never been tempted nor prompted to say any thing falsely against the said Mr. Pepys by the said Member. This is all that is thought fit to say of this Matter at Present.

Whereas by the *Mercurius Anglicus* of March 17, 1679, it is reported, That the Information given by John James to the late Parliament, against his Master Samuel Pepys Esq; had been delivered in by him upon Oath; this is by the express desire of the said John James before his death, to give notice, That he never did make Oath to the same; the whole of the said Information being untrue, as (for the disburthening his Conscience before his death) he has sufficiently testified under his Hand, and confirmed by his receiving the blessed Sacrament thereon. Of which he did desire this Publication, for preventing any endeavours of representing his other Errors more criminal, by the addition of Perjury.

ROGER P. MCCUTCHEON.

3. **THE FIRST REMISSION OF THE BOXER INDEMNITY**

The published documents regarding the first remission of a portion of the Boxer Indemnity by the United States and China’s use of these funds for the education of Chinese students in the United States are well known. The questions as to the origin of the plan, the men who were behind it, and the decision to use the funds for education are not thoroughly understood either in China or in the United States.

There were several precedents for America’s action. On two previous occasions the United States had remitted surplus indemnity funds to Oriental powers, $785,000 to Japan in 1883, and $453,000 to China in 1885.

The earliest suggestion that remitted indemnity funds be used for education that I have found is attributed to Anson Burlingame, American minister at Peking. About the year 1865 he proposed to establish a college in Peking with the surplus of the indemnity which was actually returned to China in cash twenty years later. Meantime, in 1872, the Chinese government itself, quite independently of any indemnity funds, had launched the first Chinese Educational Mission to the United States under the guidance of Yung Wing, a plan which lasted for less than ten years. Again in 1902 the sum of $376,000 which had been seized by American troops in Tientsin in 1900 was restored to China.

The Boxer Indemnity was on a much larger scale than any of these. It totalled over $333,000,000 gold, with interest at 4 per cent., payable in installments during thirty-nine years. The American government was of the opinion that China was being burdened with a debt greater than she could pay without financial disaster and consequent loss of independence and territorial integrity, greater too than
the actual losses of the powers concerned. Throughout the negotiations at Peking in 1900 and 1901 the American government urged the powers to reduce the total amount of the indemnity, and stood ready to reduce its own claims, if the rest would do likewise. It was unsuccessful in this effort, however. No nation except the United States has ever admitted that it had any surplus, even though some others have remitted indemnity funds to China as a mark of friendship.

Very soon after 1901 it became known that the losses of American citizens and the cost of the naval and military expeditions sent by the United States to protect its citizens did not amount to more than half of the $24,440,000 of indemnity which China was required to pay to the United States. Those engaged in diplomatic, missionary, and educational work in China and America began at once to expect the return of the surplus. That this was the real intention of the American government in 1900 is revealed in a statement by Mr. Stafford in Congress in 1908. He says, "I am told by Secretary Root, who was present at a meeting between President McKinley and Secretary Hay to determine this nation's policy in joining with the other nations in exacting punitive damages from the Chinese Empire, that it was never intended that this government should retain this indemnity".

Dr. Jeremiah W. Jenks once told me that as early as 1905 he had talked with President Roosevelt about the possibility of remitting the indemnity and that the President had told him that the plan was already under consideration. Dr. Jenks said that the idea of using the money for educational purposes had been suggested by several different persons, Gilbert Reid for one, but that he, Professor Jenks, had urged that the money be devoted to assisting China to adopt the gold standard.

Education, however, soon proved to be the more popular claimant for these funds. Several events in the year 1906 influenced the project. Harvard, Yale, and Wellesley began offering scholarships to Chinese students. President James of the University of Illinois wrote a memorandum, which was submitted to the President of the United States and privately circulated, which advocated inviting Chinese students to American schools and colleges. Of still greater importance than these was the interview of Dr. Arthur H. Smith with President Roosevelt at the White House on March 6 of that year. Dr. Smith took it for granted that the indemnity would be returned to China some day, but in order to prevent the squandering

of the money, he strongly recommended that it should be designated for education.  

The documents published in the series *Foreign Relations* tell of the parts played by Roosevelt, Root, and Rockhill, but make no mention of Hay's ideas. Mr. Stafford's statement, quoted above, is the only published reference I have found to Hay's part in the plan. For a long time I was puzzled to know why the Chinese generally gave the credit to John Hay and their own minister in Washington.

My puzzle was solved when I discovered in the archives of Tsing Hua College, Peking, a file of copies of official correspondence of the Chinese Board of Foreign Affairs relating to the college. These letters contain a fuller account of the diplomatic negotiations than the *Foreign Relations* series. They give us the earliest discussions between Secretary Hay and Minister Liang, the Chinese minister at Washington, regarding the remission, and attribute to Liang the plan to use the money for education.

The first official intimation that the American government might be willing to remit a part of its share of the Boxer Indemnity appears in the first letter of the series, written, evidently, in December, 1904. Minister Liang was appealing to Secretary Hay to help to secure for China a more favorable exchange rate on the Boxer Indemnity payments to all the powers. He mentioned China's financial difficulties and the danger of anti-foreign feeling if the taxes were increased, and, as Hay had always stood for the principle of helping others, asked for help for China. Liang's letter says: "I saw that he was speaking more freely or perhaps not quite so unyieldingly, so I suggested that if each country should reduce the amount of indemnity it would be of great benefit to China's finances. 'If your honorable country would take the lead, wherever the voice of righteousness spread, those countries would rise and follow it.' Hay answered, 'What the Honorable Minister has said is quite reasonable. I will try my best to plan for you.'"

Hay did propose the scheme to the President. Minister Liang made speeches on the proposal. The American minister to China was in Washington conferring with the Chinese minister. Minister Liang's letter reporting these facts was received in Peking on May 15, 1905. It contains also the first official suggestion to use the money for education. "Rockhill says that the President . . . would like to know whether the remitted money would be given to the people or used for some other purpose. . . . It seems appropriate for us to inform the American government that this indemnity should be re-

---

mitted for the purpose of establishing schools and sending students to study abroad."

Minister Liang's arguments for this plan are that it would furnish a satisfactory answer to the President's question, would win public approval both in the United States and in China, would greatly benefit China's development, would be a pleasing example to set before the other powers which might be thinking of remitting indemnity, and would hasten the action of the American government. There is no evidence that the plan was in any way forced on Minister Liang, or even first suggested by American diplomats.

The next letter in the series came from the famous Yuan Shih-K'ai, who was at that time viceroy of North China. His suggestion was, "China's needs are numerous. Let the money be used first for railways and mines and the profits on these go to building schools". The Board of Foreign Affairs replied to the powerful viceroy that "because of the recent difficulties over the Canton-Hankow Railroad, China's motives might be suspected if she used this money for railroads now."

In a letter received in Peking in November, 1905, Minister Liang reports a conversation with President Roosevelt after the death of John Hay, in which the President agrees to carry out Hay's plan, and suggests that the Chinese minister take the matter up with Root, the new secretary of state. Thus we see that the plan was well started before the death of Hay.

One event which served to delay the project was the discussion by the diplomats of a new immigration treaty, and another was the Chinese boycott of American goods in the years 1905 and 1906. It was not until June 15, 1907, that Secretary Root wrote his well-known note to the Chinese minister in which he declared that it was the intention of the President to recommend to Congress that the surplus of the indemnity be returned to China.

President Roosevelt did this in his message to Congress of December 3, 1907, adding significantly enough in the next paragraph the recommendation that Chinese students be encouraged to come to American universities. Minister Liang wrote later that American opinion generally approved of this plan.

He also quoted an English newspaper as saying: "America received $15,000,000 from England on an uncertain claim. If America received less than the agreed indemnity from China, England should ask for a recalculation of the Alabama claims."
The form in which the bill passed Congress, May 25, 1908, made it possible for the President to satisfy himself that the money would be used for the benefit of the Chinese people, before he remitted a dollar. Over $10,000,000 was to be returned to China “at such time and in such manner as the President shall deem just”.

There are no records to show that the United States imposed any specific conditions as to the use of these funds. The details of the educational scheme were worked out by the Board of Foreign Affairs. The legation in Peking approved the plan submitted in December, 1908, and the remissions began in January, 1909. The details of the negotiations in Peking between Minister Rockhill and the Board of Foreign Affairs have never been made public. But the published documents ⁴ show that China expressed her deep gratitude, left the time and manner of the remission entirely to the American government, and apparently quite voluntarily stated her intention of using the money for the education of Chinese students in the United States. This was done as an expression of her appreciation of the friendliness of the American government. It was in accordance with the recently expressed desire of the President to welcome Chinese students to American universities, and with the advice of Minister Liang to the Board of Foreign Affairs in 1905, to the effect that such a use would please both the United States and China.

CARROLL B. MALONE.

⁴ For. Rel., 1907, 1908; Tsing Hua correspondence.