, and disperse the followers of the Boxers" and to protect the mission chapels.²³⁴

Monseigneur Favier, vicar-apostolic of Peking, wrote on May 28 that the foreigners "may expect the worst" and attributed the "anti-Christian" movement to Prince Tuan who with the old Chinese party and high personages were thoroughly ignorant of European affairs and hated the Europeans and the Christian religion.²³⁵ Mr. Conger whose letter dated at Peking on June 11 informed the State Department that the Chinese government had done nothing toward suppressing the Boxers except to send their friends out to parley with them. He added that Prince Tuan the anti-foreign leader was appointed president of the Tsungli Yamen on June 10, and that "no reliance could be placed on the Chinese soldiers".²³⁶ Four

233. U.S. For. Rel., 1900, p.129.

234. Ibid., p.132

235. Times, July 19, 1900.

236. U.S. For. Rel., 1900, p.144-145.

days later he wrote another letter informing the State Department that there was "no visible effort being made by the government in any to restrain" the rioting in Peking. 237

When the siege started on June 20 rifles of the Chinese troops were used for the first time on the legations,²³⁸ and the foreign colony was completely besieged by the "imperial army". However, after that date it was difficult to distinguish between a Boxer and a soldier. The Tsungli Yamen, all along, has charged all the trouble on the mob, bad Boxers and brigands, and it was likely that Boxers joined the imperial troops in the attacks but if so, "they donned the army uniform and carried the imperial arm". 239

During this period the conflicting reports of the Chinese government giving protection and supplies to the besieged legations appeared in the "Times". Mr. Conger three days after the lifting of the siege submitted a report to the State Department in which he said:

237. Ibid, p.154.

238. Morse, Int.Rel. of the Chi.Emo., Vol.III, p.233.

239. U.S. For.Rel., 1900, p.164-165.

The Chinese government was pretending to us and proclaiming to the world that they were 'protecting' us, when in fact if a thousandth part of the shots fired at us by their soldiers had taken effect we would all have been killed a long time ago. It is understood also, that they represented abroad that they were 'provisioning' us. They did send us on two occasions a few small watermelons, cucumbers, and egg plant, and on another three sacks of flour, but nothing more. We tried to establish a market where under a flag of truce, we might purchase a few eggs and some fruit or fresh meat. They consented, but the firing of their soldiers prevented it. 240

Sir Robert Hart, who was besieged in the legations, wrote after the foreigners were relieved that the provisions so ostentatiously advertised abroad would not have sufficed for one day's maintenance of the beleaguered throng.

From an inquiry made it was evident it had everywhere been given out that the government was both protecting and provisioning the legations. We had always feared some such assurances would be our ruin, but fortunately for us the telegram of Mr. Conger exploded this idea, and the governments concerned woke up to the fact that their representatives were in danger. 241

At a time during the siege the people in Europe believed the legationers were on the verge of starvation and various reports as to the amount

240. U.S. For.Rel., 1900, p.166.

241. Hart, These from the Land of Sinim, .37-38.

of ammunition and provisions they had left. Mr. Conger sent a telegram to Mr. Hay dated July 21 from Peking that they had "enough provisions; little ammunition",²⁴² Another telegram was received from Mr. Conger dated August 3 saying they have "but little provisions or ammunition".²⁴³ Six days later another message announced they "have reached half portion of horse flesh and have food for only a fortnight".²⁴⁴ In his report to the State Department after the relief forces entered Peking Mr. Conger said:

Stores of wheat, rice and coal found within our lines were quickly gathered into a general commissariat which, with such canned goods as we had in store, together with all our riding horses and cart mules, have furnished us a substantial if not a very palatable subsistence since.²⁴⁵

Further evidence of the attitude of the Chinese government was discovered after the relief and was communicated to the State Department by Mr. Conger. On September 3 he wrote:

That the Throne indorsed and encouraged the Boxers in their attacks against foreigners, organized them, placed princes and ministers in command of them, paid them, exhorted them, extolled them and made common cause with them is abundantly confirmed by the Imperial decrees transmitted in my despatch No. 395 of August 17, and is therefore responsible for the whole movement and its results.²⁴⁶

²⁴² U.S. For. Rel., 1900, p.56.

243. Ibid, p.157.

244. Ibid, p.159.

245. Ibid, p.164.

246. Ibid, p.190.

But following this passage Mr. Conger seems to believe that there was some element in the Chinese administration that was trying to help the beleaguered foreigners. He adds:

At first, under the advice of some of the more conservative and enlightened ministers, the Empress Dowager was rather inclined to suppress the Boxers, but later, especially after the repulse of Admiral Seymour and Captain McCalla, and the partial defeat of our troops at Tientsin, she was encouraged by Prince Tuan...and others, and was thereafter controlled by them...Prince Ching seeing that he was powerless, did not too strongly oppose Prince Tuan, and survived.

.....

We did not witness during the siege, nor have we been able to discover since our relief, any evidence whatever that since June 20 the Chinese government ever made one single effort in our defense or antagonistic to the Boxers in any way. All its endeavors through its ministers abroad to make the world believe that it did were basest hypocrisy. 247

The first report about Chinese authorities suppressing the Boxer movement appeared in the "Times" on May 28. This bit of encouraging news came, according to Reuter's correspondent at Shanghai, from "purely Chinese source" which said that "the government is making some attempt to check the

247. Ibid, p.191.

movement in Peking..." 248 But three days later Dalziel's Agency reported that the Imperial edict "does not disapprove openly of the horrible campaign which is being waged against foreigners and native Christians..." 249

But when the first group of foreign guards arrived in Peking at the request of the envoys the "Times" correspondent reported on June 1 that "the gates were kept open, the streets were orderly, and every facility was given by the Chinese government". 250 On the same day Reuter's correspondent reported that "the presence of foreign troops has already produced a markedly good effect, and the bearing of the Chinese towards foreigners is much better than has been the case during the last few days." 251

On June 15 the "Times" published a report from Shanghai saying that "a courier from Peking arrived at Langfang to see the expeditionary force.

248. Times, May 28, 1900.

249. Times, May 31, 1900.

250. Times, June 2, 1900.

251. Times, June 4, 1900.

He states General Tung Fu-hsiang intends to oppose our entry into Peking..and is guarding the south gate with 10,000 troops..and Boxers are not far from here".²⁵²

While these alarming reports seem to indicate that the whole Chinese empire was fermenting with a nation-wide anti-foreign movement, the Nanking viceroy addressed a strongly worded memorial by telegraph to the Throne urging "the suppression of the anti-foreign movement....." This message, which came from Shanghai, added that a similar memorial was despatched by the viceroy of Wuchang, and both vice-roys have issued stringent orders to their provincial officials to maintain law and order.²⁵³

On June 18 the "Times" published another despatch from Shanghai, this one from Dalziel's Agency, which said that "Chinese troops are openly cooperating everywhere with the Boxers". Reuter's correspondent at Berlin warned that "the attitude of the Chinese troops towards the Boxers is uncertain".²⁵⁴

252. Times, June 15, 1900.

253. Times, June 18, 1900.

254. Times, June 18, 1900.

The following eleven days the "Times" was overflowing with conflicting reports of the murder of the German minister and the destruction of the legations. And while Europe was wondering with bewilderment, the London foreign office received a telegram from the Nanking viceroy communicated to the acting British consul at Shanghai. It read: "Foreign legations in Peking continue as usual to receive every protection from the Imperial government."²⁵⁵

In central China the Chinese viceroys did not want to share the responsibilities of the North and published a proclamation which was transmitted from Paris to London on June 30. It says: "We, the viceroy of Nanking, Liu Kun-yi, and the vice-roy of Hu Kwang, Chang Chi-tung, arranged with the foreign consuls at Shanghai the following stipulations..." to protect the lives and property of the missionaries and of foreign and Chinese tradespeople. They further pledged to protect the people in the region of the Yangtze and the ports of Fuchau and Hangchau.²⁵⁶

255. Times, June 29, 1900.

256. Times, June 30, 1900.

A startling report was communicated to London by the "Times" correspondent at Shanghai that a message from Yung-lu urged the speedy advance of foreign troops and added that the position of Peking was critical and that the soldiers were rioting in the streets. The report further said "Sheng confirmed the message of Friday that Prince Tuan was dictating violent anti-foreign policy assisted by 15,000 troops under Tung Fu-hsiang in Peking and General Nieh at Tientsin and the Boxers." 257

The following day another message from Shanghai reported that the edict issued in Peking June 26 "commands other provinces to enroll Boxers and troops to assist in the expulsion of the foreigners". 258

Another Chinese official, Governor Yuan Shi-kai of Shantung, according to the "Times" Berlin correspondent, gave his assurance to the German Emperor saying that "from the outset I have been full of anxiety..and have made repeated attempts to send messengers and to get help to them, but in vain..I shall consider it my duty to do my utmost for their help..". 259

257. Times, July 1, 1900.

258. Times, July 4, 1900.

259. Times, July 8, 1900.

From Brussels Reuter's Agency reported that a Chinese newspaper states that Prince Ching's troops have arrived at Peking to defend the Europeans against the rebels.²⁶⁰ On the same day the "London admiralty received a telegram from Rear-admiral Bruce at Taku dated July 7, 4 p.m. which said: "There are grounds for hoping Prince Ching with his army at Peking is protecting the legations against Prince Tuan and his army and the Boxers." ²⁶¹

In Brussels another Chinese assurance was received from Shanghai on July 8. The "Times" correspondent's despatch said:

According to high Chinese official.... the loyal troops under the command of Prince Ching are stated to have attacked the rebels at Peking... a Chinese journal confirms the report that Prince Ching has set on foot a counter-revolution at Peking. ²⁶²

From Reuter's Washington office came the report that Wu Ting-fang had received a telegram from Sheng at Shanghai dated July 8 which said that:

...The Imperial troops are protecting the legations but meet with difficulty in doing so.....Prince Ching, who is said to be defending

260. Times, July 10, 1900.

261. Times, July 10, 1900.

262. Times, July 9, 1900.

the legations in Peking against Prince Tuan, is in command of the Manchu garrison which numbers about 10,000. 263

Tientsin's Reuter correspondent reported on July 1 a despatch which was published in the "Times" ten days later, that "two carriers arrived from Peking today. They confirmed the report that Prince Ching is doing his utmost to protect the foreigners, but native feeling is strong against them...." 264

On July 12 the "Times" published the following assurances, one coming from China and the other coming indirectly from Washington to London. The "Times" correspondent at Shanghai wired on July 10 to the effect that a Chinese paper published an imperial edict dated July 7 exonerating the Chinese government from all blame for the present situation, alleging it was due to the misguided action of the foreign powers, and the Chinese ministers abroad are directed to convey an intimation in this sense to the foreign powers to which they are accredited.

Reuter's correspondent at Washington reported on July 11 that Wu Ting-fang had delivered a copy of a telegram from the Imperial government to Mr. Hay.

263. Times, July 10, 1900.

264. Times, July 10, 1900.

The communication disclaims responsibility on the part of the Chinese government for the Boxer troubles and asserting that the engagement at Tientsin was the direct result of the bombardment of the Taku forts. Similar telegrams were sent to all governments. The imperial decree also referred to the permission given by the Chinese government for the foreign troops to enter Peking to protect the legations, showing clearly "how much care China exercised in the maintenance of friendly relations". It added that the foreign troops did not devote themselves exclusively to the protection of the legations, but sometimes patrolled the streets, and everywhere there were reports of persons being hit by stray bullets, and of these foreign soldiers strolling about the city without sign of restraint thus provoking the resentment among the Chinese soldiers and citizens. As a consequence the lawless took advantage of the situation to do mischief by burning and killing the Christian converts. The decree states further that after "considering the matter from every point of view", it was decided as a precautionary measure to request the foreign minister to retire temporarily to Tientsin for safety. But while this proposal was

under discussion a riotous mob assassinated the German minister, Baron von Ketteler, who on the previous day had written appointing a time for calling on the Tsungli Yamen. The latter, fearing that His Excellency might be molested en route, did not give its consent to the appointment.

The anarchist had now become bolder and more threatening, the decree went on to say, and it was consequently deemed unwise to carry out the project of sending the foreign diplomats to Tientsin under escort. However, the troops protecting them were ordered to keep a stricter watch and to take greater precautions against any emergency. Referring to the Taku incident of June 16-17, the decree says that the foreign officers actually fired on the forts and thus the conflict began, but the initiative did not come from the Chinese side. "Even supposing" the decree continued, "that China was unconscious of her true conditions how could she take such a step as to engage a war with all the Powers simultaneously." The Chinese ministers are to assure the respective countries to which they are accredited that the military are still enjoined to protect the legations to the utmost. The anarchist will be severely dealt with as

circumstances permit, the decree concluded.²⁶⁵

Another "floating rumor" was picked up from the native press by the "Times" correspondent at Shanghai on July 13 and sent to London. It indicates that there are two parties in the Chinese administration, apparently conflicting over the problem of "protection" of the legations. It says:

It is alleged that information has been brought to Tsinanfu by courier from Peking July 7 stating that Gen. Nieh, who at the time of the outbreak of the disturbances at Tientsin was re-proved by the throne for firing on the Boxers, reached Peking with 9000 men after a long detour to the northeast, having defeated a force of Prince Tuan's followers east of Tung-chau. He is stated to be now supporting the party of Prince Ching and Yung-lu in the suppression of the Boxers whose members have been greatly reduced in the protection of the legations. 266

Mr. Wu Ting-fang received another message from the viceroys at Nanking and Wuchang and Sheng dated July 16 of further Chinese assurances. It was published in the "Times" July 18. It says: "The utmost efforts have been made to protect the foreign ministers who were well on July 13 Chinese calendar, corresponding with the 9th in the Gregorian calendar..."²⁶⁷

265. Times, July 12, 1900.

266. Times, July 14, 1900.

267. Times, July 18, 1900.

A message dated July 21 at Shanghai was communicated to London by the Indo-European Telegraph saying that it is alleged that an edict has been received at Shanghai calling for the protection of Christians. It adds in an uncertain tone that "if it is genuine it confirms the view that the Dowager is anxious to conciliate the Powers".²⁶⁸

From St. Petersburg the "Times" correspondent said that:

We learn from a private message from Shanghai dated July 21 that the professed object of Li Hung-chang's mission to Tientsin is to try his utmost to place Imperial Chinese troops alongside of those of the Allied powers for the purpose of cooperating with them in the repression of the Boxer movement.²⁶⁹

Further news that the Chinese troops were opposing the Boxers appeared in the "Times" on July 25. This came from Reuter's Tientsin correspondent and was dated July 19. "Chinese arriving here from neighboring country report that the Imperial troops are killing the Boxers wherever they see them, giving as their reasons that the Boxers deceived them into embarking on a hopeless struggle". The next day another

268. Times, July, 23, 1900.

269. Times, July 24, 1900.

despatch, published in the same issue of the "Times" said: "A considerable amount of fighting had taken place between the Boxers and the Chinese soldiers in Peking." A third message came from Reuter's Taku correspondent two days later which said that "General Li, commanding the Pei-tang forts near Taku, informs British officers that a few Chinese princes were desirous of protecting the foreigners but they were in a minority".²⁷⁰

On July 16 Reuter's correspondent at Tientsin sent another despatch, which was published in London ten days later. It said that "the Chinese troops and the Boxers are now enemies, the former being enraged against the rebels for having drawn them into a disastrous fight".²⁷¹

On July 30 the "Times" published a message circulated by Laffan's Agency at Tientsin dated July 24 saying that "an imperial edict was issued commanding all persons to protect foreigners".²⁷² In the same issue a message from Berlin received from

270. Times, July 25, 1900.

271. Times, July 26, 1900.

272. Times, July 30, 1900.

Tientsin stated that the Empress Dowager had issued an edict "ordering the bombardment to be entirely stopped". 273

Some writers have severely criticized the Chinese ministers abroad, particularly Wu Ting-fang, Chinese envoy at Washington, for having made efforts to minimize the effect on Western nations of the actual conditions of the besieged legations and foreigners in Peking. These ministers were under the instructions of the Chinese government at Peking and executed their work according to the instructions they received. During this time all the so-called assurances which reached them, and disbelieved by the press and foreign governments, were communicated to the executive of the country to which they were accredited. From June 22 to November 28 all the reports Wu Ting-fang transmitted to the State Department came from his home government and were subsequently, as it is the duty of any foreign minister, communicated to Mr. Hay.

The confirmation of the genuineness of Mr. Conger's much-discussed cipher telegram of July 16,

273. Times, July 31, 1900.

which caused the whole world to doubt its authenticity, received from Mr. Fowler vindicated the good faith of the Chinese officials concerned in the transmission of the message.²⁷⁴

The reports regarding the food supplies and ammunition which were published in the "London Times" were just as conflicting and unfounded as the other reports concerning the legationers.

Laffan's Agency at Tientsin sent a message on July 27 during the truce saying that individual messages state that the foreign colony had "plenty of food, rice and horses...." Another message reported that the "provisions are still sufficient and the hospital arrangements are excellent".²⁷⁵

Mr. Morrison's first direct despatch to the "Times" after June 14, dated July 21 was published in London on August 2. It said that the "supplies are beginning to come in, and the conditions of the siege are improving" and added that "the members of the legations and their families are in good health....."²⁷⁶

274. U.S. For. Rel., 1900, p.282.

275. Times, August 1, 1900.

276. Times, August 2, 1900.

From Reuter's Yokohama correspondent came a message dated July 13 saying that the Japanese commander at Tientsin telegraphed his home government that he had received a despatch from the officer in charge of the Japanese legation dated July 22, stating that the "legations were provided for about one week longer".²⁷⁷

A different story, however, was presented by Sir Claude MacDonald's despatch of July 21 communicated by the "Times" correspondent at Tientsin. It said in a more hopeful tone that "...We have provisions for many weeks, but little amunition."²⁷⁸

From Washington Reuter's correspondent sent a despatch saying that Mr. Fowler, United States consul at Chifu, had received word from the governor of Shantung asking him to inform Mr. Hay that a telegram from the Tsungli Yamen dated July 30 stated that "provisions were frequently sent" into the legations.²⁷⁹

A communication on the same subject was received at the London foreign office through the

277. Times, August 2, 1900.

278. Times, August 3, 1900

279. Times, August 4, 1900.

Exchange Telegraph Company and published in the "Times" August 7, stated that a message had been received from the Tsungli Yamen saying that "supply of vegetables and other foodstuffs has been repeatedly made to the legations...." ²⁸⁰ On the same day the "Times" correspondent at Shanghai reported that the British consul at Tientsin was informed by a Japanese colleague that the "Tsungli Yamen had ceased providing the legations with supplies on July 28...." ²⁸¹

The next day Reuter's reported from Brussels that the Belgian foreign office had received a message from the Belgian minister at Peking saying that the "provisions almost exhausted...." ²⁸²

The day that the Japanese colleague informed the British consul at Tientsin that the "Tsungli Yamen had ceased providing the legations with supplies on July 28" Laffan's Agency reported that a Chinese messenger had arrived at Tientsin with the information that the Empress Dowager "sent four carts loaded with provisions to the legations on July 28". ²⁸³

280. Times, August 7, 1900.

281. Times, August 7, 1900.

282. Times, August 8, 1900.

283. Times, August 10, 1900.

The "Times" correspondent at Paris sent a despatch on August 12 saying that M. Delcassé had received a telegram from M. Pichon, French minister at Peking which said that "our provisions are nearly exhausted".²⁸⁴ The next day Reuter's correspondent at Tientsin reported that "two carriers who left Peking on the first, state Empress Dowager supplied the legations with food for a few days..."²⁸⁵

The next day the "Times" correspondent at Berlin wired that the "...foreigners had only provisions to last till August 8th".²⁸⁶

The hopeful signs of the assured "supplies" reports were soon shattered when Dr. Morrison's note dated August 4 was published in London on August 20. It said:

Since the siege began on June 20 no stores of any kind have been permitted to enter the legation. The government is endeavoring to reduce the garrison by starvation...The Chinese with fiendish inhumanity are trying to starve the Christians into surrender...
.....²⁸⁷

M. Delcassé's telegram from M. Pichon communicated from Paris by the "Times" correspondent,

284. Times, August 13, 1900.

285. Times, August 14, 1900.

286. Times, August 15, 1900.

287. Times, August 20, 1900.

dated August 9 reported that "we are reduced to siege rations. We have provisions...horsemeat, rice and bread..for 15 days." 288

On August 23 there appeared in the "Times" a report from Reuter's correspondent at Peking dated August 14 which said that "they (foreigners in the legations) had only three day's ration...." 289

The final report regarding the so-called food problems was published in the "Times" on September 2. It was communicated from the "Times" correspondent at Shanghai. It said:

Two American correspondents, who left Peking on August 21, with a party of 40 American missionaries, arrived here yesterday....They believed that the total food supplies which even included luxuries, was still considerable. However, as no common stock had been formed, the accounts sent out at intervals by different persons naturally disagreed. 290

288. Times, August 16, 1900.

289. Times, August 23, 1900.

290. Times, Sept.2, 1900.

PART VI

THE ALLIED TROOPS ENTER PEKING

After Conger's message from Peking dated July 16 reached the State Department four days later the world knew definitely that the foreign colony besieged in the legations since June 20 were still living.²⁹¹ The despatches which followed from Conger asked for immediate assistance.²⁹²

The second "China Relief Expedition" moved out of Tientsin on August 4. On August 12 the Russian commander proposed that the forces should rest on the thirteenth. Not agreeing to this proposal by the other commanders, it was agreed to devote the day to reconnoitering. The Russians remained in camp at Tungchow and marched out towards Peking on the evening of the thirteenth. About 9 p.m. heavy firing was heard from the northwest, continuing through the night, and the next day this was discovered to be the sound of the Russian attack on the Tungpien Gate.

At daybreak of the fourteenth General Chaffee ordered his troops to advance beyond the

291. U.S. For. Rel., 1900, p.156.

292. Ibid.

reconnoitering line and about noon he found the Russians occupying the Tungpien Gate. Some of his own American troops were there also and, boldly climbing the wall of the Tartar city, and covered by troops and artillery below, they swept the top of the wall and by 3 o'clock were abreast of the American legation. Their flag was the first actually on the wall. 293

In the meantime, the Japanese were attacking the Chihwa Gate, the point indicated by their line of advance. They were met with "fierce opposition" and were the last to enter Peking. The British attacked the Shakwo Gate where they were met with "trifling opposition", and entered the gate "unopposed. The British had the honor of being the first to enter the Tartar city, and the first to enter the beleaguered legations, which they did at 3 o'clock. The Americans, also entering by the water gate, soon followed. 294

On August 14 Mr. Conger reported that the legations were saved by the arrival of the relief

293. Gen. Chaffee to Adjutant General, Sept. 1, U.S.

For. Rel., 1900, p.66, cited in Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol. III, p.276.

294. Morse, ibid, p.277.

column, which entered the city with "little trouble". Another telegram two days later was more in detail saying that the American and British troops entered without "serious resistance" while the Japanese and Russians had "considerable fighting". He stated further that on August 15 General Chaffee, in order to drive the enemy out of shooting distance from the legation, fought his way into the "Forbidden City", but after a conference with the other generals he "withdrew his men".²⁹⁵

The following are the reports appearing in the "Times" with regard to the entrance of the allied troops into Peking.

The first news of the relief came from the "Times" correspondent at Berlin dated August 17, three days after the actual lifting of the siege. The message said that the semi-official telegram dated August 15 had been received at the German capital from Shanghai which says: "According to an apparently trustworthy Chinese report from Tsinanfu the Allied Troops have entered Peking and relieved the ministers....."

295. U.S. For. Rel., 1900, p. 160-161.

Reuter's sent from Shanghai on the following day a despatch saying that Li Hung-chang had received a telegram announcing the allied troops entrance into Peking "unopposed on the fifteenth". On the same day the "Times" correspondent at Paris wired that "Rumor reached Paris from London of allies entrance into Peking...and although it is confidently taken as true, no absolute confirmation thereof is to be had from French sources...." A later message from the "Times" correspondent at Berlin on the same day said that news received from Shanghai of the allied troops' entrance into Peking is "accepted as authentic by the press" but added that "as is only natural, the fact that it comes through Chinese sources causes certain amount of misgiving...." 296

On August 20 the following report appeared in the "Times": "Peking captured August 15. Legations safe. Details follow".

This was sent by Rear-admiral Bruce to the London admiralty.

The correspondent at Tokio apparently

meant that the international troops had reached Peking when he announced that "all foreigners are safe". And on the same day the Japanese legation in London gave Reuter's Agency the following report dated August 17 from the Japanese consul at Chifu which said "... ministers and foreigners safe", but did not mention anything about the entrance of the allied troops into the city.²⁹⁷

A more detailed message of the attack on Peking came through the "Times" correspondent at Shanghai which said that the Japanese official telegram describes the capture of Peking. It said that the Japanese attacked and entered by two eastern gates, while the Americans and British entered by the northeastern gate.²⁹⁸

A vivid picture is presented in the Russian despatch which was communicated from St. Petersburg correspondent. The message was sent by Admiral Alexieff at Chifu. It said: "On August 14, after one day's bombardment, the Russian and allied troops blew up the gate on the eastern side and

297. Times, August 20, 1900.

298. Times, August 20, 1900.

entered Peking....." 299

From Washington, Reuter's reported on August 19 that General Chaffee telegraphed from Peking on August 15 saying that "we entered the legation grounds at five last night...." 300

Another despatch from Reuter's Washington correspondent the next day said that Admiral Remy telegraphed from Taku on August 19 that it is "authentically reported from Peking on August 15 troops are marching on Imperial City and clearing out Tartar City....." 301

Rear Admiral Bruce sent another telegram to the London secretary of admiralty from Taku dated August 19 which said: "The Allies are reported to have entered the sacred city of Peking on August 17." What this "sacred city" meant in the message was not specified. 302

The dissension among the allied troops was first reported by the "New York Herald" correspondent

299. Times, August 20, 1900.

300. Times, August 21, 1900.

301. Times, August 21, 1900.

302. Times, August 22, 1900.

at Paris. This despatch said:

Contrary to the agreement of the Allied commanders, the Russians advanced and occupied the first door of the east gate early in the morning of the 14th. At 2 p.m. on the fourteenth the British and Americans entered the gate near the legation.....

In the same issue of the "Times", a statement from Conger after the siege was published. It said in part:

They tried to annihilate us the day before you got in.....The whole movement is a governmental one. The Boxers are only a pretense, having no guns. The confidential advisors of the Empress were the leaders of the imperial troops here..... 303

On the same day that this Conger interview was published in the "Times", Reuter's correspondent at Washington wired to London saying that the War Department telegraphed General Chaffee to "report operations, conditions and requirements". The correspondent explained that this had been done because of a fear that the strain might have influenced Mr. Conger's judgement blaming the Chinese for what had occurred. 304

303. Times, August 22, 1900.

304. Times, August 23, 1900.

Reuter's correspondent at Washington again reported that the American government had received a communication from Conger via Chifu dated August 20 which said: "Saved. Relief arrived today. The allied troops entered city with little trouble..."³⁰⁵

From Berlin a report stated that a semi-official telegram from Tokio, dated August 20, described the occupation of the walls into the city "preceded by bombardment between eight and nine hours".³⁰⁶

The skeptical center of St. Petersburg was uncertain when the news of the relief reached the city. The "Times" correspondent reported that the Russian newspapers had only "taken for granted" that the telegrams from abroad reporting the safety of the ministers on the arrival of the international troops in Peking were true.³⁰⁷

Furthermore, American "official" reports were received at Washington. Reuter's Agency reported that Admiral Remy sent a telegram from Taku dated

305. Times, August 22, 1900.

306. Times, August 22, 1900.

307. Times, August 22, 1900.

August 20 saying that "Despatches from Peking dated August 16 state that all except the Imperial City have been cleared of Chinese troops. The American troops were the first to enter the Imperial City and have penetrated the gates of the palace". 308

Another message from Conger to the Secretary of State dated August 19 said that "...the palace is expected to be taken immediately..." 309

The first direct news from Peking came through Reuter's correspondent describing the entrance of the allied troops into Peking. The message dated August 14, the date of the lifting of the siege, said that the American and Russian flags were the first to be planted on the city walls. 310

The first direct report from Dr. Morrison after the relief was dated August 15 and published in the "Times" August 24. It said: "...The Russians attacked the city and begged for reinforcements... General Gaselee, advancing rapidly, entered the Tartar city by the Water Gate and rescued the

308. Times, August 23, 1900.

309. Times, August 23, 1900.

310. Times, August 23, 1900.

legations...." 311

Confident reports by the Russians were published in the "Times" on August 24, communicated from St. Petersburg by Reuter's correspondent on the previous day. It said: "...Our troops...were the first to enter the city, where the Russian flag was the first to be hoisted on the city walls...the bombardment lasted fourteen hours..." 312

The manager of the Russo-Chinese Bank at Peking wrote on August 14 that "after two months' siege we have been relieved today..." This was transmitted from St. Petersburg by the "Times" correspondent to London. 313

Official despatches at the French capital were made public on August 28 in London when the "Times" published a telegram sent by M. Pinchon dated August 19. It said in regard to the capture of Peking:

The international troops entered by daylight on the fourteenth and continued their operations the next day and bombarded Imperial City...we penetrated into the palace gardens....The generals decided unanimously, with the concurrence of the diplomatic

311. Times, August 24, 1900.

312. Times, August 24, 1900.

313. Times, August 25, 1900.

corps to enter the Imperial Palace in order to clear it of Chinese soldiers, but to confine themselves to traversing the palace without camping there.... 314

Rear Admiral Courrejolles, telegraphed the ministry of marines at Paris on August 27 that "after a fairly long cannonade the allied troops entered Peking on the night of August 14-15...the legations were saved..the imperial palace was captured on August 16..." This report was communicated to London by the "Times" correspondent. 315

While the despatches reached London that the "allied troops entered Peking and relieved the ministers" and that the "legations were saved" and that "we found all well in the legations" nothing in particular was mentioned about the general conditions of the foreigners who had been besieged for more than two months. Reuter's message dated August 14, the day the international troops entered Peking, which was published in London on September 1, gives the first description of the foreigners. It said in part:

.....The troops entering the legations stared in amazement and inquired if it were a garden-party. They expected to find the besieged in a worse condition than themselves, but the

314. Times, August 29, 1900.

315. Times, August 29, 1900.

rescued looked fresh and well..... 316

The following day the "Times" published a message from a Shanghai correspondent which said:

Two American correspondents, who left Peking on August 21 with a party of 40 American missionaries, arrived here yesterday. They described the conditions of the legations on the day of relief, showing that there were no signs of acute distress. They believed that the total food supplies which even included luxuries were still considerable.....317

316. Times, September 1, 1900.

317. Times, September 2, 1900.

PART VII

REPORTED CASUALTIES DURING THE SIEGE

According to the official record of Dr. Gustav Velde, surgeon in charge of the hospital at Peking during the siege, the total casualties in the legations were 67 killed and 167 wounded. This number includes all legation guards, officers, volunteers and independents.³¹⁸

The first reports of the casualties in the legations appeared in the "Times" on August 22, communicated from a correspondent at Paris. It stated that the "New York Herald" published a message from Peking as saying that "...the total casualties during the siege of the legations were 67 killed and 120 wounded".³¹⁹

Another casualty report came in the following day from Reuter's Agency at Peking which said that the "...casualties 65 killed and 160 wounded".³²⁰

Two days later the "Times" received a despatch from a correspondent at St. Petersburg,

318. U.S. For. Rel., 1900, p.190. The figures quoted do not include casualty list at Peitang as shown in table.

319. Times, August 22, 1900.

320. Times, August 23, 1900.

dated August 23, which said that the Russo-Chinese bank manager writes from Peking that "there are 75 dead and 120 wounded".³²¹ A second message from St. Petersburg the following day reported that M. Pokotiloff's figures of the casualties at Peking were "195 killed and wounded" but did not give a separate list of the dead and wounded.³²²

The second despatch from Reuter's Agency at Peking dated the day of the relief announced that "our total loss during the siege was 65 killed 160 wounded" which supports his first despatch published in the "Times" four days earlier..³²³

The third report from Reuter's said that "through most of the siege 414 people lived in the legation..11 civilians killed, 19 wounded, 54 marines and sailors killed and 112 wounded..." which brings the total to 65 killed and 131 wounded.³²⁴

321. Times, August 25, 1900.

322. Times, August 25, 1900.

323. Times, August 27, 1900.

324. Times, September 1, 1900.

PART VIII

THE OCCUPATION OF THE IMPERIAL PALACE

The American commander, after consultation with the envoy, decided to clear the Chinese troops from the Imperial City who were still threatening the legations. Being fired on from the inner gates of the city, he forced in succession the first, second and third gates leading into the Forbidden City--the Imperial Palace. But at the fourth gate his advance stopped. In his official report General Chaffee gave no specific reasons why he stopped only saying that "at a conference that afternoon it was decided not to occupy the Imperial City". The American troops withdrew.

The foreign commanders agreed that the Imperial Palace, or the Forbidden City, should not be occupied, but detachments of the foreign troops, accompanied by their envoys and legations staffs, entered its portals and marched through its courts on August 28. The envoys and higher officers "also inspected" the imperial throne rooms and chambers.³²⁵

325. Morse, Int. Rel. of the Chi. Emp., Vol. III, p.

It was apparent that the news reports reaching London were confused over the various names such as the "Forbidden City" the "Imperial City" and the "Imperial Palace". It should be noted now that the international troops did not enter the city till August 28.

On August 23 the "Times" published a report from a Berlin correspondent, dated the day before, saying that semi-official telegrams from Tokio stated that "Japanese troops took possession of Imperial Palace in Peking on August 16..."³²⁶ But from Washington Reuter's correspondent reported that Admiral Remy telegraphed from Taku on August 20 saying that despatches from Peking stated that all except the Imperial City has been cleared of Chinese troops and that the "American troops were the first to enter the Imperial City having penetrated the gates of the palace".³²⁷

More perplexing came Conger's message to the Secretary of state dated August 19, at Peking which said that "the palace is expected to be taken immediately...."³²⁸

326. Times, August 23, 1900.

327. Times, August 23, 1900.

328. Times, August 23, 1900.

The next day the "Times" correspondent at Shanghai reported that the Japanese official at Chifu stated that the "allies occupied Imperial Palace on 16th". This message was dated August 22. Appearing in the same issue of the "Times" another report from Laffan's Agency at Peking, dated August 15 said that the "United States troops attacked Imperial City this morning and penetrating four gates, passed through the Forbidden City to the Purple Palace". But the same message adds that General Chaffee said that the generals had decided that the Chinese had been punished enough and that it would be unwise to take the Imperial City.³²⁹

A report came from the "Times" correspondent at Peking, Dr. Morrison, whose message dated August 18 and published a week later in London said: "Looting is proceeding systematically". It added that the French and Russian flags are flying over the best portion of the Imperial domain, where it is believed that the Imperial treasure is buried.

329. Times, August 24, 1900.

The Japanese have seized a hoard amounting, according to rumor, to one-half million taels silver...³³⁰

Reuter's Agency at Peking reported on August 16 that the "Americans attacked the Imperial City yesterday (August 15) forced five gates..." But the message goes on to say that the Imperial City was "attacked by the combined forces...." ³³¹

The "Times" correspondent at Shanghai reported on August 24 that Li Hung-chang received a telegram from Peking stating that the Japanese troops alone occupy the Palace.³³² Supporting this despatch came a telegram from St. Petersburg, communicated to London on August 27, which said that the Russian consul at Chifu informed that the Japanese admiral occupied the Palace on the 16th.³³³

Laffan's Agency sent a communication to London dated August 17 saying that "detachment of the allied troops now occupy the Imperial City". The message added that the American marines are at

330. Times, August 25, 1900.

331. Times, August 25, 1900.

332. Times, August 27, 1900.

333. Times, August 27, 1900.

the south gate, as it was agreed that they should not enter the Palace, which is full of Imperial troops.³³⁴

Official and definite reports were made by Conger to the State Department on August 27. It said: "The generals decided not to enter the Imperial Palace leaving it practically vacant..."³³⁵ Another message came three days later which said: "The Imperial Palace will be entered on the 28th. Military demonstrations."³³⁶ These two reports reveal that the "Imperial Palace" is not occupied at that date and that only "military demonstrations" will be made on August 28.

Supporting Mr. Conger's despatch came a communication from Russia transmitted by a correspondent to the "Times" on August 31. It was a despatch from General Linevitch dated August 19 which said: "By agreement with the commanders of the foreign troops not one of the Powers has yet entered the Imperial Palace..." The Russian general's message added in a proud tone that "our troops have occupied

334. Times, August 27, 1900.

335. Times, August 27, 1900.

336. Times, August 31, 1900.

stores with hundreds of tons of rice and at the Tsungli Yamen we found a small quantity of silver," and to give credit to his own soldiers he said that "during the siege our marines, protecting the legations, behaved like heroes...." 337

The news of the actual "occupation" of the "Imperial Palace" reached London through a correspondent from Vienna dated September 3. It announced that the Imperial Palace was occupied by "all nationalities" who "marched through" on September 28. 338

The "London Times" received its "official" announcement through the secretary of state for India. It was composed of a telegram received from Sir A. Gaselee, dated August 29 at Peking which said that the "allied troops marched through Forbidden City yesterday (August 28)". 339

337. Times, September 1, 1900.

338. Times, September 4, 1900.

339. Times, September 6, 1900.

PART IX

THE FLIGHT OF THE COURT

The Empress Dowager and the Imperial Court fled from the city just before the arrival of the relief forces.³⁴⁰ It was not a long, prepared measure designed to continue the war, but a hasty action inspired by actual fear.³⁴¹

At 4 p.m. on August 14 Duke Lan and Kangyi informed the Empress Dowager that the foreign troops were in the city, and urged her to escape at once.

At 4 a.m. the following morning the Emperor and Empress Dowager secretly left the palace in a common cart, disguised in the clothes of Chinese peasants. They arrived at the Summer Palace four hours later and after a short rest they continued their flight to Sianfu, Shansi Province, escorted by a party of nearly 5000 men, including 1000 soldiers.³⁴²

The flight of the Chinese court from Peking as reported in the newspapers is probably just as amusing and conflicting and unfounded as the news

340. U.S. For. Rel., 1900, p.165.

341. Morse, Int.Rel. of the Chi.Emp., Vol.III, p.282.

342. Ching Shan Diary, Aug.14-15, p.296-297.

of the "Peking massacre". The first message came from the "Times" correspondent at Shanghai, who reported on June 27, forty-eight days before the actual flight, that the "Empress Dowager and the Emperor have fled westward..." 343

Reuter's correspondent at Berlin reported on July 2 that the "Empress Dowager has fled" but did not mention in what direction. 344

After these two reports appeared in the "Times" it was followed by a bit of interesting conflicting news from Washington communicated to London by Reuter's Agency. It originated from a telegram sent by the United States consul at Shanghai and is regarded as "official" but unreliable as most of them were found to be. It stated that the "Emperor and Empress are prisoners in palace..." 345

On July 5 there appeared a story concerning the Empress Dowager communicated by the "Times" correspondent at Shanghai and dated July 3 in which

343. Times, July 1, 1900.

344. Times, July 3, 1900.

345. Times, July 4, 1900.

it was said that "Boxers and troops total 15,000 attacked legations on 27th...one gate of inner palace opened daily for few hours. Emperor and Empress there with attendants, all members of the Boxer Society."³⁴⁶

The next day a report came through Reuter's Agency which said that "reports state Emperor Kwang Hsu and the Empress Dowager had been poisoned..."³⁴⁷

A delayed message dated June 29 from Reuter's Agency at Tientsin said that "the Empress had fled to the Summer Palace..."³⁴⁸ a palace which the Empress herself had built and where she usually spent the summer.

Reuter's Agency at Shanghai sent a despatch on July 10 saying that reports from Peking reveal the fact that the Empress resumed the reins of the government on June 30.³⁴⁹

Ten days later Reuter's correspondent at Berlin communicated an alarming despatch to London in

346. Times, July 5, 1900.

347. Times, July 6, 1900.

348. Times, July 7, 1900.

349. Times, July 11, 1900.

which he said that American newspaper correspondents announced on July 6 that the "Emperor is dead and that Prince Tuan has usurped power and General Nieh, who was favorable to foreigners, has been compelled to commit suicide". 350

For nearly a month following, nothing appeared in the newspapers concerning the Empress Dowager's "health" or her "flight". On August 18 the "Times" correspondent at Berlin transmitted a semi-official despatch dated August 15 saying that the "Empress has disappeared from Peking. Nothing is known of the whereabouts of the Emperor." 351

Two days later an announcement from the London admiralty was published in the "Times". It was received from Rear Admiral Bruce at Chifu, dated August 19, 1:30 p.m. and runs as follows: "...Yung-lu prevented Empress from leaving and last stand now being made in inner city, which is surrounded by allies and being bombarded." 352

The flow of despatches regarding the flight

350. Times, July 20, 1900.

351. Times, August 18, 1900.

352. Times, August 20, 1900.

of the Empress and her court after the relief continued to flow into European capitals.

The "Times" correspondent at Shanghai sent a despatch on August 19 saying "Empress and Emperor etc. fled northwest to Shansi." 353

The "Times" correspondent at Berlin reported the next day that the German consul at Chifu sent a telegram announcing that the "Allied troops bombarded Imperial City which has been fortified and where it is said the Empress Dowager still is." 354

Reuter's Washington correspondent sent a despatch on the same day which probably comes closest to the truth, that the "Chinese sources state Royal Family en route to Si-ngan-fu (Sianfu)." 355

A second report from the "Times" correspondent at Shanghai came to London dated August 20 which said that the native press states that "Yu Hsien marching with Boxer force toward Kalgan to meet the Empress and escort her to the South." The despatch further said that native telegrams state "Dowager's

353. Times, August 20, 1900.

354. Times, August 21, 1900.

355. Times, August 21, 1900.

flight took place on the 10th".³⁵⁶

The "Times" Shanghai correspondent, in a usual unfounded tone, sent a telegram dated August 21 to Paris saying that "the Empress has fled carrying with her a treasure of 50 million taels", and added that "she is hemmed in by the Japanese cavalry".³⁵⁷ This news was transmitted from Paris to London by the "Times" correspondent.

From Washington Reuter's Agency reported the first "confirmation" of the Empress' flight. It stated that the American government had received from official Chinese sources confirmation of the report that the Dowager Empress and the Emperor have left Peking for the West.³⁵⁸

From Vienna the "Times" correspondent reported on August 21 that the semi-official "Fremdenblatt" "appears to credit the report that Prince Tuan has fled with the Emperor and Empress Dowager whom he holds as hostages..."³⁵⁹

The "Times" correspondent at Paris reports

356. Times, August 21, 1900.

357. Times, August 22, 1900.

358. Times, August 22, 1900.

359. Times, August 22, 1900.

that the "New York Herald" published a message from Peking dated August 17 stating that Conger said, "The Imperial Family left four days ago for Shansi Province", which is apparently one of the "official" despatches closest to the truth.³⁶⁰

Another despatch from the "Times" correspondent at Berlin, dated August 22, communicated the contents of a semi-official telegram from Tokio which said that the "Empress Dowager and the Emperor and the ministers left four days before it was captured."³⁶¹

From the "Times" correspondent at Shanghai came a message stating that a Japanese official at Chifu informed that the "Court fled on 11th", three days before the relief forces entered Peking. Another message from Shanghai by the same correspondent said that "Yuan Shi-kai telegraphed Li Hung-chang that he believes that the "Emperor has not left the capital."³⁶²

While the correspondent at St. Petersburg

360. Times, August 22, 1900.

361. Times, August 23, 1900.

362. Times, August 24, 1900.

reported on August 26 that the Russian consul at Chifu telegraphed on the 19th that the "Empress and ministers escaped..." another message from Paris said that the "New York Herald" published a report from China that "Prince Ching and Yung-lu have reached Paotingu. The Emperor left Peking on the 15th and was captured by Japanese troops on the road to Si-ngan-fu. He is now in prison."³⁶³

While the Japanese were being "credited" with having "captured" and "hemmed in" the Empress Dowager's court en route to Sianfu, Reuter's Agency at Tokio said that the Japanese General Yamaguchi at Peking informed his government that "the Japanese cavalry report..the Chinese Imperial family who left Peking on the 14th set out for the West after a short rest in the village of Man-san..."³⁶⁴

The final report appearing in the "Times" was published on August 30 and came from the "Times" own correspondent at Shanghai under date of August 29.

363. Times, August 27, 1900.

364. Times, August 28, 1900.

It said: "Native telegrams from Paotingfu announce that the Court arrived at Taiyeunfu, Shansi, on the 26th....." 365

CHAPTER V

From a comparison of the Siege of Peking as reported in the "London Times" and in the records of the historians and the accounts in official data, one may draw the following conclusions.

It may be observed that during this period it was extremely difficult to get the facts directly from Peking. Correspondents and news agencies in Chinese cities, other than Peking, did not get their facts by "covering" the events, but by picking up wayside rumors and tea-house gossip.

Foreign officials in Chinese cities, other than Peking, sent official reports to their respective governments. But they were in the same position as the press correspondents in regard to getting news. Both the press and official reports published in the "London Times" during the siege were in most cases unreliable and conflicting.

The foreign governments abroad as well as Chinese envoys in foreign capitals were in many cases dependent on such press reports. During the isolation of Peking most of the reports published in the "Times"

came indirectly from other European cities. The Chinese envoys in foreign capitals found it difficult to get the facts and all reports transmitted to the foreign governments were discredited, disregarded, or received with skepticism.

From the "Times" it is observed that many newspapers abroad, particularly in Berlin "jumped" to a conclusion without "positive" evidence. Many foreign governments and officials "credited certain newspaper reports" notwithstanding the absence of official confirmation.

The accounts given by the Chinese minister at Washington concerning the authenticity of the Conger despatch, the safety of the foreign ministers, with the exception of Baron von Ketteler, the first report of the entrance of the relief forces into Peking, were all finally proved to be true.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

BOOKS:

Ching Shan, Ching Shan Diary. The diary of H.E. Ching Shan, a Chinese account of the Boxer troubles, translated and published by J.J.L. Duyvendak, Leiden, 1924.

PERIODICALS AND NEWSPAPERS:

Llewellyn, James Davies, "The Chinese Boxers" in The National Geographic Magazine. Vol. II, July 1900, p. 281-289.

The London Times. Issues from May 22 to September 14, 1900, inclusive, Printing House Square, London.

MISCELLANEOUS:

Foreign Relations of the United States, 1891. Papers relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1892.

Foreign Relations of the United States, 1900. Papers relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1902.

Secondary Sources

BOOKS:

- Allen, Roland, The Siege of the Peking Legations.
London, Smith, Elder and Co., 1901.
- Campbell, Charles Williams, China. London, H.M.
Stationery Office, 1920.
- Chamberlin, Wilbur J., Ordered to China. New York,
F.S. Stokes and Co., 1903.
- Clements, Paul Henry, The Boxer Rebellion. New York,
Columbia University, 1915.
- Dennis, Alfred L.P., Adventures in American Diplomacy.
New York, E.P. Dutton and Co., 1927.
- Hart, Sir Robert, These From the Land of Sinim. London,
Chapman and Hall Ltd., 1903.
- Hsia, Ching-ling, Studies in Chinese Diplomatic History.
Shanghai, Commercial Press Ltd., 1925.
- Hsu, Shu-hsi, China and Her Political Entity. New York,
Oxford Press, 1926.
- Jones, Kennedy, Fleet Street and Downing Street. London,
Hutchinson and Co., 1919.
- Koo, Vi Kyuin Wellington, The Status of Aliens in China.
New York, Columbia University, 1912.
- Krausse, Alexis, China in Decay. Ed.3, London, Chapman
and Hall Ltd., 1900.

- Krausse, Alexis, The Far East, Its History and Its Question. Shanghai, Commercial Press Ltd., 1927.
- Martin, W.A.P., The Lore of Cathay. New York, Fleming H. Revell Co., 1901.
- Martin, W.A.P., The Awakening of China. New York, Doubleday, Page and Co., 1907.
- MacNair, Harley Farnsworth, Modern Chinese History. Shanghai, Commercial Press Ltd., 1927.
- Morse, Hosea Ballou, International Relations of the Chinese Empire. Vols. I, II, and III, London, Longmans, Green and Co., 1910-1918.
- Pott, F.L. Hawks, A Sketch of Chinese History. Ed.2, Shanghai, Kelly and Walsh, 1908.
- Savage-Landor, Arnold Henry, China and the Allies. Vols. I and II, New York, Scribner's and Sons, 1901.
- Thayer, William Roscoe, Life and Letters of John Hay. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1915.
- Tyau, Min-chien T.Z., The Legal Obligations Arising Out of Treaty Relations between China and Other States. London, Sweet and Maxwell, 1917.
- Willoughby, W.W., Foreign Rights and Interests in China. Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1920.

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI - COLUMBIA
JRM JOUR 496380
378.7M71 XL958



010-005142650

378.7M71

XL958

cop. 2

Journ.

496380

University Libraries
University of Missouri

Digitization Information Page

Local identifier Lu1932

Source information

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Format | Book |
| Content type | Text |
| Source ID | 010-005142650 |
| Notes | Pages 35, 43, 114, 124, 139, 146 are printed very faintly. Some pages have smudges or fingerprints that may go through text. Page numbering doubles on page 134 (122 A) and skips on 145 (134). Many pages have handwritten marks. |

Capture information

| | |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| Date captured | 11/18/2025 |
| Scanner manufacturer | Plustek OpticBook |
| Scanner model | A300 Plus |
| Scanning system software | Book Pavilion |
| Optical resolution | 600 dpi |
| Color settings | 8 bit grayscale |
| File types | tiff |
| Notes | N/A |

Derivatives - Access copy

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Compression | Tiff: LZW compression |
| Editing software | Adobe Photoshop 2025 |
| Resolution | 600 dpi |
| Color | grayscale |
| File types | tiff, combined into pdf |
| Notes | Images cropped, straightened, and brightened to best ability. Many pages have faint or illegible text due to printing. |