

This item was submitted to [Loughborough's Research Repository](#) by the author.
Items in Figshare are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise indicated.

Protestant missionary periodicals debate the Boxer War, 1900-1901: martyrdom, solidarity and justification

PLEASE CITE THE PUBLISHED VERSION

<http://www.steiner-verlag.de/titel/59686.html>

PUBLISHER

Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden GmbH

VERSION

VoR (Version of Record)

PUBLISHER STATEMENT

This work is made available according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) licence. Full details of this licence are available at:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

LICENCE

CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

REPOSITORY RECORD

Klein, Thoralf. 2019. "Protestant Missionary Periodicals Debate the Boxer War, 1900-1901: Martyrdom, Solidarity and Justification". figshare. <https://hdl.handle.net/2134/15760>.

PROTESTANT MISSIONARY PERIODICALS DEBATE THE BOXER WAR, 1900–1901

Martyrdom, Solidarity, and Justification

Thoralf Klein

The Boxer War of 1900–1901 constituted an unprecedented crisis in the history of both 'Western' imperialism and Christian missions in China in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. For many contemporary observers, it seemed to threaten the 'Western' presence in China altogether – although this claim was probably exaggerated – yet by the same token, mission work in North China, where the Boxer movement concentrated, was severely disrupted, with around 250 missionaries and at least several thousands of Chinese Christians killed, mission stations and chapels burned and abandoned, and Christian homes looted or destroyed.

At the same time, the Boxer War also exposed the uneasy relationship between Christian missions and imperialism. It had been triggered by the Boxers, a popular religious and social movements that had emerged amidst social and ecological tensions in the border districts of the Northern Chinese provinces of Shandong and Zhili. The Boxers held the foreigners responsible for the misfortunes befalling China and called for their extermination. However, the movement also arose out of conflicts between local communities and against the backdrop of a high degree of local violence endemic in rural China.¹ For this reason, Boxer groups began by attacking Chinese Christians in 1898 and through 1899, took on foreign missionaries at the turn of 1900 and expanded the scope of their attacks to encompass all 'Westerners' and all things foreign in the spring and summer of 1900. Mismanagement of the crisis by both the Imperial Chinese government and the representatives of the 'Western' powers led first to a diplomatic crisis and then, in June 1900, to an outright, if undeclared war. A combination of Chinese Imperial regular troops and Boxer militia besieged the Legations Quarter in Beijing (where many missionaries and Chinese Christians had found shelter) as well as the foreign enclave, the so-called 'concessions', in the port city of Tianjin. Both communities were relieved by a multinational intervention army organised by the governments of eight powers (in alphabetical order: Austria-Hungary, France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Japan, Russia and the United States), which defeated the Chinese regular forces, organised punitive expeditions against Boxer

1 A good discussion of this point is in R. G. Tiedemann, "Boxers, Christians and the Culture of Violence in North China," *Journal of Peasant Studies* 25 (1998): 150–160.

villages and ultimately forced a peace settlement from the Beijing government – the so-called Boxer Protocol, signed on 7 September 1901.²

In my paper I will examine the discourse on these events in a number of Protestant missionary periodicals, giving special emphasis to the specific ways in which this discourse differed from the political-military one as it emerged, among others, from daily newspapers and secular-oriented periodicals. To achieve a sufficient breadth of analysis, I have decided to focus on a cross-section of five periodicals that allow for a variety of perspectives: They represent different nationalities (two from Germany, one from England, one from the USA and one ‘international’) as well as different denominations; some were attached to particular mission societies, while others were independent; some had immediate interests in areas of Boxer activity and had links with missionaries in the war zone, while others were mere observers.

The first three periodicals were typical ‘society publications’ (to coin a term), designed to keep supporters abreast of a particular mission society’s achievements and drawbacks, to stimulate fund-raising and – an important though easily overlooked aspect – to further the cause through common prayer. *The Mission Field* was published by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel (SPG), one of the oldest Protestant mission societies (founded in 1701) and with a strict orientation towards the Church of England.³ *The Missionary Herald* appeared under the auspices of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM), an interdenominational, rather liberal and decentralised organised society, whose highly educated missionaries raised their own funds and enjoyed considerable influence on the society’s decision-making.⁴ The *China-Bote* was the mouthpiece of the German Alliance Mission, one of several smaller societies across Europe affiliated with the China Inland Mission (CIM).⁵ This society had been founded in England by the charismatic Hudson Taylor (1832–1905), and was the only European mission society to have moved its headquarters to China. Owing to its cooperation with non-British societies, the CIM was widely viewed as an “international”⁶ society at the time; it was also interdenominational. As a so-called “faith mission,” it rarely solicited funds, its missionaries rather placing their faith in God’s hands for support. It aimed at the provinces in the Chinese interior which

2 For an overview of the events see: Paul A. Cohen, *History in Three Keys: The Boxers as Event, Experience and Myth* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997); Joseph W. Esherick, *The Origins of the Boxer Uprising* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1987); Xiang Lanxin, *The Origins of the Boxer War: A Multinational Study* (London: Routledge Curzon, 2003).

3 See: Daniel O’Connor et al., *Three Centuries of Mission: The United Society for the Propagation of the Gospel 1701–2000* (London: Continuum, 2000).

4 Janet E. Heininger, “Private Positions Versus Public Policy: Chinese Devolution and the American Experience in East Asia,” *Diplomatic History* 6 (1982): 287–302.

5 For the CIM see now: Alwyn J. Austin, *China’s Millions: The China Inland Mission and Late Qing Society, 1832–1905* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007); for the German Alliance Mission see: Austin, *China’s Millions*, 319.

6 “Missions in China,” *Missionary Herald* 96 (1900), 96–97, 97.

had been largely unclaimed by mission societies, expected its missionaries to adopt Chinese dress, and became the single largest mission organisation in China by the early twentieth century. The unassuming posture of the CIM was also reflected in the unadorned and simple language of the *China-Bote*, which suggests a readership with a rather modest social and educational background.

The other two were periodicals that recorded the progress of missionary work in China or worldwide. The *Chinese Recorder*, the leading mission periodical in the Chinese field, appeared with the American Presbyterian Press in Shanghai. Its contributions were written by and for missionaries, and discussed mainly strategic, educational and linguistic issues.⁷ Nothing symbolises the professionalism of the *Recorder* better than its use of Chinese characters, which were of interest only for readers with the necessary language skills. An otherwise English-language publication, it was at the same time 'international' and interdenominational in that it provided a forum for authors from different countries and with different affiliations; up to WWI, German missionaries (usually counted among the Lutherans in China) were among the contributors. In almost all these aspects, *Die evangelischen Missionen* was diametrically opposed to the *Chinese Recorder*. Its editor was Julius Richter (1862–1940), then a pastor in Brandenburg and later professor of Mission Studies in Berlin.⁸ Richter had close ties with mission circles and in 1900 became a member of the directorial board of the Berlin Mission. Despite his missionary connection, the magazine demonstrated no denominational preferences (although I will return to one exception later in this essay). As its subtitle, *Illustriertes Familienblatt* suggests, the periodical targeted families and seems to have been aimed at a mixed, but largely middle-brow readership.

These periodicals, all of which appeared monthly, not only differed with regard to language, nationality, editorship, contributors and denominational ties, but they were also affected to varying degrees by the Boxer outbreak: Both the SPG and the American Board were active in the geographical areas of Boxer outbreak and hence suffered directly, thus both *The Mission Field* and the *Herald* expressed immediate interest in the Boxer War. The case of the *China-Bote* was more complicated: Although the China Inland Mission experienced the greatest loss of missionaries at the hands of Boxers and Imperial Chinese officials, the German Alliance Mission was active in South China, beyond the range of Boxer activity. It therefore occupied a middle ground between direct involvement and mere observation. With its ties to the mission community in China, the *Chinese Recorder*, with headquarters in Shanghai, provided a forum for those missionaries and societies involved in the events. In contrast, *Die evangelischen Missionen* took the posture of an observer. Despite the differences, however, all these periodicals shared a common rhetoric and discourse.

7 Kathleen L. Lodwick, "Hainan for the Homefolk: Images of the Island in the Missionary and Secular Press," in *United States Attitudes and Policies Toward China: The Impact of American Missionaries*, ed. Patricia Neils (Armonk, NY: Sharpe 1990): 97–110.

8 Karl Rennstich, "Richter, Julius," in *Biographisch-bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon*, vol. 8 (Herzberg: Bautz, 1994): 251–252.

In analyzing the coverage of the Boxer War by these periodicals, I will address three aspects: first, the question of martyrdom and deliverance and its wider implications for the relationship between politics and salvation history; second, the attitude of missions towards Chinese in general and Chinese Christians in particular; and third, the debate about the responsibility of Christian missions for the outbreak of the Boxer disturbances. On the basis of James Carey's theory of communication as ritual,⁹ I will draw some general conclusions as to the role of politics – understood here as secular governmental ideologies, projects and actions – in the missionary periodicals' discussions of the Boxer War.

MARTYRDOM AND DELIVERANCE

In general and with few exceptions, both decision-makers and the wider public in the 'West', viewed the Boxer War as a struggle between modern 'Western' civilisation and Chinese barbarism. Discourses on civilisation often referred to Christian principles; for example, the German Kaiser Wilhelm II. (1859–1940), in his infamous 'Hun Speech', declared the Chinese civilisation inferior because it was 'not based on Christianity.'¹⁰ However, the Christian element was rather seldom present in the political justification of intervention in China.

Missionary periodicals, on the other hand, took a radically different approach. What was important for them was not so much to explain and comment the import of events in China per se, but rather their significance for mission work and hence for the salvation of mankind. This is why martyrdom is a thread that runs through all the publications analyzed here (and indeed many others). The elevated position of martyrdom in the missionary discourse on the Boxer War was not created in retrospect, after the missions had taken stock of the death toll. Already after the first missionary, a member of the SPG named Sidney Brooks (1875–1899), had been killed on New Year's Eve, 1899, the *Mission Field* printed a letter by one of his colleagues stating that "we cannot deny the martyr's name for him." A German translation of the same letter appeared in *Die evangelischen Missionen* soon afterwards, creating an impression of transnational solidarity that was quite typical of nineteenth-century Protestant missions.¹¹ For missionary periodicals commenting on the Boxer War, the concept of martyrdom was 'pre-mediated' in two ways. Since Christian missions had established themselves in the interior of China in the 1860s, missionaries had closely monitored anti-Christian disturbances at the

9 James W. Carey, *Communication as Culture: Essays on Media and Society* (Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman, 1989).

10 Bernd Sösemann, "Die sogenannte Hunnenrede Wilhelms II: Textkritische und interpretatorische Bemerkungen zur Ansprache des Kaisers vom 27. Juli 1900 in Bremerhaven," *Historische Zeitschrift* 222 (1976): 342–358, 350.

11 H. Mathews, "Sidney Brooks' Martyrdom," *The Mission Field* 45 (1900): 167–170, 170; "Die Unruhen in der Schantung-Provinz und die Ermordung des Missionars Sidney Brooks: Aus einem Briefe des Missionars H. Mathews [!] in Ping-yin," *Die evangelischen Missionen* 6 (1900): 154–156, 156.

local level, where missionaries had occasionally lost their lives, and their correspondence found its way into missionary periodicals as well as book-length publications.¹² More importantly, especially in an Anglo-Saxon context, there existed a discourse on martyrdom whose genealogy reaches back to the mid-sixteenth century. In 1563, John Foxe (or Foxe, 1517–1587) published the English version of his *Acts and Monuments*, commonly known as *Fox(e)'s Book of Martyrs*, a Protestant account of persecutions from the times of the Apostles to the England of his day. Beginning in Foxe's later years, additional material had been added (although later editions were mostly abridged), and Foxe's narrative was continued into the early nineteenth century.¹³ In German Protestantism (and possibly other parts of continental Europe) the tradition of martyrdom may have been less strong, but was not unfamiliar either.¹⁴

In either context, the discourse of Protestant missionaries was markedly different from their Catholic counterparts, who rejoiced in opportunities of laying down their lives as a symbol of spiritual purity and a token of God's grace.¹⁵ Protestant missionaries did not strive to become martyrs, in part because they had women and children to protect. For Protestant missionary periodicals, martyrdom

12 For example during the unrest of 1892; see, for example: "Thrilling Experience of Rev. J. Parker – His Escape from the Rebels," *Chinese Recorder* 33 (1892), 112–119; *The Anti-Foreign Riots in China 1891: With an Appendix* (Shanghai: North China Herald Office, 1892). Although the latter publication appeared under the auspices of a leading English treaty-port newspaper, its contributors were for the most part missionaries – an indication that at least in China the difference between mission and secular presses was not absolute.

13 I have used the following adaptation: John Foxe and Charles A. Goodrich, *The Book of Martyrs or, A History of the Lives, Sufferings and Triumphant Deaths of the Primitive as well as Protestant Martyrs: From the Commencement of Christianity to the Latest Periods of Pagan and Popish Persecution* (New York: Reed, 1831). For the influence of the book see: Elizabeth Evenden and Thomas S. Freeman, *Religion and the Book: The Making of Foxe's "Book of Martyrs"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 320–347; John N. King, *Foxe's Book of Martyrs and Early Modern Print Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 244–320; Peter Nockles, "The Nineteenth Century Reception," in John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* online, accessed March 28, 2012, <http://www.johnfoxe.org/index.php?realm=more&gototype=modern&type=essay&book=essay9>. For the importance of Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* in shaping the discourse on the Boxer War, see: James L. Hevia, *English Lessons: The Pedagogy of Imperialism in Nineteenth-Century China* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2003), 290–291; Roger R. Thompson, "Reporting the Taiyuan Massacre: Culture and Politics in the China War of 1900," in *The Boxers, China, and the World*, eds. Robert Bickers and R. G. Tiedemann (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007): 65–92, 66–67.

14 See: Bernhard Rogge, *Das Evangelium in der Verfolgung: Bilder aus den Zeiten der Gegenreformation* (Cologne: Wulfers, 1912), v. Rogge, a former court preacher, had been asked by the publisher to write a history of Protestant martyrdom, which he declined; however, he decided to respond by writing a history of the persecution of Protestantism in the period of Counter-Reformation.

15 Klaus Mühlhahn, *Herrschaft und Widerstand in der "Musterkolonie" Kiautschou: Interaktionen zwischen China und Deutschland, 1897–1914* (München: Oldenbourg, 2000), 327–331; for an eighteenth-century example referring to China see: Walter Demel, *Als Fremde in China: Das Reich der Mitte im Spiegel frühneuzeitlicher europäischer Reiseberichte* (München: Oldenbourg, 1992), 235–236.

was important because it evoked the concept of a unified history of salvation, connecting what was transpiring in China with earlier stages of church history and ultimately with biblical history.¹⁶ Comparisons between the situation of missionaries in China and the church under "Decius and Dioclesian" by the *Missionary Herald*, the *Chinese Recorder* and *Die evangelischen Missionen* were written in retrospect, after the success of the Allied military intervention.¹⁷ But as early as February 1900 (and without direct reference to the Boxers), the *Herald* had stated what was to become a kind of leitmotif: "Now, as always, the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church."¹⁸

Martyrdom hence contained a script for the future and thus substantiated the typical missionary rhetoric of displaying optimism in times of crisis in guaranteeing a bright future for the evangelisation of China. To some extent, missionary periodicals adopted this ostentatiously confident posture in order not to let drawbacks discourage the missions' supporters (and potential donors). But at a deeper level, the same also applies to missionaries' correspondence with their directory boards at home.¹⁹ By the same token, tales of atrocities committed against missionaries were also mitigated by an emphasis on the calmness and confidence with which the victims had accepted their fate. Aside from being an end in itself, this also justified the decision of the home boards not to give up the mission field.²⁰ Last but not least, martyrdom found its counterpoint in innumerable accounts of miraculous rescue from the Boxers that testified to divine intervention in human history. Part of these came from missionaries with regard to those missionaries who had fled the countryside for Beijing, only to become holed up during the siege of the Legations Quarter.²¹ That some of these were in the service of SPG or ABCFM made such stories readily available, and indeed both the *Herald* and the *Mission Field* followed the state of affairs with almost the same anxiety as the secular press, albeit with far less sensationalism, of which the *Herald* published a

16 Thoralf Klein, "Weltgeschichte, Heilsgeschichte: Umwälzungen in China als Folie missionarischer Geschichtskonstruktionen, 1900–1912," *Comparativ* 19, no. 5 (2009): 50–65, 58.

17 Judson Smith, "China, the Situation and the Outlook," *Missionary Herald* 96 (1900): 462–69, 464; see: "The Missionaries in China," *Chinese Recorder* 32 (1901): 27–30, 28; Paul Richter, "Die Märtyrer der evangelischen Mission in China 1900," *Die evangelischen Missionen* 7 (1901): 97–106, 101.

18 "Sunshine after clouds," *Missionary Herald* 96, no. 2 (1900): 45. That this short article followed two equally short notices on Boxer disturbances is without doubt significant, but its immediate reference was to occurrences in the South Chinese province of Fujian.

19 In my work on the German-Swiss Basel Mission in China, this has emerged as a recurring pattern; see: Thoralf Klein, *Die Basler Mission in der Provinz Guangdong (Südchina), 1859–1931: Akkulturationsprozesse und kulturelle Grenzziehungen zwischen Missionaren, chinesischen Christen und lokaler Gesellschaft* (München: Iudicium, 2002), 42.

20 See, for example: "The Society's Grants for 1902," *The Mission Field* 46 (1901): 216–217.

21 Arthur H. Smith, "The Hand of God in the Siege of Peking," *Chinese Recorder* 32 (1901): 83–88. This is the printed version of a speech made on the occasion of a thanksgiving service in Beijing in August 1900.

scathing critique.²² Similar and often more personalised stories also came from other parts of North China.

Missionary periodicals thus created a complex fabric of stories about anxiety, ordeal, death and deliverance, underpinned by the dialectics of martyrdom and miraculous rescue. This still left room for the inclusion of 'high' politics. In all cases, the missionary periodicals under discussion here presented no clear-cut distinction between matters religious and matters political. Examples of such absence consisted, at a very basic level, in reprinting documents related to the war, in providing short biographies of Chinese leaders, or in discussing Court politics in Beijing in rather simple terms. This was a publication strategy pursued by the intellectually modest *China-Bote*, although the more sophisticated *Chinese Recorder* also chronicled the Boxer crisis.²³ At another level, political and religious conflicts became intertwined. It is interesting to see, for example, that Richter's journal, despite reprinting the article about the martyrdom of the SPG missionary Brooks, was at the same time very critical of what it perceived as the SPG's "Anglocatholicism" – a concept that, in Richter's view, propagated the "spiritual expansion of the [British] empire," but in fact only led to injustice and prejudice.²⁴ And as if to confirm Richter's suspicions, some time later *The Mission Field* published the following resolution of the SPG's monthly meeting:

It is fairly certain that the native [Chinese] church will be a strong Church headed by capable native Bishops who will glory in Catholic antiquity. The English and the English Church must have a greater influence over them than any other form of Christianity.²⁵

At issue here was both the question of Anglican theology (was it Protestant at all?) and imperial rivalry between Britain and Germany.

Missionaries of the American Board, for their part, analyzed at length the political development in China, both in the *Herald* and the *Chinese Recorder*, and like the SPG they were largely supportive of their government's political and military representatives (and more critical of those of other countries).²⁶ Typically,

22 "The Outbreak in China," *Missionary Herald* 96 (1900), 308–309.

23 For example "Ein Unglückstag für China," *China-Bote* 9, no. 11 (1901): 85–86; "Soldatenbrief aus China," *China-Bote* 9 (1901): 86–87; "Li-hung-tschang," *China-Bote* 10, no. 5 (1901): 42; "Yuan-Schi-kai," *China-Bote* 10 (1901): 42–43; "Diary of Events in the Far East," *Chinese Recorder* 31 (1900): 377–378.

24 "Imperialismus und Kirche in England," *Die evangelischen Missionen* 7 (1901): 234.

25 "The Monthly Meeting," *The Mission Field* 47 (1902): 199. See also the remarks made at a meeting held on 22 November 1900 in Exeter Hall as cited in *The Mission Field* 46 (1901): 36.

26 See: H. Mathews, "Sidney Brooks' Martyrdom," *The Mission Field* 45 (1900): 167–170, 170. Mathews argued that the death of Brooks had been beneficial to missions in China in forcing the 'Western' diplomats to adopt measures to protect the missionaries. This passage was also reprinted in *Die Evangelischen Missionen*. The *Herald* began to trace developments early on, see: "A New Decree," *Missionary Herald* 95 (1899): 338–339. For its political attitude see, among others: Judson Smith, "The Situation in North China," *Missionary Herald* 96 (1900): 188–190, 189–190; Arthur H. Smith, "The Situation at Peking During the Last of May," *Missionary Herald* 96 (1900): 310–312, 311. See also: "Japan and 'Interference'," *Missionary*

political comments were not isolated from nor necessarily at odds with religious ones. Writing in the *Herald*, the secretary of the American Board, Judson Smith (1837–1906), attempted to reconcile the Christian and secular-progressive world-views by envisioning a future that “will reveal a new China, facing progress and learning and Western arts and the Christian faith; and *that* will be a new world, with a glorious destiny before it.”²⁷ In another article, however, Smith and his associate James L. Barton (1855–1936) juxtaposed the religious and political spheres, implying a hierarchy between the two:

[T]he outcome [of the Boxer War, T.K.] will be, not the heightened power of Russia or Germany, not the greater glory of England or America, but the deliverance and evangelisation of China’s millions, the prevalence of the Kingdom of God in all that populous Oriental world.²⁸

This was another example of how discussion of matters political was framed by the ultimate goal of China’s salvation.²⁹ Both martyrdom and deliverance were tokens of the ultimate purpose of mission work, which was other-worldly.

MISSIONARIES AND CHINESE CHRISTIANS

In an article published in 1992, James Hevia argued that missionary publications in the wake of the Boxer War were part and parcel of the overall Western discourse, and that missionaries were in favour of the symbolic punishment of China for its alleged wrongdoings. On the basis of the discourse on ‘Western civilisation’ versus Chinese ‘barbarism’, missionaries thus contributed to the ‘Othering’ of the Chinese.³⁰ Although the argument is compelling as far as it goes, Hevia does not take missionary periodicals into account, which may be responsible for his excluding from analysis of the ways by which one important strand within missionary discourse undercut the binary opposition between Chinese and ‘Westerners’: the demonstration of solidarity with Chinese Christians.

For most missionaries, the Boxers were “fiends in human shape,” to use a phrase by the missionary William Ament (1851–1909) published in the *Herald*.³¹ This left little room for a nuanced treatment of the movement. Yet the *China-Bote* published the account of a group of CIM missionaries’ encounters with Boxer

Herald 96 (1900): 385, which argued that ‘Western’ interference and Christianity had been beneficial to Japan, although that country had initially rejected them.

27 Judson Smith, “China, the Situation and the Outlook,” *Missionary Herald* 96, no. 11 (1900): 462–649, 462–463.

28 Judson Smith and James L. Barton, “Annual Survey of the Work of the American Board, 1899–1900,” *Missionary Herald* 96, no. 11 (1900): 448–461, 452.

29 A clear indication of this is the summary of the final agreement between China and the powers in September 1901 – the so-called ‘Boxer Protocol’ – in “Der Friedensvertrag,” *China-Bote* 10, no. 5 (1901): 43–44.

30 James L. Hevia, “Leaving a Brand on China: Missionary Discourse in the Wake of the Boxer Uprising,” *Modern China* 18 (1992): 304–332.

31 “Letters from the Mission: North China Mission,” *Missionary Herald* 96, no. 9 (1900): 361–363, 361.

groups who not only expressed human sentiments, but repeatedly spared their lives, although – it was alleged – for rather selfish motives.³² Descriptions such as these were not meant to exonerate the Boxers, rather, they supported an argument occasionally put forward that only a minority of the Chinese were opposed to Christian missions. A Miss Hartwell, for example, was quoted in the *Herald* as writing that it was not “the population at large” that was intent on killing foreigners, but “the evil elements, the many roughs who would rise and murder and loot their own people at any time, except as restrained by the authorities.”³³ The *China-Bote* translated an article by the renowned American missionary William Alexander Parsons Martin (1827–1916) to the effect that not the Chinese, but the Manchus who ruled them were responsible for the Boxer movement.³⁴ And Julius Richter argued in *Die evangelischen Missionen* that the Boxers were not a spontaneous popular movement, but had been instigated by Chinese magistrates.³⁵ This reasoning led one missionary faction to advocate for the punishment of the Chinese government and officialdom, although mission bodies seem to have been divided on this issue.³⁶ More importantly, the same reasoning provided an encouragement to resume evangelistic work, as the missionaries were not hated by everybody; likewise, it also lent itself to justification of the missionary enterprise, which I will address in the last section of this chapter.

More importantly, the way that the missionaries wrote about Chinese Christians created an element of transcultural solidarity. Missionaries praised the steadfastness and patient suffering of the converts. The *Chinese Recorder*, for example, published a letter by the American Presbyterian Mission in West Persia stating that:

We have remembered, too, our beloved Chinese brothers and sisters in Christ, to whom the baptism of fire and blood has come so soon after the in baptism with water. We rejoice with you in the steadfastness of their faith and love, and believe that their witness in enduring even unto death has proclaimed the gospel of Christ more effectually than could have been done by word.³⁷

Picking up on the theme of martyrdom, the veteran missionary Griffith John (1831–1912) echoed this language in stating that:

The converts in China have been getting their baptism of fire, and they have stood the test. [...] As the result of this fiery trial, we have in China to-day a purer, stronger, nobler church

32 “Abenteuer mit Boxern,” *China-Bote* 9 (1901): 74–76; 83–85. Interestingly, Paul Cohen has recently argued for a perspective that humanises the Boxers. See: Paul A. Cohen, “Humanizing the Boxers,” in *The Boxers, China, and the World*, eds. Robert Bickers and R. G. Tiedemann (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2007): 179–197.

33 “From Foochow,” *Missionary Herald* 96 (1900): 429. Though this letter was not sent from a more peaceful area in Southeast China, the argument is echoed by missionaries reporting from the hotbeds of Boxer activity.

34 “China und die Boxer,” *China-Bote* 9, no. 6 (1901): 45–46.

35 “Zur Lage in China,” *Die evangelischen Missionen* 8 (1902): 130–134, 130.

36 Arthur J. Brown, “Future Missionary Policy in China: A Notable Conference of Mission Secretaries,” *Chinese Recorder* 32 (1901): 398–405, 403.

37 “Letter of Sympathy,” *Chinese Recorder* 32 (1901): 94.

than we had before; we have a church of which we may well be proud, and of which we are proud.³⁸

Missionary periodicals also pointed out the heavy losses of life and property that had incurred. Of the sample under discussion here, the *Missionary Herald* was the one that went furthest in drawing practical consequences, calling for relief work among the Christians and reporting on fundraising activities for this purpose.³⁹ This perspective could be broadened, as both the *Herald* and the *China-Bote* alerted their readers that the famine that had been a cause of the Boxer movement in the first place continued even after the movements' suppression.⁴⁰

The treatment of Chinese Christians must nevertheless be qualified with a few caveats. First, it became more critical after the missionaries had begun to reoccupy their stations, only to discover that many Christians, contrary to what was expected of them, had indeed renounced their faith, if only in order to survive.⁴¹ Second, it must be noted that it was the missionaries who established the standards by which to judge the Chinese Christians. This reflected the patronising attitudes and the ultimately colonial character of Christian missions at the time.⁴² And finally, Catholic Christians were clearly excluded. Especially in the early phase, attacks on Catholic missions were carefully recorded in order to underline the Boxer threat – and, interestingly, Catholics were more often reported as having been killed than Protestants, which implied what was also sometimes made explicit: that the Boxers hated Catholics more.⁴³ This last point was also an element in the defensive strategy to which I now turn.

DEFENDING MISSIONS AGAINST THEIR CRITICS

The relief of the Beijing Legations quarter marked a remarkable shift in the international press coverage: Initially, the media had focused on the peril of the besieged 'Westerners' and on the legitimising the military intervention on their be-

38 "Dr. Griffith John's Address at the Annual Meeting of the Central China Religious Tract Society: Hankow, 11th January, 1901," *Chinese Recorder* 32 (1901): 128–129.

39 "Aid for Sufferers in China," *Missionary Herald* 96, no. 10 (1900): 384; "A Week of Prayer for China," *Missionary Herald* 96, no. 11 (1900): 428; "Gifts from Hawaii," *Missionary Herald* 96, no. 11 (1900): 426.

40 "Famine in China," *Missionary Herald* 96, no. 9 (1900): 344; "Notstand in Nordchina," *China-Bote* 9, no. 11 (1901): 87.

41 Frederick Jones, "After the Troubles in North China: An Account of the Shantung Missions," *The Mission Field* 47 (1902): 217–220, 218; "Zur Lage in China: Die evangelische Mission in Schantung," *Die evangelischen Missionen* 7 (1901): 181–186, 183.

42 For the colonial character of missions in general and in China see now: Thoralf Klein, "The 'Other' German Colonialism: Power, Conflict, and Resistance in a German-speaking Mission in China, c. 1850–1920", in: *Asian and African Responses to German Colonialism*, eds. Nina Berman, Klaus Mühlhahn and Patrice Nganang (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, forthcoming).

43 "Letters from the Missions. North China Mission," *Missionary Herald* 96 (1900): 361–363, 362.

half. With that danger removed, they gradually took notice of shortcomings on the 'Western' side – such as the atrocities committed by the intervention forces – and they began to reflect on what had made the crisis possible in the first place. As the Boxers had initially attacked missionaries and only later broadened their enemy image to include 'Westerners' and 'Western' civilisation in general, many commentators began to hold Christian missions responsible for the outbreak of hostilities. With their intellectual limitations, their ignorance of Chinese customs, their insensitivity to Chinese sensibilities, and their aggressive attacks on Chinese culture, missionaries were said to have constituted the single most important factor in the emergence of the Boxer movement. If it had not been for the missions, the argument went, 'Western' interests in China would not have been put in jeopardy.

Quite obviously, missionary periodicals could not ignore such charges, and indeed went to great lengths to refute them. They were, however, no sites for critical debate or public intervention. To reach a wider public, missionaries resorted to publishing articles in secular journals, or to writing pamphlets, with their access to media channels outside missionary periodicals always dependent on their status in society at large (which was arguably greatest in the U.S.).⁴⁴ Refutations in missionary periodicals were rather intended to immunise the supporters of the mission against critical reports they were likely to have read elsewhere. Indicative of this is the fact that the denunciations were often referred to rather vaguely and anonymously, and attributed to the hostile, secular press, which the *China-Bote* regarded as having become a "great power, which intelligent people in our days do not dispute," implying that its readers might have been exposed to the influence of newspapers and magazines.⁴⁵ Only a few outstanding critics, such as the British Prime Minister Lord Salisbury (1830–1903), and the famous American writer Mark Twain (1835–1910), were ever (although not always) mentioned by name.⁴⁶

44 For the general impact of American missionaries on U.S. society, see: Patricia Neils, "Introduction," in: *United States Attitudes and Policies Toward China: The Impact of American Missionaries*, ed. Patricia Neils (Armonk, NY: Sharpe, 1990): 3–22, 10–11; although her argument prioritises missionary periodicals. In the context of 1900, German missionaries seem to have found it more difficult to get access to the publication outlets used by their critics, so they had to resort to publish their refutations in the form of pamphlets. See: Ernst Miescher, *Die Mission, die Urheberin von Wirren* (Basel: Verlag der Missionsbuchhandlung, 1901), 6–8; Gustav Warneck, *Die chinesische Mission im Gerichte der deutschen Zeitungspressen* (Berlin: Martin Warneck, 1900).

45 "Gottes Wort bleibet," *China-Bote* 9, no. 2 (1900): 14–15, 15; see also: "China at the Front," *Missionary Herald* 96, no. 10 (1900): 388; Clement J. R. Allen, "A Layman's Defence of Missions in China," *The Mission Field* 46 (1901): 24–28, 24. Allen was a former British consul at Fuzhou.

46 For Mark Twain, see: "Editorial Comment," *Chinese Recorder* 32 (1901): 368–371, 369. For Lord Salisbury, see: Arthur J. Brown, "Future Missionary Policy in China: A Notable Conference of Mission Secretaries," *Chinese Recorder* 32 (1901): 398–405, 402; "Who is Responsible?" *Missionary Herald* 96, no. 10 (1900): 384; see: Allen, "A Layman's Defence", 24. Allen, in line with the *Field's* support of the government, was quick to point out that Salisbury had been properly misunderstood. A similarly careful interpretation of Salisbury, in

More important than listing the charges levelled against missions were the strategies of refuting them, of which there were several. First, the missionary periodicals discussed here argued that it was not 'Western' religion, but 'Western' civilisation that had been the target of the Boxer onslaught, leaving open the question of whether Christianity was or was not part of that civilisation.⁴⁷ Second, the authors of various contributions argued that missionaries were not only well-versed in Chinese culture; but further that missionaries had in fact made crucially important contributions to knowledge about China, and it was rather their critics who were ignorant of the situation of Christian missions.⁴⁸ In attempting to turn the tables on the critics, the *Chinese Recorder* went so far as to deny any difference of opinion between 'Western' merchants and missionaries regarding the way China should be treated, denying that missionaries (notwithstanding a few exceptions) had called for revenge on China – a catchphrase that was used not infrequently in the secular press.⁴⁹ Third, periodicals used the Catholics as scapegoats, arguing that the criticism applied to them and not to the Protestants. As the *Herald* argued, Catholic missionaries had successfully demanded direct access to the Chinese magistrates and had been placed on equal footing with them, which gave them a power that Protestant mission societies – not only those of the American Board – had renounced.⁵⁰ Pointing to the Catholics not only deflected criticisms from outside mission circles, it even structured how the relationship of missionaries was discussed in internal debates. This made it difficult for Protestant missionaries to acknowledge their own problematic role as local power brokers supported by the unequal treaties, creating a blind spot in Protestant discourse.⁵¹ Finally, missionaries lamented the atrocities committed by the Allied troops in China, even against Chinese Christians.⁵² To bolster their defence, some missionary periodicals also cited diplomats' and other laypeople's interventions in favour of

particular of his speech on the occasion on the 200th anniversary of the SPG, can be found in Miescher, *Die Mission, die Urheberin von Wirren*, 6.

47 "The Hostility of the Chinese," *Missionary Herald* 96, no. 8 (1900): 302; "Why the Chinese Are Aroused," *Missionary Herald* 96, no. 9 (1900): 347.

48 C. Maus, "Zur Abwehr," *China-Bote* 9, no. 2 (1900): 14; "Die evangelische Mission und ihre Ankläger," *China-Bote* 9, no. 10 (1901): 76.

49 "Editorial Comment," *Chinese Recorder* 32 (1901): 98–101, 99–100. The German Emperor exhorted his soldiers to "avenge" the death of the German minister and other 'Westerners', see: Sösemann, *Die sogenannte Hunnenrede*, 350; *The London Times*, July 17, 1900, 9, which spoke of a "righteous cry for vengeance."

50 "Roman Catholics in China," *Missionary Herald* 96, no. 11 (1900): 432. This explanation was used as early as April 1900. See: "The Riots in North China," *Missionary Herald* 96 (1900): 131. See also: Wm. Ashmore, "The 'Missionary Question'," *Chinese Recorder* 32 (1901): 484–492, 488–489.

51 A good example is Jacob Speicher, "The Relation of the Missionary to the Magistrates," *Chinese Recorder* 32 (1901): 391–398. For a good discussion of the problem as a whole see: Joseph Tse-hei Lee, *The Bible and the Gun: Christianity in South China, 1860–1900* (New York: Routledge, 2003).

52 "Zur Lage in China," *Die evangelischen Missionen* 8 (1902): 130–134, 131.

Christian missions in China, making it clear that support existed in society at large.⁵³

Nonetheless, missionary periodicals probably had their critics in mind when they reported on the most profoundly political question that mission societies faced in the wake of the Boxer War, namely whether or not they should accept indemnities for incurred damages. Most of the missionary periodicals simply stated that they would not demand any compensation for destroyed property of the missions and not even for the private property of the missionaries. Citing the China Inland Mission as an example, both *Die evangelischen Missionen* and *China-Bote* reported how such practical examples of loving one's neighbour earned missionaries the favour of some Chinese officials, who commended publicly the way that the foreign preachers lived up to Christian standards.⁵⁴

However, the material losses of the Christians were a different matter, and most journals once again evoked their plight as a justification for demanding indemnities, describing in detail how missionaries secured the help of local officials to negotiate settlements. It was what he perceived to be extortions on the part of the missionaries – partly on the basis of distorted information – that prompted Mark Twain to publish his famous article “To the person sitting in darkness” in the *North American Review*, in which he delivered a scathing critique not only of Christian missions, but of American imperialism in general.⁵⁵ With regard to Christian missions, he particularly criticised acts of ‘looting’ by the AMCFM missionary William Ament, a charge that the *Missionary Herald* and the *Chinese Recorder* promptly denied.⁵⁶

53 For example: “The Diplomats Concerning Missionaries in China,” *Missionary Herald* 96 (1900): 395–398; “Notes of the Month,” *The Mission Field* 47 (1902): 31–32; Allen, “A Layman’s Defence.”

54 Julius Richter, “Zur Lage in China,” *Die evangelischen Missionen* 8 (1902): 130–134, 132–133; “Entschädigungsfrage d. China-Inland-Mission,” *China-Bote* 10, no. 7 (1902): 55.

55 This debate appeared in purely secular periodicals. For background information see: Larry Clinton Thompson, *William Scott Ament and the Boxer Rebellion: Heroism, Hubris and the “Ideal Missionary”* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, 2009), 205–214. Mark Twain’s initial intervention referred to an article in the New York *Sun* quoting from an interview with ABCFM missionary William Ament. See: Mark Twain, “To the Person Sitting in Darkness,” *North American Review* 122 (1901): 161–176; Mark Twain, “To my Missionary Critics,” *North American Review* 122 (1901): 520–534. The same magazine published a rejoinder by ABCFM’s Judson Smith, “Missionaries and their Critics,” *North American Review* 122 (1901): 724–733. For further refutations in secular publications see: Gilbert Reid, “The Ethics of Loot,” *Forum* 31 (1901): 581–586; Gilbert Reid, “The Ethics of the Last China War,” *Forum* 32 (1901): 446–455.

56 Mark Twain, “To the person sitting in darkness,” 162–164; the term “looting” appears on page 163. For the reply see: “Looting by Missionaries,” *Missionary Herald* 97 (1901): 46, characteristically without mentioning Mark Twain’s name. By contrast, W. E. Smith, “Missionaries on Their Defence,” *Chinese Recorder* 32 (1901): 371–374, 372, makes direct reference to the debate initiated by Mark Twain. This article is an interesting example of intermediality, as it was obviously reprinted from the *Shanghai Mercury*, which in turn obtained it from its original source, an editorial comment in the *North China Daily News*. The text itself quotes a letter by renowned English-speaking missionaries in China. This intermedial flow

Characteristically, the *Chinese Recorder* featured a lengthy debate on the issue of indemnities, with the majority of the missionaries arguing in favour of compensation and justifying their position by a complex mixture of legal, political, economic and cultural considerations. One of the discussants, a Reverend Chalfant, gave the following reasons for advocating indemnities: the duty to uphold national honour and dignity, the principle of justice to the sufferer, the principle of justice of the investor (by which he meant the supporters of Protestant missions), the guarantee against recurrence of the offence (an argument that recurs prominently in other contributions to the debate), the responsibility of the Chinese central government for the atrocities, and finally the anti-foreign (and not anti-missionary) character of the Boxer movement.⁵⁷ Devello Z. Sheffield (1841–1913) of the ABCFM argued that Christian missions in China required the protection of their respective home governments. He not only pointed to China's treaty obligations, but also to the Christian rootedness in religious freedom, claiming that "the missionary is operating within the limits of his natural rights and is entitled to receive protection in their exercise from his government."⁵⁸ Politics was thus placed at the service of evangelisation. The only opponent was Bishop George Evans Moule (1828–1912) of the Church Missionary Society, who argued that although international law provided for the demand and acceptance of indemnities, missionary *policy* (!) and humanitarian considerations suggested a different course of action, one that aimed at winning favour from the local population.⁵⁹

It almost goes without saying that such debates, with their complex arguments and their recourse to legal, political and cultural discourses had no place in those missionary periodicals designed for communications between mission societies and their constituencies, as they might have weakened support from the home bases. In fact, the 'society periodicals' in particular refrained from portraying missionaries as political actors in their own right. Thus only *Die evangelischen Missionen* reported on the resolution of a meeting of several hundred missionaries in Shanghai in September 1901, which demanded not only the guarantee of the rights of both missionaries and Chinese Christians and the punishment of murderers, but also the reinstatement of the Guangxu emperor (who had been placed under house arrest in 1898 by his great-aunt, the Empress dowager and de facto ruler Cixi) on the throne. This was a political demand which had earlier contributed to

points to a relationship (and solidarity) between mission and non-mission publications that may have been greater in China than in the missionaries' home countries.

57 F. H. Chalfant, "An Argument for Indemnity," *Chinese Recorder* 31 (1900): 540–542.

58 D. Z. Sheffield, "Christian Missions in China Should Be Protected by Western Nations," *Chinese Recorder* 31 (1900): 544–547, 547. The other advocates of indemnity were G. A. Stuart, "The Demand for Indemnity," *Chinese Recorder* 31 (1900): 543–544; P. D. Bergen, "Remarks on the Subject of Securing Indemnity for Losses in Connection with Mission Work," *Chinese Recorder* 31 (1900): 548–550.

59 Bishop Moule, "Should Missionary Societies Claim Indemnities," *Chinese Recorder* 31 (1900): 537–540.

the escalation of the Boxer crisis in 1900 in the first place.⁶⁰ On the other hand, the restraint of most periodicals under discussion here may reflect the caution exercised by leaders of mission societies, which in turn impacted on those missionary periodicals that could afford a more open discussion of political matters. Characteristically, the *Chinese Recorder* reported on an interdenominational conference of mission secretaries in New York which had debated, among other topics, the relationship of Protestant missions vis-à-vis their governments. According to the report, several boards had been asked by their missionaries in China to protest against the proposed evacuation of Beijing by the Allied occupation troops and the return to power of the Empress Dowager, who was widely held responsible for the outbreak of the war and had fled Beijing for the safety of Northwest China. However, the conference unanimously declined to make such an appeal, although,

[s]ome of its members had decided convictions as to what the governments ought to do; but they held that it was not proper for missionary workers, as such, to proffer unasked advice to the government in a matter so distinctly within its sphere, nor were they willing to go on record as saying that an armed force is necessary to missionary interests anywhere.⁶¹

On the one hand, this statement suggests a separation of the political and religious spheres. On the other hand, there is a distinction here between political opinion, which is said to be permissible for mission societies, and political action, which clearly is not. The limitations proposed for missionary involvement in political decision-making imply again that while missionary periodicals did not abstain from politics altogether, what mattered was the Christian framework into which political issues could be integrated.

CONCLUSION

In his cultural theory of communication, James Carey has distanced himself from a conventional understanding that focuses on the transmission of information. Instead, he has put forward a ritual approach that views communication not as "imparting information but [as] the representation of shared beliefs" that manifests itself in "the construction and maintenance of an ordered, meaningful cultural world that can serve as a control and container for human action."⁶² Carey goes on to write:

60 "Neuste Nachrichten," *Die evangelischen Missionen* 7 (1901): 24. For the original document see: "Resolutions adopted at an International Meeting of over 400 Missionaries, representing some 20 Societies, held in Shanghai, September 7, 1900," in *British Documents on Foreign Affairs. Reports and Papers from the Foreign Office Confidential Print. Part I, Series E: Asia, 1860–1914*, ed. Ian Nish (Frederick, Md: University Publications of America, 1993): 238–239. See also the time lag. The "latest news" from China were almost half a year old.

61 Arthur J. Brown, "Future Missionary Policy in China: A Notable Conference of Mission Secretaries," *Chinese Recorder* 32 (1901): 398–405, 403.

62 Carey, *Communication as Culture*, 18.

News reading, and writing, is a ritual act and moreover a dramatic one. What is arrayed before the reader is not pure information but a portrayal of the contending forces in the world. Moreover, as readers make their way through the paper, they engage in a continual shift of roles or of dramatic focus. ... The model here is not that of information acquisition, though such acquisition occurs, but of dramatic action in which the reader joins a world of contending forces as an observer at a play. We do not encounter questions about the effect or functions of messages as such, but the role of presentation and involvement in the structuring of the reader's life and time. We recognise, as with religious rituals, that news changes little and yet is intrinsically satisfying; it performs few functions yet is habitually consumed. Newspapers do not operate as a source of effects or functions but as dramatically satisfying, which is not to say pleasing, presentations of what the world at root is. ... Under a ritual view, then, news is not information but drama.⁶³

If Carey attributes a (quasi-)religious dimension to the secular press – he emphasises the common roots of the terms ‘commonness’, ‘communion’, ‘community’ and ‘communication’ and speaks of newspaper reading as of “attending a mass”⁶⁴ – the case should be even clearer in the case of missionary periodicals. These were part of the concerted communication strategy of missionaries and their societies to keep in touch with their home constituencies, on whose contributions their work depended and who demanded to be kept abreast of developments in the mission field.⁶⁵ There existed thus a link between religion and reporting on the mission field that was not metaphorical, but real.

Missionary periodicals thus reflect and even dramatise – in Carey's sense – the fundamental conflicts that missionaries and their supporters saw active in the world: the struggle between the dichotomies of forces of ‘darkness’ and ‘light’, God and Satan, Christianity and paganism and/or modern atheism. Politics is covered within this framework. Rather than being interesting per se, it is a means to an end, and the question is always to what extent it furthers the Kingdom of God.

This explains the unique way that missionary periodicals, notwithstanding their different degrees of political understanding, covered the Boxer War as opposed to most other media. To begin with, martyrdom became a central element of missionary discourse right from the beginning (and not necessarily posthumously), both legitimising the past efforts as well the present sacrifice and guaranteeing a brighter future. With regard to the latter, it became possible to reconcile the secular – in the widest sense political – with the ultimate goal of salvation in conjuring up a rejuvenated China that would be progressive and ‘Western’ *as well as* Christian. Although some missionary periodicals were openly supportive of their respective national governments (and sometimes critical of other nations and their policies), missionary periodicals generally privileged the Kingdom of God over secular interests.

63 Carey, *Communication as Culture*, 20–21.

64 Carey, *Communication as Culture*, 18, 20.

65 Lodwick, “Hainan for the Homefolk”, 97; Lawrence D. Kessler, “‘Hands Across the Sea’: Foreign Missions and Home Support,” in *United States Attitudes and Policies Toward China: The Impact of American Missionaries*, ed. Patricia Neils (Armonk, NY: Sharpe, 1990): 78–96.

Second, missionary dichotomised thinking could easily merge with a political discourse that postulated the struggle of an isolated China that had relapsed into 'barbarism.' And there is no doubt that missionaries' political interventions built on and contributed to this binarism.⁶⁶ But they took place outside missionary periodicals. In their 'internal' coverage, missionaries again emphasised the dichotomy between Christianity and paganism. The ideational solidarity of missionaries (including their societies and, it was inferred, their supporters) could be used for practical ends, in particular to raise funds for Christians in need. There was probably also some strategic thinking behind the way the suffering of Chinese Christians in 1900 was portrayed in the missionary periodicals. The growing criticism of the Chinese Christians' conduct during the persecution is thus due to two reasons: As the missionaries returned to their stations, they received more reliable information; moreover, as the storm had passed, the concern for Christians and hence the emphasis on Christian suffering and uprightness dwindled. The withering away of this discursive pattern made other aspects once again both 'articulable' and 'visible'.⁶⁷ On the other hand, missionary discourse on Christians was generally complex. Depending on the situation, missionary reports and publications could either elaborate on the contrast between 'good' Christians and 'bad' 'heathens', distinguish between 'good' and 'bad' Christians or portray all Christians as deficient, pointing to their entanglement with their native culture.⁶⁸

Against this backdrop, politics could come to be viewed as a disturbing influence. From the missionary point of view, the debate on the conduct of missionaries and their responsibility for the outbreak of the war was forced on the mission from the outside. The *Missionary Herald*, for example, spoke of an "assault upon missionary work."⁶⁹ Critics of evangelisation in China, the argument went, acted out of either ignorance or ill-will. This is reflected in missionary periodicals, with the obvious aim to immunise the missionary constituencies at home against information received through other media. To this end, other binarisms could be activated. In addition to the contrast between the missions and their discontents, the Protestants sought to exploit the divide separating them from the Catholics.

That politics was thus an integral part of missionary periodicals' coverage of the Boxer War will come as no surprise. However, politics was always refracted through the prism of a specific Christian worldview that invariably prioritised the sacred over the secular. The former referred to the Kingdom of God, the latter to the affairs of men, which were to be judged by the extent to which they furthered the spread of the Gospel. This made it possible for some mission societies and

66 See: Hevia, "Leaving a Brand on China."

67 For the complex relationship between the articulable and the visible see: Gilles Deleuze, *Foucault*, trans. Séan Hand (London: Continuum, 2006), 43–57 and *passim*.

68 See: Thoralf Klein, "The Basel Mission as a Transcultural Organization: Photographs of Chinese Christians and the Problem of Agency," in *Getting Pictures Right: Context and Interpretation*, ed. Michael Albrecht et al. (Köln: Köppe, 2004): 39–56, 40. For a contemporary differentiation, albeit one that employs different criteria, see: F. Ohlinger, "Our Three Classes of Converts", *Chinese Recorder* 32 (1901): 352–356.

69 "China at the Front," *Missionary Herald* 96 (1900): 388.

their periodicals to seem to lend their support to the respective national governments. Nevertheless, the relationship between missionaries on the one hand and policy-makers as well as some influential opinion shapers on the other hand was always fragile. Although mission and imperialism were linked through an elective affinity, their relationship was and remained complex.