



Leaving a Brand on China: Missionary Discourse in the Wake of the Boxer Movement

Author(s): James L. Hevia

Source: *Modern China*, Vol. 18, No. 3 (Jul., 1992), pp. 304-332

Published by: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/189335>

Accessed: 30-08-2016 02:35 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>



Sage Publications, Inc. is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Modern China*

Leaving a Brand on China

Missionary Discourse in the Wake of the Boxer Movement

JAMES L. HEVIA

Indiana State University

In the aftermath of the historical events commonly known as the “Boxer Uprising” and the “Relief of the Legations,” the armies of the eight Powers launched another kind of warfare, an assault on what they understood as important symbols of Chinese sovereignty.¹ In Beijing, this “symbolic warfare”² included a “grand march” by the allied armies through the “Forbidden City” (a place where it was said no white man had stepped before) and a memorial service for Queen Victoria at the Meridian Gate; bivouacking American and British troops at the temples of Agriculture and Heaven, respectively; photographing diplomats on imperial thrones and removing thrones to Europe; and appropriating Manchu ancestral tablets for delivery to the British Museum. Written accounts of the conflict present these activities as ones that profaned the sacred space of China and humiliated the Chinese emperor.

Symbolic warfare was not confined to Beijing, nor was it directed only at Chinese sovereignty. In Baoding and Taiyuan, where missionaries had been killed, representatives of the Powers blew up city walls and gates, and destroyed temples. Far from being merely random acts like much of the looting, rape, and murder in which allied forces also engaged (Simpson, 1907; Lynch, 1901; Savage-Landor, 1901: 2; *Literary Digest*, 22: 4.22, 5.140-141, 6.168-169; Forsythe, 1971:

AUTHOR'S NOTE: *A number of people commented and made suggestions on various drafts of this article. I wish to especially thank Tao Feiya and Liu Tianlu, both of whom aided my research at Shandong University, Judith Farquhar, Tani Barlow, Paul Cohen, Dan Bays, Don Lopez, and Stephen Shutt.*

MODERN CHINA, Vol. 18 No. 3, July 1992 304-332
© 1992 Sage Publications, Inc.

304

83-84), retaliation outside Beijing was designed to negate or overwhelm imputed Chinese beliefs, many of which were seen as directly responsible for what was described by one missionary as the “Yellow Crime” (Coltman, 1901) and by another as that “awful catastrophe that cast its shadow over the whole world” (Reid, 1901-1902: 447). The victors aimed, therefore, to do more than merely retaliate; they also wished to teach the Chinese lessons for the future so that such catastrophes would not recur.

These two sides of symbolic warfare—the retaliatory and the pedagogical—are important for understanding actions taken by the Powers in and outside Beijing. Although certainly designed to punish, they were also intended, at least for some, to incorporate Chinese people into a Christian “moral universe” (see Sayer, 1991 on the use of this phrase) of “retributive justice” (Brown, 1904: 209) and to leave a memorable “brand” (A. Smith, 1901: 2.611) on the land and its inhabitants. Such action was presumed necessary if missions were to be reestablished in areas where they had been destroyed.

In this article, I consider processes of symbolic warfare in Baoding and Taiyuan, my focus being on American and British Protestant missionary writers and their *representations* of events in these two prefectural cities, including their explicit and implicit comparisons with biblical events, their presentation of deceased missionaries as martyrs, and their pronouncements on Chinese character. In addressing missionary representations, I follow Anita Levy and a number of other recent critics in arguing that the historical “real” is ultimately inseparable from verbal accounts of “reality.” In rejecting the usual opposition between “word” and “world,” a distinction that lies at the very foundation of representationalism, I argue that missionary discursive practices were intended to, and in fact did, shape reality rather than merely passively reflect or mirror it.³ Let me point out just a few of the implications for an approach that argues for the constitutive nature of representations.

Questioning the relationship between representations and reality reminds us that those events considered significant in our history books come to us precontested, fought over, argued for and against; it is precisely within this process of contestation that events become represented as history. Indeed, one might add that oblivion rather than

the “dustbin of history” is the fate of uncontested events. Contestation further suggests that there is no such thing as an unmediated or transparent presentation of reality; all documents, texts, and so on are informed by unstated assumptions and have agendas that are more or less opaque.⁴

Such a consideration has important implications for how one reads and interprets Anglo-American missionary writing on post-Boxer events. The narrative structure of this literature provides a good case in point. Almost all accounts begin with references to Chinese atrocities, review the application of Western-style justice directed against the “guilty,” describe the creation of Christian sacred sites where atrocities had been perpetrated, and frequently end with a celebration of the missionary endeavor in China. Just as important as the accounts themselves is the general structural uniformity of these writings. In other words, the literature provides not only descriptions of retaliation, pedagogy, and the physical re-insertion of Westerners into Chinese communities but, equally important, the assumptions that make sense of these actions. In this instance, the logic is that of suffering, death, and resurrection — New Testament Christianity’s metanarrative.

Considered from this position, the works of Protestant missionary authors, just like those of statesmen and soldiers, are both more and less than sources of fact. They are more because these missionary writers were often themselves the authors of actions they describe. They played a crucial role as go-betweens who linked military authorities and the Chinese population. In this position, they functioned as cultural arbiters who defined Chinese “symbols” and the meaning of the Boxer uprising to Anglo-American audiences.⁵ Moreover, seizing this unusual opportunity, Protestant missionaries also actively positioned themselves as advocates. The rhetorical projects found in these same writings (not the least of which is embodied in the shared salvation narrative) were designed to shape public sentiments, influence government policy, justify the missionary enterprise in China, and aid fund-raising in the United States and England. They are less than factual because they are so clearly polemical. But it is therein that much of their representational interest lies. Addressing American and British readers, missionary writings embody an ideology about China and Chinese characteristics, a certain “common sense” (the taken-for-

granted, unquestioned, seldom conscious), fragments of which continue to appear in interpretations of the Boxer movement.⁶

Before proceeding further, I wish to clarify one last methodological consideration. I am not so much concerned with establishing the range of missionary opinion on the events considered here. Nor am I particularly interested in the “truth” or “falsity” of specific pronouncements but only with their effects in early twentieth-century discourses. Nor am I anxious to present justifications for or condemnations of missionary behavior. George Lynch, a reporter on the scene, certainly came closer than most when he characterized the conflict as a war of civilizations. Provided we do not essentialize that notion as Lynch seems to (i.e., by positing a unitary “China” and “West”), it usefully points to the fact that for those American and British Protestant missionaries who claimed to represent Western civilization, the struggle in and outside Beijing was very much over meanings.

Following a poststructuralist lead, then, I treat missionary writings as part of a discursive history.⁷ Such a history would concern itself with the historical conditions of missionary statements. Second, it would explore the effects of statements in constituting the object they purport to represent,⁸ and third, it would investigate the temporal effects of statements or, as Michael Taussig (1987: xiii) put it, the effects of the “real” carried through time. In the following sections, I delineate some of the conditions from which various emblems of symbolic struggle draw their coherence, beginning with remembrances of the atrocities perpetrated by the Chinese against Western missionaries.

THE ATROCITY STORY AND RETRIBUTION

In the succeeding narratives, while it has not seemed best to crowd the pages with the heart-sickening details of butchery, neither is there any attempt to conceal the fact that cruelty was rampant. Thank God that lust was not rampant also, that women were spared what they would have suffered at the hands of Turks [Miner, 1903: 23].

There are certain themes of which the interest is all-absorbing, but which are too entirely horrible for the purposes of legitimate fiction. These the mere romanticist must eschew, if he does not wish to offend

or to disgust. They are with propriety handled only when the *severity and majesty of Truth* sanctify and sustain them.

We thrill, for example, with the most intense of “pleasurable pain” over the accounts of the passage of Beresina, of the Earthquake at Lisbon, of the Plague at London, of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, or of the stifling of the hundred and twenty-three prisoners in the Black Hole at Calcutta. *But in these accounts it is the fact—it is the reality—it is the history which excites.* As inventions, we should regard them with simple abhorrence [Poe, 1982: 168; emphasis added].

Many of the accounts that would appear in the United States and Europe within a few years of the Boxer Movement paralleled closely the statement of Luella Miner just cited. Miner went a bit further than most in alluding to the absence of rape, but with others she emphasized barbarities while stating a reluctance to describe them (Martin, 1900: 140). Not all felt so constrained. Despite concern over offending the sensibilities of one’s audience, many writers provided their readers with “pleasurable pain” by attempting to establish the severe and majestic “Truth” of the physical trials of missionaries in a setting described by the Rev. Gilbert Reid (1901: 582) as “a carnival of hell” (also see Conger, 1909: 183; A. Smith, 1901: 2.619; Ketler, 1902: 389-392). All the missionaries and their children had, of course, died the death of martyrs, but martyrdom carried a heavy physical, emotional, and psychological price. It is precisely the price that was paid by the dead that we are repeatedly reminded of. The following extract is a typical account of the events in Baoding presented by the Rev. Arthur Brown concerning the ordeal of two American women:

The fate of the young women Miss Morrill and Miss Gould, thus deprived of their only protector, was not long deferred. After the fall of Mr. Pitkin, they were seized, stripped of all their clothing except one upper and one lower garment, and led by the howling crowd along a path leading diagonally from the entrance of the compound to the road just east of it. Miss Gould did not die of fright as she was taken from the chapel, *as was first reported*, but at the point where the path enters the road, a few hundred yards from the chapel, she fainted. Her ankles were tied together, and another cord lashed her wrists in front of her body. A pole was thrust between legs and arms, and she was carried the rest of the way, while Miss Morrill walked, *characteristically giving to a beggar the little money at her waist, talking to people, and with*

extraordinary self-possession endeavoring to convince her persecutors of their folly. And so the procession of blood-thirsty men, exulting in the possession of defenseless women, one of them unconscious, wended its way northward to the river bank, westward to the stone bridge, over it and to a temple within the city, not far from the southeast corner of the wall [Brown, 1904: 206; emphasis added].

Throughout the telling of atrocity stories such as this, certain common elements, or motifs, are repeated: 1) the particular sufferings of each individual; 2) the fact that chief among the victims were defenseless or “delicate women” and children (Reid, 1901-1902: 453); 3) the sequence of deaths; 4) the exact location of each death and how each person died (in almost every case, by beheading); 5) the words that each had spoken during the ordeal; 6) the extraordinary heroism displayed by most of the victims; and 7) the identification, if possible, of the responsible Chinese party. At the same time, there are a number of curiosities in these stitched-together narratives. Where deaths occurred, there were seldom foreign survivors. This meant that native informants had to be relied on to provide the necessary information, informants who themselves might have been involved in the killing of missionaries. Moreover, because most such interviews were done several months after the fact, informants gave contradictory and often partial accounts. The Morrill-Gould case provides a good example of this.

Establishing the “truth” appears to have been crucial for the authors of these stories, but, at the same time, multiple versions of events circulated. Brown indicated as much when he noted that “Miss Gould did not die of fright . . . as first reported.” But there were other discrepancies as well. Accounts variously record that the two women were stripped of their clothing and then paraded naked through the streets of Baoding, that they were only partially stripped (as Brown has it), or that they were not stripped at all but that their clothing was torn by the hands of an enraged mob as they were taken through the streets. One report has Miss Gould suspended by her hair from the pole on which she was carried, and another claims that Miss Morrill’s breasts were cut off before she was beheaded. Each of these accounts was contradicted by other testimony (Forsyth, 1904: 24-25; Ketler, 1902:

387, 390; Lynch, 1901: 204-205; *The Boxer Rising*, 1967: 83; A. Smith, 1901: 2.611; Conger, 1909: 183).

Although the "truth" remained elusive, none of the authors cited here felt compelled to avoid telling these tales, based as they were on sketchy evidence. What then, we might ask, are these atrocity stories about? What purpose do they have in the broader narratives of suffering, martyrdom, and resurrection? Poe (1982) provided one possible answer, but in the case of these tales, there is more to be said for them than that they simply provide readers with "pleasurable pain."

In the literature, atrocity stories are either immediately followed by or closely linked to accounts of retribution. As such, they prepare the way for the return of light to Chinese darkness, and in so doing, they give legitimacy to what might otherwise be construed as "blood and iron" triumphalism. They have, in other words, an ideological effect—they normalize revenge, transforming it into a reasonable reaction to "Chinese brutality." Such transformations were, however, not inherent in the structure of the Christian metanarrative noted earlier but were rather appended to that narrative. In this respect, what happened in China, at least for some influential missionary writers, could just as well have happened elsewhere, for the appended tale, of which the narrating of atrocities made up a part, was an "Old Testament" story of the righteous struggle against heathenism and Satanic barbarism.

In addition to paving the way for tales of retribution, there is another plausible reason why missionary writers might emphasize atrocities in their writings. By the end of 1900, several members of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions had come under heavy criticism for their activities in China and for their seemingly bloodthirsty desire for revenge (Forsythe, 1971: 83-86). Defenses of the missionaries' position, especially after attacks by Mark Twain and various newspapers, did little to improve the situation (see Young 1968 and Miller 1974 on the exchange between Twain and missionaries). Moreover, in some instances, supporters of the missionary effort in China expressed concerns over missionary behavior (Conger, 1909: 175; Hart, 1901: 89).⁹ The retelling of atrocity stories could, at the very least, help explain why the passions of survivors ran so high after the fate of missionaries in Baoding and Taiyuan were known.

JUSTICE IN BAODING AND TAIYUAN

THE PUNITIVE EXPEDITION TO BAODING

Pao Ting Fu . . . as the scene of unheard-of atrocities, has been occupied by a joint expedition of British, German, and French; its walls broken down, some of its public buildings destroyed, and some of its highest officials condemned to death. *The city has been intentionally subjected to disgrace. It deserves to be sown in salt* [Martin, 1900: 139, emphasis added].

Although there were numerous incidents of violent retribution in the Chinese countryside (Lynch, 1901; Simpson, 1907; A. Smith, 1901: vol. 2; Nicholls, 1986; Lin Weihai, 1986: 442-459; Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan, 1982: 1.104, 118, 122, 148, 150, 196, 205-206, 374, 411, 2.802, 803), Baoding Prefecture, where seventeen American and British missionaries had been slain, took on emblematic significance for European and American military leaders and Protestant missionaries. In October 1900, a joint expedition of French, German, British, and Italian forces arrived to punish those responsible for the killings. On reaching Baoding, allied military commanders established a board of inquiry. The Rev. James W. Lowrie, who had been a member of the Baoding mission but was absent when the killings occurred, acted as sole interpreter. According to Arthur Brown, Lowrie advised moderation and encouraged the allied commanders to try only those Chinese officials responsible for the atrocities. Three were singled out: the Provincial Judge Dingrong, Guiheng, commander of the Manchu garrison, and Wang Zhangui, colonel of the Chinese garrison (Brown, 1904: 208). The three were found guilty and condemned to death.

Soon after the trial, the three officials were taken to a spot near the southwest corner of the city wall, "as near as practicable to the place where the missionaries had been beheaded, and there, in the presence of all the foreign soldiers, they themselves were beheaded" (Brown, 1904: 209). According to a contemporary newspaper account, the executions were a spectacular affair, one that, it must be emphasized, was carried out in a Chinese fashion by Chinese swordsmen (Nicholls, 1986: 90). Such executions were symbolic warfare on two counts. In

the first place, they mimicked the deaths of martyred missionaries. Second, allied authorities were led to modify their preferred form of execution (firing squads) apparently because they believed that the Chinese thought the foreign form a minor punishment (Nicholls, 1986: 106).

Once the “guilty” had been dealt with, however, allied authorities faced a difficult question, one that was repeated throughout the areas of Boxer activity: what would be an appropriate punishment for a local population, members of which, though difficult to identify, were clearly implicated in the actions of their leaders? First in Tianjin and later in Beijing, various Westerners reasoned that although they could not directly punish each guilty Chinese, they could carry out a collective punishment. Their strategy, as indicated earlier, was to strike at symbols that they thought were collectively valued, such as the walls, gates, and towers of the Chinese city. The Powers destroyed all but two of Baoding’s gate towers and blew up a section of the southeast wall near where the missionaries were believed to have been executed. In addition, they dynamited the Baoding city god temple as well as temples where the Boxers were said to have held their meetings and examined missionary prisoners (Brown, 1904: 210). The destruction of gates and temples left, according to Arthur Smith, “a brand upon the provincial capital which had witnessed such official crimes” (1901: 2.611).

RETRIBUTION IN TAIYUAN

It was almost universally recognized at the entry of the foreign forces into northern China that the honour of the five countries represented among those officially butchered at this time (Great Britain, the United States, France, Italy, and Holland) as well as the safety of all future residents of Shansi, required that an *indelible brand* be affixed to T’ai Yuan Fu, as was done at Pao Ting Fu, and that the yamen of the Governor ought to be destroyed [A. Smith, 1901: 2.615-616; emphasis added].

If Baoding provided Westerners with the physical sites against which symbolic warfare could be directed, Taiyuan gave them a profoundly demonized villain in the person of the Shanxi governor,

Yuxian. As the Smith quotation indicates, Yuxian's "crimes" elicited strong responses from missionary writers; he fit well into Arthur Brown's characterization of the Qing official whose hands, rather than "restraining, actually guided and goaded the maddened rioters" (Brown, 1904: 195).

Before coming to Shanxi, Yuxian had been governor of Shandong, where, according to most contemporary foreign accounts relied on here, he "officially started the Boxer organization" (Reid, 1901-1902: 451).¹⁰ These accounts stress that after a number of incidents in which the governor was considered complicit, the Powers demanded that he be removed from his office. In March 1900, he was appointed governor of Shanxi, where Boxers began to appear soon afterward (Forsyth, 1904: 32). Near the end of June, riots occurred at missions in and around Taiyuan. Protestant and Catholic missionaries were gathered together and on July 7 were taken to the governor's yamen, ostensibly for their protection. Instead, on July 9, Yuxian personally oversaw their executions, many of which were carried out by the governor's own troops. Almost all the victims were beheaded and the severed heads displayed outside the governor's yamen (Edwards, 1903: 64-82; Forsyth, 1904: 32-41; A. Smith, 1901: 2.613-615; S. Smith, 1901: 82-88). Among the more spectacular accounts of these executions was one given by an "eyewitness" that appeared in the *North China Herald* on October 17, 1900. In it, Yuxian himself was condemned as a murderer:

When the first batch of missionaries was brought to T'ai-yuan-fu . . . Yu Hsien ordered them to be brought straight into his yamen and taken to an archery ground in the rear, and then placed standing at a distance of a few feet from each other. The sanguinary Governor then took off his outer official robe and necklace, mounted a horse ready saddled for him, and then taking a long sword from an orderly, cantered to the other end of the ground. As Yu Hsien turned his horse towards the victims, standing some 15 chang (about 200 feet) away, he started at a hard gallop towards them, swinging his long sword as he swept past them, carrying off four or five heads on the onrush. Then his horse balked and would go no further, so Yu Hsien had to get off his horse, and the rest of these unhappy missionaries were then massacred by the Boxers and soldiers who were present. This was Yu Hsien's way of "setting an example" to his myrmidons [cited in S. Smith, 1901: 87].

Following the executions, Yuxian (missionary writers emphasized) was honored by the people of Shanxi for having rid the province of foreigners. When he left Taiyuan, he was accompanied by thousands of people, food and drink for his refreshment were evident for miles along his progress, his "boots of honor" were hung in the city gate, and a stone tablet, paid for, according to one account, by six Taiyuan merchant guilds, was erected to glorify his achievements (A. Smith, 1901: 2.615; Edwards, 1903: 139).

Given these "facts," it was generally presumed that the punishment of Yuxian and the city of Taiyuan would parallel Baoding. However, in spite of the fact that German forces occupied the passes leading into the province in April 1901 (Edwards, 1903: 140), no punitive expedition was dispatched. According to Arthur Smith (1901: 2.616), the failure of the Powers to act as the Chinese expected them to led "later to the unalterable conviction on the part of the population of Shansi that the province was totally inaccessible to foreign troops." These factors eventually led missionary writers to the conclusion that retribution in Taiyuan was far less complete than it had been in Baoding.

Yet regardless of how missionaries might have measured these matters, a number of actions were taken in Taiyuan to leave the "indelible brand" that the Rev. Smith called for. The governor's yamen was not blown up, but the Qing court was forced to remove all of Yuxian's honors, execute him, and put up a stone monument to the dead martyrs in place of the one for Yuxian. In addition, the Powers razed to the ground the building where some of the missionaries had been imprisoned awaiting their fate, erected a monument, and turned the site into a public garden (Forsyth, 1904: 41). Finally, as a result of negotiations in July 1901 between missionaries and officials in Taiyuan, it was arranged that "the funeral ceremonies at T'ai Yuan Fu were to be repeated at every place in Shansi where foreigners had been massacred; cemeteries made and kept in order at public expense; and suitable commemorative tablets erected" (Edwards, 1903: 134).

THE MEANINGS OF RETRIBUTION

We might pause here for a moment and consider the significance of the particular forms of symbolic warfare deployed by the Powers

in Baoding and Taiyuan. The destruction of temples in Baoding and of Yuxian's monument in Taiyuan appear to be uncomplicated acts of revenge, acts that American and British missionaries more than casually supported at the time. The temples, for example, were the sites of both "pagan rites" and places where missionaries were supposed to have suffered.¹¹ Yuxian's memorial had to be destroyed because of his unspeakable crimes. But why were walls and gates destroyed? Why did Westerners think that the Chinese put a special value on walls, making their destruction an especially appropriate punishment for Chinese transgressions? According to some missionary writers, city walls were for the Chinese both magical symbols and the source of misguided pride on the part of a city's inhabitants (Martin, 1900: 138; A. Smith, 1901: 2.522; the nonmissionary S. Smith [1901: 130] also made this claim). Destroying walls was therefore interpreted as a singular act of bringing China low, of punishing China for decades of high-walled exclusion and the more recent outrages (see Hevia, 1990: 381), as well as a means for striking out against Chinese superstition. The Rev. Arthur Brown (1904: 197) commenting on much more widespread destruction in Tianjin, noted that "the city wall had been rased [sic] to the ground and a highway made where it had stood — an unspeakable humiliation to the proud commercial metropolis." It would seem, therefore, that collective punishment on this order simultaneously demonstrated the superior power of the allied forces assembled against China and the ability of those forces to decode a Chinese symbolic order.

But why would such decoding be viewed as an effective way of punishing and teaching lessons to the Chinese? If inquiry is confined to missionaries with lengthy experience in China, for example, they apparently believed that these acts would be effective because of their own "understanding of Chinese character and conditions" (cited in Young, 1968: 188; Miller, 1974: 274). Central to such an understanding appears to have been what missionaries identified as a fundamental trait of the Chinese — their notion of "face." The Rev. Arthur Smith, at the time one of the most widely read "experts" on Chinese behavior,¹² defined face as "an integral part of both Chinese theory and practice," one in which "realities" were far less important than "appearances."¹³ "If the latter can be saved," he argued,

the former may be altogether surrendered. This is the essence of the mysterious "face" of which we are never done hearing in China. The line of Pope might be the Chinese national motto: "Act well your part, there all the honour lies"; not, be it observed, doing well what is to be done, but consummate acting, contriving to convey the appearance of a thing or a fact, whatever the realities may be.

Smith went on to explain that the Chinese were continually caught up in the process of gaining, preserving, or losing face. In so doing, they frequently had to act in an "arbitrary and violent manner," "fly into a violent rage," or otherwise use "reviling and perhaps imprecatory language." Such behavior was essential for indicating to the "spectators" of the "drama" in which the individual was "at the moment acting" that he was "aware just what ought to be done by a person in his precise situation." Not to do the proper thing would be to descend from the stage, or "lose face" (A. Smith's "Rex Christus," cited in Brown, 1904: 37-38). The language here is important, for in Smith's version of face, the Chinese treated all the world as a stage on which appearance was all and reality insignificant.

Smith presented this "Chinese characteristic" as an accurate representation of Chinese social behavior, and it has come down to us largely unquestioned in that form. The point is not whether face is actually an organizing category in Chinese practices but rather the place that it holds in a Western discourse of ritualized destruction and lesson teaching. We must consider, in other words, the role of face in authorizing the destruction of walls, towers, and temples. The China lore of missionaries such as Brown and Smith constituted "face" as a singular attribute of the colonized, while denying that representatives of the allied powers were concerned themselves with appearances or that their discursive practices might actually produce "face." Constructing their Chinese in these terms (making their object, as it were, responsible for the illusions of face), the Powers could then in good conscience act with impunity against symbols they took as significant to a Chinese mind that could mistakenly ascribe magical powers to walls and confuse the apparent and the real. The actions taken in Baoding and Taiyuan can also be understood, therefore, as designed to inflict a loss of face on a people continuously play-acting the game of face.

*CONSTRUCTING CHRISTIAN SACRED
SITES IN BAODING AND TAIYUAN*

Clouds lowered as we left Peking, July 6 [1901], on the Peking and Hankow Railway for Paoting-fu, that city of *sacred and painful* interest to every American Christian [Brown, 1904: 200; emphasis added].

In early 1901, groups of Protestant missionaries returned to places where their compatriots had been killed and performed rituals of sacred consecration. At Baoding, Taiyuan, and a number of other locations, missionaries, with the cooperation of local Chinese officials, held memorial services, dedicated cemeteries, and put up or arranged for the erection of monuments. These services were, in turn, paralleled by memorial services held, according to Isaac Ketler (1902: 400), “by almost all Christian denominations, and in almost all lands.” We might see this process as the constructive phase of retribution, one that put another kind of brand on the Chinese hinterland. For all intents and purposes, the establishment of sacred sites was designed to inscribe on the land and on the minds of the Chinese a perpetual memory of Christian martyrdom.

In February 1901, the first group of missionaries, including E. H. Edwards, arrived in Baoding. At the site of a mass grave near the southeast corner of the city wall, Edwards and the others dug up the remains of the dead and placed them in coffins. Given the length of time that the bodies had been in the ground and the fact that all had been beheaded, absolute identifications were difficult; some coffins only contained a skull. After the disinterment, the missionaries held a short service (Forsyth, 1904: 26).

A month later, another group of missionaries, accompanied by German and French officers, arrived to conduct formal burial services at a new cemetery that would include the bodies of Chinese converts (Ketler, 1902: 390ff). On the “Crowning Day,” March 23, services were held in a tent pavilion that had been set up by Chinese officials where the Presbyterian compound had stood. According to the Rev. J. W. Lowrie,

the service opened with some rich and plaintive strains from the band which were followed by a reading of Scripture by Rev. C. A. Killie, a

singing in English of the beautiful hymn, "Asleep in Jesus, blessed sleep," which, especially the last verse, never seemed more appropriate, a memorial address by Rev. John Werry, D.D., who spoke of each individual whose death we had gathered to commemorate. The German musicians followed with two stanzas [of] "Ein fest Burg ist unser Gott." Rev. Dr. Sheffield of the American Board led in prayer, Mr. Lowrie followed in some remarks to the Chinese gathered there. The Chinese sang the native rendering of the hymn, "I'm but a stranger here, heaven is my home." Rev. Dr. Arthur Smith of the American Board pronounced the benediction. The band followed with a soft and gentle air and the service ended [Ketler, 1902: 394-395].

The following day, additional services were held at the site of the American Board, where twenty-six bodies were buried, and at Lowrie's residence that evening. At that time, missionaries discussed the possibility of constructing another burial ground on the site where the Baoding contingent had been executed (Ketler, 1902: 395).

Similar services were held in Taiyuan on July 18, 1901 (Edwards, 1903: 132-146; Forsyth, 1904: 499-501). Wreaths were presented by Chinese officials, but one account noted that, unlike Baoding, neither the local gentry nor merchants' guilds presented any "tangible token" of respect (Edwards, 1903: 139). Services were also held at Xinshou on July 29, Taigu xian on August 9, and Shouyang on November 29, 1902 (Edwards, 1903: 147-154; Forsyth, 1904: 501-502). All of these services apparently closely resembled those that Lowrie described for Baoding, with Chinese officials present and ceremonies held in tent pavilions that the officials provided.

From Lowrie's account and from comments made concerning events in Taiyuan, there was more at work in these ceremonies than simply honoring the "martyred" dead. First, the services reconfirmed the "right" of missionaries to proselytize in the Chinese hinterland. The common burial of Chinese converts and Western missionaries and the participation of Chinese converts in the memorial service in the presence of Chinese officials, gentry, and merchants all point to such a conclusion. Second, missionaries wanted from the same Chinese some sort of admission of past errors. This, according to all accounts, is what apparently happened in Baoding. But in Taiyuan, quite another attitude emerged. Robert Forsyth, in commenting on the memorial

service held in Taiyuan, captured succinctly the attitude that missionaries hoped the Chinese population would display:

How different the scene then to the sight many bystanders saw about a year before! Then the martyrs stood pale and silent in the presence of their persecutors; now the officials stood silent and abashed in the presence of missionaries. The contrast was striking, and to the thoughtful must have afforded suitable food for reflection [Forsyth, 1904: 500].

Yet even given this apparent submissiveness of the Taiyuan population, there were signs that, unlike Baoding, the people of Taiyuan were not truly remorseful. As was mentioned, one account noted that the gentry and merchants of Taiyuan did not present an appropriate sign of remorse, and the population itself, according to an eyewitness cited by E. H. Edwards, “appeared sullen rather than repentant.” In addition, the new governor did not participate in the services but gave an audience afterward in which he was said to have “apologized and expressed great regret” (Edwards, 1903: 139). According to Edwards, the decisive factor leading to official, though limited, remorse was the German occupation of the passes to Shanxi in April. Edwards appeared to be implying here that without the sort of retributive justice applied in Baoding, the Powers could not expect the people of Shanxi to be properly remorseful.

The arguments of Edwards and others concerning the application of force appear rather curious, for, after all, what sort of remorse or regret is it that is imposed from the outside? However, such logic is accountable in view of how Westerners constructed Chinese characteristics. As the stern Dr. Ament remarked on more than one occasion, repeating what had become by the end of the nineteenth century a cliché about Chinese character, “If you deal with the Chinese with a soft hand, they will take advantage of it” (cited in Miller, 1974: 276). According to this view, only the application of force could refashion this character in such a way that it could be capable of regret.

Finally, there was another element also at work in these memorial services, one having to do with the very notion of martyrdom. Martyrdom has a long history within Christianity, dating back to its very beginning. The word itself means to witness, to testify to the fact that Jesus is the Son of God. It involves the refusal to renounce one’s faith

in the face of persecution and death and has also been characterized as a second baptism or a baptism in blood. In the early church, martyrs were venerated through ceremonies held at their gravesites, usually in extraurban cemeteries, on the date of their deaths, and miracles were associated with them. In the Roman Catholic church, martyrdom was one road to sainthood, and cults of saints emerged in which the faithful prayed for martyrs to intercede on their behalf with God. Relics of martyrs — pieces of their bodies or of their clothing — sanctified altars. As Catholicism grew and spread globally, martyr relics consecrated new churches, thus incorporating ever larger areas into Christendom (on martyrdom, see Eliade, 1987: 11.251ff, 4.172-174; Hastings, 1916: 11.53; Jackson, 1910: 7.216ff; Weinrich, 1981: 78-79, 205-206; on martyr burials, see Aries, 1974: 16-17). From the third century C.E. forward, it was also held that “the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the Church,” a notion repeated by Isaac Ketler (1902: 400) in *The Tragedy of Paotingfu*.

However, here we are not dealing with Roman Catholic theology but with Protestantism. As Kolb (1987: 148) pointed out, from its inception, Lutheranism rejected the notion of the intercession between man and God provided by saints and martyrs. At the same time, persecution of Protestants during the Reformation led to the emergence of new martyrologies. Foremost among the Protestant writings devoted to martyrdom, at least in the English-speaking world, was *Foxe's Book of Martyrs* (Foxe, 1856), a text that continues to be published to this day and apparently enjoyed renewed interest as missionary enterprises expanded globally (Haller, 1963: 251-253). Martyrologies such as Foxe's argued that martyrs could exist in the present. However, rather than working miracles, Protestant martyrs called on believers to confess or testify to their belief, provided models of exemplary actions in the face of persecution or, more humbly, of the virtue of piety, and supported the claim that the Christian god concerned himself with every aspect of his people's daily life (see Kolb, 1987: 148-156).

The memorial services discussed earlier resonate with this Protestant reworking of martyrdom. Certainly, those who died at the hands of the Boxers could, in various Protestant definitions just discussed, be considered martyrs. Atrocity stories maintain that they had suffered

and borne witness to their belief and had all led pious and exemplary lives. At the same time, insofar as missionary authors asserted a connection between martyr's blood as "seed" and the growth or extension of Christianity, the memorial services held in China were much like those held centuries before around the graves of the Church's first martyrs. Therefore, we might view the events described by Lowrie and other missionaries as rituals, which, by means of the blood of martyrs, incorporated China into Christendom.¹⁴ If this is indeed the case, it may help explain why a number of these authors could find cause for hope and optimism about the missionary enterprise in China.

RISING FROM THE ASHES

"Wickedness has overthrown the sinner." What the destruction of Jerusalem did in making the old order of Judaism impossible, this cataclysm has in measure done for China. For the greater freedom and boundless opportunities which we believe in answer to prayer God will give, the Church should arouse herself [Broomhall, 1901: 12].

The Church in China is also demonstrating before the world, that the blood of the martyrs *is* the seed of the Church. Until the latest day in that far away land men will treasure the record of sacrifice and suffering which God's people, in the year 1900, endured in China, and hand down the story of Paotingfu [Ketler, 1902: 400].

That which remains is much more than that which perished; China's need of the Gospel is greater and more clearly revealed than ever before; the lessons of history lead us to expect that after these convulsions cease and peace has been secured, *a wider door of opportunity than heretofore will greet us in this great Empire* [Missionary Herald, January 1901: 8, cited in Forsythe, 1971: 78; emphasis added].¹⁵

As these quotations indicate, missionaries soon interpreted the "cataclysm" of 1900 in a positive way. Couched in millenarian terms, they transformed the disaster into a triumph that served to confirm past success. As that old missionary hand W.A.P. Martin (1900: 170) put it, "The fires kindled by Boxers throw light on the success of missions, and prove that Christianity was making no little headway." In this revivalist atmosphere, Martin believed that the uprising had opened the way for the total conversion of China to Christianity. Even those

who might be less optimistic than the missionaries themselves could still argue that the missionaries' steadfast "work of love" in China could not be for "naught" (Conger, 1909: 167). The story of the sacrifices made at Baoding served as a reference point from which progress could now be asserted to arouse others to the dawn of a new age. The statements quoted at the beginning of this section encouraged readers to view the disaster as something that would serve to regenerate Christian evangelism in the future. In calling for a revival of missionary efforts in China, Ketler and others cited the last words of Rev. Pitkin, killed at Baoding, to his wife, words faithfully carried to the world by the Chinese convert Lao Man and transmitted to Mrs. Pitkin by J. W. Lowrie. According to these sources, Pitkin asked that his son Horace be told that "his father's last wish is that when he is twenty-five years of age, he may come to China as a missionary" (Ketler, 1902: 385-386; also see A. Smith, 1901: 2.618).

Biblical images of sacrifice and renewal were not the only analogies that missionaries employed. Some cited more recent examples of Christian suffering and indicated that in each case, they also began a new and more successful age of missionary enterprises. Arthur Brown observed that "the faint-hearted said that the India mutiny of 1857 and the Syria massacre of 1860 ended all hope of regenerating those countries, but in both they ushered in the most successful era of missions" (Brown, 1904: 361). Both Martin (1900: 175-185), who also compared the Boxer movement to the Sepoy mutiny (p. 140), and Broomhall (1901: 13) concurred with Brown.

These pronouncements are, of course, consistent with the Christian metanarrative referred to earlier. But something else is also present in these accounts: an assertion that China and perhaps the world was on the verge of great change. Arthur Brown, for example, argued that the Boxer uprising indicated that China was undergoing an "unwelcome" but "inevitable awakening,"¹⁶ a situation that led him to ruminate on Asia's long history of "grandeur" and "horror":

Has that mighty continent nothing more to contribute to the world than the memories of a mighty past? It is impossible to believe that this is all. The historic review gives a momentum which the mind cannot easily overcome. As we look towards the Far East, we can plainly see that the evolution is incomplete. Whatever purpose the Creator had in

mind has certainly not yet been accomplished. More than two-thirds of those innumerable myriads have as yet never heard of those high ideals of life and destiny which God Himself revealed to men. It is incredible that a wise God should have made such a large part of the world only to arrest its development at its present unfinished stage, inconceivable that He should have made and preserved so large a part of the human race for no other and higher purpose than has yet been achieved [Brown, 1904: 16-17].

“Impossible,” “incredible,” “unfinished,” and “inconceivable,” when coupled with “innumerable myriads,” are the key words here; they help to clarify and justify the missionary enterprise in the aftermath of the Boxer movement. But they do more than this: they weld a Christian teleology to secular visions of evolution and progress in a universal pattern of natural historical development.¹⁷ Like many other missionaries, Brown saw part of China’s salvation lying in modernization and industrialization, forces of change that China could not resist. But he also viewed these inevitable changes as incomplete without a corresponding Christianization of China (Brown, 1904: 116, 127-128). It was Christianity, according to Arthur Smith, that would allow the Chinese to adapt to the impact of Western civilization. The combination of Christianity and Western science would, he asserted, “make the dry bones of Chinese scholarship live by unifying, and for the first time completing, their knowledge of ‘Heaven, Earth, and Man’ ” (A. Smith, 1901: 2.738). The Chinese, as it were, would be doubly saved; thanks to the missionary enterprise, they would have bestowed on them a Christianized modernization.

Indeed, such moral modernization, aided in no small measure by the application of New Testament principles, soon emerged. In a spirit of forgiveness that was favorably contrasted to the insistence by the Catholic church on exorbitant indemnities (A. Smith, 1901: 2.729), Protestant missionary writers noted a number of farsighted and commendable programs that were soon implemented under the leadership of Rev. Timothy Richard. Richard negotiated a settlement that among other things provided a fund for the education of the people of Shanxi, so that, as Robert Forsyth explained, “the ignorance and superstition which was the root cause of this terrible tragedy may be removed for ever” (Forsyth, 1904: 42; Reid, 1901-1902: 450). Provided the Chinese

atoned, missionaries appeared willing to extend their charitable pedagogy to the masses who had rebelled against their presence. They would forgive and help to reform and rehabilitate China.

There is one final observation to be made about the regenerative theme struck by these authors. As indicated earlier, missionaries consecrated the sites of massacres as sacred ground, ground that now entered a new order of symbolic construction in which it provided material signs of remembrance for Christian sacrifice and Chinese transgression. But such ground could also serve to instill hope for the future by becoming sites for Christian pilgrimage. In a June 20, 1904 letter to one of her sisters, Sarah P. Conger (1909: 316) the wife of the American minister to China, implied as much:

We found the missions [in Baoding] rebuilt and all their many lines of work moving on with activity. The Chinese converts who survived the troubles of 1900 and bore their awful test are strong helpers to-day, and there is more interest manifested, far more sympathy offered, and more respect shown the Christian thought than ever before.

CONCLUSION

In this article, I have treated missionary discourse as a product of a historically specific culture rather than as a natural or commonsense response to a transparent situation. This approach to missionary writings follows suggestions outlined by the anthropologist Paul Rabinow, many of which seem particularly significant for historical studies of cross-cultural conflict. According to Rabinow (1986: 241),

we need to anthropologize the West: show how exotic its constitution of reality has been; emphasize those domains most taken for granted as universal (this includes epistemology and economics); make them seem as historically peculiar as possible; show how their claims to truth are linked to social practices and have hence become effective forces in the social world.

The exotic actions of missionaries included attacking walls and temples, generating martyrdom stories in a conventional mythic form, ritually consecrating Christian sites, and essentializing Chinese characteristics, such as face and superstition. For many Anglo-American

readers of the time, missionaries succeeded in transforming the Boxer challenge to Western penetration of China into a narrative of Christian sacrifice, suffering, death, and resurrection. Although it is not surprising that such a narrative should dominate missionary writing, its significance lies in its familiarity that facilitated claims to truth that overrode many of the contradictions inherent in the positions of American and British Protestant missionaries.

Although contradictions such as religious universalism versus nationalistic particularism or Old Testament retribution versus New Testament forgiveness were recognizable to critics of post-Boxer missionary behavior, they were seldom directly confronted. This elision may partly be accounted for by the fact that the missionaries who had been attacked during the uprising were consistently represented as innocent victims of Chinese “barbarism.” It may also be accounted for by the very structure of the missionary narrative. Recall the figure of Miss Morrill, who Christ-like presented alms to beggars in the face of persecution; recall the monuments to the dead and the services that consecrated them. Perhaps critics were silenced in the face of martyrs who both embodied and transcended the classic contradictions of the Judeo-Christian tradition.

Missionary conception of reality was not just “exotic” and “cultural,” however; it was also powerful, becoming an “effective force in the social world.” Not the least of these effects, of course, was to materially refashion the Chinese environment, both destructively and constructively, in an effort to make certain that the Chinese would long remember their transgressions against the Western presence. But a second important effect of missionary discourse was its long-term influence on Western, particularly American, perceptions of China. Indeed, it is a measure of success of the missionaries that their widely disseminated version of reality served to partly structure discourse on China for the next half-century or more. In the United States, for example, echoes of missionary discourse are discernible in the pious moral tone of American foreign policy toward China, in the American notion of a special relationship between the United States and China, and in the “charitable pedagogy” of the American government’s remission of the Boxer indemnity.¹⁸ On a more global scale, missionary writings contributed to making the Boxer uprising a staple in

imperial propaganda. Popular versions of events such as this were used by governments to win mass consent for imperial adventures (see MacKenzie, 1986a, 1986b).

The effects of missionary discourse, particularly as they were carried through time, raise other kinds of issues as well. For example, what sort of Chinese subject did missionary writers posit? At times, the Chinese subject was represented as a savage, barbarous fanatic only capable of comprehending the use of force, as well as a superstitious idolater and believer in magic. At other times, missionaries saw the Chinese as capable of being civilized, first through discipline and later through education and/or conversion to Christianity. Although these missionary beliefs ran parallel to Victorian-era discourse on children, women, and "primitive" peoples (Levy, 1991: 51-54, 107; Kiernan, 1986: 153-154; on colonized peoples, see Hunt, 1987: 69-77), what makes them especially interesting in the context of the post-Boxer period was that missionaries also acknowledged that China, though stagnant, was an old and great civilization. How then to account for missionary identification of a precivilized Chinese personality?

Among the more striking peculiarities of missionary discourse is its insistence on imputing to others a deficient understanding of reality and a corresponding claim that as a result of this deficiency the Chinese ascribed fantastic and questionable value to objects. These claims were, as argued earlier, the foundation of symbolic warfare. Such imputed fantasizing was not unique to the Chinese, however, nor was it only noticed by Protestant missionaries writing about China. Whereas Kantians in the nineteenth century wrangled over which representations should be privileged foundations of knowledge (Rorty, 1979: 159-162), politicians, soldiers, businessmen, and the educated elite argued that "lower" races everywhere had not yet learned to distinguish illusory appearances from an objectified reality, an argument that at the least served to justify the "civilizing" aspects of colonial adventures. By the end of the century, the claim that the "unenlightened" were symbol oriented was a generally accepted tenet of anthropological knowledge (on symbols, see Eliade, 1987: 14.198-208; Firth, 1973). In some cases, such "knowledge" was used to facilitate penetration into yet to be exploited lands; in others, it was used to manage subjugated populations (for other examples, see

Taussig, 1987: 384-387; Comaroff and Comaroff, 1991: 234, 259-261). Ignored in these claims and representations was the transformation imposed by the enlightened on the "symbols" of the benighted: the "fetishes" of others became so much loot with a market value or so much bric-a-brac to fill the new institution of the public museum and international expositions (Stocking, 1985; Rydell, 1984). As if this was not peculiar enough, objects supposedly valued by others could also become surrogates for the others themselves, so that the enlightened could believe that punishing walls and temples was the same as punishing people.

The fetishization of symbols is less interesting, however, than the continuation of the appearance-reality divide in our treatments of Chinese history. Such distinctions are maintained by those who, through an implicit or explicit comparison, treat the West as the domain of hardheaded realpolitik and proper historical development and China as a site where politics remains improperly caught up in culture, drama, or ritual (Fairbank, 1942: 129-133; Pritchard, 1943: 196-200; Cranmer-Byng, 1965-1966: 68-77; Wills, 1984: 21-22, 187). Once Western behavior is shifted into the domain of historically specific cultural practice and the naturalness of the "West" is questioned, the dichotomies on which much evaluation of Chinese behavior has been built correspondingly weaken. This ought to be liberating, allowing us to rehistoricize events such as the Boxer uprising in terms of their contingent rather than deterministic or inevitable constitution.

NOTES

1. The eight Powers were Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia, Japan, the United States, Italy, and Austria. Although there was general agreement among their representatives on the necessity of striking a blow against Chinese notions of sovereignty, there was occasional disagreement over the appropriateness of certain acts. See Hevia (1990: 382, 396) for some examples. For additional examples and citations on the specific acts of desecration that are discussed in the remainder of this paragraph, see Hevia (1990: 381-382).

2. Because the Chinese attacked and destroyed Christian missions and cemeteries, one is tempted to speak in terms of the symbolic warfare carried out by Westerners *and* Chinese against each other's "sacred" objects. For a number of reasons, however, I am limiting the use of the term to Western actions. First, in the absence of clarifying evidence, it is far from clear if Chinese attacks on foreign "sacred" sites held the same meanings for the Chinese as similar actions

against Chinese sites held for foreigners. There are also certain problems with the terms in which "symbolic behavior" is ascribed to others. In anthropology and history of religions, where the notion is most often deployed, there is little consistency in usage or agreement on what constitutes the "symbolic." Moreover, when accounting for Chinese behavior, Anglo-American historians quite often pit the "symbolic" against the "real," with Chinese beliefs demeaned as unclear or, in some cases, irrational (see, e.g., Mancall, 1971: 85).

3. Levy (1991: 4). There are now available numerous explorations of the world-constituting nature of representations (see, e.g., Haraway, 1989; Lowe, 1982; Woolgar, 1988). The historical basis of representationalism is discussed by Foucault (1970), Reiss (1982), Barker (1985), and Judovitz (1988). A devastating philosophical critique of representation as foundation can be found in Rorty (1979) in his discussion of "epistemology centered philosophy" (p. 390) since Descartes.

4. Latour (1988: 3-7), following Tolstoy, reminds us how complex even the seemingly simple determination of an event can be.

5. This was especially the case with Rev. James W. Lowrie in Baoding. Missionaries also gave public lectures in Beijing for the allied expeditionary forces in which they reviewed recent events in China, including the siege and the rise of the Boxers (see Daggett, 1903: 53). Army Chaplain Leslie Grove noted these lectures in a letter to his wife, Gwen Grove, on September 9, 1900 (Grove Correspondence, United States Army Military History Institute, Carlisle, PA).

6. The association of ideology with common sense here follows Catherine Belsey (1980: 5), whose use of these terms argues that "ideology is not an optional extra, deliberately adopted by self-conscious individuals, but the very condition of our experience of the world."

7. Belsey (1980: 5) defined a discourse as "a domain of language use, a particular way of talking (and writing and thinking)" involving "certain shared assumptions which appear in the formulations that characterize it."

8. The discussion of missionary writings in these terms draws attention to their place within orientalism, which Edward Said (1979) defined as a body of knowledge about the "Orient" produced by texts and institutional practices. On orientalism, see Inden (1986) and Prakash (1990). Each of these authors argues for the historicity and discontinuity rather than the accumulative nature of knowledge.

9. In letters to his wife on September 13 and October 16, 1900, Leslie Grove lamented missionary desire for revenge and their involvement in looting, especially among members of the American Board. Once these stories got out, Grove felt it "will be tough for the cause" (Grove correspondence, United States Army Military History Institute, Carlisle, PA).

10. For a frank assessment of Yuxian's involvement in the Boxer movement based on available evidence, see Esherick (1987: 190-193, 255-270).

11. Temples, especially those associated with Buddhism, epitomized for many missionaries what they viewed as their major enemy in China: Chinese superstition (see Martin, 1900: 61-69). Also see the comments of Henry Savage-Landor in *The Literary Digest* (1901: 23, 5.143), which lay the blame for the Boxer uprising at the feet of Buddhist monks.

12. A. Smith (1894) was the author of *Chinese Characteristics* the first chapter of which is aptly titled "Face." Hayford (1985: 153) and Mackerras (1989: 51) noted that the book continued to be influential from the 1920s to the 1970s. The book's postwar demise may in part be accounted for by the discrediting of nineteenth-century scientific racism, elements of which can be found in Smith's writing. For example, Smith's work, rather than being without structure as Hayford (1985: 161) claims, mimics the anthropology of the time, particularly in its widely disseminated popular form of using imputed physiological traits to establish racial hierarchies. On scientific racism, see Stocking (1968), Gould (1981), and Miles (1989: 30-38), the last of

which provides a brief synopsis with ample citations. On the popular anthropology of the time and its dissemination in American society, see Rydell (1984).

13. The idea that the Chinese either could not or would prefer not to distinguish appearance from reality has a long pedigree going back at least to the Macartney embassy of 1793 and continuing into the present day. See Hevia (1990: 396).

14. I am indebted to Don Lopez who encouraged me to further explore Christian notions of martyrdom and suggested that having martyrs in China effectively turned China into a part of Christendom.

15. Such pronouncements appear to have had an effect. According to Hastings (1916: 8.741), the number of missionaries in China increased from 2,785 to 4,175 during the first decade of the twentieth century.

16. The quotations are from the subtitle of Brown's 1904 book. The notion of a somnambulant and awakening China was prominent in titles and subtitles of Western works on China during this era and was a notion shared by Westerners outside the missionary community (see Cohen, 1978: 587). On recent repetitions of this notion, see Cohen (1984).

17. Brown, Arthur Smith, and others freely used the contemporary language of evolution, adaptation, and race, all seen as natural processes or categories in the development of civilizations. See Rydell (1984) on the pervasiveness of these ideas in late nineteenth-century America. On similarities between missionary and secular reformers in China, see Cohen (1978: 585-589).

18. See Isaacs (1958: 106-107) for a general discussion of the long-term impact in the United States of representations of the Boxers. Isaacs also noted that the next three decades were a "golden age" of missionary enterprise in China (pp. 144-150), a pattern of growth that seems linked to the effects of the constructive phase of symbolic warfare.

19. In his treatment of this aspect of colonialism as it relates to American Indians, Hinsley (1989: 170) argued that museum and exposition representations of Indians worked to dehistoricize and tame them. Much the same could be said for other rebellious populations such as the Chinese.

REFERENCES

- ARIES, PHILLIPE (1974) *Western Attitudes toward Death: From the Middle Ages to the Present*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press.
- BARKER, FRANCIS (1985) *The Tremulous Private Body: Essays on Subjugation*. New York: Methuen.
- BELSEY, CATHERINE (1980) *Critical Practice*. London: Methuen.
- The Boxer Rising (1967) Reprinted from the "Shanghai Mercury." New York: Paragon Book Reprint Corp.
- BROOMHALL, MARTIN (1901) *Martyred Missionaries of the China Inland Mission*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co.
- BROWN, ARTHUR (1904) *New Forces in Old China: An Unwelcome But Inevitable Awakening*. New York: Fleming H. Revell.
- COHEN, PAUL (1978) "Christian missions and their impact to 1900," pp. 543-590 in John K. Fairbank (ed.), *The Cambridge History of China*, vol. 10. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- COHEN, PAUL (1984) *Discovering History in China*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.

- COLTMAN, ROBERT (1901) *Beleaguered in Peking: The Boxer's War Against the Foreigner; The Yellow Crime*. Philadelphia: F. A. Davis.
- COMAROFF, JEAN and JOHN COMAROFF (1991) *Of Revelation and Revolution*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- CONGER, SARAH (1909) *Letters from China*. Chicago: A. C. McClurg.
- CRANMER-BYNG, J. L. (1965-1966) "The Chinese attitude towards external relations." *International Journal* 21, 1: 57-77.
- DAGGETT, AARON (1903) *America in the China Relief Expedition*. Kansas City: Hudson-Kimberly.
- EDWARDS, EBEN (1903) *Fire and Sword in Shansi: The Story of the Martyrdom of Foreigners and Chinese Christians*. Reprint. New York: Arno Press and The New York Times, 1970.
- ELIADE, MIRCEA [ed.] (1987) *The Encyclopedia of Religion*. New York: Macmillan.
- ESHERICK, JOSEPH (1987) *The Origins of the Boxer Uprising*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
- FAIRBANK, J. (1942) "Tributary trade and China's relations with the West." *Far Eastern Q.* 1: 129-149.
- FIRTH, RAYMOND (1973) *Symbols, Public and Private*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press.
- FORSYTH, ROBERT (1904) *The China Martyrs of 1900*. London: Religious Tract Society.
- FORSYTHE, SAMUEL (1971) *An American Missionary Community in China, 1895-1905*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard East Asian Monograph 43.
- FOUCAULT, MICHEL (1970) *The Order of Things*. New York: Random House.
- FOX, JOHN (1856) *Foxe's Book of Martyrs*. Philadelphia: Jas. B. Smith.
- GOULD, STEPHEN (1981) *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: Norton.
- HALLER, WILLIAM (1963) *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and the Elect Nation*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- HARAWAY, DONNA (1989) *Primate Visions*. New York: Routledge.
- HART, ROBERT (1901) *These From the Land of Sinim*. London: Chapman & Hall.
- HASTINGS, JAMES [ed.] (1916) *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- HAYFORD, C. (1985) "Chinese and American characteristics: Arthur H. Smith and his China book," pp. 153-174 in Susan Barnett and John Fairbank (eds.), *Christianity in China*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- HEVIA, J. (1990) "Making China 'perfectly equal'." *J. of Historical Sociology* 3, 4: 380-401.
- HINSLEY, C. (1989) "Zunis and brahmins: cultural ambivalence in the gilded age," pp. 169-207 in George Stocking (ed.), *Romantic Motives*. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press.
- HUNT, MICHAEL (1987) *Ideology and U.S. Foreign Policy*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press.
- INDEN, R. (1986) "Orientalist constructions of India." *Modern Asian Studies* 20, 3: 401-446.
- ISAACS, HAROLD (1958) *Scratches on Our Minds*. New York: John Day.
- JACKSON, SAMUEL [ed.] (1910) *The Schaff-Hersog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*. New York: Funk and Wagnall.
- JUDOVITZ, DALIA (1988) *Subjectivity and Representation in Descartes*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- KIERNAN, VICTOR (1986) *The Lords of Human Kind*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.
- KETLER, ISAAC (1902) *The Tragedy of Paotingfu*. New York: Fleming H. Revell.
- KOLB, ROBERT (1987) *For All the Saints*. Macon, GA: Mercer Univ. Press.
- LATOUR, BRUNO (1988) *The Pasteurization of France*. Translated by A. Sheridan and J. Law. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- LEVY, ANITA (1991) *Other Women*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.

- LIN WENHAI [ed.] (1986) *Yihetuan yundong shishi yaolu* (Essential Historical Records of the Boxer Movement). Ji'nan: Jilu shushe.
- The Literary Digest, 1900-1901. New York.
- LOWE, DONALD (1982) *History of Bourgeois Perception*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- LYNCH, GEORGE (1901) *The War of Civilizations*. London: Longmans, Green.
- MACKENZIE, JOHN (1986a) *Propaganda and Empire*. Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press.
- MACKENZIE, JOHN [ed.] (1986b) *Imperialism and Popular Culture*. Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press.
- MACKERRAS, COLIN (1989) *Western Images of China*. Hong Kong: Oxford Univ. Press.
- MANCALL, MARK (1971) *Russia and China*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- MARTIN, W.A.P. (1900) *The Siege in Peking*. New York: Fleming H. Revell.
- MILES, ROBERT (1989) *Racism*. London: Routledge.
- MILLER, S. C. (1974) "Ends and means: missionary justification of force in nineteenth century China," pp. 249-282 in John Fairbank (ed.), *The Missionary Enterprise in China and America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- MINER, LUELLA (1903) *China's Book of Martyrs*. Cincinnati: Jennings & Pye.
- NICHOLLS, BOB (1986) *Bluejackets and Boxers*. Sidney: Allen & Unwin.
- POE, EDGAR ALLAN (1982) "The premature burial," pp. 168-181 in *The Tell-Tale Heart and Other Writings by Edgar Allan Poe*. New York: Bantam.
- PRAKASH, G. (1990) "Writing post-orientalist histories of the third world: perspectives from Indian historiography." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 32, 2: 383-408.
- PRITCHARD, E. H. (1943) "The kowtow in the Macartney embassy to China in 1793." *Far Eastern Q.* 2, 2: 163-201.
- RABINOW, P. (1986) "Representations are social facts: modernity and post-modernity in anthropology," pp. 234-261 in James Clifford and George Marcus (eds.), *Writing Culture*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
- REID, G. (1901) "The ethics of loot." *Forum* 31: 581-586.
- REID, G. (1901-1902) "The ethics of the last war." *Forum* 32: 446-455.
- REISS, TIMOTHY (1982) *The Discourse of Modernism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Univ. Press.
- RORTY, RICHARD (1979) *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.
- RYDELL, ROBERT (1984) *All the World's a Fair*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- SAID, EDWARD (1979) *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage.
- SAVAGE-LANDOR, HENRY (1901) *China and the Allies*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- SAYER, D. (1991) "The Amritsar massacre and the British reaction 1919-20." *Past and Present* 131, 1: 130-164.
- SIMPSON, BERTRAM (1907) *Indiscreet Letters from Peking*. Reprint. New York: Arno Press and The New York Times, 1970.
- SMITH, ARTHUR (1894) *Chinese Characteristics*. Reprint. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat, 1970.
- SMITH, ARTHUR (1901) *China in Convulsion*. 2 vols. New York: Fleming H. Revell.
- SMITH, STANLEY (1901) *China From Within*. London: Marshall Brothers.
- STOCKING, GEORGE [ed.] (1985) *Objects and Others*. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press.
- STOCKING, GEORGE (1968) *Race, Culture, and Evolution*. New York: Free Press.
- TAUSSIG, MICHAEL (1987) *Shamanism, Colonialism and the Wild Man*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- WEINRICH, WILLIAM (1981) *Spirit and Martyrdom*. Washington, DC: Univ. Press of America.
- WILLS, JOHN (1984) *Embassies and Illusions*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.

- WOOLGAR, STEVEN (1988) *Science, the Very Idea*. London: Routledge.
- YOUNG, MARILYN (1968) *The Rhetoric of Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan jindaishi yanjiusuo "Jindaishi ziliao" bianjizu [comp.] [The "Modern Historical Source Materials" Editorial Group of the Chinese Academy of Social Science] (1982) *Yihetuan shiliao* (Historical Materials on the Boxers). 2 vols. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan.

James L. Hevia, an assistant professor of history at Indiana State University, is also a visiting assistant professor of history at the University of North Carolina for the 1991-1992 academic year. He is currently working on a manuscript on the Macartney mission to China in 1793.